James Devine

What is 'simple labour'? A re-examination of the value-creating capacity of skilled labour

...In his seminal critique, Böhm-Bawerk (1896) dismissed Marx’s reduction of the value-creating capacity (VCC) of skilled labour to that of unskilled labour as tautological. This ‘reduction problem’ challenges Marx’s law of value in its core. But Hülsering’s (1986) influential reply favouring the VCC of skilled labour as the sum of the unskilled labour done in the past to create skills is well doubtful. Harvey (1985), Scott (1985) and others have denounced Hülsering’s ‘solution’.

This paper aims to rethink the ‘reduction,’ to defend the law of value. First, in terms of method, the ‘problem’ is merely one of refining core concepts of value (see part 1). So the gap turns out to be very simple: Böhm-Bawerk’s critique, though accurate, is beside the point. So we can move on to using value (socially necessary abstract labour time) 1 in itself to understand capitalism as a social system rather than to criticise definitions of calculate prices. Next, in part 2, Marx’s writings are re-examined, especially those on ‘simple labour’. His confusion of ‘simple-average’ labour with ‘unskilled’ labour is one source of the problem of the reduction. Simple labour should be emphasised and treated as equivalent to skilled. Further, Marx’s discussion indicates that differentics in VCC are socially determined at the time of the product’s sale. However, once

Examining the conceptual controversy over the meaning of ‘simple labour’, the author argues for an approach which distinguishes between simple, average and marginal labour. These distinctions are used to shed light on processes within the working class of the accumulation process.
Two cheers for tautology?

The aversion to tautology and circular reasoning is hardly startling in this age of Popperian positivism. It is now common to reject a theory as tautological, i.e., empirically or logically untestable. This 'scientific method' is an antidote to faith-based thinking, as with the Cambridge critique of neoclassical capital theory. Similarly, much of Chicago school 'laissez-faire economics' should be rejected as a seemingly seamless web of tautologies.

However, we cannot take Popperian positivism too far. While appropriate for developed theories, it does not apply to basic concepts. As Lukacs (1970) argues, each 'scientific research program' has its 'hard core' concepts and axioms that are immune to falsification. Just as Marxism has basic value categories, neoclassicals have utility maximization. Indeed, falsificationism is itself a core concept, hardly subject to falsification. And to reject core concepts is to embark on the road to sterile empiricism or naive falsificationism.1

A key difference between paradigms concerns the goals and uses of the various sets of tautologies. The Marxist value categories reflect an antithetical world-view to that of the neoclassicals. As Sweezy (1975: xxii) argues, Böhm-Bawerk and the neoclassicals have a utilitarian and unvaried view; they presume that Marx pursued the same aims as they, such as the derivation of prices. But Hilferding (as with other Marxists) had a social and historical perspective, seeing value as 'the bond uniting an atomized society' (1904: 133).

Marxist analytical, philosophical, and political goals are clearly distinct from those of the neoclassics. While core concepts are not revocable, the principle of parsimony must be applied: we should try to get as much as possible in the way of understanding, explanation, and even

measures of VCC turn out to be weak in understanding the dynamics of labour under capitalism. Finally, in part 3, the VCC is linked to the 'New Solution' to the transformation problem and this paper's conclusions are summarized.

It should be stressed from the outset that the subject is not the value of labour-power (the capacity to work) but the wage of that labour-power to create value.3 Thus relative wages are not the issue. Rather, it is the core concepts of the law of value.
prediction from core concepts. As much as possible of our theories should be subject to falsification. After all, having avoided the empiricist road, we do not want to become mired in pure formalism, the leisure of the theory class (a 'degenerative research program').

The discussion of skill coefficients below may seem reminiscent of Chicago taxonomies about 'human capital'; for that school, one worker is paid more than another despite equal education, IQ etc., because of unmeasurable elements of human capital such as 'character'. The employer (or the market) is the only judge of human capital: no independent scale such as measures of comparable worth can be used. So the theory is not falsifiable.

The obvious distinction between that theory and ex post the skill coefficient calculus is that the latter is not a theory of wages. But more fundamentally, there is a difference of goals. The Chicago school aims to defend the 'free market,' against comparable worth and similar proposals. The skill coefficient calculus has an entirely different role.

What, then, is this role? For Marx, the 'mediation' of skilled to simple labour — which, as seen below, is part of the theoretical rejection of wage — was just the prelude of the law of value. Unlike the Ricardian system, this law is not primarily a price theory. It is an accounting framework for understanding capitalism as a social system. Once such has been isolated, it is used to answer the following twin questions:

A. Where do profits come from? (exploitation)
B. How are prices determined? Why do they deviate from values? (comparative)
C. How are prices connected to values, require this deviation? (socialized production)
D. Why and how are profits distributed among capitalists? (individual appropriation and unequal exchange)
E. How is the class nature of capitalism obscured by the capitalist competition? (commodity fetishism)
F. What are the laws of motion of the system? (accumulation, the contradiction between socialized production and individual appropriation)

My use of the law of value to answer these questions appears elsewhere (Devine, 1989). The present paper suggests further that the simple/skilled distinction helps us understand
relations within the working class in the process of capitalist accumulation and class struggle, with other institutions such as the family. But as this paper aims only to refine core concepts, it can only be the prelude to science. This may help with explanation and other goals of political economy. But this is left for future papers and other authors.

Simple labor and skill coefficients

To double the reduction problem, three steps are posited. First, the nature of the basic unit is discovered: what is Marx's 'simple labour.' Second, a simple accounting framework relating skilled and simple labour is set up. Third, the determination of skill coefficient is discussed.

What is simple labour? What, we must ask, is this creature that Marx called 'simple labour'? It is work which any average individual can be trained to do . . . . (Marx, 1970: 31). As for an image of some high-school student working at a fast food joint springs to mind. But they realize that by the standards of five centuries ago that worker might be skilled, if such comparisons are possible, since the content of skill has changed so much. We thus agree with Marx's statement that 'simple average labour . . . varies in character in different countries and at different times' (1967a: 44, cf. 1970: 51).

Note also that the 'average individual' must be trained to do simple labour. Thus, this labour is hardly an indivisible atom, which forms a building block for the more abstract molecules of skilled labour. Nor is it 'zero-skill labour,' akin to 'zero-skill land.' A newborn infant, who has yet to be trained, is not a worker.

Those are: vital strikes against Habermas's embodied-labour interpretation of skilled labour. The simple labour 'embodied' last year in today's skilled labour may be quite different in kind from simple labour done today, since societal standards have changed. Indeed, for Marx, 'accidental circumstances . . . play such a large part that these two forms of labour (skilled and unskilled) sometimes change places' (1967a: 197–86).

The disparity between today's simple labour and past simple labour is also one of magnitude: there is nothing to guarantee that the same number of hours of today's simple labour is needed to produce a skilled prototype machinist as it took last year with the simple labour of the day. As with fixed capital valuation, current reproduction costs usually vary
from historical costs. This issue cannot be assumed away, since capitalism is inherently dynamic, with skill content and requirements changing frequently and often unnoticeably. We do not live in an equilibrium unison such as that of the neoclassicals or the Stabilitans.

The trouble with a embodied-labour method becomes clearer in the following:

Skilled labour counts as simple labour intensified, or, rather, as multiplied simple labour. . . . The different proportions in which different sorts of labour are reduced to unskilled labour as their standard, are established by a social process that goes on behind the backs of producers. . . . (Marx, 1967a: 44)

'Reduction' is a societal process appearing to be fixed by custom. There is no historical story of the accumulation of simple labour into stocks of skill carried by skilled workers.

So far, so good. But within the passage a crucial ambiguity arises with the slip of a single word. At first, simple labour was referred to as 'average' labour. But the passage ends by bringing in 'unskilled' labour. Later in Capital, the two are combined as 'simple, unskilled labour of average quality' (1967a: 198). Herein lies a problem that Bobo-Bawack and later authors mixed: unskilled labour is quite distinct from average labour. This confusion is the basis for the confusion in this literature.

Diagram I contrasts average and 'unskilled' labour using a hypothetical frequency distribution. As noted, 'unskilled' labour is not just skill labour but has at least a socially-determined minimum (SDM) of skill: a century ago children were to work for pay at a much earlier age than they do today; in most of today's underdeveloped countries, the starting work age is still low. The SDM is determined historically by the vicissitudes of capitalist accumulation and class struggle, along with such organizations as the family. Though it changes over time, the SDM can be known with reasonable approximations in any period.

Unskilled labour might be identified with 'marginal' labour, at the SDM. Despite Marx, this clearly differs from the social average. In his time, it may have not been very wrong to equate marginal labour and average labour, if the frequency distribution was skewed to the left. He asserts that 'statistical
Diagram 1: Marginal vs. Average Skill Levels
data show that the 'greatest part of the labour performed in bourgeois society is simple labour' (1970: 311) and predicts that labour will become more homogenous and of lower skill (the famous des-skill theory). Either way, marginal and average labour are similar. It is not a gross error to combine them, and can be seen as a first approximation for some purposes. But it is an error all the same. No matter how skewed the distribution, marginal and average labour differ, except in the relevant case where all workers are at the SDM.

Which of these should we use for computations of degrees of skill? The average is suggested by its dominant role in Marx's method in Capital, volume 1. For example, he defines socially necessary labour-time as 'that required to produce an article under the normal conditions of production and with the average degree of skill and intensity of labour prevalent in the time' (1967a: 39). Further, in his discussion of the labour process:

... labour should be carried on under normal conditions

... then again, the labour-power itself must be of average efficacy. In the trade to which it is being employed, it must possess the average skill, hardiness and quickness prevalent in that trade... This power must be applied with the average amount of exertion and with the usual degree of intensity... (1967a: 56)

The use of averages is part of Marx's study of the totality of capitalist production, by examining the typical microcosm. His volume 1, he focuses on 'representations of economic categories, embodiments of particular class-relationships and class-interests' (1967a: 30). The many differences between workers and the relations among segments of their class were left, it seems, for the never-written volume on Wage Labour. To Marx, relations within the working class, including those between skilled and unskilled workers, are not essential to understanding exploitation and the dynamics of capitalist accumulation and class conflict, the main topics of Capital.

Not only is the method of averages preferred, but there is a clear link between simple labour and obsolete labour. Marx's paragraph on the 'reduction problem' in Capital turns with abstract labour, 'the expenditure of human labour in general' or labour, 'expenditure of simple labour-power which, on an average,
apart from any special development, exists in the organization of every ordinary individual" (1867a: 44). Again we see the emphasis on averages. In sum, the so-called 'reduction problem' is part of Marx's distinction between abstract and concrete labour, the abstraction from all but the shared characteristics of the diverse labourers (1867a: 44-45). Crucially, simple labour is abstract labour. More correctly, as seen below, simple labour is **not** defined as just in exchange.

An Accounting Framework. Next, we must break with Holloway's additive approach in favor of Marx's multiplicative view (skilled labour comes only as many multiplied simple labour . . . .). This suggests a different mathematical relationship than the presented below.

Marx's comment above that skilled labour is simple labour intensifies suggests that VCC is analogous to labour intensity. But there is a difference: intensity is defined in terms of labour done per hour of labour-power sold, the 'corporation of a greater mass of labour into a given period' (1867a: 410; cf. p. 525). This refers to greater expenditure of human muscles, nerves, brain, etc. per hour, similar to common notions of 'effort'.

On the other hand, VCC refers to the effectiveness of such effort.

This distinction suggests the following equation for the value created (VCC) by labour-power $X$:

$$VCC = VCC_i \cdot LP$$

(1)

where $VCC$ is value-creation per hour of labour, $i$ is intensity (hours of labour actually done per hour of labour-power hired), and $LP$ is hours of labour-power $X$ hired.

To Marx, intensity was relevant only if it differed from the average:

The value created varies with the extent to which the intensity of labour deviates from its normal intensity in the society (1867a: 525-5). If the intensity of labour were to increase simultaneously and equally in every branch of industry, then the new and higher degree of intensity would become the normal degree for the society, and would thenceforth cease to be taken account of (1867a: 525)

If so, the average worker's labour intensity should equal unity:

$$i = 1$$

so that $VCC = VCC \cdot LP$. 
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Second, the value-creating capacity of an hour of labour $X$ is

$$VCC_X = \sigma_X VCC_0$$

(2)

where $VCC_0$ is the VCC of an hour of the average worker’s labour time and the skill coefficient $\sigma_X$ is a positive number. Since there can be no negative skill, $\sigma_X > 0$. The skill coefficient for marginal labour is less than unity. Unskilled labour might be defined as that labour for which $\sigma < 1$. Similarly, “skilled” labour might be defined as above-average labour. Thus for the social determination of notions of skilled and unskilled.

Combining (1) and (2) gives

$$VCC_X = \sigma_X VCC_0, \epsilon, LP_e$$

(3)

Note that equation (2) implies that $\sigma_X = 1$. Thus, similar to intensity, only the deviation of $\sigma$ from the norm are relevant. Similarly, set $VCC_0$ equal to unity.

To understand the problem of different conceptions of skill coefficients, develop the formula for the rate of surplus value. Assume that the value of an hour of $X$’s labour-power is $W_X$ small per hour. So the rate of surplus value for worker $X$ is defined as:

$$RSV_X = \left(1 - \frac{W_X}{W_Y}\right) \epsilon, LP_e$$

(4)

Similarly, for the average worker:

$$RSV = \left(1 - \frac{W_Y}{W_X}\right) \epsilon, LP_e$$

(5)

Thus $RSV_X = RSV$, if and only if

$$\epsilon, \sigma_X = \frac{W_X}{W_Y}$$

(6)

Rates of surplus value are equated if and only if worker $X$’s relative value of labour-power reflects that worker’s intensity and skill relative to the average exactly. Adam Smith’s theory of compensating differences may apply (as Marx assumed) at one point (1967: 142).

Skill Coefficients. What, then, determines the skill coefficients of different labour? There are at least five options:

1. Historical cost (Hölzinger); $\sigma$ are current labour cost of commodities, relative wages or values of labour-power, and $\epsilon, \sigma$; definition in exchange. Below I argue that the last two diverge views but that the other options are of the most use.
Hörding's historical-cost method is subject to Harry's critique (1985: 96–98). Briefly, if historical costs determine both sides of equation (6), there is no reason for the equation to be true. In addition, we have the criticisms above.

The second conception is the ex-ante current-cost method of finding skill coefficients. Here, the value creation of a skilled worker's unit of labour-power \( x_t \) is set equal to the value creation of the number of hours of average labour-power \( x_L \) needed to produce the same use-value. If the intensity of worker \( X \) 's work \( x_t \) is known, then \( x_t \) can be calculated using the following:

\[
\sigma_t = 1 + \frac{x_t}{x_L}.
\]

(7)

Even without this knowledge, \( x_t \) and \( x_L \) can be calculated.

Ex-ante skill coefficients are more consistent with the law of value than are historical-cost coefficients. A commodity's value \( x_L \) is the amount of labour-time actually used to produce it, the labour actually and historically 'embodied' in the product (as in the Ricardoian tradition). Labour's physical productivity may have changes since the object was made – so that less labour is now required to reproduce it than before (Marx, 1967a: 19–40). This contrast with 'ex-ante' training implies the case of 'supply-side' valorization of skill during the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century. For example, technical change allowed the replacement of skilled craft-workers by unskilled operators. The skilled workers found that their value-creating capacity was decreased as a result.

But this ex-ante framework is deeply flawed: the VCC of workers producing Apple computers cannot be compared to that of those producing orange crates (different use-values are not quantitatively comparable). Further, the skill of a production engineer and an assembly line worker may be incomparable since the former may be as poor on the line as the latter is at engineering. The ex-ante method is more applicable to true-series comparisons in the same sector than in the cross-sector. Even this falls short as the nature or quality of the work changes over time.

More fundamentally this solution assumes that labour is directly social, i.e., that the extent of value creation can be known ex-ante. Marx's critique of notions of 'labour-money' (1977a: 94n, 1970: 81–86; 1955: 620) suggest that we cannot know the VCC before commodities exchange. It is exchange-
that proves the value-creation. Marx put it in The Poverty of Philosophy:

"Is your boot's labour worth mine? That is a question which is decided by competition. Competition... determines how many days of simple labour are contained in one day's compound labour." (1855–56).

In Capital, he equated the values created by different labourers:

'A commodity may be the product of the most skilled labour, but its value, by equating it to the product of simple... labour, represents a definite quantity of the latter labour alone' (1867a: 44).

So the ex ante method is fundamentally flawed.

Sometimes relative values of labour-power (wages) or wages are used to define relative value-creating capacities. Using the former works only if we assume that the RSP is the same for all workers. Thus we can read equation (60) from right to left, with the relative value of labour-power defining $a_k$ and $a$. Using wages requires the further assumption that wages are proportional to the values of labour-power.

Either way, there are several problems. First, there is no textual indication that Marx followed this solution, which in essence makes exiled value-creation an automatic reality of being paid more. He discussed the reduction problem far before wages or the value of labour-power were treated (cf. 1867a: 44 n2). Second, this solution applies only when the theory of compensating differences applies. Finally, as above, this assumes that labour is directly social.

Moreover, the fourth, ex post version, seems to fit Marx's view better. It is seldom noted that for Marx, commodity demand has a role in making labour socially necessary. If the market "cannot stomach" as much as labour produced, some labour turns out to be wasteful ex post and does not form part of value (1867a: 104). So the YCC of a worker's time is not directly social but is only proven in the market place. Though the production of use-value (concrete skill) is necessary to YCC, it is not sufficient. Further, though differences in skill appear to be determined by costum (as Marx puts out in reality, it is the market test which is decisive under capitalism. Thus, 'demographic deviation' of skill can occur. The market may not be sufficient to 'stomach' all of product of
skills’ makers of buggy-whips. More crudely, unemployed workers lack VCC until they are employed. Similarly, even the most skilled homeworkers are paid nothing for their products and thus create no value. Products must be sold for the workers to create value.

The actual contribution of raw training labour to the current VCC of labour depends on the final product mix. As my reader knows, much of the time spent training a future worker can be wasted, in the sense of not increasing a worker’s ability to produce use-values. Moreover, even training that raises a worker’s use-value productivity may not help boost the exchange-value productivity. It is not uncommon for a worker with an advanced degree to find that, despite long years of blood, tears, sweat, and sweat, her or his product is valued by the market no more similar to that of a worker with less training.

The workings of the export method are simple. Suppose that $\text{v}$ is the value of the product of LE, hours of average labour-power $X$; (2) the intensity of labour $X$ is known; and (3) the commodities trade at value. Then, we can use equation (1). But here the commodities we assumed not itemized into use-value but equals in exchange-value.

Here skill can be expressed as a one-dimensional variable. As mentioned in note 5, unidimensionality is usually only attainable by the literate, but, as we can imagine, skill in the production of use-values cannot be reduced to a single dimension. A basic fallacy of IQ, with its cultural biases, is that intelligence is reduced by a single number instead of a vector (Gould, 1981). Similarly, as Elster (1985: 131) argues, ‘non-producible skills’ such as natural talents or skill-based on secret information, imply truly heterogeneous blocs. This heterogeneity is the natural irregularity of crafts or separate labour. However, if skill coefficients in the production of exchange-value are determined as part of exchange, it makes sense to write of multidimensional skill. It is cephalogism that reduces skill to a scalar quantity.

At this point, we find an important limitation of this measure of skill coefficients. Most commodities are produced not individually but by collectives. If the skill coefficient is calculated by incurring to the exchange of commodities, we often cannot measure the skill coefficients of individual workers.
The skills of the production engineer and low worker are merged together. This limitation does not seem severe, but instead appropriate, where cost synergy effects and externalities among the different labourers make a skill coefficient impossible to measure. But there is no reason to despair: e., e., = LP, can be reinterpreted as saying that skill and intensity can be substitutes for each other in the creation of value. Critically, a less-skilled worker has to work harder than a skilled worker. Moreover, the actual measurement of skill coefficients is less important than the understanding of its role in the law of value.

Assumption (iii) cannot avoid examination. Trading at value occurs in Marx's hypothetical world in volume 1, where 'equal exchange' occurs between all traders. This might occur if there is no surplus-value production, no capital mobility between sectors, or no organic composition of capital (OCC) differences between sectors. In sum, equal exchange occurs if there is no capitalism. The concept of equal exchange — or rather, this high level of abstraction — allows a focus on class relations between workers and capitalists to the exclusion of relationships within classes. But in the real world of capitalism, prices and values differ.

To understand the role of skill coefficients, consider the familiar deviations between prices and values arising from differences in OCC. Cottongrass: a product with above-average OCC sells for more than its value, while a product with below-average OCC sells for less than its value. But we cannot mechanize as analogous to skill or intensity in rising VCC since to Marx, machines do not create value. Instead, mechanization is a substitute for intensity or skill as a basis for the ability to claim part of the aggregate surplus value: a capitalist with high-OCC production who receives prices in proportion to values will stop investing, allowing the capitalist a claim on the total surplus-value (Devine, 1989).

If values and prices differ, how are skill coefficients, or even intensities of labour, relevant? They relate to the production of value, which in turn represents an aggregate constraint on all of the individual claims on value. How are skills and intensities to be measured? They cannot be measured empiri-
ally. Rather, they are one concept that help us understand capitalism and to develop more complex hypotheses. Even so, we can get a first approximation by using any of the other measures of skill coefficients. This should be adequate for many purposes.

In the end, we do not have to choose between the two concepts of skill coefficients. All four have their role, for example, in a continuous Marx's neoclassical name for wage labour. It might be possible to measure the historical cost of any concept. The contrast between the conceptual cost of old ex ante VCC and current VCC is a notion of supply-purpose of value, unlike for Ricardian's labour theory of value (cf. Moksun, 1981). Similarly, we must abandon Helftand's embossed-labour interpretation of skill and re-examine the purpose of the whole enterprise. The VCC of skilled labour does not simply reflect the unskilled labour used to enhance the worker's skills. Rather, that capacity is socially determined at the time of sale of the labour's product. Second, the goal of analysis is not price determination but the determination of capitalism as a societal mode of production.

Thus, turn now to Harvey's more specific criticism of Helftand's 'solution', the VCC of skilled labour is totally dependent upon the training labour done while that of simple labour is independent of such labour. Above, this asymmetry disappears. All labour can create value only after training. A worker below not SDM would not survive. The only asymmetry is the VCC of skilled labour is limited relative to that of simple labour (i.e., MDI). This limited asymmetry arises because of Marx's focus on the social average.

Second, in Helftand's schema, a skilled worker's lifetime VCC is simply that of a simple worker (P) plus the total TVC of the simple labour spent on training of the worker. There is no labour having quality to skill. So why not hire P+T simple workers, since hiring the skilled worker would use the same amount of simple labour? Harvey (1985: 39) suggests that it is greater physical productivity that differentiates skilled labour from simple labour. In many cases, this is true. But in the post-slavery to the 'reduction problem', productivity in the making of exchange-values is only necessary to establishing value-creating capacity. If it is not sufficient, it is the relative ability to create exchange value for the capitalist that establishes skill
Third, Harvey's *Root of the Problem* (1985: 94-5) is that when no determinate relationship exists between the value-carrying capacities of various types of labour and the value... of the corresponding types of labour-power (as in Hilbert's solution), then the link between socially necessary labour [i.e. value] and prices of production is completely broken (1985: 94).

This, in Harvey's view, makes values irrelevant.

Instead of values, we should drop Ricardoian conceptions of value and transformation, to embrace the 'New Section' to the transformation problem. This suggests that the price calculation from values is at best contingent to Marx's law of value: prices and values are determined simultaneously by real-world market processes, not by mathematical models. Instead, macro-societal relations between money claims or value (i.e., prices net of intermediate materials costs) and the actual value creation becomes crucial. The equations $\Sigma v = V + \Sigma s$ and $\Sigma v + \Sigma s$ become conservation principles that organize the understanding of capitalism. Much of the 'transformation problem' is thus resolved into a statistical accounting framework, in which deviations of prices from values are just as important as their resemblance: the difference between individual price claims on aggregate value and the contributions to this total is one way of seeing the contradiction between individual appropriation and social production under capitalism, giving us a deeper understanding of crises and inflation (Devere, 1989).

Harvey's final problem is that in a world of commodities selling at value, capitalism hire workers on the basis of the difference between their VCC and the value of their labour-power ($l$). If this gap is larger for skilled workers, it is quite possible since there is often no clear link between VCC and $l$, then the skilled workers will be hired. If it is lower for skilled workers, then the unskilled will be hired. But Harvey points out that this means that the value of the commodity depends not only on the VCC of the workers, but on relative values of labour-power. This is contrary to the received vision of Marx's law of value.

Again, this can be answered by the New Solution. Of
course, commodities do not trade at value. Capitalists do not care about the value of labour-power in making their decisions. Indeed, they do not care about values at all (Marx, 1967c, 875). They do not see, nor can they act on, socialized production. Under capitalism, prices and values are determined simultaneously by market exchange, so that neither are derived from the other. Prices and value are looked at as the macro level, with the latter limiting the former. Individuals cannot claim more value than is produced.

It is thus not the connection between Wc, and the individual value of labour-power (Wl) that matters. Indeed, if there is some relation between Wc and worker X's wage, they might well be a connection between Wc and the price of the product of X's labour. Instead, to the New Solution, what is important is the link between the value of labour for all of society and the aggregate value of labour-power. To Marx, it is these aggregate that must differ, so that total value created by labour $\geq$ total W. Of course, Marx often stated these social relations in aggregate terms but with representative social averages. But it is seldom noticed that the only one is simple labour's social average (as argued above), but Marx defines the value of labour-power is terms that can only represent an average for the entire working class.

The sum of the means of subsistence necessary for the production of labour-power must include the means necessary for the labourer's substitutes, i.e., his children, in order that the rate of peculiar commodity-owners [i.e., the working class] may reappear as its appearance in the market (1967a, 172).

In these terms, the Wc is the mechanisms to reproduce the 'race' as a whole, divided by the number of workers hired (or for the framework above, the hours of labour-power paid).

In sum, Harvey's objections apply very well to demolishing Hufeland's 'reduction and Ricardian views of value but they do not contradict the view that simple labour is abstract labour and that skill coefficients are determined as part. Not does his analysis contradict the New Solution, which of course was crafted purely in response to similar objections to the Ricardian interpretation of value.
I. This section is found near the end of a work by Marx (1867, 309).

2. The paper makes use of unquantifiable assertions concerning Marx's goals, methods, and conclusions. Though he is quoted at length, this is not a paper on what Marx himself said. The real reduction problem is the selection of theory to Marxism. Nouba's appeal is the perfection and application of Marx's method and theories.

3. Similarly, Brown (1980) states that Marx, until recently, has not been able to discuss both the minimum and the average labor requirements.

4. In another translation of Capital (1977, 115, 402), it contained does not occur, except on page 500. Nevertheless, both William Brown (1980) at 81 and Hithington (1984) at 150, who did mention (translations of Marx, focus on unskilled labor. Assuming that the 2nd translation was erroneous, I focus on the 1968 translator and on Marx's (1970). The Reader, should get a better understanding and its dependence on translations, by looking at dictionaries, index, and historical knowledge instead.

5. Note that I have assumed, as in most of this debate, that 'skill' is one-dimensional.

6. I assume that the social average is the arithmetic mean, not some other type of average. Also, it would be unreasonable to call the social average unskilled, since it would imply that unskilled labor was superior.

7. He does this on the materialism in the theory of labor. That conclusion was part of a volume, Marx's commentary on the ordinary corroboration of the agents of production (1969, 2). The average is relevant to setting up a general accounting framework.

8. Marx's criterion that no matters whether it follows which families that quota varies. He used one of the average. To be consumer, we might want to assume that there is a social-average degree of will. But Marx's recommendation here fits with another theme of Capital in its critique applies not only to the real world of capitalism with monopoly, rent, and competition, capitalism. That is, he means between consumers on their own ground.

9. Also, abstract labor (human labor in general) is said to row in the form of average labor which, in a given society, the average person can perform (1969, 31).

10. Abstract labor is not mere numerical determination, for the charged characteristics of all concrete labor, i.e., the productive expenditure of human bodies, nature, and machines (Marx, 1967, 4). Anyone who sees the world labor without qualifications, rather than saying the total of those who see abstraction as a concept of abstract labor. Marx's contribution way to clarify the struggle for (in this context, productive inputs to creation of commodities, rather than production of commodities, as in Marx's non-developed concept.)

11. In addition, it is in a sense to consider abstract labor with homogeneous labor in Lenin (1985, 101). For the case of concept of abstract labor, does not deny the importance of the within this field variations among useful labor, the.

12. The formal approach then complicated labor to 'simple labor' related to a higher order (1970, 150) to very much metaphysical.
capacity, as also affected by the objective condition of work.
11. Suppose (CW) 20 units, a similar figure. The same of their members be at 0.05, VCC, at laborer's rate. VCC 100, being, of course, all members of labor done by N, and k, annual of labor, which is part of the labor-power sold.
12. Thus, as to each year, average capacity should equal the intensity of the average hour of labor-power. That is:
   \[ S_0 = \frac{1}{P_L} \times 1 \text{ unit of labor-power per hour.} \]
Assuming that labor-power equals kP_L, this can be stated in total labor-power need:
13. The output of the process to make books, the average laborer's efficiency per hour of labor-time. The concept is:
   \[ AVCC = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \text{VCC} \times \frac{1}{N} \]
where N = total labor hours, labor-hours done at hours of labor-power need to process the process. Books, AVCC should equal VCC, the average of the book shown in the process (patronage, in the equation), should equal unity. So the book should be equal to N:
14. This assumption follows (for example, 1982) assumption that equal in proportion to equal in book power process.
15. The above explains the variable capital.
16. Hummert (1984) suggests that AVCC should be equal between a group process, or regional, or capital and profit rates. This practice is in a very high level of human work. A particular market allows technical differences and to function in an equal manner.
17. The average efficiency might be based on a combination of technical, social, and material factors. The book should be equal to N:
18. The overall capacity by many experts, this is that, in an hour, may be equivalent to an extra-
19. Wages, the value of the book worked, is transferred to the worker. An individual capacity is a part of the aggregate wage before the final book and the entire productive labor total value. In the new labor level, the only relationship this.
20. \[ S_0 \times \text{AVCC} = 1 \text{ unit of labor-power output.} \]
21. This concept is (1984) concept, the total value of books of labor-power output.
23. In this sentence, wages might be equal units of a single labor and profit rates. Here, the value of money in social production is required to make the value out of this value to be determined.