FIFTH INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP ON VALUE THEORY

MINI-CONFERENCE ON VALUE THEORY AT EATERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION.

FEBRAURY 27-MARCH 1, 1998.

NEW YORK CITY, USA.

THEORY OF VALUE AND TRANSFORMATION.

Lénine Rojas

Marx defines value in *Le Capital* (Editions Sociales) as the quantitave characteristic of merchandise; and merchandise as a collective economic category and entity formed of specific individuals (I Book , 1 Tome, p96 & p116). and I would add, produced and circulated -sold and bought, in the same market in a certain period of time, in a certain place, at a same price or so.

So I think that It does not exist the value of a single member of the collective merchandise but instead of it, its market or commercial price (IB,1T,p52). The addition of the price of each one of these specific individuals is the total price of a single merchandise -its value.

So, *strictu sensu* there is not one unique market price, but many market prices and a mean market price. There is not an individual value, but a mean, social value (IB,2T,p11).

Merchandise as well as value and total price are then *a posteriori* not *a priori* and collective, not individual categories (BI,t2,p46).

In my opinion this is the reason why the total addition of prices equals the total value of a merchandise. This is a definition, not a mathematical and surprising theorem, nor a conclusion. This definition marks the boundaries and mechanisms of transformation of value in price.

A merchandise cannot be sold nor bought over or under its value -as the general law of exchange says (IB,1T, p162,163 & 168). If it is so, one cannot transfer value from one merchandise to another,by selling the different individuals of a collective merchandise, at one unique price -the mean market price, for instance, nor by selling the merchandise at its value.

Let us have two collective merchandises A and B, such as A{a1,a2,a3} and B{b1,b2,b3,b4,b5,b6} and suppose they are exchanged in the next way:

small a1 by b1; a2 by b2 and b3; and a3 by b4,b5 and b6. We have a mean exchange coefficent of small a by 2 small b's.

We can see that proprietor of small a1 is loosing what proprietor of small a3 is winning, but we can also see that there is not any transference of value from proprietors of A to proprietors of B since value of A is B without reference to any particular distribution of small b's. The exchange can also be small a1 by b1 and b2; a2 by b3 and b4; and a3 by b5 and b6, where proprietors of A have exactly the same number of small b's.

If we use monetary prices, for instance one dollar for each element of B, we could say that propietor of small a1 has transferred one dollar to the propietor of small a3, in the first distribution; but at the same time we must recognize that value of A is 6 dollars independently of any small b's distribution.

Now A and B can be any merchandise. Reasoning can go under different degrees of generalization: One can conceive a merchandise such as shoes, or means of production, but after so, one must not expect to exist one single mean value for all shoes nor for all means of production. There is no reason for ballet and alpinist shoes to contain the same value nor for a raw material and a complex electronic machine.

Bortkiewicks and Samuelson had reasoned on this way when they pretended a unique price of production of a unique merchandise -total Merchandise, formed by three individual specimens I, II & III productive sectors. This is, by all means a foreign idea to Marx.(BI,T1 note p 130).

They also have found unitary transformation coefficients as the unique possible solution to this problem, which, as I'm trying to demonstrate, is exactly the consequence to be drawn from Marx's definitions of value and merchandise.

In other words: transformation is an operation to be realized inside the ensemble A, and inside the ensemble B, not an operation to be realized between A and B ensembles, and so there is a mean value for A, a mean value for B but not a mean value for A and B.

The total value produced by a society in a certain period of time is mesured by the total number of hours used in production of sold and bought merchandises because it is the addition of value of each merchandise.

Society buys merchandises using a fraction of its available time to produce them but there is not a necessary tie between the total quantity of the social time used to produce a social article and the size of the social need for it (III B,1T p232).

The masses of products corresponding to the different needs of society requiere different and *quantitatively determined* masses of the total labor of society (Marx to Kugelman, London, july 11,1868) and capitalist society charges private proprietors of means of production of assigning the effective amounts of labor to production of specific merchandises.

Now, private producers ignore these *quantitatively determined* masses as well as the total labor time of society and consequences are those one can expect of a blind assignment -anarchy, wastage and scarcity (IB, 2T, pp45-46).

If value of social capitalist production depends on the total amount of labor utilized on total sold and bought production, the value of a single merchandise depends on the time of labor required by production of only a certain number of use values not on the total labor time used in the production of the total number of articles obtained.

Articles produced in excess of social requierement are not use values but useless values. They are not values and they only represent social labor wastage.

On the other side, there are also those branches -the rest of them- which absorbe not enough labor time to produce the correct number of use values requiered by society. In these branches is again the socially required labor time to satisfy the social need, who determines the value of production, -not the social labor effectively used in real production.

This is why Marx insisted over and over again in saying that it is the socially necesary labor time and not other kind of labor time, which only forms value.

Now, individual capitalist looks for the best rate of profit under these conditions. He does not know the rates of profit in the current period but in the immediatly past period. So, if it is the case, to obtain a better rate of profit in another sphere of business he must invest in the targeted sphere in the next period. When he behaves in this way he will reduce the total production of the initial branch and he will increase the total production in the targeted branch.

On one hand, one can say that the establishment of a mean rate of profit is an operation realized from one period to the next, and that its instrument is capital mobility not value transferences among merchandises; in the other hand, that in the current period, transferences of value are the instrument of the establishment of a mean rate of profit among producers of the same merchandise, through the selling and buying of it in the same market at the same price or so.

Finally, in this establishement, one must also consider the kind of active agent of such a movement, since an artisan proprietor as well of his means of production as of his labor force, cannot look for a mean but for his individual rate of profit. An individual capitalist will look for a mean rate of profit.

In conclusion I think that transformation problem has these determinant concepts: Value and merchandise as collective and *a posteriori* categories; value transferences among producers of the same merchandise sold an bought in the same market at a same commercial price, or so, in the current period; capital mobility from current to the next period and individual capitalist as the agent of the exchange process.