

劳动价值论冗余论批判



· 张忠胜 著 ·

中国社会科学出版社

劳动价值论冗余论批判



张忠胜 著

中国社会科学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

劳动价值论冗余论批判 / 张忠胜著. —北京: 中国社会科学出版社, 2018. 4

ISBN 978 - 7 - 5203 - 1803 - 7

I. ①劳… II. ①张… III. ①劳动价值论—研究 IV. ①F014. 3

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2017) 第 324776 号

出 版 人 赵剑英
责任编辑 孔继萍
责任校对 夏慧萍
责任印制 李寡寡

出 版 中国社会科学出版社
社 址 北京鼓楼西大街甲 158 号
邮 编 100720
网 址 <http://www.csspw.cn>
发 行 部 010 - 84083685
门 市 部 010 - 84029450
经 销 新华书店及其他书店

印 刷 北京明恒达印务有限公司
装 订 廊坊市广阳区广增装订厂
版 次 2018 年 4 月第 1 版
印 次 2018 年 4 月第 1 次印刷

开 本 710 × 1000 1/16
印 张 12.5
插 页 2
字 数 205 千字
定 价 59.00 元

凡购买中国社会科学出版社图书,如有质量问题请与本社营销中心联系调换
电话:010 - 84083683
版权所有 侵权必究

◆ 北京高校中国特色社会主义协同创新中心
(中央财经大学) 资助出版

摘 要

本书所界定研究批判的劳动价值论冗余论对象是指，20 世纪 70 年代前后，以斯蒂德曼为代表的新李嘉图主义、以萨缪尔森为代表的新古典主义和以罗默为代表的分析马克思主义，基于对马克思价值转化为生产价格问题在数学论证中的质疑和否定，提出的劳动价值论是多余的冗余论观点。

马克思的劳动价值论是在批判古典经济学劳动价值论基础上建立和完善的。英国威廉·配第和法国布阿吉尔贝尔都提出了朴素的劳动价值论；斯密是第一个尝试系统论述劳动价值论的古典经济学家，但是他对于资本主义生产方式成为主导生产方式以后的价值规律说明，采取了一种断裂式的思维逻辑，将商品价值由耗费的劳动量决定直接转向商品价值由市场上支配的劳动量决定；李嘉图批评了斯密的二元价值理论，但是却不能够解决两大理论难题而最终使得李嘉图学派破产。马克思在《资本论》第一卷从资本主义财富的元素形式商品出发揭示出劳动价值论的基本内容后，按照整个《资本论》从抽象上升到具体的叙述方法，在第三卷中通过价值转化为生产价格的理论解决了价值规律与一般利润率的矛盾。但是，甚至第三卷未出版之前，马克思的批评者们就不断质疑甚至嘲讽。等到恩格斯将《资本论》第三卷编辑出版后，庞巴维克虽然没有真正进

入转形问题的考察，但是他关于马克思《资本论》第三卷否定和推翻了第一卷理论基础的结论仍然产生了极大的影响。从斯密到庞巴维克，虽然他们对劳动价值论的放弃或者斥责并不属于本书界定的劳动价值论冗余论的范畴，但是他们却呈现了庸俗经济学在价格理论上的共性。真正的问题开始于20世纪初鲍特基维茨以一种“严谨”的方式开始的研究，其提出问题的方法和解决方案在斯威齐将其引入英语世界后，受到广泛关注。温特尼茨、米克等人对鲍特基维茨提出的解决方案和模型进行了进一步的发展，当塞顿将鲍特基维茨的研究推至顶峰之时，却也在西方学术界范围内形成了这样一种所谓“共识”，即马克思在进行生产价格的计算时并没有将投入要素生产价格化，因此并未恰当地给予价值转化为生产价格以合理的解决方案，需要修正。新李嘉图主义、新古典主义和分析马克思主义的各自的代表人物正是在该“共识”尤其是该共识所代表的对马克思的解读方式和分析方法基础上，提出了劳动价值论是多余的冗余论观点。

从新李嘉图主义者斯蒂德曼到新古典经济学的执旗手萨缪尔森，再到尝试在西方重现马克思主义的分析马克思主义学派在经济学上的代表人物罗默，在对马克思价值转形问题的批判研究中，都呈现了鲍特基维茨开启的同期双体系研究传统，即在孤立地建立价值价格双体系下，对投入品和产出品价值价格进行同期的计算。鲍特基维茨对马克思价值转形问题的指责和“修正”是在错误曲解马克思的价值转形解法的基础上作出的。第一，马克思的价值转形不是构建两个相互独立的价值和生产价格体系，而只是剩余价值在资本主义生产方式下如何按照统一利润率的规则进行分配，也就是说，在资本主义生产方式出现以后，价值将以一种新的转化了的形式呈现出来，问题的核心是一般利润率的形成，投入品的生产价格化并不影响转形问题的说明。第二，鲍特基维茨对马克思价值转形

的第二个严重误读是，其在价值价格双体系下通过引入再生产平衡条件指责马克思的价值转形解法是内在矛盾的，并基于再生产平衡条件构建价值或价格体系，而通过引入再生产平衡条件构建价值价格体系，又使其陷入同期的计算投入品产出品价值价格和从实物量关系出发，也即同期主义和实物主义的陷阱。新李嘉图主义、新古典主义和分析马克思主义正是将这种同期双体系的解读作为一种“共识”所接受，与实物主义结合起来，在数学论证中得出了劳动价值论是多余的冗余论观点。实际上，西方学者分期单体系解释的一个例证可以表明，同期主义的价值价格计算，将直接导致价值成为多余。这一劳动价值论冗余论的提出反映了庸俗经济学只是在现象上兜圈子的本质。

20 世纪 80 年代始西方学术界为回应新李嘉图主义和新古典主义对马克思劳动价值论的批判相继提出了关于劳动价值论的一些新的解释，如“新解释”、同期单体系解释和分期单体系解释。“新解释”和同期单体系解释都在不同程度上对鲍特基维茨研究传统提出了质疑和挑战。与“新解释”、同期单体系解释相比，分期单体系解释从根本上对鲍特基维茨所开启的同期双体系的错误解读提出了反驳。分期单体系解释所构建的关于马克思价值转形的数学化表述，被包括反对者在内的一些学者认为是至少“以一种让马克思讲得通”的方式说明了马克思的价值转形并不是内部不一致的。20 世纪 90 年代以来，我国学者也不断对马克思的价值转形问题提出新的解释或模型，其中丁堡骏从对不变资本和可变资本的生产价格化的处理出发所构建的价值转化模型以及对该模型的说明，呈现了分期单体系思想。该解法也被很多学者认为基于马克思的原意解决了价值转形问题。在对马克思价值转形问题的解读中分期单体系思想至关重要。

然而，在西方学术界，即使是分期单体系解释方法及依此

构建的数学化表述成功说明了马克思价值转形的成功，但是也面临“缺少对为什么斯拉法以后马克思还需要一种劳动价值分析的一个清晰和有说服力的表述”以及“存在陷入黑格尔式循环论证的可能”。分期单体系解释的最主要代表人物克莱曼本人也承认，关于生产价格对于价值的依赖，只能从总量关系上保证。也就是说，即使在分期单体系解释那里，劳动价值论的必要性在数学化论证中并未得到充分说明。英国学者弗利特伍德则从批判实在论视角出发指出演绎主义推动的数学化模型中预先嵌入以封闭体系为条件的事件恒常关联，但现实并不满足这种情形，因而反对任何形式的数学化表述。实际上，数学化表述在经济学发展中具有积极意义。弗利特伍德没有认识到马克思在《资本论》中基于历史和逻辑相一致原则对劳动价值论的阐述中所运用的辩证逻辑演绎，因而只能停留在资本主义的具体层面上，而陷入封闭体系与现实主义不可调和的矛盾之中。离开马克思的逻辑与历史相一致的方法论或者说辩证逻辑演绎构建劳动价值论的数学化表述，是包括分期单体系解释的倡导者在内的西方学者在价值转形问题研究中存在的一重大缺陷。马克思的逻辑与历史相一致的方法论逻辑是构建劳动价值论的数学化表述中说明价值转形成功所不可缺少的。在科学地说明了价值转形在数学上成功以后，依据马克思在价值转化为生产价格问题中运用的逻辑与历史相一致的方法论逻辑进行数学化的理论探讨，将价值定位于社会必要劳动时间，不仅突破了批判实在论所指陈的缺陷，而且为劳动价值论在数学表述中的必要性提供理论支持。

数学方法的使用在经济学研究中是具有积极意义的，但是必须以该学科本身所特有的方法论为基础。斯蒂德曼、萨缪尔森等人则是在错解马克思价值转形问题的基础上错误地使用数学得出了劳动

价值论是多余的冗余论观点，呈现出庸俗经济学在现象中兜圈子的庸俗经济学本质。

关键词：劳动价值论冗余论；同期双体系；分期单体系；辩证逻辑演绎

Abstract

This research delimits the critical studies about the redundancy of the Labor Theory of Value around the 1970's, with Ian Steedman representing the Neo-Ricardian economics, Paul Samuelson representing mainstream Neoclassical economics and John Roemer representing Analytical Marxist economics. They all used mathematical formulas to show doubts and refute Marx's transformation of value into price of production problem, arguing that the Labor Theory of Value is redundant and unnecessary. We call it redundancy of the Labor Theory of Value.

Based on the critic of the Classical economists' Labor Theory of Value, Marx established and improved the Labor Theory of Value. The English economist William Petty and the French economist Pierre Le Pesant de Boisguilbert both raised a simple Labor Theory of Value; Adam Smith was the first Classical economist to systematically expound the Labor Theory of Value. However, concerning the law of value after the capitalist mode of production became dominant, a rupture in his logical thought occurred. Therefore, the determination of the quantity of the value of the commodity by the consummation of the labor was directly re-oriented to the determination of the quantity of the value of the commodity by the val-

ue distribution in the market; David Ricardo criticized Smith's Dual Theory of Value, but was unable to resolve the two difficult theoretical problems and Ricardians finally failed to do so. Considering the *Capital* as a whole, after Marx brought to light the fundamental content of the Labor Theory of Value by looking at the form of commodity as an element of capitalist wealth in the Volume I of *Capital*, using a method of explanation from abstract to concrete, in Volume III he put forward the transformation theory from value into production price to resolve the contradiction between the law of value and the law of the average rate of profit. Nevertheless, even before the publication of Volume III of *Capital*, the critics of Marx continuously raised doubts and tried to ridicule him. After the publication by Friedrich Engels of Volume III of *Capital*, although Eugen von Bôhm-Bawerk did not really analyze the transformation problem, he rejected the conclusion of the basic theory exposed in Volume III of *Capital*. Until now, Bôhm-Bawerk still has an enormous influence. From Smith to Bôhm-Bawerk, even though they abandoned or denied the Labor Theory of Value, they do not belong to the category of the redundancy of the Labor Theory of Value. Nonetheless, on the common theory of price, they represent the common character of the vulgar economics. The real problem started in the beginning of the 20th Century with Ladislaus Bortkiewicz, using a "rigorous" method of research. His method was accepted and introduced into the English-speaking world by Paul Sweezy. It has since then attracted widespread attention. Bortkiewicz, Joseph Winternitz, Ronald Lindley Meek, among other economists, developed further propositions as solutions and models. When Francis Seton pushed the research of Bortkiewicz to its summit, at the same time it became a so-called "consensus" in the Western acade-

mia. In other words, when Marx put forward his solution to the transformation problem, he did not calculate the inputs in the price of production. This is why it was not appropriate to consider his transformation theory from value into price of production as a successful solution and that it had to be corrected. Each representative of New Ricardianism, Neoclassical economics and Analytical Marxism, based on the "consensus", especially based on the means of interpretation of the "consensus", put forward the redundancy of the Labor Theory of Value.

The critical studies of Marx's transformation of value problem conducted by Neo-Ricardian economist Ian Steedman, flag* bearer of Neoclassical economics Paul Samuelson and the Analytical Marxist economics representative John Roemer all appeared after Ladislaus Bortkiewicz established the traditional study of the simultaneous dual system, setting independently the dual system of value and price. Bortkiewicz isolated the dual system of value and price, considering the calculation of the simultaneous progress of the value and price of the inputs and outputs. Concerning Bortkiewicz's critics and "corrections" to Marx's transformation of value problem, it was actually based on a misinterpretation of the basic solution of Marx's transformation theory from value to production price. Firstly, Marx's transformation from value to production price is not a construction of two mutually independent system of value and price of production. Instead, it is the distribution of the surplus value in capitalist mode of production, in accordance with the principle law of the general rate of profit. In other words, after the capitalist mode of production becomes dominant, the value will have a new form of transformation. The core issue is the formation of the general rate of profit, and the calculation of the production price of the inputs does not influence the explana-

tion of the transformation problem. Secondly, the other important misinterpretation made by Bortkiewicz about Marx's transformation theory is that he used the conditions of equilibrium reproduction to criticize Marx's explanation of transformation theory, saying that it has internal contradictions because the conditions of equilibrium reproduction should be satisfied in the construction of value or price system. Yet, using the conditions of equilibrium reproduction to construct the system of value and price, he stayed trapped in the simultaneous calculation of inputs and outputs, which led the research lost in the relation of quantity of material. It is a simultaneous and materialistic trap. Neo-Ricardian economics, Neoclassical economics and Analytical Marxist economics all accepted the simultaneous dual system interpretation as a kind of "consensus" combined with materialism, using mathematical formulas to demonstrate that the Labor Theory of Value is redundant and a useless theory. In reality, the calculation of value by simultaneous interpretation directly make the value redundant. In reality, the redundancy of the Labor Theory of Value shows that the research of the vulgar economics, by revolving around the nature of the problem, only stays on its surface.

From the beginning of the 1980's, in response to the Neo-Ricardian economics and Neoclassical economics, some Western academic circles have put forward several new explanations concerning the critics of Marx's Labor Theory of Value, such as the "New interpretation" (NI), Simultaneous single-system interpretation (SSSI) and the Temporal single-system interpretation (TSSI). The "New interpretation" and the Simultaneous single-system interpretation, in various degrees, raised questions and challenged Bortkiewicz's traditional research. Compared to the "New interpretation" and the Simultaneous single-system interpretation,

the Temporal single-system interpretation fundamentally refutes the misinterpretation made by the simultaneous dual system established by Bortkiewicz. The mathematical formulation of Marx's value transformation theory by the Temporal single-system interpretation shows that Marx's solution is not inconsistent. Many scholars, including those opposed to TSSI, consider that TSSI at least refutes the inconsistency in a way to "make Marx make sense". Since the 1990's, many Chinese scholars kept putting forward new interpretations and models to Marx's transformation theory. Among them, we can mention Ding Baojun who used the transformation of constant and variable capital as a starting point to explain by using a model, the transformation problem. His method shows similarities with the Temporal single-system interpretation. Many Chinese scholars consider his interpretation shows that Marx already resolved the transformation problem successfully. The Temporal single-system interpretation method is very important in the interpretation of Marx's transformation theory from value to production price.

However, in Western academia, even if the Temporal single-system interpretation is able to illustrate by mathematical formulas the success of Marx's value transformation, yet it also faces the critic that "what the Temporal Single System argument lacks is a clear and persuasive statement of why Marx, after Sraffa, requires a labor-value analysis at all" as well as "the possibility of circular argument, Hegelian type". The main representative of the Temporal single-system interpretation (TSSI), Andrew Kliman, admitted himself that, regarding the price of production and its dependence on the value, it can only be guaranteed by the total amount relationship. In other words, even in the Temporal single-system interpretation, the necessity of the Labor Theory of Value has not been

adequately illustrated by mathematical demonstration. The English economist Steve Fleetwood pointed out, from a Critical Realist perspective, the quantitative model promoted by deductivism, pre-inserted in constant conjunction of events based on a condition of closed system. But reality does not satisfy this kind of situation. Therefore, it is opposed to any form of quantitative explanation. In fact, the mathematical formulation has a positive significance in the development of economics. Fleetwood did not understand that, for the elaboration of the Labor Theory of Value in the *Capital*, Marx used a dialectical logic deduction based on the principle of the dialectical unity of history and logic. Thus, he could only stay on the concrete aspect of capitalism, leading to contradictions which are incapable to conciliate between Critical Realism and a closed system. Without Marx's principle of the dialectical unity of history and logic or dialectical logic deduction, constructing the mathematical formulation of the Labor Theory of Value is a significant defect from Western scholars, including pioneers of the Temporal single-system interpretation who studied the transformation theory from value to production price. Marx's historical and logical methodology can not be lacking in the mathematical model construction which explains the value transformation theory successfully. After a scientific explanation about the value transformation theory in mathematics, based on historical and logical methodology, we can locate value on social necessary labor time and then interpret the Labor Theory of Value in mathematics. This does not only break through the defects which the Critical Realist economics pointed out and provide quantitative and qualitative analysis, but also provides theoretical support for the necessity of the Labor Theory of Value in the mathematical formulation.

Using mathematics in economic research is positive, but it should

be based on the fundamental method of the particular discipline itself. Steedman, Samuelson among other economists, in their misinterpretation of Marx's transformation problem, incorrectly used mathematics which led to the false conclusion that the Labor Theory of Value is redundant. Their conclusion shows the nature of the vulgar economics, which revolves around the nature of the problem, but only stays on its surface.

Keywords: Redundancy of the Labor Theory of Value; Simultaneous Dual System; Temporal Single-system; Dialectical Logic Deduction

目 录

导 论	(1)
第一节 问题提出的背景和意义	(1)
第二节 研究问题的界定及前人相关研究	(3)
第三节 研究方法的界定	(11)
第四节 本书框架和主要内容	(13)
第五节 本书特点及存在不足的说明	(18)
一 本书特点	(18)
二 存在不足的说明	(19)
第一章 劳动价值论冗余论的历史渊源	(21)
第一节 劳动价值论的起源与早期相关争议	(21)
第二节 庞巴维克的批判及其影响	(29)
第三节 鲍特基维茨研究传统与“共识”的形成： 从鲍氏到塞顿	(34)
第四节 理论渊源的小结	(43)
第二章 劳动价值论冗余论的提出	(45)
第一节 新李嘉图主义或斯拉法主义	(45)