



Title	BOOK REVIEW Albert Moyseevich Kogan,PLAN SCHESTI KNIG K.MARKSA I "KAPITALA",Moskva,1976,translated into Japanese by Yasuku Nakano,(Japanese edition entitled PLAN OF CRITICS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AND "CAPITAL" -A VIEW OF THE THEORY OF CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM)Tokyo,1979.
Author(s)	ARAMATA, SIGEO
Citation	HOKUDAI ECONOMIC PAPERS, 13, 116-123
Issue Date	1983
Doc URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/30711">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/30711</a>
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	13_P116-123.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

## BOOK REVIEW

**Albert Moyseevich Kogan, PLAN SCHESTI KNIG K. MARKSA I "KAPITALA", Moskva, 1976, translated into Japanese by Yasuku Nakano, (Japanese edition entitled PLAN OF CRITICS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AND "CAPITAL" —A VIEW OF THE THEORY OF CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM) Tokyo, 1979.**

SIGEO ARAMATA

Professor

Faculty of Economics, Hokkaido University

Albert Moyseevich Kogan, whose book I am happy to review in this paper, is a famous theorist, born in 1926 in Moskva, who has studied for a long time Marx's "Capital" from the standpoint of developing Marx's economic theory along with Marx's own "Plan".

The translator of the book into Japanese, Yasuku Nakano, was one of those who introduced A. M. Kogan to Japanese social scientists. An eager student of Kogan's papers, Mr. Nakano has visited the USSR twice to meet and discuss with him. As a Japanese scientific researcher in K. Marx's "Capital", my attention has been drawn through Y. Nakano's paper to A. M. Kogan's study.

A. M. Kogan's original book is not a published one in the usual means but a deposited one to the Institute of Scientific Information on Social Science belonging to the Academy of Science of USSR. (Information on the deposition is in the journal "Novaja Sovietzkaja Literatura po obschestvennym naukam, Ekonomika", 1976, No. 9, p. 90, No. 1260.) To this Japanese edition the author added one chapter entitled "Recurrent movement from the problem of special theory concerning a competition to the commodity". As we have heard, he also made a great deal of revision at this time. Thus, we may say without overstatement that A. M. Kogan's original book has been published in a broader sense and that the Japanese edition has a special and worldwide significance. We might say that there is a happy scientific cooperation of the Japanese Marxology with the Soviet one.

The title of the Japanese edition is PLAN OF CRITICS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AND "CAPITAL", A VIEW OF THE THEORY ON CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM. This title was set by the translator considering the sense of the author's title SIX BOOK PLAN OF K. MARX AND "CAPITAL". We are able to guess the author's mind more correctly by knowing these two titles. The author wishes to develop Marxist economic

theory in order to understand the meaning of contemporary capitalism. He takes the theoretical standpoint that K. Marx's "Plan" was not completed at the time in the existing "Capital" and that it is useful and necessary for us to learn from K. Marx's "Plan". In this regard, there is a difficult question whether K. Marx's "Plan" was changed or unchanged by Marx himself. In other words, was the task of "Plan" essentially completed by K. Marx in "Capital"? A. M. Kogan insists on one of two possible directions; that is, the "nonchanged theory".

On that problem there are many discussions in both the USSR and Japan. As influential discussion participants, we may nominate D. I. Rosenberg, V. S. Vygotskii, Kinzaburo Sato, and others. In western countries, there are M. Rubel and Roman Rosdolsky. The question whether "Plan" was changed or unchanged is difficult in nature because of the following circumstances. A plan is always only a proposal for the sake of results that as yet do not exist. When real research is carried out along this plan, the plan is inevitably changed in contact with reality. But just that the plan has been changed does not mean that the plan has been carried out. It is sure that the existing "Capital" is broader in contents than "planned" at the beginning. But it does not mean the parts not carried out are absent. If a man wishes to analyze complex reality of contemporary capitalism, he would be charmed with "Plan". But a mere "plan" means the absence of results of real research. Therefore, details of "Plan" must be the everlasting riddle. Therefore, A. M. Kogan, standing on the "unchanged theory", tried to develop himself a Marx concept of political economy along the parts of "Plan" not carried out. I am in sympathy with the author on these attitudes. And this is the reason for my writing this paper.

Determined by my own ability and concern, in this review my attention will be concentrated upon the discussion on wage labour, one of the parts of the SIX BOOK PLAN. What contents would be incorporated in the "planned" book on wage labour in K. Marx's imagination? How useful are concepts developed from Marx's "Capital" to analyze contemporary capitalistic labour problems? Some of my opinions on this point have already been published in three books. (CHINRODO NO RIRON ((A THEORY ON WAGE LABOUR)), Tokyo, 1968; KACHIHO SOKU TO CHINRODO ((THE LAW OF COMMODITY VALUE AND WAGE LABOUR)), Tokyo, 1972; CHINRODO RON NO TENKAI ((EMBODIMENT OF THE THEORY OF WAGE LABOUR)), Tokyo, 1978). A small part of these is printed in this journal (Hokudai Economic Paper, Vol. VIII, Vol. X).

Well, how did the author set forth his view on this point? Chapter 4, Section 4 of the book is devoted to this question. A. M. Kogan's arguments are as follows. "Capital" dealt with wage-labour but only as a source

of surplus value. The most essential point of wage-labour, that is, the interdependence of wage-labour and capital, was made clear in "Capital". But there are movements which are relatively independent of surplus value in wage-labour phenomena. Such is the subject of a special theory concerning wage-labour. What items are there on this subject? Some of them are proposed as follows. First of all, there is a problem relating to segmentation inside a labouring class: the composition of a labouring class. This problem contains subproblems: Where is a social boundary of a labouring class and in what types of non-material production have working men engaged and so on. Next, there is the problem of class struggle which reacts against the general law of capitalistic accumulation. This problem contains subproblems on trade unions and labour aristocracy. The third is a problem about skilled labour forces, reproduction of which shows many specialities. Accumulation of capital makes many skills of labour useless on the one side, and demands raising of skill-levels on the other side. The fourth is a problem relating to fluctuation of wage rate around the value of the labour force. Referring to Book 1, Chapter 15 of "Capital", the author said that the peculiar interaction among labour productivity, the value of the labour force and real wage, was a subject of special wage labour theory. The fifth is a problem regarding expense of labour force and its equivalent replacement: physiological energy, fatigue, food-physiology and labour-physiology. For these, a special theory of natural sciences and labour statistics which K. Marx unfortunately couldn't use, must widely be used. As a whole, the special theory of wage labour must concretely reflect class antagonism between proletariat and bourgeois on itself and must make clearer the possibility of concession of capitalistic economy to proletariat. As we have seen, the author argued in this way.

Differing in opinion was W. Z. Foster, whose effort was to generalize the law of labour movements through studying the complete history of socialism and trade unionism (HISTORY OF THE THREE INTERNATIONAL, New York, 1955; OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE WORLD TRADE UNION MOVEMENT, New York, 1956). The outgrowth of which is huge research into the world labour movement now being promoted by the USSR Academy of Science; and Jurgen Kuczynski, whose effort was to generalize the law of the labourer's economic condition in connection with the discussion on the destitution theory (DIE THEORIE DER LAGE DER ARBEITER, Berlin, 1948). A. M. Kogan's argument has a highly theoretical character. It has a strong starting point in existing "Capital" and possibilities to associate with modern labour economics. At a glance we can see the author make efforts to grasp objects such as these that have always contradicting natures. For example, there are inner unity and segmentation

of a labouring class, trade union movements and labour aristocracy, birth and death of skill, and so on. A. M. Kogan's study only goes as far as indicating the direction to follow. But we should judge it a valuable contribution to the scientific world.

In Japan, especially during the post World War II period, the same task of how to develop the K. Marx's concept of wage-labour to analyze real labor problems was presented to Marxist economists. Methodology of German Social Politik was at the forefront of the task, and American labour economics, afterwards being changed into a branch of neoclassical school, is close behind. Therefore, sometimes the task mixed with Lujo Brentano; at other times it mixed with A. Marshall or L. G. Raynolds. The former is, for example, represented by Kazuo Okochi; the latter by Mikio Sumiya. The purest and most direct presentation of that task is the article by Kiyoko Imura entitled "On Wage-Labour in the plan of critics of political economy" (Keizai Hyoron, February, 1957). K. Imura's arguments considerably resemble A. M. Kogan's. K. Imura says that the real competition of capital is the starting point of the special theory of wage labour, that the contents of this theory are supposed to be an analysis of real fluctuation of working conditions, of institutions in a factory and wage payment system, of composition of a whole labouring class, of historical tendencies of wage labour. As to a starting point, A. M. Kogan seems more stout than K. Imura. But it would be a weak point had he not mentioned historical tendencies of wage-labour even though his book was written in the 1970's when post-war capitalism had showed its surprising power; against K. Imura's article written in the 1950's when the dream of Marxism was still rosy.

Existing "Capital" includes some analysis of wage labour, and a special theory of wage labour must be developed from existing "Capital". These circumstances move several Japanese scholars to examine wage labour in "Capital". Nisaburo Muragishi (CHINRODO GENRON ((PRINCIPLES OF WAGE LABOUR)), Tokyo, 1972) and Hiroaki Satake (SHIHONRON NO CHINRODO BUNSEKI ((ANALYSIS OF WAGE LABOUR IN "CAPITAL"))). Tokyo, 1977) should be nominated. Studies of this sort are important as preparative for the study of special theory.

My own attempt to develop a theory of wage labour was started from the concept of labour force commodity. In the first chapter, I set the actual process of labor force transaction. The second presents the production process of labour force and the third presents the social allocation process of labour force. The fourth examines the socially relating process of wage labor contradiction. The last chapter presents an argument about the historical tendencies of wage labor. In every chapter, I try to develop a theory from the concept of labour force commodity and to see some historical

tendency. I dare say that my attempt is very rare as an effort to really construct a system of all concepts concerning wage labour. However, to my regret, it was subject to criticism that it is excessively drawn to "Capital", and that the historical tendency view always comes to a stop at government policy. It does not satisfy the requirement of special theory nor describe the birth of independent of capital wage labour. I am sure that it tries to theorize many economic forms of wage labour by qualifying their characteristics. But I am also sure that it is still incomplete in analyzing their quantitative and functional characteristics. Therefore, my study is continuing now.

In my eyes, A. M. Kogan's study is not criticizing modern labour economics, though it stands at an entrance point. Nevertheless, to criticize means to also be absorbed in the excellent elements one criticizes. In comparison with K. Marx's criticism of political economy, we must sincerely criticize neoclassical and institutional economics of labour at this time. No theorist can exist absolutely independent of his contemporary theorists. In addition, there are researchers on the developed labour movements such as Lujo Brentano and S. and B. Webb who can not be said to be contemporaries of Marx. Therefore, A. M. Kogan's statement that the fragmentary manuscript on "wages" written in 1847 was a general draft of a large book planned to contribute to the wage labour theme should be an overestimate. I am of the opinion that items beyond the limits of "Capital" in that manuscript do not necessarily mean it is such a draft, and that the manuscript written at the same time with "Wage Labour and Capital" just before the revolution of 1848 is supposed to be the latter half following the existing "Wage Labour and Capital"; and that in that latter half, statements inspecting K. Marx concerning labour problems in bourgeois literature wanted to show the illusional character of the social reform based on capitalistic production.

The author, A. M. Kogan, similar to K. Imura, devoted his attention to the methodology on how to develop the special theory of wage labour and didn't reach the point of how should be the order by which enumerated items are arranged. Around this problem, we cannot overlook some theoretical efforts being done by Japanese theorists such as my above mentioned books. The next is Rei Yoshimura's article, "Marukusu Chinginron no Hoho to Kosei" ("Method and Construction of Marxist Theory of Wages", Osaka City University Keizaigaku Zasshi, May, 1968) which presents a detailed plan of wage labour theory as follows. The starting point must be the concept of the pure labour force commodity. The first step is the production process of labour force commodities, in which the simple concept of labour force changes to concrete concepts. The second step must be the circulation process of labour force commodities, in which a simple concept of labour

market will change into a concrete and complex one. The third step should be the consumption process of the labour force, in which industrial relations are described. The last step is the all-inclusive process of labour force commodities, in which production price, monopoly and historical tendency should be argued in connection with wage labour. R. Yoshimura was succeeded by Masayuki Sakaguchi (Osaka City University Keizaigaku Zasshi, April, 1972 and February, 1974).

On the other hand, Shigeyoshi Tokunaga stands on the "changed theory" of Marx's plan with the opinion that no different theory of wage labour from the capital theory is possible and that special theories of wage labour can exist in research of special stages of capitalistic development such as commercialistic, liberalistic and imperialistic. In these fields, a pure theory is not sufficient to generalize phenomena. (RODOMONDAI TO SHAKA-ISEISAKURON ((LABOUR PROBLEMS AND THE THEORY OF SOCIAL POLICY)), Tokyo, 1970). In my observation, methodological attitudes such as S. Tokunaga's lead rather to a static understanding of history than to clarify contradictory reality.

Japanese theorists who do not explicitly stand on the "changed theory" and are interested in some concrete labour or social problems, frequently intend to inspect pure concepts of wage labour or labour force commodity in general. In this inspection, they meet problems of the peculiarity of labour as a marketable commodity and the possibility of application of the concept of commodity to labour force. M. Sumiya, who presents the original concept of wage labour as a combination of the subjective labourer and the objective labour force, has a strong influence upon younger theorists. That concept itself was influenced by L. Brentano and A. Marshall. (RODOKEIZAIKON ((LABOUR ECONOMICS)), Tokyo, 1965.) My first book argues against that concept by presenting the concept of labour force commodity as the combination of the labour force contents and the commodity form. M. Sumiya was succeeded by Ryuji Horiuchi (in collaboration with Yoshitaka Imajo in GENDAI SHAKAISEISAKURON ((CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL POLICY)), Tokyo, 1982).

There is one more problem in logically adjusting Marx's concept of commodity to labour force. Those who discussed this problem were Fusao Shimoyama, Masatatsu Takahashi, Takashi Yamashita and myself. The idea in which the labour force value is thought to be materialized in living labour force itself is on one side; and the idea in which commodity value is able to materialize not in living labour force itself but in consumable commodities is on another side. I have kept the latter idea and discuss it in my second and third books. T. Yamashita is on my side and F. Shimoyama and M. Takahashi are on the counter side. (Ryukoku University Keizaigaku

market will change into a concrete and complex one. The third step should be the consumption process of the labour force, in which industrial relations are described. The last step is the all-inclusive process of labour force commodities, in which production price, monopoly and historical tendency should be argued in connection with wage labour. R. Yoshimura was succeeded by Masayuki Sakaguchi (Osaka City University Keizaigaku Zasshi, April, 1972 and February, 1974).

On the other hand, Shigeyoshi Tokunaga stands on the "changed theory" of Marx's plan with the opinion that no different theory of wage labour from the capital theory is possible and that special theories of wage labour can exist in research of special stages of capitalistic development such as commercialistic, liberalistic and imperialistic. In these fields, a pure theory is not sufficient to generalize phenomena. (RODOMONDAI TO SHAKA-ISEISAKURON ((LABOUR PROBLEMS AND THE THEORY OF SOCIAL POLICY)), Tokyo, 1970). In my observation, methodological attitudes such as S. Tokunaga's lead rather to a static understanding of history than to clarify contradictory reality.

Japanese theorists who do not explicitly stand on the "changed theory" and are interested in some concrete labour or social problems, frequently intend to inspect pure concepts of wage labour or labour force commodity in general. In this inspection, they meet problems of the peculiarity of labour as a marketable commodity and the possibility of application of the concept of commodity to labour force. M. Sumiya, who presents the original concept of wage labour as a combination of the subjective labourer and the objective labour force, has a strong influence upon younger theorists. That concept itself was influenced by L. Brentano and A. Marshall. (RODOKEIZAIKON ((LABOUR ECONOMICS)), Tokyo, 1965.) My first book argues against that concept by presenting the concept of labour force commodity as the combination of the labour force contents and the commodity form. M. Sumiya was succeeded by Ryuji Horiuchi (in collaboration with Yoshitaka Imajo in GENDAI SHAKAISEISAKURON ((CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL POLICY)), Tokyo, 1982).

There is one more problem in logically adjusting Marx's concept of commodity to labour force. Those who discussed this problem were Fusao Shimoyama, Masatatsu Takahashi, Takashi Yamashita and myself. The idea in which the labour force value is thought to be materialized in living labour force itself is on one side; and the idea in which commodity value is able to materialize not in living labour force itself but in consumable commodities is on another side. I have kept the latter idea and discuss it in my second and third books. T. Yamashita is on my side and F. Shimoyama and M. Takahashi are on the counter side. (Ryukoku University Keizaigaku



Ronshu, September, 1967, Meijo Shogaku, October, 1977)

Principal items of the special theory of wage labour, of course, should be outside of "Capital" as the author, A. M. Kogan, insists. The deeper inspection of the concept of wage-labour, however, cannot be absent. Only the analysis of the concept of labour force commodities makes different their contents from their historical form which combines labouring life and consuming life of the labourer as its use value and exchange value. And here is a possibility of labour forces not to take the historical form as a commodity but as a somewhat new social form. Besides this possibility, concrete competition as the starting point does not parallel with the "Capital" a field for the special theory of wage labour.

The setting of the starting point and identification of the items in that field are not determined a consideration of what constitutes the main theme of that special theory and of what we hope to make clear. Yôichi Fujishima answers as follows. Research into Marx's "Plan" reminds us that K. Marx began to study political economy with the inspiration that the proletariat is the leading part of revolution, and that concerning the "Plan", K. Marx himself wrote the significant phrase, that of the emerging independence of wage labour from capital or the wage labour wishing to establish his independence. The fundamental viewpoint of the special theory of wage labour should be that wage labour is a negative element of bourgeois society and that necessary growth of the proletariat is a leading part of revolution and the route of its growth. (Kagoshima University Keizaigakuronshu, 1974).

A. M. Kogan paid considerable attention to this disputing point. He also presented that significant phrase of K. Marx and indicated unity of a labouring class, class struggle and so on.

Judging from this point of view, the study about the condition of labour and life and about destitution of labouring class is not sufficient. Although it gives the labouring class the wish to be independent of capital, it doesn't give an explicit new social form in which the labouring class would be satisfied.

Thus, some theorists give attention to the socialization of labour, cooperation containing within it a division of labour and advancing along with capital accumulation. Main discussing participants on this are Kenji Tomisawa (YUIBUTSUSHIKAN TO RODOUNDO ((HISTORICAL MATERIALISM AND LABOUR MOVEMENTS) Tokyo, 1974) and Yoichi Aizawa (GENDAI SHAKAI TO RODOSHAKAI MONDAI ((MODERN SOCIETY AND LABOUR-SOCIAL PROBLEMS)), Tokyo, 1979). But it should be said that the socialization under the economic and political influence of capital doesn't directly show the active form of the wage labour side. Socialization sometimes means the capital itself as the social power. At other times it means

the capitalistic modification of wage labour's identity.

There appears basic problems in front of us. What is wage labour's identity? What is a new social form latent in wage labour? To what extent does labour's unity against capitalistic competition contain the new social form? These are the most up-to-date issues among Japanese theorists who examine the theory of wage labour as Marxist labour economics. The author, A. M. Kogan, would be also interested in these. He said that wage labour's ability to build a new society is found for us in the upgrading tendency of labour's skill and in the entire development of labour's individuality. But on this point, he seems not to pay sufficient attention to the association of labourers. It might be proper for me to end this review nominating Makoto Kumazawa (ed. HATARAKU NICHIGO NO JICHI ((SELF-CONTROL ON EVERYDAY WORKING LIFE)), Tokyo, 1982) and Yoshihisa Tokita (Keizai, July and August, 1983) whose concerns are indeed relevant to these problems.