



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	CONTENTS AND FORM OF LABOR POWER VALUE
Author(s)	ARAMATA, SHIGEO
Citation	HOKUDAI ECONOMIC PAPERS, 8, 11-24
Issue Date	1978
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/30678
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	8_P11-24.pdf



CONTENTS AND FORM OF LABOR POWER VALUE

SHIGEO ARAMATA

I. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Wage labor is a historical phenomenon. Labor is always something social to human society, while wage labor appears and disappears according to the transfer of a social form of labor. In other words, it appears replacing an existing social form and then disappears being replaced by another one. Investing the fundamental concept of wage labor, we can find the concept of labor power as a commodity, and then the concept of labor power value which composes the concept of labor power as a commodity. Here is the necessity of proving the historical character of labor power value for the theoretical analysis of the history of wage labor.

It reminds me of Marx's critical analysis of fetishism of commodities. From the form of commodity, that is, commodity value; he distinguishes the content of commodity value prescription, which consists of two aspects of labor, abstract human labor as a substance of value and social average labor whereby the quantity of abstract human labor is prescribed. Abstract human labor expended in general human activities as the disburse of social human beings' physiological energies is a part of social gross labor. It should be distributed into each department of social division of labor in time of need and be measured socially. According to the form of commodity value itself, on the other hand, when abstract human labor, content of value prescription, is solidified, it comes to have the form as commodity value, whereas social labor can also be given the form for the first time in the transfer of the form of living labor to that of dead labor, which is characteristic of commodities as an external object. Distinguishing the content of value prescription from the form of commodity value, he criticizes that economics before him has failed to mention the problem of the form of value except the problem of labor as a structure of value. His conclusion is that the social character of labor to produce commodities (private labor for social production) requires a form for the maintenance of social production and it deprives abstract human labor of the social form except the form of commodity value. Thus, investing the fetishism of commodities, he can understand easily the historical character of producing commodities from a general survey of the history relating to the category of commodity value. For, it is related to the transition of labor's social character.

This point of view shall be consulted in the examination of the historical character of labor power value. What should the content of the labor power value prescription be? Labor power value has been proved, from an examination thereof, to be, after all, the value of various living method commodities necessary to reproduce labor power, that is, to maintain worker's life. From a general prescription of commodity value, value of various necessary living methods is thought to be the solidified abstract human labor connected with various concrete and useful labor for the production of many kinds of use values. The abstract human labor in the above-mentioned sentence is, in the analysis of surplus value production, limited to necessary labor opposed to surplus labor, which produces surplus value. It has been proved from the foregoing explanations that the content of labor power value prescription is necessary labor. Accordingly, the social amount of necessary labor is a social consumption fund of workers. Human society must always secure some amount of abstract human labor as necessary labor to maintain labor power and exhibit various concrete useful labor by various combinations and create various methods of necessary living. In this sense, necessary labor and the consumption fund of workers can represent not only the content of labor power value prescription but something else. We should look on either of the two as changeable historically, if we consider how large abstract human labor is and what kind of concrete useful labor, as well as use value, it is combined with. Its corollary is, however, that the discovery and the utility of various use value is a historical behavior of human society. Anyway, no matter what the social form may be, it is prescribed that some part of abstract human labor is not surplus labor but necessary labor.

Then, what is the form of labor power value? To begin with, necessary labor, as abstract human labor, takes the form of commodity value. Coincidentally, various kinds useful labor, whose necessary labor is expended, take also the form of use value of various necessary living method commodities, which means the transfer of necessary living methods to commodities. The reason is that necessary labor cannot unify concrete useful labor and abstract human labor within a unit of labor power reproduction. A worker's labor, which can be his necessary labor as abstract human labor here, does not finally bring about his necessary living methods as concrete useful labor. Indeed, necessary labor takes the form of commodity value for necessary living methods. Up to this point is the first step of prescription, while the elucidation of the form of labor power value requires the second step prescription. It is because the value of necessary living method commodities equals that of a labor power commodity; otherwise it takes the form of a labor power commodity.

In regard to the second prescription, the so-called analysis of labor power commodity may be called to remembrance. The meaning of necessary labor's having taken the form of labor power value is that the realization of labor power value has been possible for the first time by realizing the use value of a labor power commodity. Necessary labor is used up by the buyer just as one of the factors to the multiplication of value. The return process of necessary labor to a worker himself is the process in which the seller of a labor power commodity receives the money which has realized the value of the labor power commodity as the monetary form of necessary living method commodities. The division of a worker's life into both labor and living in a narrow sense is noticeably in this respect, which means the division of a worker's life into both the production of an output by the offer of labor power and the reproduction of labor power by the consumption of the output. The conclusion is that the form of labor power value in necessary labor regards labor power itself as an inevitable vice.

The following represent the originality of the form of labor power value in necessary labor, too. Necessary labor, being the value of a labor power commodity, is the one for a small family as the unit of reproducing labor power, so the dissolution of necessary labor extends even into such a small unit as a family. Necessary labor, however, transcends such a small unit in the next double reason. The first reason is that necessary labor, which can be enjoyed by units of small families, is actually expended only to realize the use value of a labor power commodity, and accordingly that the actually expenditure of necessary labor is left to the buyer of labor power and is of no concern to a worker's family. The second reason is that the sphere of necessary living method commodities, being the form of necessary labor, as strictly limited to a small family's life in quantity, can be extended to the almost entire world market in comparison with the combination of the concrete and useful labor of the formation like use value.

To answer why the content of value prescription takes the form of commodity value, it is necessary to reconstruct substantially the problem of the transfer of products to commodities. Such a prescription as production for sale and exchange is provided for developing social divisions of labor directly as private production. To answer why necessary labor takes the form of labor power value, it is necessary to rebuild more substantially the problem of the transfer of a labor power to a commodity. As to this transfer, freedom in the so-called double sense has been discussed. Of this prescription, it is true as in itself, but in the process of the description, the condition of it is not made clear. Only with freedom in the double sense, this original form of necessary labor cannot be explained, with the exception of the formal originality of wage labor against slaves and serfs. Then, it

calls for an analysis (of surplus value production) concerning the condition of the buyer as well as that of the seller. The analysis makes clear the social character of necessary labor; namely in addition to necessary labor under the buyer a worker is forced to exhibit surplus labor to enjoy the result of necessary labor in his private and free life in a narrow sense.

Various prescription of the so-called "wage protection" give legal protection to the form of labor power value: The principle of wage payment to a worker himself directly gives protection for the realization of a labor power commodity just in the hand of the seller; the purposes of the limitation of an allowance in kind, of the prohibition of compulsory using of Tommy shop, and the purpose of the principle of paying in legal tender are all to protect of the seller for the realization of value and ensure him freedom in the transfer of the form money to various necessary living method commodities; the regular payment of wages, the payment near the workshop and the prohibition of payment in a wine shop, and the like are established to prevent a worker's independence from being infringed in the living process in a narrow sense; the prescription of the system of advance and compulsory savings which are discussed in relation to "wage protection" as well as the regulation of the maximum term by a service contract, are to prevent wage labor from being reverted to the older labor form. Neither the content of the prescription referring to the content would rather be prohibited nor the size of value except for the form of labor power value do all these prescriptions refer to.

II. INEVITABILITY OF FORM OF LABOR POWER VALUE

Supposing that the content of labor power value prescription constitutes necessary labor or a worker's consumption fund, necessary labor not necessarily take the form of labor power value. As long as labor is not wage labor, necessary labor does not become labor power value. But supposing that in capitalistic production necessary labor takes the form of labor power value and that capitalistic production exists all through the defined historical times, there is some undeniable correspondence, a consistent contradiction as it is, between the content and the form. If capitalistic production can play also a progressive role in the history of mankind, a reasonable relation should be found between the content of labor power value prescription and the form of labor power value as compared with the fundamental direction of the history of mankind in the future. The history of mankind mentioned here is the history of the humanization of nature and a human development in nature, that is, the changing process of a human life with the purpose of blooming humanity. Can we find such a corresponding relation between the content and the form?

Generally speaking, only in the following relations the form of labor power value can correspond to the content: Under the form a stimulus to labor power expenditure keeps pace with the development of labor power itself, and what is more, the enrichment of necessary living methods keeps pace with the frugality of the quantity of necessary labor. Then, in what conditions can it happen?

Necessary labor taking the form of labor power value is actually expended by the buyer as labor power to be recognized as use value of a labor power commodity, which is the condition in which it is accumulated as capital under the buyer to be organized into a cooperation for higher productivity. To develop labor productivity it is necessary to develop labor power. As far as the result of necessary labor which is realized as exchange value compensates for labor power expenditure handed over as use value, the form of labor power value ensures a certain high level of labor productivity. Besides, the development of labor productivity may also increase the productivity of necessary labor, only in this case the increasing efficiency of a labor power can be returned to a worker himself positively, so that a worker will receive a benefit from the development of labor power. Repeatedly, to consider such a situation in which it is possible to raise productivity only by cooperation organized by capital, necessary labor's productivity rises because necessary labor takes the form of labor power.

Next, when necessary labor takes the form of labor power value, a worker can enjoy the result of necessary labor in his private and free living process in a narrow sense with his earned money which has realized labor power value. It ensures an increase in efficiency of necessary labor, too. The problem in the improvement of labor productivity as mentioned above is to raise the efficiency of necessary labor which results in necessary living methods, while the problem in the consumption process of products is the efficiency which concern itself with a combination of various necessary living methods he chooses and ways in which he consumes them in the M-C...L process. The privateness and freedom of this process, while it covers a small sphere of economic life, makes it possible to investigate the combination of necessary living methods with much originality, economize the consumption of necessary living methods and eliminate waste. If expending labor power by the buyer economizes necessary labor as abstract human labor by producing more amount of use value at the same quantity of labor, this way economizes by the consumption of necessary living methods raising a degree of realization of use value. The living process in a narrow sense, as within a small limit, because of the private and free character, can take the first step toward the blow of humanity especially the free development of labor power.

Considering the inevitability of the form of labor power value in the two aspects, namely labor and living process in a narrow sense as mentioned above, we cannot omit the problem of the labor market without catalysis of which these two aspects cannot combine. In the situation in which capital is divided mutually among individual capitals or buyers of labor, and labor power is divided mutually among workers' families, or sellers of labor power, it is impossible to grasp directly the productivity which unifies necessary labor into necessary living methods and the qualitative composition of necessary living methods. Freedom of workers is ensured only in the privately and mutually confronted situation between individual capitals and each worker's family. The contents itself, necessary labor, a worker's consumption fund as a social total of necessary labor, the qualitative composition of necessary living methods and a size of each elements as a more concrete form of necessary living methods cannot exist without taking a social form. Necessary labor takes the form of value for various necessary living method commodities, which cannot help taking the form of value of a labor power commodity. Without the form, an average amount of necessary labor, an average share and a total amount of a worker's consumption fund cannot be measured socially and cannot be handed over to a worker actually.

It is not necessary to say that the contradiction between the content and the form should not be overcome by the correspondence between the two. The correspondence is nothing but a concrete way of existence of the contradiction. It is only because those which are hostile substantially do not appear hostile all the time. In other words, it is necessary for the correspondence between the form and the content of labor power value that the improvement of a labor power and the living standard should keep pace with an increase in production of surplus value, and that an increase in both quality and quantity of necessary living methods the worker earns should keep pace with a decrease in labor expenses to capital. A pastoral relation like this is relative. Necessary labor opposes directly to surplus labor and labor power value opposes surplus value. The former is a necessary vice as well as a means to the latter. Though necessary labor has no way of existing except for taking the form of labor power value, the form of labor power value does not always ensure necessary labor in the content.

First of all, surplus labor can be expended sacrificing necessary labor. A stimulus to the expending of labor power may check the development of it. In actually expending necessary labor, surplus labor expenditure is a prescribing goal, which necessary labor expenditure is subordinate to, no labor being expended without the pain of labor. This constitutes the first difficulty. Secondly, as to the enjoyment of necessary labor, the money

realizing labor power value is not often enough in comparison with the value of necessary living methods. Surplus value production can be pursued by reason of the insufficient ensurance of necessary living methods, namely, the partial reduction of necessary living methods. Although a worker's private and free life in a narrow sense contains a possibility to economize necessary labor by efficient using methods, it also contains the economy of necessary labor without real enrichment of those methods. Then, this constitutes the second difficulty. Thirdly, the value of a labor power commodity involves a risk of unrealization, so does the value of a produced commodity in the capitalistic commodity. To be concrete, this is approximately a cause for unemployment. This constitutes the third difficulty. The first is pain of labor, the second is poverty and the third is uneasiness of livelihood.

We will misunderstand the correspondence between the two as a harmony and fail to grasp the history of the form of a labor power commodity if we do not admit the contradiction between the form and the content of labor power value, admitting the fundamental category of capitalistic production in a labor power commodity. In regard to the first difficulty as to pain of labor, there are the following theory: Social gross capital will set itself to secure labor power for maintaining the productive foundation of its own. Regarding to the second difficulty as to poverty, we have had the theory that the size of labor power value should be adjusted according to business fluctuation. Namely, raising wages over the value in the prosperous times and its standard of living should be adjusted to a normal standard as compared with those in the depression days. Besides, as for the third difficulty related to the uneasiness of living, the logic that generally only those realized bring about the produced commodity value and the others do not in actuality can be applied to marginal labor power dismissed in depression, which is not labor power from the beginning.

Actually, the contradiction between the content of labor power prescription and the form of labor power value often faces a crisis mainly by reason of insufficient security from the form of labor power value for necessary living methods. I think it reasonable to reflect on the fact that the wage theory in the postwar critical times has been concerned too much only with the fundamental prescription of labor power value, as the problem of labor disputed on the subject even theoretically, which implies that in those days we inquired as to what the social form of production for a worker's living itself should be and whether the content of labor power value prescription can correspond to the form of labor power value.

We have the same problem as the above concerning a wage demand for seventy thousand yen a month in "the Wage Program", presented by the 1952's General Council of Japanese Labor Unions (Sohyo). The monthly

wage of seventy thousand yen was estimated when labor statistics show fourteen thousand yen per month as a total amount of monthly wage of a regular worker in a business firm. The opposite side of them argued that, it was a matter of surprising that such a large amount of money was estimated as the value of labor power they exclaimed, "Multiply seventy thousand yen by the number of workers and we will get the figure much more than a gross amount of national income immediately!" But, Japanese capitalism which developed mainly through the parasitic land owner system and the Emperor system, without establishing average household wages for a long time, employing a peasant's daughter who went out for work to reduce the number of mouths to feed, involved a constant risk of excess lowering of the wage level. The revelation of the crisis was delayed by a workers' low concern over their rights. The standard of wages in the postwar Japanese capitalism started far below that of the prewar days because of destroyed productivity and pressure from the occupation forces as the result of the defeat in the latest war. The original combination in prewar days between capitalism and low wage standard has made its emergence appeal to workers for awakening their consciousness of rights from their traditional obedience and also a challenge to capitalists for organizing the economy to enable the payment.

As to the late incomes policy, too, as related to the disputed point here, it includes a discussion of the scope of necessary living methods as the size of necessary labor. If the discussion is caused by the reason that capitalistic accumulation cannot be continued without an agreement on necessary living methods, it must be considered that we are urged to solve alternative problem, namely, the establishment of the quantity of necessary living methods to ensure surplus labor or to form the conception of another social form of production which ensures a certain quantity of necessary living methods. This situation suggests the crisis of the form of labor power value.

But, at the same time, we have to recognize that those crises have been temporarily solved each time so long as capitalistic production continues to exist. Even if it is wrong not to admit the inconsistency except a harmony in corresponding the form to the content, it is not true either that only the crisis of a contradiction should be exaggerated more than necessary.

III. CHANGE OF LABOR POWER VALUE PRESCRIPTION IN CONTENT

Labor power value prescription undergoes change in content. As the long term trend, firstly, the quantity of necessary living methods is increasing. An increase in labor productivity has an influence on the quantity of a worker's living methods, increasing at various rates according to the relation

between labor and capital.

Allen W. Rucker, who is famous for Rucker's plan taking up this relation, tries to lead a consensus in the decision of the future rate of labor expenses from the past rate, which in truth was a consequence of a labor-management dispute, by saying that some common rate is decided between the additional value and labor expenses by something unknown. The rule of a worker's destitution will be denied if we can find a common relation between the development of labor productivity and the increasing quantity of necessary living methods and if this increasing quantity corresponds to the improvement of a worker's standard of living.

To raise labor productivity under capitalistic production is, however, fundamentally to increase the production of relative surplus value. In a competition between labor and capital, all the results of increased labor productivity are likely to be identified with surplus value. Without an successful labor dispute, workers are unable to gain some benefits from the results as their consumption fund. In addition, increase of necessary living methods does not always mean the raise of a standard of living.

To begin with, in the transfer of a small commodity producer to a wage worker various pains accompany, as the loss of freedom in determination of the speed of labor and selection of various formalities of labor days at his convenience, and the obedience to labor disciplines. Compensation is allowed for a worker in terms of a little regular leisure, a little adjustment of both the length of a labor day and labor intensity, various methods for livelihood in a narrow sense. But they make little difference. The necessity for capital to automatically control a working process makes the content of labor less interesting to an individual worker. He comes to lose his interest in doing such work as is controlled by capital automatically. The poorer in content labor is, the more compensation is required. It is, what we call, a substantial recreation. A wage worker, on the other hand, finds another way to develop his humanity by using a little private and free time left to him in the rest of his living process in a narrow sense as the result of an automated working process. Consequently, the achievement of the high standard of living causes the worker to feel the pain of labor relatively strong. The compensation for the pain should grow larger acceleratedly. What happens when it cannot grow large enough? A worker's ability of labor corresponds to that of consumption. Only those, which are produced devotedly, are enjoyed very well. How can those who cannot devote themselves to production, respect products? Who bends all of his energy to produce those which he knows will be wasted? Both "the gor gemeousness" in part of a worker's life at the last stage of "the highly-advanced economic growth" and anti-civilizational "Luddite's" reaction to products at the same

stage happened as an expression of a contradiction of increase in amount of necessary living method themselves.

Mother Nature comes to be under the influence of human labor with the expansion of a man's production ability. Only to keep the same living circumstances, the more amount of living methods than before comes to be needed. Though water from a mountain is not enough, neither from a well nor from a large river we can draw enough water. Next, as soon as various labor in an individual household is replaced by social labor, necessary living methods from the point of view of social products increase in quantity for all the same quantity of living methods in a broad sense as required before. In contrast with an increase in quantity of necessary living method commodities, the social role of "free labor" of housekeeping diminishes. Capitalistic production, whose basis of economic calculation is commodity value, gives rise to waste of land and labor power naturally, which causes much more products to be required so that the waste is made up for. The problem of air pollution has caused the invention of the air purifying equipments; and public nuisance of noises has called for the invention of sound proofing devices; lack of leisure equipments has urged people to buy cars; and medical supplies have been developed to restore failing health, and so on.

No strong evidence exist to prove that increasing necessary living methods in this department do not exceed the limit of the development of capitalistic productivity. In addition, necessary living methods themselves happen to be an immediate cause for the aggravation of a worker's standard of living. According to economics till this age, consumers are thought to have an ability of distinguishing the use value of commodities. Nevertheless, workers who are organized in a more closely divided and specialized division of labor, tend to the ignorant of the use value of goods consumers should know. Being moved by a dazzling advertisement and the latest artificially created fashion, the harmful and the useless to the reproduction of labor power come to take the form of necessary living methods.

Secondly, a long term changing tendency of the content of labor power value prescription is that the use value of necessary living methods divided into individuals becomes a net consumption and that, on the other hand, it becomes durable consumption commodities and grows large in units. It follows from further developments in the division of labor power value as well as in "a nuclear family" and "a household apart from his family" that the unit of a worker's living methods changes from the household to the private, from raw material to commodities and services which require less family labor. Meanwhile, in spite of the division in usage, a large-scale methods are created among consumption commodities. It occurs that part of necessary living methods changes to a social facility, or to capital being

absorbed into a producing process of capital and a circulating process. Various commodities in a lumber room and a closet in a private household become the inventory of a public or an enterprise's warehouse. A public coffee house and various halls replace a private guest room and a parlor. It is not necessary to touch on education and medical care. "The urbanization" of life enlarges to a worker the scope of necessary living methods, whose private utility causes the problem. To secure a private utility, a worker should concern himself much about the administration of common facilities.

As the content of labor power value prescription changes, it begins to be reconsidered that an increase in quantity of necessary living methods does not always bring about the improvement of the condition of labor power reproduction and the development of labor power. The reflection of what the really useful necessary living methods is will lead to the recognition of labor as a stimulus to the development of labor power and the necessity of establishing a workshop condition available to develop labor power.

Similarly, with a change in the content of labor power prescription, especially with an increase in number of material units, the content and the size of labor power value, which cannot be grasped from the experiences except indirect index of market, because of the two conditions of necessary living methods, (1) Such methods are spread out in the whole society qualitatively because of its social division of labor and (2) the combination and the adoption of such methods are left to the private and free will of a worker's household, can gradually be grasped more directly from the experiences of various facilities related to necessary living methods and from the activities of giant capital. Besides, especially in the growing tendency of the consumption of necessary living methods, changing processes from a man to an object and vice versa become near a stream without a pool, so we can hardly tell necessary living methods from production methods. If the field of production methods has a tendency to enlarge in proportion to the diminishing workers' consumption into net consumption, the stream of production to consumption has been ready to be designed in the background for the purpose of developing labor power. Such a society where everything is changeable to necessary living things has been ready to be born from the society in which framing of a worker's necessary living methods and accumulating of capital raise productivity.

IV. CHANGE OF LABOR POWER VALUE IN FORM

The form of labor power value is conditioned upon the reproduction of labor power in a small private household. The household is united as a unit by its common expenses. As to the division of labor power value, the divided labor power value, at the beginning, can not work independently

in the process of L-M-C...L and must be collected together so that it can support the process of living in a narrow sense for the first time. But necessary living methods have a tendency to be gradually divided per consumption unit, because the division of labor power value stimulates the establishment of a household apart from a family, which leads to develop necessary living methods for individuals. That gives no reason for the immediate dissociation of a small family as a unit of labor power reproduction, but, above all, the times of household expenses which take on a strong character of necessities of life, such as lunch expenses, become expenses from the individual's pocket. It is in compensation for an increasing difficulty in family life and succeeding generations of labor power that we can gain more freedom from small families of our own.

Meanwhile, the unit of labor power reproduction is magnified and socialized partially. The increase in number of a small-scale families of workers and the popularization of single-handed households deprive a worker's life of flexibility to accomodate himself to various difficulties of life. A community bonded together by blood and territorial relations has lost authority to defend its members against difficulties, in the place of which there appears a system ranging from mutual aid among workers to social security. The fund based on labor power value, being organized by the contribution from labor power value, composes a larger unit of labor power reproduction. Prescribed by the form of labor power value, the fund is worth more than labor power value. Through the transfer of social insurance to social security, the new character of the fund becomes stronger than ever. Thanks to the making of compulsive contribution, those necessary living methods which are materialized as labor power value, are gradually reduced only to be the so-called "take-home wages".

In the form of labor power value, the necessity of a worker is admitted only on an average, whereby using this average necessity as a basis, some necessity according to labor is admitted to an individual worker. Labor in this case includes the expenditure of surplus labor as well as of necessary labor; essentially speaking, this labor will rather be surplus labor. The first point is to realize value of labor power commodities for the realization of use value of labor power commodities, while the payment of wages stimulates surplus labor, and the second point is, at the same time, that wages are paid according to the possibility of surplus labor, since evidence for labor power to become use value must be presented for the realization of value of labor power commodities. Supposing that the form of labor power value is, in this sense, the form of payment according to labor for a free worker household in private, the fund of social insurance is, as far as the internal group of workers is concerned, distributed according neither to

the average necessity nor to labor but to the concrete and individual necessity. Only the accidents in a small part of a wage worker's life, which are directly related to dire poverty, are insured, besides the degree of satisfaction is not always enough, as compared with the degree of necessity to some extent or at the minimum degree of necessary satisfaction; the distribution here is according not to labor but to the concrete and individual necessity.

Just as monopoly has risen above free competition, the social insurance fund is established on the form of labor power value as an original form partially inconsistent with its foundation of labor power value. As long as wage labor owes its existence to a stimulus due only to the payment of wage, the form of labor power value on a private and free household of a worker is not abolished, whereas the sphere of insurance will be confined within narrow limits of a worker's life and moreover competition will be continued between those protected by the fund and those not, as well as between one fund and another. But we cannot deny that labor power value as the form of necessary labor undergoes an important change. A partial change in competition is connected with prevention against the poverty of a worker. So long as the social insurance fund tries to achieve the aim by controlling an increase in necessary labor, namely by raising the efficiency of a consumption fund to labor power reproduction, it has also an effect of causing poverty instead. It has been proved from the existence of this fund that not only a household of a worker but other social organizations should actually be responsible for labor power reproduction. Instead we have had another problem of violation of private freedom in each household of workers. In this connection, there are developments of various fields of social security, which should be distinguished from social insurance, as combined with the development of social insurance and "the urbanization" of life. They represent public aid, social welfare, public health, public housing policy, and so on. Their concrete contents are concerned with necessary living methods which are the same as those of labor power value. The form is, however, the redistribution of incomes on the municipal and national government levels. It can be said that those composed of a part of the content of labor power value are specialized to involve the distribution according to individual necessity. Still it makes no difference on the basis of the form of labor power value. The standard formula of benefits in social security such as a standard of protection in public aid, a standard of action in social welfare, a standard of residence in public housing, and so on, is specified according to the size and the degree of realization of labor power value of a workers in service. It is also necessary for us to note that social security can fulfil its administrative function according not only to the object of the policy itself, but also to the life of a worker in service, taking the form in

which the standard formula of benefits reacts on an average size of labor power value.

In the form of labor power value, the quantity of necessary living methods is measured experimentally and indirectly through the competition. The aggravation of a worker's poverty and the necessity of a social policy against it have given rise to the direct measurement of necessary living methods. The fact that the amount of minimum wages, the standard of the daily life security and other national minimums are established, is related to an attempt to calculate the minimum quantity of necessary living methods. The calculation of standard living expenses pushes forward that of necessary living methods. The experience of social insurance makes the partial measurement of necessary living methods more precise. For, a mass observation makes it possible to measure fluctuation factors which cannot be grasped by analyses of each worker's household economy. This experience further magnifies the sphere of accurate measurement of such necessary living methods. Individual measurement encourages direct measurement of the part of necessary living methods whose degree of necessity can be easily measured. This measurement however, stimulates a dispute between labor and capital. The measurement works as a lever to counter-attack workers as well as a lever to control a worker's life bureaucratically. The more directly labor and capital talk about both the quality and quantity of necessary living methods, the less worth the existence of the form of labor power value becomes. For, the value of commodities, generally speaking, is worth existing only because we cannot acquire a direct grasp of the quantity of social necessary labor.

We should point out difficulties in measurement of the quantity of necessary living methods, too. By the marketing action of monopolistic capital and the influence of a luxurious consumption in the capitalist classes may cause a worker's life to assimilate those which are not admitted as a necessary living method in a long term. The securing of land and labor power, as well as the developing of democracy among workers will necessarily distinguish the original necessary living methods from the others. As to the measurement of the quantity of social necessary labor, we meet with another difficulties, such as monopoly prices, the movement of speculation on land and of bank rates for consumers' finance, inflation, and the like. They will be overcome by progress of a workers' management of social production.