

Freedom and Unfreedom in Marxian Economics

JULIE A. MATTHAEI*

Unlike orthodox, Neo-Classical economic theory, Marxian economics attempts to account for the life of the economic individual. While Neo-Classical theory begins by postulating needy, utility-maximizing individuals, who then drive the economy, Marxian theory centers on the analysis of the self-determining process of capital accumulation, and accounts for the creation and sustenance of the individual within this process. By referring to the system of economic relationships, Marxian theory accounts for individual continuing choices to reproduce the accumulation of capital. Individuals are absorbed into social and economic life not as its goal or endpoint, but as an integral part; they are constructed and sustained within the web of social relationships, in particular, property ownership, exchange, and capital accumulation. For example, the worker, deprived of ownership of the means of production, is forced to offer his only commodity, labor power, to the capitalist in exchange for his subsistence. The capitalist is prevented from consuming all of his profits by his competition with other capitalists, which necessitates continual investment and expansion. No reference need be made to human nature; individual identity and behavior can be ac-

counted for as social products.

There are, however, serious flaws in the Marxian conception of the social determination of the individual. Specifically, it consistently denies an essential feature of life within capitalism—the centrality of freedom of contract, and of the individuation it entails. The lives of all but the shrinking minority of capitalists are portrayed as a purely negative experience of exploitation, drudgery, and unfreedom. Wage labor is presented as a process of alienation and exploitation, engaged in by the worker only to keep from starving. Consumption is only the purchase of the subsistence necessary to live, work, and reproduce. The positive aspects of the economic life of the individual as worker and as consumer within capitalism are ignored or glossed over. As a result, Marxists have been unable to understand the loyalty of the majority of American workers to capitalism as anything other than ideological brainwashing and “false consciousness.”

Why does Marxian economic theory thus ignore or underplay the economic freedom experienced by the individual under capitalism? One reason is certainly political—Marxian theory has always been a critique of capitalism, including as one of its essential tenets the desirability and inevitability of the overthrow of capitalists and capitalism by the working class. Another connected reason can be found in the historical development of economic theory. Marxian and Neo-Classical theories have developed alongside of and opposed to one another: Marxists have emphasized the unfreedom and oppression of life

*Assistant Professor, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181. This paper originated as a Wellesley College Economics Department Working Paper; it was presented at the 1981 meetings of the History of Economics Society in East Lansing, Michigan. I would like to thank both audiences for their helpful comments, as well as Roy Rotheim, Nai Pew Ong, Teresa Amott, Ingrid Rima, and the anonymous referee.

under capitalism, while Neo-Classicists have centered on the freedom of contract and choice. Although the existence of individual freedom is not incompatible with the social determination of the individual, it is incompatible with what most view as the theoretical core of Marxist theory—its labor theory of value. This observation provides the framework for criticizing Marxian theory as it relates to the individual as a basis for a revised conception which can account for the existence and content of individual freedom under capitalism.

Inherent in the Marxian conception of capitalism is the recognition that the development of private property and capitalist production simultaneously brought freedom and unfreedom. As Marx wrote:

Hence, the historical movement which changes the producers into wage-workers, appears, on the one hand, as their emancipation from serfdom and from the fetters of the guilds, and this side alone exists for our bourgeois historians. But, on the other hand, these new freedmen became sellers of themselves only after they had been robbed of all their own means of production, and of all the guarantees of existence afforded by the old feudal arrangements. And the history of this, their expropriation, is written in the annals of mankind in letters of blood and fire.¹

Within Marxist theory, however, the emphasis is always on the oppression of workers and their resulting lack of freedom; real freedom, it is argued, can only be achieved when workers gain control over the production process by overthrowing the capitalists.

For Marxists, the freedom of contract provided by private property and exchange has no substance for the worker. He chooses between work and starvation: offering his labor power to the capitalist is the only way to provide himself and his family with the necessities of life. The Marxist denigration of freedom of contract derives from viewing labor

as a means to subsistence, and, consumption as the means to reproducing of the labor force.

Unfreedom in Consumption: Consumption as Production

A glaring weakness of Marxian theory is its inability to adequately grasp the involvement of the American working class in consumption. While Neo-Classical theory centers its analysis on "consumer choice", Marxian theory denies such choice, and the self-expression it allows.

There are two reasons for Marxists' silence on this issue. First, Marx theorized that the wage would be kept at the bare minimum necessary to reproduce the laboring class. Although an initial labor shortage would bid up wages, capital responds with labor-saving technical changes which create a permanent reserve army of unemployed. Workers' competition for jobs keeps the wage at the minimum required to keep them, and their children, alive.² Hence, workers are prevented from buying anything other than necessities, which effectively denies them any real freedom in consumption. With choice eliminated, consumption is reduced to the animal-like process of biological survival.

Some Neo-Marxists have revised Marx's prediction that the standard of living would remain at a basic subsistence level. They note that underconsumption, the increasing productivity of labor, and union pressures have, in fact, necessitated the expansion of workers' needs and consumption. However, they portray this development as unambiguously negative, because it engenders false needs, diverting attention from real human concerns. They thus continue the Marxist tradition of ignoring or downplaying the freedom of choice involved in consumption.³

²*Capital*, V. 1, Chap. XXV, "The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation."

³Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy's, *Monopoly Capital* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1966) conceived of increasing needs as a way for corporations to dispose of

¹Karl Marx, *Capital*, V. 1 (New York: International Publishers, 1967), pp. 715. See also pages 84-5.

Why have Marxists been so reticent about the freedom of choice involved in consumption? Certainly, part of the reason is provided by their political position: acknowledging freedom means recognizing something positive about the worker's life under capitalism, which detracts from his motivation for socialist revolution. But there is, I think, a more powerful, theoretical reason for this analytical lapse. For, in order to incorporate choice into the consumption of the workers, one must reject or severely modify the labor theory of value. That cornerstone of Marxian economics requires that consumption be "collapsed" into a process of production, i.e. the production of the individual's labor power or ability to work.

According to Marx's labor theory of value, prices are expressions of commodities' values. A commodity's command over money in exchange (its price) is proportionate to its value, this latter being determined by the labor time socially necessary to produce it.⁴ The labor power offered by workers to capitalists is "produced" by the consumption of commodities; i.e. "production" in the home. Thus,

"the surplus" which, if not spent, would bring insufficient effective demand and stagnation. John Kenneth Galbraith, an eclectic Marxist in my view, made a similar point in his *Affluent Society* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958). Andre Gorz writes of expanding needs without expanding satisfaction due to the deteriorating quality of life in *Strategy for Labor*, trans. by Martin A. Nicolaus and Victoria Ortiz (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), Ch. 4; William Leiss deprecates this phenomenon as distorting our real, non-material needs in *The Limits to Satisfaction: An Essay on the Problem of Needs and Commodities* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976). In *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), C. B. MacPherson argues that market society sustains a view of man as infinite desirer rather than as a holder of potentials, using this view effectively to harness men's energies to labor.

⁴This view of the value-price relationship is presented in *Capital*, V. 1, Chap. I; in Volume 3, Part II, Marx recognizes that differences in the organic composition of capital (capital/labor ratios) between industries disrupt the direct proportionality of price to value, but argues nevertheless that value continues to govern accumulation as well as prices.

the value of the commodity labor power—the wage—is determined by the value of the commodities consumed by the worker and his family.⁵

At first look, this appears to be a tautology rather than a theory of wage determination—the value of the wage indeed will equal the value of the commodities consumed by workers, if none of the wages are saved. But the quantity and mix of commodities consumed by the workers are not determined by their wage—on the contrary, it is the shared, "subsistence basket" of commodities, determined outside of the economy by biology and history, which regulates the wage.⁶ The contents of the subsistence basket represent the technology for the production of the commodity labor power, delineating the nature and quantity of the commodity inputs required to produce and reproduce workers. Given this technology of labor power production, the value of the wage will vary with changing technology in the production of the subsistence goods so as to remain equal to the amount of labor embodied in the commodities contained in the subsistence basket. For example, the development of capitalism brings labor-saving technical change in the subsistence goods industries, reducing the labor embodied in the subsistence basket, and hence reducing the value of labor power.

Why can not choice be incorporated into this framework? Choice is antithetical to the idea of a biologically or historically given

⁵*Ibid.*, V. 1, Chap. VI, "The Buying and Selling of Labor Power." This view of consumption led feminists, seeking to extend Marxian theory to include women's housework, to conceptualize the latter as the production of labor power, and began a lively debate as to whether or not housework produced surplus value. See, for a summary, Susan Himmelweit and Simon Mohun, "Domestic Labour and Capital," *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, V. 1 (1977).

⁶*Capital*, V. 1, pp. 170-3. Even workers who earn higher wages do not gain freedom—these higher wages must go to payment for the training which has increased the value of their labor power as well as the value which it produces.

subsistence bundle of goods that all workers must consume in order to reproduce themselves as workers. Even if we claim that, due to ethnic background, age, occupation, or success in the class struggle, each worker, or group of workers, has a different subsistence basket, and hence a different value of labor power—and bring in the market as an average to transform values of labor powers into wages such that equally skilled labor earns equal wages—we have not introduced choice. Workers are still forced to consume a pre-determined basket of goods. Choice in consumption can only exist if workers have the ability to determine which commodities they will purchase with their wages.

Choice could be introduced into the theory by assuming a value of labor power or wage, and then allowing workers choice in spending by picking the contents of their subsistence baskets. But this involves using the value of labor power to determine the contents of the subsistence baskets, rather than vice versa; to say at this point that the value of labor power is an average of the values of the workers' subsistence baskets is now a tautology, since the values of the subsistence baskets are determined by the assumed value of labor power, and the theory of wage determination is lost.

In short, the Marxian theory of wages, since it links wages to a subsistence basket whose contents are determined outside of the economy, precludes choice as to the contents of this basket by workers. Since, once paid in money, the worker is not only permitted but indeed forced to decide upon the contents of his "subsistence basket", the monetary character of the wage must be suppressed.⁷ If this

⁷The concept of the value of labor power abstracts from the monetary nature of the wage in another way—by claiming that the worker's *real* wage—i.e. his command over commodities—is set in the wage bargain. In fact, only the money wage is set in the typical wage bargain—the resulting real wage depends upon the pricing decisions of the capitalists, which themselves reflect changes in money wages. See David P. Levine, *Economic Theory*, V. 1, (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978) p. 143n, and V. 2, pp. 213–4, 220.

incontrovertible freedom within consumption is to be incorporated into Marxian theory, the conceptions of the subsistence wage and of the value of labor power must be abandoned. The notion of consumption as merely the production of labor power through the fulfillment of naturally (or historically) fixed needs must be put aside, allowing for both the acknowledgement of the rising standard of living and of choice and individuation within consumption. This does not mean, however, giving up the economic determinacy of consumption and reducing it, as does Neo-Classical economics, to the process of fulfilling given, infinite, subjective needs. But before we develop some of the essential aspects of consumption within capitalism, we must look to the other side of the wage bargain—the labor process.

Unfreedom in Production: Alienated Labor

The other side of the Marxian conception of the subsistence wage is the conception of labor as an alienating, degrading, unfree activity. Those deprived of means of production enter the labor force out of abject necessity, receiving for their efforts only the most basic necessities. Their only interest, then, in working is the subsistence basket which employment provides. The freedom and self-expression involved in the choice of a job and the performance in it are, again, without reality. Why?

The first reason—the Marxist conception of labor as simply the means to the consumption of a subsistence basket—has already been discussed. A job is but the means to earning a wage to provide subsistence goods. The worker is virtually reduced to an animal, and laboring is little more than foraging for food. There is no incentive to work harder or acquire skills for job advancement—the wage increases thus earned will not increase the worker's discretionary income, but rather, will only increase to keep

pace with the cost of any added necessities, such as training. Hence the social importance of work under capitalism is ignored; the fact that the worker works within a web of social relationships which construct and maintain his public identity is overlooked, except in discussions of the manner in which the growth of the firm unites workers and increases the possibility for revolution.

A second and related reason is that Marxists have ignored the worker's freedom and self-expression in the labor force. Marx foresaw the continual simplification and degradation of the labor process and the laborer as skilled, craft labor was replaced with unskilled labor, tied to machinery.⁸ Jobs become more and more similar, and workers increasingly interchangeable. At the same time, as machinery replaces tools and takes control of the labor process, labor becomes transformed from an expression of the worker's will and skills to mere machine-tending. Abilities and knowledge have no bearing on the shape of the product; one's only impact is the negative result of a task not properly completed. The choice between different jobs has little importance as jobs become more and more similar.⁹ Hence, the freedom involved in the labor process—the choice between employers and jobs, and the choice of how to actually perform one's labor assignment—becomes increasingly insignificant.

There is also a purely theoretical reason for the Marxist view of labor as an unskilled, ho-

mogenous process—such labor is most consistent with the labor theory of value. Since, according to the latter, the value of a commodity is determined by the labor embodied in it, measured in hours, the labor of different workers must be comparable, if not homogeneous. Unskilled labor is virtually the same across industries—it is reasonable that an hour of unskilled labor anywhere would produce the same amount of value.

What about skilled labor? In order to maintain the labor theory of value, Marxists have had to accept Marx's proposition that it is reducible to unskilled labor. The training acquired by a skilled craft worker increases the value he creates in an hour proportionately to the increases in the wage cost (which reflects the training cost).¹⁰ This again, is a tautological argument: if worker X receives a higher wage than worker Y, it must be because he is more productive, having had higher training costs (which is akin to Neo-Classical human capital theory). This mechanism for explaining wage differences begs more questions than it answers, in particular, can the productivity of labor really be measured as a physical or technological datum, abstracted from the process of the market?¹¹ And, would Marxists claim that the higher paid, managers are more productive than the assembly line workers in their plants? These theoretical problems have resulted in the virtual banishment of skilled labor and wage hierarchies from rigorous Marxist discussions of value, surplus value, capital accumulation, and the laws of capitalist development. In these dis-

⁸This comes across most clearly in Marx's early work; see, for example, "Estranged Labor" in Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, edited by Dirk J. Struik, and translated by Martin Milligan (New York: International Publishers, 1964). See also *Capital*, V. 1, Part IV.

⁹"The indifference to the particular kind of labour corresponds to a form of society [advanced capitalism] in which individuals pass with ease from one kind of work to another, which makes it immaterial to them what particular kind of work may fall to their share." Karl Marx, "Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy," in David Horowitz, ed., *Marx and Modern Economics* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1968), p. 44.

¹⁰*Capital*, V. 1, pp. 44 and 172. All of these reductions must, of course, keep the rate of surplus value (unpaid over paid labor hours) the same for the different types of workers.

¹¹Joan Robinson has attacked the Neo-Classical marginal productivity theory on the same grounds; with heterogeneous inputs and outputs, she argues, it is impossible to measure productivity without using prices. But prices are what both theories are attempting to explain. See her *Economic Heresies: Some Old-Fashioned Questions in Economic Theory* (New York: Basic Books, 1971), especially pp. 55–58.

cussions, the working class involves only unskilled workers. In recent years, Marxist analysis of the differentiation of the labor force has blossomed in the form of dual or segmented labor market analysis, but theorists in this tradition are forced to ignore the Marxian theory of value, surplus value, and accumulation.¹²

So again, as in consumption, the freedom and individuation of workers is ignored or underplayed. Deprived of any real avenues of self-expression in his work or choice of work, the worker is virtually reduced to an animal. His relationship to the labor process is a purely negative one and his labor is a dehumanizing activity he must undergo in order to earn his subsistence. In the words of Marx, "The worker . . . only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself . . . His labor . . . is forced labor . . . Its alien character emerges clearly in the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists, labor is shunned like the plague . . . in his human function (i.e. work) he no longer feels himself to be anything but an animal."¹³

Capitalism, Freedom, and Unfreedom

This section presents a brief, revised framework for analyzing the economic freedom of the individual within capitalism. It is predicated on our critique of the Marxian analysis as ignoring the freedoms that capitalism provides to the individual whom Marxists depict as unfree. Our criticism does not, however, mean that we accept the Neo-Classical interpretation of individual freedom because both the differentiated preferences of individuals, and their preoccupation with maximizing utility are assumed, rather than explained. The economy becomes nothing more than the expression of these irreducible, inexplicable urges, placed into confrontation with the scarcity of resources and aided by technology. To properly analyze the individual within capitalism we can not begin, as Neo-Classical theorists do, with the individual. For in doing so we are taking as given what we wish to explain.

To grasp the content of individuality within capitalism we must build on the Marxian tradition, and look to the manner in which the individual is constructed in his social relations. As Marx and Marxists contend, capitalism is based upon the centralization of ownership of the means of production in the hands of a few. Those individuals who do not possess capital adequate to undertaking the production of commodities are forced to sell the only commodity they own—their own labor power—to capitalists in exchange for money with which to buy consumer goods. However, this analysis of the economic determination of the individual omits one basic unfreedom—that created by the sexual division of labor—and ignores the freedom of self-expression demanded of the individual in both the labor force and in consumption. These three are briefly examined below, in turn.

The Sexual Division of Labor: One cannot properly analyze the individual within capitalism without taking into account the sexual

division of labor.¹⁴ Participation in this latter differentiates social beings into men and women, masculine and feminine beings.¹⁵ Work in capitalism is divided into women's work and men's work, assigned to females and males, respectively. This exclusion from the work of the opposite sex is accepted by individuals as nature- or God-given; this belief in the naturally different abilities of the sexes becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy as participation in the sexual division of labor actually differentiates the sexes into different social beings or genders.

The sexual division of labor in capitalism has two aspects: first, a division of spheres in which work in the home, defined as serving the family, is women's work, and work in the economic and political spheres is men's work. Second, jobs are sex-typed so as to conform with gender differences, hence reinforcing rather than undermining them. The sexual division of labor does not individuate social members—indeed, it denies individual freedom, essentially assigning them a given gender identity, and prohibiting them from doing the work of the opposite sex. However, within their spheres, both sexes experience considerable freedom.¹⁶

¹⁴Marxist-Feminists have been trying to convince Marxists that capitalism can not be adequately analyzed without taking the social differentiation of the sexes, or patriarchy, into account. See Zillah Eisenstein, ed., *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979), especially the first essay, "Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy"; Heidi Hartmann, "The Unhappy Marriage between Marxism and Feminism," *Capital and Class*, Summer 1978, and in Lydia Sargent, ed., *Women and Revolution* (Boston: South End Press, 1981); Annette Kuhn and AnnMarie Wolpe, eds., *Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978). However, most male Marxists have continued to see male workers as people, and to discuss women workers as a special case, if at all.

¹⁵For a concise analysis of the sexual division of labor, see Claude Levi-Strauss, "The Family," in Arlene and Jerome Skolnick, eds., *The Family in Transition* (Boston: Little Brown, 1971).

¹⁶The development of capitalism in the United States

Freedom, Unfreedom, and Competition in the Labor Force: The labor force in capitalism provides men with an arena for self-constitution and self-expression in two ways: as husbands, by providing them with a family wage to support their wives and children, and as men, by engaging them in competition with other men for labor force advancement. One's earnings are, then, much more than simply the way to acquire subsistence: they provide a man with a measure of his manhood. A man's freedom to advance himself in the economic hierarchy through hard work, shrewdness, or union organizing, is tied to and indeed motivated by his responsibility for his economic position. Indeed, men are held accountable for their positions in spite of inherited privileges such as wealth or whiteness. Women in the labor force, centered in the service of others, are not involved in such competition, and are hence segregated into dead-end, supplementary-wage jobs. Their freedom is centered, instead, in the sphere of consumption.¹⁷

Freedom and Unfreedom in Consumption: Inherent within the wage is the worker's freedom, indeed necessity, to choose

has brought the breakdown of the sexual division of labor, by drawing married women into the labor force and bringing the entrance of women into traditionally masculine jobs. For an analysis of this process see Julie A. Matthaei, *An Economic History of Women in America: Women's Work, the Sexual Division of Labor, and the Development of Capitalism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1982).

¹⁷See David P. Levine, *Economic Theory*, Vol. II, Ch. 7, "The Social Purpose of the Market," and Matthaei, *Economic History of Women*, Chs. 5–9. Labor market segmentation theorists have acknowledged the importance of divisions within the labor market, as well as of job ladders, however they have ignored the freedom involved in choice of occupation; see especially Richard Edwards's *Contested Terrain* (New York: Basic Books, 1979); Richard Edwards, Michael Reich, and David Gordon, eds., *Labor Market Segmentation* (Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975); and "Symposium: The Labor Process, Market Structure, and Marxist Theory," *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, V, 3#3.

¹²An exception is Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, who have attempted to integrate segmented labor market theory with value theory in "The Marxian Theory of Value and Heterogeneous Labour: A Critique and Reformulation," *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1:2 (June 1977). They defined the labor embodied in a commodity as a vector of three different kinds of labor, corresponding to the different labor market segments (all assumed to be at the same skill level, but with different "values of labor power"). Their article caused a stir in the literature; they were attacked both for faulty mathematical proofs, and for avoiding the skilled/unskilled labor issue. By attempting to introduce market forces and "social relations" into the discussion of value, Bowles and Gintis opened a Pandora's box. As one critic pointed out, the important issue becomes how the differences in wages are created, which their new labor theory of value does not explain. See Michio Morishima, "S. Bowles and H. Gintis on the Marxian Theory of Value and Heterogeneous Labor" in *Ibid.*, 2:3 (September 1978), and Edward McKenna, "Comment on Bowles and Gintis' Marxian Theory of Value," *Ibid.*, 5:3 (September 1981), and replies by Bowles and Gintis in those issues.

¹³*Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, pp. 110–111.

which commodities to consume. This freedom gains substance in advanced capitalism where high labor productivity brings workers high standards of living. The set of commodities that a family chooses to purchase with its income expresses the personalities of its members, as interpreted by the primary consumer, the homemaker. The proliferation of styles and colors as well as kinds of consumer goods allows each individual to create, in consumption, a unique identity. Competition in the masculine job/wage hierarchy also spills over into consumption; families strive to consume more because they feel deprived relative to those higher on the hierarchy, increasing the pressure on husbands to achieve in the labor force, and even drawing homemakers into wage work as a means to filling needs. Hence poverty persists, inextricably bound up with wealth, and the unfreedom to fill needs above ones means coexists with the freedom of expression in giving shape to ones standard of living.¹⁸

Finally, as we have suggested, one cannot incorporate these individual freedoms into the Marxian framework without rejecting the labor theory of value. The latter forces us to reduce all workers to abstract, unskilled labor, and to collapse the wage into a subsistence bundle—in other words, to deny the importance of hierarchy and competition within the labor force, which are the bases of the

living out of individual freedom within capitalism.¹⁹

Marxist theory correctly accounts for the individual's need to sell his labor power, and to purchase consumer goods. However, instead of precluding freedom of choice, as traditional Marxist theory would have it, these obligations to participate in the economy as worker or consumer demand it. Incorporating freedom into a Marxian analysis of capitalism does not destroy the essential notion that the individual is a product of social relations. It simply shows that freedom, as it is now defined and experienced, is itself the product of capitalism. Capitalism sustains specific kinds of individuals—capitalists (or corporations) and workers; men and women. It allows for self-expression in two arenas, the labor force competition, and the realm of consumption—arenas monopolized by men and women respectively. The freedom it sustains is not absolute—individuals are not free to realize themselves without competing against each other (as men) or subordinating themselves to others (as women), they are not free to fully exercise their rights as citizens. According to these revisions, capitalism has created a working class which is not only alienated and oppressed by the process of capital accumulation, but also invested in it as central to its freedom and self-expression.

The fact that capitalism sustains individual freedom as well as unfreedom and oppression neither deprives it of contradictions, nor eliminates the need for a radical restructuring of the economy. However, it does mean that the contradictions of capitalism are more complex than Marxists have envisioned, and suggests that the Marxist view of the socialist future must be revised if this future is to provide a higher degree of equality and freedom.

¹⁸For excellent documentation of the historical development of neediness see Winnifred D. Wandersee, *Women's Work and Family Values, 1920-1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), Chap. 1. Economists of both schools have noted that one's relative wealthiness affects one's satisfaction—see J. S. Dusenberry, *Income, Saving, and the Theory of Consumer Behavior* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press) and Karl Marx, "Wage Labour and Capital," in *Selected Works*, V. 1, p. 163—but have not connected this to competition in consumption. Yet this competition, and the concomitant association of wealth with success, are at the core of consumption in twentieth century capitalism—not simple jealousy of those who are better off.

¹⁹The work of David P. Levine is, to date, the most comprehensive and rigorous attempt to free Marx's theoretical framework from the confines of the labor theory of value. See his *Economic Theory*, 2 vols. (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978 and 1981).