

This surplus rate has been defined for me
admirably by Sraffa ~~except in so far~~
We have ~~only~~ to supplement his picture by
including ~~the below~~ the substance of labour
as a commodity to be reproduced,
and in so far as the ^{amount of} substance is institutionally -
historically determined, the whole concept of
the surplus rate ~~is not~~ is ~~not~~ to some extent
arbitrary. [This explains that in Kaldor's view of
distribution there is not this there seems
to be no such limit to the shift in the
share of distribution].

Now if we make light of this objection + ~~planned~~ see
some approximation through historically relative
meaning in the surplus rate we might say

that as long as interest + other extractions (extortions)

are derived from the surplus - in the free world
of the whole capitalist bookkeeping -
it is seen that there are limits to it,

If, however, the extortions are made directly
from the incomes, or are exact price in fact,
the limits could only appear as an ultimate

resistance of the income earners (~~is~~ typical for that
the resistance of debtors - third world countries -

against the extortions. It comes, of course, after words,
and that is typical for the extortions outside
the surplus system: They are not transparent,
+ the resistance therefore appears only rather late.

The capitalist bookkeeping

is not the same as

Sraffa's but it ends at some

extent of ~~the~~ surplus at least in monetary terms.