Diagnostic Report: The 39% vs 11% Gap
Root Cause Analysis of the Methodological Discontinuity

Methodological Investigation Team

September 28, 2025

Abstract

This diagnostic report identifies the fundamental cause of the dramatic gap between historical (39%+) and modern (11%+) profit rate calculations in the Shaikh & Tonak extension project. The investigation reveals that the discontinuity is not due to economic structural breaks, but rather stems from the use of fundamentally different mathematical formulas and data construction methodologies between the two periods. This represents an "unbridgeable gap" that cannot be resolved without choosing a single, consistent methodology for the entire time series.

Contents

1   Executive Summary

> **CRITICAL FINDING: Methodological Inconsistency Detected**
>
> The 70.3% discontinuity between 1989 (39.0%) and 1990 (11.6%) profit rates is caused by:
>
> 1. **Different Formulas**: Historical uses $r^* = S^*/(C^* + V^*)$, Modern uses $r = SP/(K \times u)$
>
> 2. **Different Data Sources**: Historical uses 1994-vintage data, Modern uses contemporary NIPA/KLEMS
>
> 3. **Different Variable Definitions**: Incompatible conceptual frameworks between periods
>
> **Conclusion**: This is not an economic structural break but a methodological artifact requiring immediate correction.

2   Methodological Investigation

2.1   Data Source Analysis

2.1.1   Historical Period (1958-1989)

- **Source**: Published values from Shaikh & Tonak (1994) Table 5.4

- **Method**: $r^* = S^*/(C^* + V^*)$ (Traditional Marxist profit rate)

- **Data Vintage**: 1994 government sources and methodologies

- **Variable Construction**: Marxian value categories (S*, C*, V*)

- **Quality**: Direct book values, no calculation required

2.1.2   Modern Period (1990-2025)

- **Source**: KLEMS/BEA data with S&T identity calculations

- **Method**: $r = SP/(K \times u)$ (Surplus product over utilized capital)

- **Data Vintage**: Contemporary NIPA accounting standards

- **Variable Construction**: Modern national accounts framework

- **Quality**: Calculated values using identity relationships

3 Formula Comparison Analysis

3.1 Historical Formula: Traditional Marxist Approach

$$r^* = \frac{S^*}{C^* + V^*} \tag{1}$$

Where:

- S^*: Surplus Value (Marxian measure of exploitation)
- C^*: Constant Capital (Marxian measure of means of production)
- V^*: Variable Capital (Marxian measure of labor power value)

Conceptual Basis: Pure Marxian value theory with sector exclusions

3.2 Modern Formula: Surplus Product Approach

$$r = \frac{SP}{K \times u} \tag{2}$$

Where:

- SP: Surplus Product (Modern national accounts surplus)
- K: Capital Stock (BEA Fixed Assets measures)
- u: Capacity Utilization (Federal Reserve measures)

Conceptual Basis: Modern national income accounting framework

4 Quantitative Impact Analysis

4.1 Magnitude of Formula Differences

Component	Historical Formula	Modern Formula
Numerator	S^* (Surplus Value)	SP (Surplus Product)
Denominator	$C^* + V^*$ (Total Capital)	$K \times u$ (Utilized Capital)
Data Source	1994 Vintage	Contemporary
Accounting Framework	Marxian	NIPA
Result Range	**36-47%**	**11-14%**

Table 1: Formula Component Comparison

Concept	Historical Measure	Modern Measure	Compatibility

4.2 Variable Measurement Differences

Concept	Historical Measure	Modern Measure	Compatibility
Surplus	S^* (Value theory)	SP (National accounts)	Incompatible
Capital Stock	$C^* + V^*$ (Marxian)	K (BEA Fixed Assets)	Incompatible
Utilization	Implicit in S^*	Explicit u adjustment	Different treatment
Sector Coverage	S&T exclusions	KLEMS industries	Different scope
Price Deflation	1994 methods	Contemporary methods	Different vintages

Table 2: Variable Measurement Incompatibilities

5 Data Construction Issues

5.1 Sector Definition Problems

5.1.1 Historical Sector Exclusions

From the original methodology:

> "nonfarm business minus finance, insurance, and real estate minus government enterprise minus professional services"

5.1.2 Modern Sector Mapping

The modern extension uses KLEMS industry classifications which do not perfectly correspond to the 1994 SIC-based exclusions used historically.

5.2 Interpolation and Data Gaps

5.2.1 Historical Approach

- **No interpolation**: Preserves original gaps (e.g., $u = 0.0$ for 1973)

- **Benchmark years only**: No data between IO benchmark years

- **Original vintage**: Uses 1994-era data sources exactly

5.2.2 Modern Approach

- **Full interpolation**: Fills all data gaps

- **Annual data**: Continuous time series

- **Contemporary sources**: Uses latest data revisions

6 The "Unbridgeable Gap" Analysis

6.1 Why the Gap Cannot Be Bridged

> **Fundamental Incompatibility**
>
> The gap is "unbridgeable" because:
>
> 1. **Different Theoretical Foundations**: Marxian value theory vs. national income accounting
>
> 2. **Incompatible Data Frameworks**: 1994 vintage vs. contemporary data standards
>
> 3. **Irreconcilable Formulas**: $S^*/(C^*+V^*)$ vs. $SP/(K \times u)$ represent different economic concepts
>
> 4. **Historical Data Unavailability**: Cannot reconstruct 1994-vintage data for modern period

6.2 Mathematical Demonstration

If we attempt to reconcile the formulas:

$$\text{Historical: } r^* = \frac{S^*}{C^* + V^*} \approx 0.39 \text{ (1989)} \tag{3}$$

$$\text{Modern: } r = \frac{SP}{K \times u} \approx 0.116 \text{ (1990)} \tag{4}$$

The ratio between approaches:

$$\frac{r^*}{r} = \frac{S^*/(C^* + V^*)}{SP/(K \times u)} = \frac{S^* \times K \times u}{SP \times (C^* + V^*)} \approx 3.36 \tag{5}$$

This 3.36x multiplier reflects the fundamental difference in measurement approaches, not economic reality.

7 Impact on Research Conclusions

7.1 False Economic Interpretation

The current project interprets the gap as:

- Economic structural break at 1989-1990

- End of post-war era

- Neoliberal transformation effects

- Fundamental change in capitalism

Reality: These interpretations are methodological artifacts, not economic phenomena.

7.2 Invalidated Research Claims

1. **Structural Break Timing**: The 1989-1990 break is methodological, not economic

2. **Regime Change Evidence**: No evidence of actual economic transformation

3. **Continuity Analysis**: Meaningless when comparing incompatible methodologies

4. **Long-term Trends**: Cannot analyze 67-year trends with inconsistent methods

8 Resolution Options

8.1 Option 1: Pure Historical Replication

Approach: Extend the original $r^* = S^*/(C^* + V^*)$ formula to modern period

- **Pros**: Methodologically consistent, preserves theoretical framework
- **Cons**: Requires reconstructing Marxian value categories from modern data
- **Feasibility**: Difficult due to data source changes

8.2 Option 2: Pure Modern Recalculation

Approach: Recalculate historical period using $r = SP/(K \times u)$ formula

- **Pros**: Creates consistent methodology across entire period
- **Cons**: Abandons faithful replication of original work
- **Feasibility**: High, using historical NIPA data

8.3 Option 3: Dual Series Approach

Approach: Maintain separate series with clear methodological boundaries

- **Pros**: Preserves historical accuracy, provides modern extension
- **Cons**: No unified long-term analysis possible
- **Feasibility**: High, requires clear documentation

9 Recommendations

9.1 Immediate Actions Required

1. **Stop treating as economic phenomenon**: Cease interpreting the gap as structural break

2. **Choose consistent methodology**: Select either Option 1 or Option 2 for the entire series

3. **Revise all documentation**: Update reports to reflect methodological nature of discontinuity

4. **Implement chosen approach**: Rebuild the entire time series with consistent methods

9.2   Documentation Requirements

- Clear statement that 1989-1990 gap is methodological artifact

- Explicit description of chosen resolution approach

- Warning against economic interpretation of the discontinuity

- Methodology comparison table for transparency

10   Conclusion

> **Final Assessment**
>
> The investigation confirms that the 39% vs 11% gap represents an "unbridge-able" methodological discontinuity, not an economic structural break. The current project's interpretation of this gap as evidence of economic transformation is fundamentally flawed.
>
> **Required Action**: Choose and implement a single, consistent methodology for the entire 1958-2025 period to produce scientifically valid results.

10.1   Project Integrity

The current state of the project undermines its scientific credibility by:

- Mixing incompatible methodologies without disclosure

- Misinterpreting methodological artifacts as economic phenomena

- Claiming "perfect replication" while using different formulas

- Producing misleading conclusions about economic history

Recommendation: Implement Option 2 (Pure Modern Recalculation) to create a methodologically consistent, scientifically valid time series for the entire 67-year period.