The case against Bortkiewicz/Sweezy seems compelling to me. I think the texts you cite suffice to show that within Marx’s framework there is no sharing of surplus-value between the gold industry and other industries. Further, if the rate of profit in the gold industry exceeds the general rate of profit, the difference is appropriated by the owners of mines as rent. And so when gold serves as commodity money that does not affect Marx’s two aggregate equalities.

p. 13:

The previous sections have argued that, according to Marx’s theory, there is no sharing of surplus-value between the gold industry and other industries in a single period analysis of the distribution of surplus-value through the transformation of values into prices of production, and thus it is not possible to equalize the rate of profit in the gold industry in such a single period transformation, unless the composition of capital in the gold industry is equal to the average composition of capital.

It is obviously correct to not mention how divergences in turnover times can equalize rates of profit here, since you are talking about “a single period analysis.” But for the sake of completeness you could add at the end of this passage that rates of profit can also be equal if the rates of surplus value diverge in the right way.

p. 14:

it might be assumed that the increased quantity of gold produced would result in a relative oversupply of gold, which in turn would increase the prices of all other commodities, including the prices of the inputs to gold production, which would reduce the rate of profit in the gold industry toward the general rate of profit.

As you point out, this argument buys into the quantity theory of money Marx rejected. You also point out that the argument fails to take into account the large stock of money already in circulation, or how small the effects of a general increase in prices would be on the prices of inputs to gold production (17-18). But it seems to me that even if we overlook these considerations the argument is internally flawed. If we (mistakenly) assume that the oversupply of gold raises the price of all other commodities, then it would raise the prices of inputs into gold production. In the logic of the argument there doesn’t appear to be any reason whatsoever to assume that the prices of inputs into gold production would rise any more than inputs into any other production process. If the prices of all inputs into all sectors rise more or less in sync, wouldn’t any general rise of prices leave a prior divergence in the rate of profit of the gold industry and the general rate of profit in place? If so, the argument fails on its own terms.

p.17, bottom:

There is no systematic necessity for gold extraction to be undertaken within a system of apartheid. I think you weaken your case if you give this contingency too much weight in your response to the above argument. Also, in the discussion up until this point you have been assuming that the rate of surplus value was equal across industries in order to discuss the problem without having to go into distracting complexities. (On p.10 you wrote, “and if it is assumed that the rate of surplus-value in the gold industry is equal to the average rate of surplus value,” and this assumption is reaffirmed on p. 18.) The
introduction of apartheid isn’t consistent with this simplifying assumption, which you explicitly drop only at the very end of the discussion (19). If you want to talk about apartheid in gold production, perhaps this conclusion is a better place to do so.

p. 21:
In addition, Bortkeiwicz and Sweezy present the determination of prices of production in terms of reproduction schemes, which is also contrary to Marx’s theory. Marx did not present his theory of prices of production in terms of the reproduction schemes, but rather in terms of five industries, which were not grouped into departments.
I think it may be worth noting that this objection doesn’t have quite the same force as the others, in my view. Even if Marx himself didn’t integrate the reproduction schemes and the theory of prices of production, I don’t see why this project couldn’t be undertaken within his overall framework, or why the results might not be illuminating.

p. 31:
At the high level of abstraction of Capital, money has to be a commodity, because Capital presents a theory of a “pure” capitalist economy, without state intervention. And in the 19th century laissez-faire capitalism (without state intervention) that Marx was analyzing, money was a commodity and money had to be a commodity in its functions of measure of value and store of value.
Fiat money created by the state is not the only form of non-commodity money. Credit money created by banks and other financial institutions also counts, and it can be introduced without having to consider state intervention. And so if money “has to be a commodity” we have to abstract from credit and financial institutions, as well as from state intervention. (Also, shouldn’t the first sentence in this passage should refer to Capital 1 alone? Doesn’t Capital 3 discusses other forms of money besides commodity money?)