

Labour, therefore, is the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities. The real price of every thing, what every thing really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it."

What are the rules which men naturally observe in exchanging them [goods] for money or for one another, I shall now proceed to examine. These rules determine what may be called the relative or exchangeable value of goods. The word VALUE, it is to be observed, has two different meanings, and sometimes expresses the utility of some particular object, and sometimes the power of purchasing other goods which the possession of that object conveys. The one may be called "value in use;" the other, "value in exchange. Nothing is more useful than water: A diamond, on the contrary, has scarcely any use-value; but a very great quantity of other goods may frequently be had in exchange for it. The real price of every thing, what every thing really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it. Price on this view was related to a factor of production namely, labor and not to the point of view of the consumer. Proponents of the labor theory of value saw that as the resolution of the paradox. Marginalism[edit] At low levels of consumption, water has a much higher marginal utility than diamonds and thus is more valuable. People usually consume water at much higher levels than they do diamonds and thus the marginal utility and price of water are lower than that of diamonds. Marginalism The theory of marginal utility, which is based on the subjective theory of value, says that the price at which an object trades in the market is determined neither by how much labor was exerted in its production, as in the labor theory of value, nor on how useful it is on the whole. Rather, its price is determined by its marginal utility. The marginal utility of a good is derived from its most important use to a person. So, if someone possesses a good, he will use it to satisfy some need or want. Naturally, the one that takes highest-priority. With the second, he will make more bread, in order to be strong enough to work. With the next, he will feed his farm animals. The next is used to make whisky, and the last one he feeds to the pigeons. If one of those bags is stolen, he will not reduce each of those activities by one-fifth; instead he will stop feeding the pigeons. So the value of the fifth bag of grain is equal to the satisfaction he gets from feeding the pigeons. If he sells that bag and neglects the pigeons, his least productive use of the remaining grain is to make whisky, so the value of a fourth bag of grain is the value of his whisky. Only if he loses four bags of grain will he start eating less; that is the most productive use of his grain. The last bag of grain is worth his life. In explaining the diamond-water paradox, marginalists explain that it is not the total usefulness of diamonds or water that determines price, but the usefulness of each unit of water or diamonds. It is true that the total utility of water to people is tremendous, because they need it to survive. However, since water is in such large supply in the world, the marginal utility of water is low. In other words, each additional unit of water that becomes available can be applied to less urgent uses as more urgent uses for water are satisfied. Therefore, any particular unit of water becomes worth less to people as the supply of water increases. On the other hand, diamonds are in much lower supply. They are of such low supply that the usefulness of one additional diamond is greater than the usefulness of one additional glass of water, which is in abundant supply. Thus, diamonds are worth more to people. Therefore, those who want diamonds are willing to pay a higher price for one diamond than for one glass of water, and sellers of diamonds ask a price for one diamond that is higher than for one glass of water. Conversely, a man dying of thirst in a desert would have greater marginal use for water than for diamonds so would pay more for water, perhaps up to the point at which he was no longer dying.

2: Adam Smith and the Division of Labor

The notion of absolute (as distinct from exchangeable or relative) value arises in classical economics from the image of a given magnitude of output being distributed between the social classes. Ricardo posited that the value of the social surplus could be expressed in terms of labour regardless of.

We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our necessities but of their advantages. But the annual revenue of every society is always precisely equal to the exchangeable value of the whole annual produce of its industry, or rather is precisely the same thing with that exchangeable value. As every individual, therefore, endeavours as much as he can both to employ his capital in the support of domestic industry, and so to direct that industry that its produce may be of the greatest value; every individual necessarily labours to render the annual revenue of the society as great as he can. He generally, indeed, neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it. By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it. I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good. It is an affectation, indeed, not very common among merchants, and very few words need be employed in dissuading them from it. The real price of everything, what everything really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it. What everything is really worth to the man who has acquired it, and who wants to dispose of it or exchange it for something else, is the toil and trouble which it can save to himself, and which it can impose upon other people. What is bought with money or with goods is purchased by labour as much as what we acquire by the toil of our own body. That money or those goods indeed save us this toil. They contain the value of a certain quantity of labour which we exchange for what is supposed at the time to contain the value of an equal quantity. Labour was the first price, the original purchase-money that was paid for all things. It was not by gold or by silver, but by labour, that all the wealth of the world was originally purchased; and its value, to those who possess it, and who want to exchange it for some new productions, is precisely equal to the quantity of labour which it can enable them to purchase or command. Equal quantities of labour, at all times and places, may be said to be of equal value to the labourer. It is their real price; money is their nominal price only. IN that early and rude state of society which precedes both the accumulation of stock and the appropriation of land, the proportion between the quantities of labour necessary for acquiring different objects seems to be the only circumstance which can afford any rule for exchanging them for one another. If among a nation of hunters, for example, it usually costs twice the labour to kill a beaver which it does to kill a deer, one beaver should naturally exchange for or be worth two deer. As soon as stock has accumulated in the hands of particular persons, some of them will naturally employ it in setting to work industrious people, whom they will supply with materials and subsistence, in order to make a profit by the sale of their work, or by what their labour adds to the value of the materials. The value which the workmen add to the materials, therefore, resolves itself in this case into two parts, of which the one pays their wages, the other the profits of their employer upon the whole stock of materials and wages which he advanced. As soon as the land of any country has all become private property, the landlords, like all other men, love to reap where they never sowed, and demand a rent even for its natural produce. Labour measures the value not only of that part of price which resolves itself into labour, but of that which resolves itself into rent, and of that which resolves itself into profit. It may either be above, or below, or exactly the same with its natural price. The natural price itself varies with the natural rate of each of its component parts, of wages, profit, and rent; and in every society this rate varies according to their circumstances, according to their riches or poverty, their advancing, stationary, or declining condition. In that original state of things, which precedes both the appropriation of land and the accumulation of stock, the whole produce of labour belongs to the labourer. He has neither landlord nor master to share with him. As soon as land becomes private property, the landlord demands a share of almost all the produce which the labourer can either raise, or collect from it. His rent makes the first deduction from the produce of the labour which is employed upon land. It seldom happens that the person who tills the ground has wherewithal to maintain himself till he reaps the harvest. His maintenance is generally advanced to him from

the stock of a master, the farmer who employs him, and who would have no interest to employ him, unless he was to share in the produce of his labour, or unless his stock was to be replaced to him with a profit. This profit, makes a second deduction from the produce of the labour which is employed upon land. What are the common wages of labour, depends everywhere upon the contract usually made between those two parties, whose interests are by no means the same. The workmen desire to get as much, the masters to give as little as possible. The former are disposed to combine in order to raise, the latter in order to lower the wages of labour. In this popular sense, therefore, labour, like commodities, may be said to have a real and a nominal price. Its real price may be said to consist in the quantity of the necessaries and conveniences of life which are given for it; its nominal price, in the quantity of money. A man must always live by his work, and his wages must at least be sufficient to maintain him. They must even upon most occasions be somewhat more; otherwise it would be impossible for him to bring up a family, and the race of such workmen could not last beyond the first generation. The distinction between the real and the nominal price of commodities and labour is not a matter of mere speculation, but may sometimes be of considerable use in practice. The same real price is always of the same value; but on account of the variations in the value of gold and silver, the same nominal price is sometimes of very different values. Labour, therefore, it appears evidently, is the only universal, as well as the only accurate measure of value, or the only standard by which we can compare the values of different commodities at all times, and at all places. There are certain circumstances, however, which sometimes give the labourers an advantage, and enable them to raise their wages considerably above this rate. The demand for those who live by wages, therefore, necessarily increases with the increase of the revenue and stock of every country, and cannot possibly increase without it. It is not the actual greatness of national wealth, but its continual increase, which occasions a rise in the wages of labour. The wages of labour, however, are much higher in North America than in any part of England. THE rise and fall in the profits of stock depend upon the same causes with the rise and fall in the wages of labour, the increasing or declining state of the wealth of the society; but those causes affect the one and the other very differently. The increase of stock, which raises wages, tends to lower profit. When the stocks of many rich merchants are turned into the same trade, their mutual competition naturally tends to lower its profit; and when there is a like increase of stock in all the different trades carried on in the same society, the same competition must produce the same effect in them all. The profits of stock, it may perhaps be thought are only a different name for the wages of a particular sort of labour, the labour of inspection and direction. They are, however, altogether different, are regulated by quite different principles, and bear no proportion to the quantity, the hardship, or the ingenuity of this supposed labour of inspection and direction. They are regulated altogether by the value of the stock employed, and are greater or smaller in proportion to the extent of this stock. In this state of things, the whole produce of labour does not always belong to the labourer. He must in most cases share it with the owner of the stock which employs him. THE whole of the advantages and disadvantages of the different employments of labour and stock must, in the same neighbourhood, be either perfectly equal or continually tending to equality. If in the same neighbourhood, there was any employment evidently either more or less advantageous than the rest, so many people would crowd into it in the one case, and so many would desert it in the other, that its advantages would soon return to the level of other employments. This at least would be the case in a society where things were left to follow their natural course, where there was perfect liberty, and where every man was perfectly free both to choose what occupation he thought proper, and to change it as often as he thought proper. RENT, considered as the price paid for the use of land, is naturally the highest which the tenant can afford to pay in the actual circumstances of the land. It is not at all proportioned to what the landlord may have laid out upon the improvement of the land, or to what he can afford to take; but to what the farmer can afford to give. High or low wages and profit are the causes of high or low price; high or low rent is the effect of it. It is because high or low wages and profit must be paid, in order to bring a particular commodity to market, that its price is high or low. But it is because its price is high or low; a great deal more, or very little more, or no more, than what is sufficient to pay those wages and profit, that it affords a high rent, or a low rent, or no rent at all. It is the highest impertinence and presumption, therefore, in kings and ministers, to pretend to watch over the economy of private people, and to restrain their expense. They are themselves always, and without any

exception, the greatest spendthrifts in the society. Let them look well after their own expense, and they may safely trust private people with theirs. If their own extravagance does not ruin the state, that of their subjects never will. OK Economics was designed and it is maintained by Oldrich Kyn. To send me a message, please use one of the following addresses: This website contains the following sections:

3: Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations Book I, Chapter V Notes

1 Comments: newson said. in smith's beaver/deer equation, he seems to take for granted a homogeneous labour market. this seems strange for the champion of division of labour.

What are the Gains of International Trade? Nirav S We may now briefly enlist the gains resulting from international trade: International specialisation and geographical division of labour lead to optimum allocation of world resources making it possible to have the most efficient use of them. Increase in the exchangeable value of possessions, means of enjoyment and wealth of each trading country. As Ohlin states, the disadvantage of disproportionate geographical distribution of productive resources are mitigated by international trade. In other words, the loss attributed to the immobility of factors is overcome by the product movements between the trading countries. Foreign trade for a country widens the size of market and thereby, helps in reducing the risks involved in huge investments undertaken for the growth of home industries. It also enlarges the scope for large-scale production. The economies of scale so realised would reduce the cost of production, consequently goods may cheaply be available to domestic consumers than otherwise. Under international trade each country will get more of each variety of goods, more varieties and qualities of goods to consume. The living standards of trading countries in turn improve. Hence, the world at large becomes a happy world. According to the classical theory, specialisation based on the principle of comparative costs advantage is the major source of gain from international trade. An additional source is the possibility of exploiting economies of scale when the size of the market is extended through the free foreign trade of a country. Under economics of large scale, when specialisation occurs, the output per unit of input may rise so that, costs per units of output fall. This is a further source of gain from international trade which makes goods cheaply available. The theory implies that comparative costs are different in different countries because the abundance of factors which are necessary for the production of each commodity does not bear the same relation to the demand for each commodity in different countries. Thus, specialisation based on comparative costs advantage clearly represents a gain to the trading countries in so far as it enables more of each variety of goods to be produced cheaply by utilising the abundant factors fully in the country concerned and to obtain relatively cheaper goods through mutual international exchange. Further, the principle of comparative cost-difference of gains in international trade should not be looked upon merely as a possibility theorem, but as a positive hypothesis relating to the real world. The doctrine of comparative costs predicts that in the real world, there will be gains from trade in terms of increased world production. As such, each trading country will gain by getting relatively more and cheaper goods and no one will lose by having less to consume than it would have if it were self-sufficient. Though, the validity of the theory of comparative costs has not been conclusively proved, its general hypothesis that production and consumption in the real world and in each country would be higher under international trade than what it would be without it if all countries were forced to be completely self-sufficient, cannot, for obvious reasons, be rejected even by any empirical tests.

4: Division of labour - Wikipedia

Division of Labour results in the division of society into workers and employers. The employer always tries to increase his profits by exploiting the workers and workers from trade unions against the employees to put an end to their exploitation or to make them increase their wages.

Relation between values and prices[edit] One issue facing the LTV is the relationship between value quantities on one hand and prices on the other. Various LTV schools of thought provide different answers to this question. For example, some argue that value in the sense of the amount of labor embodied in a good acts as a center of gravity for price. However, most economists would say that cases where pricing is given as approximately equal to the value of the labour embodied, are in fact only special cases. In General Theory pricing most usually fluctuates. The standard formulation is that prices normally include a level of income for " capital " and " land ". These incomes are known as " profit " and " rent " respectively. Yet Marx made the point that value cannot be placed upon labour as a commodity, because capital is a constant, whereas profit is a variable, not an income; thus explaining the importance of profit in relation to pricing variables. The real value of all the different component parts of price, it must be observed, is measured by the quantity of labour which they can, each of them, purchase or command. Labour measures the value not only of that part of price which resolves itself into labour, but of that which resolves itself into rent, and of that which resolves itself into profit. The final sentence explains how Smith sees value of a product as relative to labor of buyer or consumer, as opposite to Marx who sees the value of a product being proportional to labor of laborer or producer. And we value things, price them, based on how much labor we can avoid or command, and we can command labor not only in a simple way but also by trading things for a profit. The transformation problem has probably generated the greatest bulk of debate about the LTV. The problem with transformation is to find an algorithm where the magnitude of value added by labor, in proportion to its duration and intensity, is sufficiently accounted for after this value is distributed through prices that reflect an equal rate of return on capital advanced. If there is an additional magnitude of value or a loss of value after transformation, then the relation between values proportional to labor and prices proportional to total capital advanced is incomplete. Various solutions and impossibility theorems have been offered for the transformation, but the debate has not reached any clear resolution. LTV does not deny the role of supply and demand influencing price, since the price of a commodity is something other than its value. It suffices to say that if supply and demand equilibrate each other, the market prices of commodities will correspond with their natural prices, that is to say, with their values as determined by the respective quantities of labor required for their production. This could be explained by a cost of production argumentâ€”pointing out that all costs are ultimately labor costs, but this does not account for profit, and it is vulnerable to the charge of tautology in that it explains prices by prices. Smith argues that labor values are the natural measure of exchange for direct producers like hunters and fishermen. It had no single originator, but rather many different thinkers arrived at the same conclusion independently. Aristotle is claimed to hold to this view. He argued that even if earning "results from something other than a craft, the value of the resulting profit and acquired capital must also include the value of the labor by which it was obtained. Without labor, it would not have been acquired. Karl Marx himself credited Benjamin Franklin in his essay entitled "A Modest Enquiry into the Nature and Necessity of a Paper Currency" as being "one of the first" to advance the theory. He pointed out that if the "labor embodied" in a product equaled the "labor commanded" i. David Ricardo seconded by Marx responded to this paradox by arguing that Smith had confused labor with wages. The value of labor, in this view, covered not just the value of wages what Marx called the value of labor power , but the value of the entire product created by labor. Marx expanded on these ideas, arguing that workers work for a part of each day adding the value required to cover their wages, while the remainder of their labor is performed for the enrichment of the capitalist. The LTV and the accompanying theory of exploitation became central to his economic thought. They, as well as contemporary individualist anarchists in that tradition, hold that it is unethical to charge a higher price for a commodity than the amount of labor required to produce it. Hence, they propose that trade should be

facilitated by using notes backed by labor. Adam Smith and David Ricardo[edit] Adam Smith held that, in a primitive society, the amount of labor put into producing a good determined its exchange value, with exchange value meaning in this case the amount of labor a good can purchase. However, according to Smith, in a more advanced society the market price is no longer proportional to labor cost since the value of the good now includes compensation for the owner of the means of production: He must in most cases share it with the owner of the stock which employs him. But [Smith] disowns what is naturally thought of as the genuine classical labor theory of value, that labor-cost regulates market-value. David Ricardo stated it as, "The value of a commodity, or the quantity of any other commodity for which it will exchange, depends on the relative quantity of labour which is necessary for its production, and not as the greater or less compensation which is paid for that labour. However, Ricardo was troubled with some deviations in prices from proportionality with the labor required to produce them. If anyone can hold onto a bottle for four years and become rich, that would make it hard to find freshly corked wine. There is also the theory that adding to the price of a luxury product increases its exchange-value by mere prestige. The labor theory as an explanation for value contrasts with the subjective theory of value , which says that value of a good is not determined by how much labor was put into it but by its usefulness in satisfying a want and its scarcity. It is arguable to what extent these classical theorists held the labor theory of value as it is commonly defined. In a letter, he wrote: As a result, "Smith ends up making little use of a labor theory of value.

5: Labor theory of value - Wikipedia

Labour, therefore, is the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities. The real price of every thing, what every thing really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it.

On the Causes of Improvement in the Productive Powers. Adam Smith On the Real and Nominal Price of Commodities, or their Price in Labour, and their Price in Money Every man is rich or poor according to the degree in which he can afford to enjoy the necessaries, conveniences, and amusements of human life. The far greater part of them he must derive from the labour of other people, and he must be rich or poor according to the quantity of that labour which he can command, or which he can afford to purchase. The value of any commodity, therefore, to the person who possesses it, and who means not to use or consume it himself, but to exchange it for other commodities, is equal to the quantity of labour which it enables him to purchase or command. Labour, therefore, is the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities. The real price of everything, what everything really costs to the man who wants to acquire it, is the toil and trouble of acquiring it. What everything is really worth to the man who has acquired it, and who wants to dispose of it or exchange it for something else, is the toil and trouble which it can save to himself, and which it can impose upon other people. What is bought with money or with goods is purchased by labour as much as what we acquire by the toil of our own body. That money or those goods indeed save us this toil. They contain the value of a certain quantity of labour which we exchange for what is supposed at the time to contain the value of an equal quantity. Labour was the first price, the original purchase-money that was paid for all things. It was not by gold or by silver, but by labour, that all the wealth of the world was originally purchased; and its value, to those who possess it, and who want to exchange it for some new productions, is precisely equal to the quantity of labour which it can enable them to purchase or command. Hobbes says, is power. But the person who either acquires, or succeeds to a great fortune, does not necessarily acquire or succeed to any political power, either civil or military. His fortune may, perhaps, afford him the means of acquiring both, but the mere possession of that fortune does not necessarily convey to him either. The power which that possession immediately and directly conveys to him, is the power of purchasing; a certain command over all the labour, or over all the produce of labour, which is then in the market. The exchangeable value of everything must always be precisely equal to the extent of this power which it conveys to its owner. But though labour be the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities, it is not that by which their value is commonly estimated. It is of difficult to ascertain the proportion between two different quantities of labour. The time spent in two different sorts of work will not always alone determine this proportion. The different degrees of hardship endured, and of ingenuity exercised, must likewise be taken into account. But it is not easy to find any accurate measure either of hardship or ingenuity. In exchanging, indeed, the different productions of different sorts of labour for one another, some allowance is commonly made for both. It is adjusted, however, not by any accurate measure, but by the higgling and bargaining of the market, according to that sort of rough equality which, though not exact, is sufficient for carrying on the business of common life. Every commodity, besides, is more frequently exchanged for, and thereby compared with, other commodities than with labour. It is more natural, therefore, to estimate its exchangeable value by the quantity of some other commodity than by that of the labour which it can purchase. The greater part of people, too, understand better what is meant by a quantity of a particular commodity than by a quantity of labour. The one is a plain palpable object; the other an abstract notion, which, though it can be made sufficiently intelligible, is not altogether so natural and obvious. But when barter ceases, and money has become the common instrument of commerce, every particular commodity is more frequently exchanged for money than for any other commodity. The butcher seldom carries his beef or his mutton to the baker, or the brewer, in order to exchange them for bread or for beer; but he carries them to the market, where he exchanges them for money, and afterwards exchanges that money for bread and for beer. The quantity of money which he gets for them regulates, too, the quantity of bread and beer which he can afterwards purchase. Hence it comes to pass that the exchangeable value of every commodity is more frequently estimated by the quantity of money, than by

the quantity either of labour or of any other commodity which can be had in exchange for it. Gold and silver, however, like every other commodity, vary in their value, are sometimes cheaper and sometimes dearer, sometimes of easier and sometimes of more difficult purchase. The quantity of labour which any particular quantity of them can purchase or command, or the quantity of other goods which it will exchange for, depends always upon the fertility or barrenness of the mines which happen to be known about the time when such exchanges are made. The discovery of the abundant mines of America reduced, in the sixteenth century, the value of gold and silver in Europe to about a third of what it had been before. As it costs less labour to bring those metals from the mine to the market, so when they were brought thither they could purchase or command less labour; and this revolution in their value, though perhaps the greatest, is by no means the only one of which history gives some account. But as a measure of quantity, such as the natural foot, fathom, or handful, which is continually varying in its own quantity, can never be an accurate measure of the quantity of other things; so a commodity which is itself continually varying in its own value, can never be an accurate measure of the value of other commodities. Equal quantities of labour, at all times and places, may be said to be of equal value to the labourer. In his ordinary state of health, strength and spirits; in the ordinary degree of his skill and dexterity, he must always lay down the same portion of his ease, his liberty, and his happiness. The price which he pays must always be the same, whatever may be the quantity of goods which he receives in return for it. Of these, indeed, it may sometimes purchase a greater and sometimes a smaller quantity; but it is their value which varies, not that of the labour which purchases them. At all times and places that is dear which it is difficult to come at, or which it costs much labour to acquire; and that cheap which is to be had easily, or with very little labour. Labour alone, therefore, never varying in its own value, is alone the ultimate and real standard by which the value of all commodities can at all times and places be estimated and compared. It is their real price; money is their nominal price only. But though equal quantities of labour are always of equal value to the labourer, yet to the person who employs him they appear sometimes to be of greater and sometimes of smaller value. He purchases them sometimes with a greater and sometimes with a smaller quantity of goods, and to him the price of labour seems to vary like that of all other things. It appears to him dear in the one case, and cheap in the other. In reality, however, it is the goods which are cheap in the one case, and dear in the other. In this popular sense, therefore, labour, like commodities, may be said to have a real and a nominal price. Its real price may be said to consist in the quantity of the necessaries and conveniences of life which are given for it; its nominal price, in the quantity of money. The labourer is rich or poor, is well or ill rewarded, in proportion to the real, not to the nominal price of his labour. The distinction between the real and the nominal price of commodities and labour is not a matter of mere speculation, but may sometimes be of considerable use in practice. The same real price is always of the same value; but on account of the variations in the value of gold and silver, the same nominal price is sometimes of very different values. When a landed estate, therefore, is sold with a reservation of a perpetual rent, if it is intended that this rent should always be of the same value, it is of importance to the family in whose favour it is reserved that it should not consist in a particular sum of money. Its value would in this case be liable to variations of two different kinds; first, to those which arise from the different quantities of gold and silver which are contained at different times in coin of the same denomination; and, secondly, to those which arise from the different values of equal quantities of gold and silver at different times. Princes and sovereign states have frequently fancied that they had a temporary interest to diminish the quantity of pure metal contained in their coins; but they seldom have fancied that they had any to augment it. The quantity of metal contained in the coins, I believe of all nations, has, accordingly, been almost continually diminishing, and hardly ever augmenting. Such variations, therefore, tend almost always to diminish the value of a money rent. The discovery of the mines of America diminished the value of gold and silver in Europe. This diminution, it is commonly supposed, though I apprehend without any certain proof, is still going on gradually, and is likely to continue to do so for a long time. Upon this supposition, therefore, such variations are more likely to diminish than to augment the value of a money rent, even though it should be stipulated to be paid, not in such a quantity of coined money of such a denomination in so many pounds sterling, for example, but in so many ounces either of pure silver, or of silver of a certain standard. The rents which have been reserved in corn have preserved

their value much better than those which have been reserved in money, even where the denomination of the coin has not been altered. By the 18th of Elizabeth it was enacted that a third of the rent of all college leases should be reserved in corn, to be paid, either in kind, or according to the current prices at the nearest public market. The money arising from this corn rent, though originally but a third of the whole, is in the present times, according to Dr. Blackstone, commonly near double of what arises from the other two-thirds. The old money rents of colleges must, according to this account, have sunk almost to a fourth part of their ancient value; or are worth little more than a fourth part of the corn which they were formerly worth. But since the reign of Philip and Mary the denomination of the English coin has undergone little or no alteration, and the same number of pounds, shillings and pence have contained very nearly the same quantity of pure silver. This degradation, therefore, in the value of the money rents of colleges, has arisen altogether from the degradation in the value of silver. When the degradation in the value of silver is combined with the diminution of the quantity of it contained in the coin of the same denomination, the loss is frequently still greater. In Scotland, where the denomination of the coin has undergone much greater alterations than it ever did in England, and in France, where it has undergone still greater than it ever did in Scotland, some ancient rents, originally of considerable value, have in this manner been reduced almost to nothing. Equal quantities of labour will at distant times be purchased more nearly with equal quantities of corn, the subsistence of the labourer, than with equal quantities of gold and silver, or perhaps of any other commodity. Equal quantities of corn, therefore, will, at distant times, be more nearly of the same real value, or enable the possessor to purchase or command more nearly the same quantity of the labour of other people. They will do this, I say, more nearly than equal quantities of almost any other commodity; for even equal quantities of corn will not do it exactly. The subsistence of the labourer, or the real price of labour, as I shall endeavour to show hereafter, is very different upon different occasions; more liberal in a society advancing to opulence than in one that is standing still; and in one that is standing still than in one that is going backwards. Every other commodity, however, will at any particular time purchase a greater or smaller quantity of labour in proportion to the quantity of subsistence which it can purchase at that time. A rent therefore reserved in corn is liable only to the variations in the quantity of labour which a certain quantity of corn can purchase. But a rent reserved in any other commodity is liable not only to the variations in the quantity of labour which any particular quantity of corn can purchase, but to the variations in the quantity of corn which can be purchased by any particular quantity of that commodity. Though the real value of a corn rent, it is to be observed, however, varies much less from century to century than that of a money rent, it varies much more from year to year. The money price of labour, as I shall endeavour to show hereafter, does not fluctuate from year to year with the money price of corn, but seems to be everywhere accommodated, not to the temporary or occasional, but to the average or ordinary price of that necessary of life. The average or ordinary price of corn again is regulated, as I shall likewise endeavour to show hereafter, by the value of silver, by the richness or barrenness of the mines which supply the market with that metal, or by the quantity of labour which must be employed, and consequently of corn which must be consumed, in order to bring any particular quantity of silver from the mine to the market. But the value of silver, though it sometimes varies greatly from century to century, seldom varies much from year to year, but frequently continues the same, or very nearly the same, for half a century or a century together. The ordinary or average money price of corn, therefore, may, during so long a period, continue the same or very nearly the same too, and along with it the money price of labour, provided, at least, the society continues, in other respects, in the same or nearly in the same condition. In the meantime the temporary and occasional price of corn may frequently be double, one year, of what it had been the year before, or fluctuate, for example, from five and twenty to fifty shillings the quarter. But when corn is at the latter price, not only the nominal, but the real value of a corn rent will be double of what it is when at the former, or will command double the quantity either of labour or of the greater part of other commodities; the money price of labour, and along with it that of most other things, continuing the same during all these fluctuations. Labour, therefore, it appears evidently, is the only universal, as well as the only accurate measure of value, or the only standard by which we can compare the values of different commodities at all times, and at all places. We cannot estimate, it is allowed, the real value of different commodities from century to century by the quantities of silver which

were given for them. We cannot estimate it from year to year by the quantities of corn. By the quantities of labour we can, with the greatest accuracy, estimate it both from century to century and from year to year. From century to century, corn is a better measure than silver, because, from century to century, equal quantities of corn will command the same quantity of labour more nearly than equal quantities of silver. From year to year, on the contrary, silver is a better measure than corn, because equal quantities of it will more nearly command the same quantity of labour. But though in establishing perpetual rents, or even in letting very long leases, it may be of use to distinguish between real and nominal price; it is of none in buying and selling, the more common and ordinary transactions of human life. At the same time and place the real and the nominal price of all commodities are exactly in proportion to one another. The more or less money you get for any commodity, in the London market for example, the more or less labour it will at that time and place enable you to purchase or command. At the same time and place, therefore, money is the exact measure of the real exchangeable value of all commodities. It is so, however, at the same time and place only. Though at distant places, there is no regular proportion between the real and the money price of commodities, yet the merchant who carries goods from the one to the other has nothing to consider but their money price, or the difference between the quantity of silver for which he buys them, and that for which he is likely to sell them. Half an ounce of silver at Canton in China may command a greater quantity both of labour and of the necessaries and conveniences of life than an ounce at London. A commodity, therefore, which sells for half an ounce of silver at Canton may there be really dearer, of more real importance to the man who possesses it there, than a commodity which sells for an ounce at London is to the man who possesses it at London. If a London merchant, however, can buy at Canton for half an ounce of silver, a commodity which he can afterwards sell at London for an ounce, he gains a hundred per cent by the bargain, just as much as if an ounce of silver was at London exactly of the same value as at Canton.

6: Division of Labour: Meaning, Types and Advantages| Economics

1 Value, Use Value, Needs and the Social Division of Labour Heesang Jeon (hidarang@www.enganche cubano.com)
Introduction This paper attempts to provide a consistent interpretation of the statement that value is fully created in.

Well then, how will our state supply these needs? It will need a farmer, a builder, and a weaver, and also, I think, a shoemaker and one or two others to provide for our bodily needs. So that the minimum state would consist of four or five men Silvermintz notes that, "Historians of economic thought credit Plato, primarily on account of arguments advanced in his Republic, as an early proponent of the division of labour. Just as the various trades are most highly developed in large cities, in the same way food at the palace is prepared in a far superior manner. In small towns the same man makes couches, doors, ploughs and tables, and often he even builds houses, and still he is thankful if only he can find enough work to support himself. And it is impossible for a man of many trades to do all of them well. In large cities, however, because many make demands on each trade, one alone is enough to support a man, and often less than one: In his Muqaddimah , he states: The power of the individual human being is not sufficient for him to obtain the food he needs, and does not provide him with as much as he requires to live. Even if we assume an absolute minimum of food Thus, he cannot do without a combination of many powers from among his fellow beings, if he is to obtain food for himself and for them. Through cooperation, the needs of a number of persons, many times greater than their own number, can be satisfied. Classically the workers in a shipyard would build ships as units, finishing one before starting another. But the Dutch had it organized with several teams each doing the same tasks for successive ships. People with a particular task to do must have discovered new methods that were only later observed and justified by writers on political economy. Petty also applied the principle to his survey of Ireland. His breakthrough was to divide up the work so that large parts of it could be done by people with no extensive training. Bernard de Mandeville[edit] Bernard de Mandeville discusses the matter in the second volume of The Fable of the Bees But if one will wholly apply himself to the making of Bows and Arrows, whilst another provides Food, a third builds Huts, a fourth makes Garments, and a fifth Utensils, they not only become useful to one another, but the Callings and Employments themselves will in the same Number of Years receive much greater Improvements, than if all had been promiscuously followed by every one of the Five. David Hume[edit] When every individual person labors apart, and only for himself, his force is too small to execute any considerable work; his labor being employed in supplying all his different necessities, he never attains a perfection in any particular art; and as his force and success are not at all times equal, the least failure in either of these particulars must be attended with inevitable ruin and misery. Society provides a remedy for these three inconveniences. By the conjunction of forces, our power is augmented: By the partition of employments, our ability increases: And by mutual succor we are less exposed to fortune and accidents. We are going to go through these operations in a few words to stimulate the curiosity to know their detail; this enumeration will supply as many articles which will make the division of this work. Adam Smith[edit] In the first sentence of An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations , Adam Smith foresaw the essence of industrialism by determining that division of labour represents a substantial increase in productivity. Like du Monceau, his example was the making of pins. Unlike Plato , Smith famously argued that the difference between a street porter and a philosopher was as much a consequence of the division of labour as its cause. Therefore, while for Plato the level of specialization determined by the division of labour was externally determined, for Smith it was the dynamic engine of economic progress. However, in a further chapter of the same book Smith criticizes the division of labour saying it can lead to "the almost entire corruption and degeneracy of the great body of the people. Smith saw the importance of matching skills with equipment " usually in the context of an organization. For example, pin makers were organized with one making the head, another the body, each using different equipment. Similarly he emphasised a large number of skills, used in cooperation and with suitable equipment, were required to build a ship. In modern economic discussion, the term human capital would be used. Babbage wrote a seminal work "On the Economy of Machinery and Manufactures" analyzing perhaps for the first time the division of labour in factories. All

crafts, trades and arts have profited from the division of labour; for when each worker sticks to one particular kind of work that needs to be handled differently from all the others, he can do it better and more easily than when one person does everything. Where work is not thus differentiated and divided, where everyone is a jack-of-all-trades, the crafts remain at an utterly primitive level. He described the process as alienation: The worker then becomes "depressed spiritually and physically to the condition of a machine". As the work becomes more specialized, less training is needed for each specific job, and the workforce, overall, is less skilled than if one worker did one job entirely. He also argues that in a communist society, the division of labour is transcended, meaning that balanced human development occurs where people fully express their nature in the variety of creative work that they do. He claimed that the average man in a civilized society is less wealthy, in practice, than one in a "savage" society. Durkheim arrived at the same conclusion regarding the positive effects of the division of labour as his theoretical predecessor, Adam Smith. In *The Wealth of the Nations*, Smith observes the division of labour results in "a proportionable increase of the productive powers of labor. Durkheim hypothesized that the division of labour fosters social solidarity, yielding "a wholly moral phenomenon" that ensures "mutual relationships" among individuals. The main argument here is the economic gains accruing from the division of labour far outweigh the costs. It is argued that it is fully possible to achieve balanced human development within capitalism, and alienation is downplayed as mere romantic fiction. The price system is just one of those formations which man has learned to use though he is still very far from having learned to make the best use of it after he had stumbled upon it without understanding it. Through it not only a division of labour but also a coordinated utilization of resources based on an equally divided knowledge has become possible. The people who like to deride any suggestion that this may be so usually distort the argument by insinuating that it asserts that by some miracle just that sort of system has spontaneously grown up which is best suited to modern civilization. It is the other way round: Had he not done so, he might still have developed some other, altogether different, type of civilization, something like the "state" of the termite ants, or some other altogether unimaginable type. This would mean that countries specialize in the work they can do at the lowest relative cost measured in terms of the opportunity cost of not using resources for other work, compared to the opportunity costs experienced countries. Critics, however, allege that international specialization cannot be explained sufficiently in terms of "the work nations do best", rather this specialization is guided more by commercial criteria, which favour some countries over others. Efficient policies to encourage employment and combat unemployment are essential if countries are to reap the full benefits of globalization and avoid a backlash against open trade. Job losses in some sectors, along with new job opportunities in other sectors, are an inevitable accompaniment of the process of globalization. The challenge is to ensure that the adjustment process involved in matching available workers with new job openings works as smoothly as possible. Few studies have taken place regarding the global division of labour. Information can be drawn from ILO and national statistical offices. The majority of workers in industry and services were wage and salary earners – 58 percent of the industrial workforce and 65 percent of the services workforce. But a big portion were self-employed or involved in family labour. Filmer suggests the total of employees worldwide in the 1980s was about 1 billion, compared with around 2 billion working on own account on the land mainly peasants, and some 1 billion working on own account in industry and services. Agriculture decreased from 1980 to 2000. The industry sector accounted for 20 percent of the workforce. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. April 2014. Learn how and when to remove this template message. In the modern world, those specialists most preoccupied in their work with theorizing about the division of labour are those involved in management and organization. In view of the global extremities of the division of labour, the question is often raised about what division of labour would be most ideal, beautiful, efficient and just. Two styles of management that are seen in modern organizations are control and commitment, control being the division of labour style of the past and commitment being the style of the future. Control management is based on the principles of job specialization and the division of labour. This is the assembly line style of job specialization where employees are given a very narrow set of tasks or one specific task. Commitment division of labour is oriented on including the employee and building a level of internal commitment towards accomplishing tasks. Tasks include more responsibility and are coordinated

based on expertise rather than formal position. However, disadvantages of job specialization included limited employee skill, a dependence on entire department fluency, and employee discontent with repetitious tasks. Labour hierarchy is a very common feature of the modern workplace structure, but of course the way these hierarchies are structured can be influenced by a variety of different factors. Size, cost, and the development of new technology are factors that have influenced job specialization structures in the modern workplace. The cost of job specialization is what limits small organizations from dividing their labour responsibilities, but as organizations increase in size there is a correlation in the rise of division of labour. Technological developments have led to a decrease in the amount of job specialization in organizations as new technology makes it easier for fewer employees to accomplish a variety of tasks and still enhance production. New technology has also been supportive in the flow of information between departments helping to reduce the feeling of department isolation. This important concept of meritocracy could be read as an explanation or as a justification of why a division of labour is the way it is. In general, in capitalist economies, such things are not decided consciously. This does not present a problem,[citation needed] as the only requirement of a capitalist system is that you turn a profit. Limitations[edit] Adam Smith famously said in *The Wealth of Nations* that the division of labour is limited by the extent of the market. This is because it is by exchange that each person can be specialized in their work and yet still have access to a wide range of goods and services. Hence, reductions in barriers to exchange lead to increases in the division of labour and so help to drive economic growth. Limitations to the division of labour have also been related to coordination and transportation costs. Hence, a Taylorist approach to work design contributed to worsened industrial relations. There are also limitations to the division of labour and the division of work that result from work-flow variations and uncertainties. For instance, one stage of a production process may temporarily work at a slower pace, forcing other stages to slow down. One answer to this is to make some portion of resources mobile between stages, so that those resources must be capable of undertaking a wider range of tasks. Another is to consolidate tasks so that they are undertaken one after another by the same workers and other resources. Stocks between stages can also help to reduce the problem to some extent but are costly and can hamper quality control. Note also that modern flexible manufacturing systems require both flexible machines and flexible workers. In project-based work, the coordination of resources is a difficult issue for the project manager as project schedules and resulting resource bookings are based on estimates of task durations and so are subject to subsequent revisions. Again, consolidating tasks so that they are undertaken consecutively by the same resources and having resources available that can be called on at short-notice from other tasks can help to reduce such problems, though at the cost of reduced specialisation. There are also advantages in a reduced division of labour where knowledge would otherwise have to be transferred between stages. It is also likely to result in the query being handled faster due to the elimination of delays in passing the query between different people. Gendered division of labour[edit] Main articles:

7: Adam Smith's Lost Legacy: Adam Smith on Exchangeable Value

Division of labour is an area of job design that is highly applicable in some factories and production line environments. Case study evidence, relevant success factors and the strengths and limitations of division of labour approaches are presented.

Growth, according to Smith, is rooted in the increasing division of labor. This idea relates primarily to the specialization of the labor force, essentially the breaking down of large jobs into many tiny components. Under this regime each worker becomes an expert in one isolated area of production, thus increasing his efficiency. The fact that laborers do not have to switch tasks during the day further saves time and money. Of course, this is exactly what allowed Victorian factories to grow throughout the nineteenth century. Assembly line technology made it necessary for a worker to focus his or her attention on one small part of the production process. Surprisingly, Smith recognized the potential problems of this development. He pointed out that forcing individuals to perform mundane and repetitious tasks would lead to an ignorant, dissatisfied work force. For this reason he advanced the revolutionary belief that governments had an obligation to provide education to workers. This sprung from the hope that education could combat the deleterious effects of factory life. Division of labor also implies assigning each worker to the job that suits him best. Productive labor, to Smith, fulfills two important requirements. First, it must "lead to the production of tangible objects. Another main concern for Smith involved tracing the roots of value. He identified two different kinds of value, "use value" and "exchange value. The diamond-water paradox, in particular, proved puzzling to him: Why is it that diamonds, which have very little practical use, command a higher price than water which is indispensable to life? By discovering the true source of value Smith hoped to find a benchmark for measuring economic growth. Eventually Smith settled on labor as the source of value: The number of hours labor that a good can be exchanged for constitutes its inherent worth. Note, this is not the same as saying that a good is worth the number of hours spent in its production. The value of a good can also be referred to as the "natural price. Competition, however, was expected to push the market price towards the natural price.

8: Adam Smith: Wealth of Nations

The division of labour is the separation of tasks in any system so that participants may specialize. Individuals, organizations, and nations are endowed with or acquire specialized capabilities and either form combinations or trade to take advantage of the capabilities of others in addition to their own.

In this article we will discuss about the definition of division of labour. Also learn about its drawbacks and disadvantages. The modern age is the age of large-scale industries and businesses. Though the bigger is not always the better and bigger does not always become the biggest, trend towards the bigger "the larger" is much too pronounced. As a matter of fact, if small-scale enterprises had retained the fields of industry and commerce, single ownership firms, partnership firms and cooperative societies would have been the main forms of business organisation "not joint stock companies and State enterprises. In that case, joint stock companies and State management would not have come into prominence. We now discuss scale of production and its two primary factors, i. Meaning and Definition of Division of Labour: Perhaps the most interesting and important feature of production in a modern economy is the fact that a worker never makes a complete product, however simple it might be. The food that we eat, the cars that we drive, the clothes and shoes we wear, the furniture we use are all made by the labour of other people. The fact is that workers specialise. Each worker makes a very small contribution to the production of some commodity or the provision of some service. This is the essence of the concept of division of labour. It refers to the fact that the production process is divided split into a very large number of individual operations and each operation is the special task of a single worker. A visit to a modern factory such as an automobile assembly plant shows that the principle of division of labour is now carried to remarkable lengths. Even in small workshops producing nuts and bolts, the production process may be broken down into several separate processes. In Adam Smith gave a simple example of specialisation which has by now become the most celebrated account of specialisation. Adam Smith pointed out that division of labour was an important source of efficiency in the economy. He cited the example of pin manufacturing in this context. To explain the workings of the division of labour, he described a factory making pins. On a visit to a factory making a very simple item, viz. The important business of making pins is, in this manner, divided into about 18 distinct operations. Adam Smith estimated that production per day in this factory was about 5, pins per worker. He estimated that if the whole operation had been carried out from start to finish by the same worker, he would have been able to make only a few dozen each day. If making a pin can be split into eighteen separate processes, each being done by a different worker, then it is obvious that making something as complicated as a car would involve thousands of different processes. Five Types of Division of Labour: A glance over any modern industrial organisation reveals distinctly that it is based on specialisation. The division of labour is not a quaint practice of eighteenth century pin factories; it is a fundamental principle of economic organisation. Specialisation or division of labour denotes the limiting of the range of activities within a particular field. Under specialisation or division of labour, a particular work is divided into several processes, and a separate group of labourers is employed for each and every process. There are at least five different types of division of labour: Different countries specialise in the production of different commodities in which they enjoy certain advantages. And international trade is based on international division of labour and specialisation. There are several reasons why the division of labour is such an efficient way of producing goods and services. Products can be produced at low cost. This is because specialist workers can be employed who are obviously far quicker and more skilful at their jobs than a worker who tries to do all the tasks by him or herself. A specialist worker is also less likely to lose time moving between jobs. A pin worker who makes and packs pins is going to have to move between a pin-making machine and a packing table. This movement wastes time compared to a situation where workers specialise in each task. Less time and effort are also needed to train workers. Special tools can be developed to help with the production of part of the finished product. These tools will also be in far greater use than in a situation where each worker had to have his or her own set of tools, which for most of the time would lie idle. The division of labour is also efficient because it is only by sharing and cooperating that complex modern products

can be created and produced. No individual, for instance, could alone have produced a pocket calculator, or a television set or a modern office block. Some advantages of division of labour are easily understandable: Great development in the fields of industry and commerce has been made possible by division of labour. For example, steam engines are manufactured by a large number of persons, each doing a little bit. Therefore, the total output of steam engines has increased enormously. Secondly, division of labour leads to great increases in the productivity of labour. As Adam Smith pointed out long ago, no man is equally efficient in all lines of production. Under a system of division of labour a man can adopt the profession or occupation for which he has an aptitude. In such an occupation he can produce more. Increase in skill and dexterity: Thirdly, division of labour increases the skill and dexterity of the labourer. Under this system a man does the same thing repeatedly for a long time. Constant practice increases his skill. With experience he becomes an expert in his chosen line. Thus, specialisation not only saves time, it saves skill as well. Fourthly, division of labour saves time. Change from one job to another and thus putting down one set of tools and picking up another or moving from one place to another involves loss of time. Division of labour confines a man to one job in one place. Hence, there is a saving of time. Time is also saved in the training of operatives. A worker can be trained very quickly for the performance of a single operation. More use of machinery: Fifthly, division of labour leads to the use of more machinery. With extreme division of labour, the duties of individual labourers become more and more simplified. A time soon comes when a machine is invented to do the work formerly done by a human being. It is no doubt very difficult, for example, to produce a machine which would carry out the whole process of making a chair. But, once the job has been reduced to a series of separate tasks operations, it becomes quite easy to use electric saws, planing machines, power-driven lathes, etc. Cheaper goods and higher wages: Finally, as a result of various advantages, the cost of production declines. More goods are available to the consumers at cheaper prices. The wage rate also tends to rise, because each labourer produces more. There are also some disadvantages of division of labour: First, division of labour when carried to extreme lengths makes work dull and monotonous. A man, who has to do the same thing throughout the day, finds no pleasure in his job. A worker gets hardly any opportunity to exercise initiative, judgment, manual skill or responsibility. Most specialised workers find their jobs rather frustrating. Specialisation, carried to a great length, creates monotony and boredom. A change from one task to another has a soothing effect on the mind. A too narrowly specialised worker does not get the chance of such relaxation. Due to technological progress i. So, an average worker is denied the psychic satisfaction of making something or enjoy the pride in creation. Thirdly, a specialised worker is an expert only in his own line of work. If, for any reason, he loses his job, he finds it difficult to get another. To put it differently, specialisation means that the workers lack marketable skills since they do not have the wide industrial training which would make them adaptable to changes in the techniques of production. This simply means that their specialised functions can become obsolete when new machines are invented and their particular skills become useless elsewhere. Hence, there is a danger of unemployment in a rapidly changing world. Most modern systems of production are based on a number of different but interrelated processes and sub-processes. This is the danger of over-specialisation. We may illustrate the point by taking the example of the publishing industry. If the offset printing machine is out of order for a couple of days, virtually all other processes will become useless. The binders and sales people will have to sit idle for even a week. A specialised worker is not self-sufficient. He has to depend on others for the fulfilment of his needs. Thus, a blacksmith depends on the farmer for his food and the farmer in his turn depends on the blacksmith for his tools. Without such cooperation, conscious or unconscious, production comes to a halt and division of labour becomes useless. Extent of the market:

9: What are the Gains of International Trade?

The labor theory of value (LTV) is a theory of value that argues that the economic value of a good or service is determined by the total amount of "socially necessary labor" required to produce it, rather than by the use or pleasure its owner gets from it (demand) and its scarcity value (supply).

Producers derive following demerits or dis-advantages from Division of Labour: Over-production means that the supply of production is comparatively more than its demand in the market. Because of the Division of Labour when production is done on a large scale, the demand for production lags much behind its increased supply. Such conditions create over-production which is very harmful for the producers as well as for the workers when they become unemployed. Many workers join hands to produce a commodity. If the production is not good and adequate none can be held responsible for it. When the production is divided into a number of processes and each part is performed by different workers, it may lead to over-dependence. For example – In the case of a readymade garments factory, if the man cutting cloth is lazy, the work of stitching, buttoning etc. Therefore, increased dependence is the result of Division of Labour. Evils of Factory System: The modern industrial or factory system has been developed as a result of the Division of Labour. This system further gives rise to the evils like dense population, pollution, class conflict, bad habits of gambling and drinking, low standard of living, poor food, clothes and housing etc. Increased Dependence on Machines: As Division of Labour increases there will be an increased use of machines. Almost all the workers work on different types of machines. It is very difficult for them to work without machines. Thus, Division of Labour increases the dependence on machines. Administrative Difficulties and Industrial Disputes: Industrial disputes mean strikes by workers, closure of factory, etc. This creates acute administrative problems and difficulties. Division of Labour results in the division of society into workers and employers. The employer always tries to increase his profits by exploiting the workers and workers form trade unions against the employees to put an end to their exploitation or to make them increase their wages. It gives rise to a severe conflict between the employers and the workers in the form of strikes, closures and lockouts of factories. Division of Labour gives many dis-advantages to consumers and important of them are as follows: Consumers cannot get Variety of Goods: The worker deteriorates in technical skills. Instead of making the whole article of variety, the worker is required just to repeat a few simple movements. The skills with which the artisan once made the article products gradually dies out. He simply becomes a machines tender. The weaver of Dacca muslin fame is now or more. Division of Labour Kills Creative Instinct: Since many workers contribute to the making of an article, none can claim the credit of making it. The work gives him no pride and no pleasure since no worker can claim the product as his own creation. Dependence on Others for Satisfaction of Wants: In olden days when Division of Labour was not developed then whatever articles a man was in position to produce he used to consume himself. But now-a-days the consumer is entirely dependent on others for the satisfaction of his wants. A labourer can have following dis-advantages from Division of Labour: Under Division of Labour a worker has to do the same job time and again for years together. Therefore, after sometime, the worker feels bored or the work becomes irksome and monotonous. There remains no happiness or pleasure in the job for him. It has an adverse effect on the production. In the absence of Division of Labour, a labourer feels a lot of pleasure on the successful completion of his goods. But under Division of Labour no-body can claim the credit of making it. The work gives him neither pride nor pleasure. Therefore, there is total loss of joy, happiness and interest in the work. The danger of unemployment is another dis-advantage of Division of Labour. When the worker produces a small part of goods he gets specialised in it and he does not have complete knowledge of the production of goods. For example – If a man is expert in buttoning the clothes and if he is removed or dismissed from the job, it becomes difficult for him to find the job of building. Thus, Division of Labour has a fear of unemployment. Reduction in Mobility of Labour: It has been observed that the mobility of labour is reduced on account of Division of Labour. The worker performs only a part of the whole task. He is trained to do that much part only. So, it may not be easy for him to find out exactly the same job where else, if he wants to change the place. In this situation the mobility of labour gets retarded. Creative Pleasure is killed: Division

of Labour kills the creative pleasure of producing an article because many men contribute to the making of an article, none can claim the credit of making it. The work cannot give him pleasure as no worker can claim the product as his own creation. In this none can be held responsible for bad production because none makes the whole article. When the result is bad everybody tries to shift the responsibility to somebody else. This adds to the difficulties of administration. As we are that Division of Labour is concerned with large scale production in big factories which are owned by the rich people. No poor worker can afford to start his own production. Therefore, they have to seek employment in big factories of rich people. These employers pay fewer wages to them as compared to their marginal productivity, because there is no other alternative to the workers but to work at very low wages. Therefore, Division of Labour results in the exploitation of labour. Employment of Women and Children: Division of Labour results in the large scale production in which children and women are also employed. It is because a simple and small part of the whole task can be easily performed by them. Thus, the number of employed women and children increases. They are also exploited by the employers by paying them lower wages. Sometimes nation also has to suffer due to Division of Labour. Important situations are as follows where nation has to suffer: Birth of Monopoly Situation: In Division of Labour producer is the alone producer of goods and to increase his profit, he adopts unfair tactics. Maximum Production Leads to Depression in the Country: In Division of Labour if maximum production is done then depression in the country takes place and the bad effect of depression directly falls on social and economic situation of the county. Division of Labour is no doubt attended with a number of drawbacks. But the advantage has outweigh the dis-advantages. The evils can be minimised by shortening the hours of work and providing more leisure to the worker. It is no longer possible nor it is desirable, to do away with this system. Remember Division of Labour is beneficial to the workers, to the producers and to the society as a whole. Remedies and Mitigation of Division of Labour: Various dis-advantages of the Division of Labour can be mitigated or remedied as under: Monotony of Work can be Avoided: Psychological Satisfaction of Work is to be Sacrificed: In mass production when the psychological satisfaction of creative work is to be sacrificed, it is not every significant as compared to the physical satisfaction of increased income and consumption and high standard of living enjoyed by the worker as a result of the Division of Labour. Risk of unemployment causes frictional or technical unemployment due to mechanisation of the process. This may be short-term phenomenon. But, in fact, the Division of Labour in the long run increases employment opportunities within the firm or industry and in other fields also. For example " The increasing use of machinery will promote work and employment in the repair and spare parts industries of the country. It Causes Lack of Responsibility: Division of Labour causes lack of responsibility among the workers. But if proper checks are introduced, workers can be made more responsible to their job. Increases the Mobility of Labour: Because to specialise in some alternative job will not take much time as the worker is required to learn only a part of the work. Moreover, the number of employment exchange centres may be increased by the government to enhance the occupational mobility of labour. Limitations of Division of Labour: Economists are of this opinion that the Division of Labour is very useful and beneficial to the workers, the entrepreneur and the society in general.

The Life Voyages of Christopher Columbus to Which Are Added Those of His Companions (Geoffrey Crayon Edit Studies in physical oceanography Pirates of the caribbean piano notes Religion and the secular nation The new expanded bibliography of jazz compositions based on the chord progressions of standard tunes A cute love story Unique considerations for biopharmaceutics Laura P. Andrews and James D. Green Underground certificates in Nova Scotian coal-mines The protest of the minority of the Corporation of Trinity College, against the resolution approving of th Music in the street Jesus journey to the cross SuperCalc for CP/M based computers Usborne Starting Gardening The law and custom of primogeniture The dawn in Palestine. Following the framers : choosing pedagogy to further fair use and free speech TyAnna Herrington Atomic and molecular spectroscopy book Prophet of Pound Cake Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (Central Act 43 of 2005 and the Protection of Women Merton social theory and social structure The self-invited Guest. Railway engineering book by rangwala Game, Set, Love-Match Becoming Europeans The Trunk Murderess Are you scared of your credit score? List of irregular verbs Everything That Rises People and Society in Scotland: A Social History of Modern Scotland What think ye of Congress now? The enchanted Desna Form i-90 WordPerfect 8 for Windows for dummies 5. Answers as a window into the interpretation of questions XML document management server (XDMS) Women dreamt horses Daniel Veronese The wonderful telephone Ghosts of the past Public policy analysis and public administration Amelie yann tieren piano sheet music