

{comments on}



Diviziunea muncii este esentiala pentru realizarea capitalismului. Odele aduse acestei inventii care a revolutionat sistemul de productie incep cu "[Wealth of Nations](#)" si se insira timp de secole pana la "[I, Pencil](#)". Cu toate acestea, radicalizarea acestui concept are efecte extrem de nocive. Corolarul sau de secol XX - specializarea, educatia fragmentata, produce indivizi incapabili sa gandeasca rupti de contextul in care au fost instruiti sa actioneze. Cu implicatii atat micro, cat si macroeconomice. Un element esential pentru iesirea unei economii din recesiune este flexibilitatea preturilor si salariilor. Ambele depind de mobilitatea capitalului material, financiar si uman. O specializare excesiva afecteaza mobilitatea fortei de munca, nu atat geografic, cat mai ales profesional. Pus in fata falimentului business-ului in care activeaza, unui angajat nu-i trece prin cap sa se recalifice, ci sa efectueze presiuni, prin intermediul sindicatului din care face parte, pentru ca statul sa sustina, macar temporar, domeniul respectiv. In plus, tocmai forma de educatie "vocationala" primita, lipsita total de elemente liberale, care ar avea rolul unei meta-educatii menite a-i deschide orizonturile, il face nereceptiv la asimilarea de noi cunostinte in alte domenii. Pus in fata alternativei: un salariu redus sau disponibilizare, un angajat alege revolta (greva): "Nu e normal, doar am o diploma!"

Iar acesta este rezultatul unei educatii exclusiv fragmentar-stiintifice in detrimentul unei liberale. "An employer was recently heard to remark that we have plenty of persons today who can tell us why a machine will not work, but none will tell us why men will not work", constata Richard M. Weaver in *Ideas Have Consequences*

. Filosoful american pune aceasta situatie si pe seama egoismului manifest al muncitorilor din ziua de azi. Care, pe de alta parte, sunt si ipocriti, acuzand lacomia "antreprenorilor". Pentru ca, asa cum observa Weaver, "*the bourgeoisie first betrayed society through capitalism and finance, and now labor betrays it*

*by embracing a scheme of things which sees profit only, not duty and honor, in work*  
”.

De altfel, aceasta incapacitate de a gandi in afara educatiei primite este responsabila de multe din “neintelegerile” moderne dintre angajati si angajatori. Si unii si ceilalti sunt incapabili sa iasa din carapacea impusa in scolile publice. Unii stiu doar ca fara capitalul lor si fara priceperea lor antreprenoriala, ceilalti n-ar avea loc de munca, ceilalti, ca fara manevrarea de catre ei a masinilor, primii vor ramane si fara capital si cu o cunoastere inutila. Iar ceea ce ar trebui sa fie rezultatul unui schimb liber consimtit, salariul, devine rezultatul unui raport de forte. Egoismul, dublat de umanitarismul utilitarist si sentimental, naste monstri. Cel mai bun rezumat al unei astfel de situatii este prezentat de Elizabeth Gaskell (cel mai important critic constructiv al capitalismului din sec XIX, mult peste Marx sau Dickens) in [Mary Barton](#) , roman publicat in 1848:

*“An order for coarse goods came in from a new foreign market. It was a large order, giving employment to all the mills engaged in that species of manufacture; but it was necessary to execute it speedily, and at as low prices as possible, as the masters had reason to believe that a duplicate order had been sent to one of the continental manufacturing towns, where there were no restrictions on food, no taxes on building or machinery, and where consequently they dreaded that the goods could be made at a much lower price than they could afford them for; and that, by so acting and charging, the rival manufacturers would obtain undivided possession of the market. It was clearly their interest to buy cotton as cheaply, and to beat down wages as low as possible. And in the long run the interests of the workmen would have been thereby benefited. Distrust each other as they may, the employers and the employed must rise or fall together. There may be some difference as to chronology, none as to fact.*

*But the masters did not choose to make all these circumstances known. They stood upon being the masters, and that they had a right to order work at their own prices, and they believed that in the present depression of trade, and unemployment of hands, there would be no great difficulty in getting it done.*

*Now let us turn to the workmen's view of the question. The masters (of the tottering foundation of whose prosperity they were ignorant) seemed doing well, and, like gentlemen, "lived at home in ease," while they were starving, gasping on from day to day; and there was a foreign order to be executed, the extent of which, large as it was, was greatly exaggerated; and it was to be done speedily. Why were the masters offering such low wages under these circumstances? Shame upon them! It was taking advantage of their workpeople being almost starved; but they would starve entirely rather than come into such terms. It was bad enough to be poor, while by*

*the labour of their thin hands, the sweat of their brows, the masters were made rich; but they would not be utterly ground down to dust. (...) With Spartan endurance they determined to let the employers know their power, by refusing to work. (...) There was a strike in Manchester. (...) Many other Trades' Unions, connected with different branches of business, supported with money, countenance, and encouragement of every kind, the stand which the Manchester power-loom weavers were making against their masters. Delegates from Glasgow, from Nottingham, and other towns, were sent to Manchester, to keep up the spirit of resistance; a committee was formed, and all the requisite officers elected; chairman, treasurer, honorary secretary.*

*The masters, meanwhile, took their measures. They placarded the walls with advertisements for power-loom weavers. The workmen replied by a placard in still larger letters, stating their grievances. (...) Meanwhile, the power-loom weavers living in the more remote parts of Lancashire, and the neighbouring counties, heard of the masters' advertisements for workmen; and in their solitary dwellings grew weary of starvation, and resolved to come to Manchester. (...) And now began the real wrong-doing of the Trades' Unions. As to their decision to work, or not, at such a particular rate of wages, that was either wise or unwise; all error of judgment at the worst. But they had no right to tyrannise over others, and tie them down to their own Procrustean bed. Abhorring what they considered oppression in the masters, why did they oppress others? Because, when men get excited, they know not what they do. Judge, then, with something of the mercy of the Holy One, whom we all love."*

Rezultatul neintelegerii din romanul scrisoarei britanice: interventia brutala a politiei. "...  
*president Truman proposal on a certain occasion to confront recalcitrant labour with military induction is the clearest proof that a nation which egotism has paralyzed will, in an emergency, have recourse to its most rigorous form of discipline, the services trained for armed combat. It thus appears that the spirit of self, which has made the workers lose sight of the calling of his task and to think only of aggradizement, is the plainest invitation yet offered by Western world to the tyranny of force",*  
explica Weaver.

PS:

Interesant este ca saltul catre autoritarism nu este neaparat efectul unor propuneri venite din

partea unor spirite autoritare. Dovada este corespondenta din 1946 dintre Fritz Machlup si Ludwig von Mises. Machlup, care poate fi banuit de orice mai putin de tendinte autoritariste ii cere un sfat fostului sau profesor:

*"I would like your advice: I must soon give a lecture for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on Monopolistic Wage Determination as Part of the General Problem of Monopoly. The lecture is to be published, and will probably receive more attention than suits my liking. If the lecture were to be presented in a scientific forum, I could go into the history of ideas, and in particular Mill and so forth. But for the Chamber I must be practical and political. I will have no choice but to say that monopoly wages are the only purpose of labor unions, and that strong labor unions mean unemployment and inflation and lead to an authoritarian state. Can an honest man avoid such statements? Are there any alternatives?... If it is politically unthinkable to outlaw labor unions—and I assume this is the case today—can one consider government limitations on private wage increases? I am not thinking, of course, of a fixing of wages through the state, but of a general interdiction to increase wages... by more than 10% in three years, or something of this sort. Of course this is entirely fantastic. Would it be smarter not to mention such makeshift solutions at all? They have no prospect of being accepted".*

Raspunsul lui Mises este usturator: *"First of all, liberate yourself from false ideas. Study economics. Then go on to convince others. I reject any outlawing or limitation of the liberty of association. No liberties shall be abolished, only coercion."* (

[Jorg Guido Hulsmann-  
Mises: The Last Knight of Liberalism](#)

)