

# Free argumentative essay on division of labor in society

[Government](#), [Capitalism](#)



Division of work, as other scholars call it, is the specialization of work in predetermined roles with an intention to increase the productivity of labor. It can also be defined as the process whereby an employee or group of employees is assigned a specialized duty in order to increase efficiency. The growth of work specialization is generally associated with an increase in output and a more complex economy. This is because every individual does what they are best at and yield the best-desired results since they do not have to divert their time and knowledge to areas they are not properly conversant with. It is believed that only a society that engages itself in work is the one that grows, therefore, when every sector in the economy has the right individuals to perform the various tasks in these departments, a maximum yield is the general expectation. Nevertheless, this is not what Karl Marx holds to be true. He has a virtually contrasting opinion though at some points, he coincides with this discipline.

Karl Marx argued that the division of labor has negative implications. He asserts that division of labor can lead to overall poor and lack of enthusiasm for their work. When workers do the same job over a period, they become bored of monotony and repetitiveness leading to alienation from the process of production. He states that the workers in this situation become depressed spiritually and physically to the condition of a machine. He clearly distinguishes between the economic and social division of labor. Whereby, some labor corporation forms are due to technical necessity, some are believed to stem from the stratifications in a society based on the hierarchical set up. By conflating these classifications of economic bias, the existing divisions of labor might appear as though, they are immutable, compared to

socially constructed and influenced by power relationships.

Marx asserts human is a very independent species. He singles out that human nature relates to what they produce and the methods employed in the process of creation of these goods. In his view, human beings are distinct from other creatures in the sense that though other animals do work, only the human engage in productive labor. He recognizes work as the primary source of achieving human meaning; this fulfillment is the factual nature of humans.

The question is on how humans can realize their nature through. This entirely depends on the organization of the production process. In the ancient times, hunters and gathers, horticulturists, and pastoralists did simple and unspecialized labor with varying levels of self-direction. In those days, it was not easy to draw a line between what was considered as work and leisure. Marx explains that when people are alienated, they do not receive the meaning and satisfaction from work but only get frustrated by the work they do.

## **Property and labor**

Marx favored the ancient way living as people did simple and unspecialized labor. People did not experience alienation to work because in the production process, people performed several tasks that did not bring monotony. Other people also acquired products from other people to satisfy their needs. Marx disputed claims that specialization of work could enhance life in the face of the earth.

Karl Marx foresaw that in the present day, several employees in the world would combine forces against their employers whom he considered as

capitalists. He further describes these employers as oppressors to their employees. He made this prediction in accordance with concern of work specialization as cause of alienation; this is about 150 years ago. He believed those employees performing monotonous jobs became tired of the same line of operation and lost their main aim of doing the jobs, which is a source of satisfaction as humans. Due to the fore mentioned provisions, Marx knew that the employees, who did not get satisfaction, did not engage themselves with their work as opposed to the time when they signed employment contract.

Marx was not in support of Adam Smith's emphasis on the concept of specialization, stating that it alienated employees from their production objectives, and altered the capacity for a motivated approach to work, and these results into low productive and less motivated employees. For instance, a worker who strives to construct pins from the start to the finish must actually press all balls of metals to make nail heads daily, then sort the various sizes. Indefinitely and continually carry tops while pressing specific knob, he would not confirm his individuality, his own objectives or have a feeling that he has satisfied himself in reality. Marx essentially argues against Smith's idea that work should be measured down to size, micromanaging and production of fragments of objects. Marxist idea holds that whatever an individual's product of labor is, it should at least reflect some cycle of completed work.

In contrast to Marxist idea, Smith believes in the convenience of pursuing wealth through individual and societal collective concern, where competition is considered as supreme. He supports the competition that intensive

division of labor helps to promote hindrance, particularly since it reduces baker-blacksmith situations where the involved parties have a mutual relationship in the provision of goods, and in return depend on each other for profit by effectively paying the supplied goods. Marx in his view, division of labor intimately addresses the pursuits of laborers completely neglecting discussion of a sympathetic or constructive attitude towards the workers themselves.

In conclusion, Marx acknowledges division of labor to be the main characteristic of the economic system, which is referred to as capitalism. Smith and his counterpart, champions this system of division of labor as beneficial to both the individuals and the society. Marx on the other hand views capitalism as unnatural occurrence that alienates man from himself and his critique of capitalism, and division of labor clearly criticizes what Smith holds as natural. Marx believes that division of labor is a framework that wears man down, divides him and destroys him. He does not support division of labor. This argument is based on the claim that nothing that is not natural is good. Even still, it cannot be argued that man is not naturally greedy.