

The reason to open sweatshops

[Business](#)



Case for the use of sweatshops

Most of the critics of the use of sweatshops argue that the use of sweatshops mark a growing instance of poverty in the developing countries. In the real sense, the developing countries that have allowed the development of sweatshops in many countries have experienced a sharp increase in their living standards. Most of the countries are experiencing some different levels of industrialization especially if the agreements that they made with the developed countries are implemented to the fullest. It is also evident that the benefits of growth in the developing countries have yet to be realized, but he leaps are being gained by the developing countries (Herman, 2012).

Regarding the argument that the development of sweatshops in the developing countries is creating repression in the countries, this idea is not particularly true. Some of the countries have benefited from the development of companies in their countries. The instances of oppressions seem to have been relaxed. The wages that are being paid in most of the sweatshops that have been developed in the developing countries are even higher than the wages that are paid by the local companies in those countries. Additionally, the areas that have the highest prevalence of sweatshops which are normally the East Asian countries have seen a rapid development in their economies (Miller, 2009).

Some of the policies that have been set up by the developed countries ensure that the rights of the individuals working in the sweatshops are protected. This is because the governments of the countries that have these large multinational companies do not permit the introduction of products

that have been developed by persons whose rights have been violated. The other factor that has greatly impacted positively on the rights of individuals working in the sweatshops is that the companies that owns these sweatshops do not want to earn the reputation that they are exploiting the rights of the individual in the developing countries. This is because it would create a bad image and this would in turn reflect on their profits. This, therefore, means that they do not want to hurt their investment through the exploitation of workers in the developing countries. In other words, if the host countries in the developing countries set the standards to high, the costs of compliance in these industries would mean that fewer individuals would have to be employed (Carden and Hall, 2009). The resulting implications are that some of the individuals who could have been employed in these sweatshops would not have any other options but to be employed in other sectors of the informal economy that may be even more hazardous than the standard provided in the sweatshops. Furthermore, it is the critics who advocate for the rights of the workers and not those of the individual companies, and thus a relationship that is not a win-win is created. A situation whereby there is an increased employment in the informal sector does not favor the development of the economy of the developing world. There would also be an increase in the gap between the poor and the rich in that the people working in the formal sweatshops would have a higher amount of income than the individuals working in the informal sector (Golodner, 1990).

It is up to the regimes of the developing countries to come up with strategies that ensure that both the individuals working in the sweat shops and the

companies both benefit. It is not a daunting task in that there is always room for improvement. It should, therefore, mean that the development of sweatshops in the developing countries should serve to the betterment of the locals. Otherwise, what is the point of having to set up in areas that they can be able to get a cheaper labor force and not guarantee the rights of the workers? The main reason for rejecting the need to use the market as a determinant of the development of wages and salaries is that in the developing worlds, there are few employment options and people would still be employed regardless of the working conditions and rights violation. If the local governments can set up strategies and measures to ensure that the wages and the salaries of employees are well catered for, then there is no need to abolish the use of sweatshops as it is both a good option. After all, the different backgrounds of individuals conducting the business should be used to judge the ethical standards that should be implemented in the sweatshops. It is therefore not permissible to exploit individuals in the developing world's due to the fact that one can gain a competitive advantage over their rivals based on the cheap labor that they can attain. The act of balancing the different arguments that have been brought forward by supporters and critics may be difficult. I believe that it is necessary to treat the people working in the sweatshops as normal human beings and not violate their rights. The companies should be able to respect the core human values that have been internationally agreed upon in regard to the labor laws. Additionally, these companies should also have a profound respect for the cultures of the host nation and be in a position that they can create a positive symbiotic relationship. The beliefs that one has should be used to judge what is morally right from what is morally wrong.