**Who is asking the question here:** AN MP, as part of a parliamentary inquiry

Who is the respondent? Mr. Abraham Whitehead, a clotheir from Scholes, Holmfirth.

What is the attitude of the inquirer?: He's trying to ascertain the state of the children staying near Whitehead, that is, how well they are treated in the mills, the morality of staying in school.

Points FOR Industrial Revolution: None. This is quite a negative part, quite against the whole employment of child labour:

Arguments for Child labour

1. That conditions were no worse than they had been on farms, in cottages or up chimneys.
   1. John Wesley : child labor as a means of preventing youthful idleness and vice
   2. Working hours and conditions had been as bad in the older domestic industries as they were in the industrial factories
   3. Work was 'easy for children and helped them make a necessary contiribution to their family's income'
2. Factory acts
   1. Cotton Factories Regulation Act 1819, set minimum age at 9, maximum hours at 12
   2. Regulation of Child Labor Law (paid inspectors to enforce the laws
   3. Ten Hours Bill of 1847. (10 for women and children
3. Many children were employed by the industries considered to be the leaders of the Industrial Revolution 'textiles and coal mining'.

Points AGAINST Industrial Revolution

1. '*They continue to work as long as they can see, and they can see to work in these mills as long as you could see to read'.*
2. *'They are generally cruelly treated'*
3. *'They smite the child with the strap or billy roller'*
4. *'Children that are not employed in mills are generally more moral and better behaved than children who are employed in mills.*

**What is happening to the way time is experienced by workers in a factory? What concrete policies and practices noted in the reading support your answer? See Article 3 and 4**

Time is experienced as a series of programs, a code by which each signal is given for the worker to start and stop. Basically, they are treated like machines.

*"Without counting rest periods":* So the workday is longer than 12 hours, while the average person's time span is 30 minutes.

*"The bell denotes the hours of entry and departure in the factory when it first rings."* So the bell holds command over the worker's everyday lives. Who is to say that the bell rings further or later?

*"It is forbidden under penalty of fines"* Fines which are frequently a lot more than the worker's pay. Kept them indentured and afraid of flouting.

**What other forms of discipline are encoded in the rules**

**What are the consequences of failing to follow the rules**

-No Smoking, (heavy fine, dismissal)

-No drinking (sent away and fined)

-No trespassing (Porter cannot admit anyone, needs to alert the foreman)

-Missing a day? Pay 2 Francs, double for a second offense.

-Miss too many days? Dismiss, plus no payment unless illness.

-Every member pays insurance.

-Search of clothes by foreman and Porter (no privacy)

-Restricted movement, (Fined, brought under suspicion, dismissed)

-Must surrender their belongings when asked to: (Reimbursed according to the valuation of the Director and the foreman? What if they are stolen from by these two parties?)

-Obedient to the foreman (What? So the foreman is master to these indentured factory workers?)

-You can only be employed by this factory (Or else punished)

-Responsible to work done: (Pay for objects not prepared on time. )

-This is freaky:

*Art 12: In return for the protection and care which all workers can expect from the directory, they pledge to him loyalty and attachment. They promise immediately to call to his attention anything that threatens good order of the Director's interests. Workers are also put on notice that any unfortunate who commits a theft, however small it may be, will be taken to court and* ***abandoned to his fate.***

This is definitely against Industrial Revolution bringing joys. Discipline is harsh and treatment is inhumane, workers required to be loyal to company despite horrible conditions.

**Are there any similarities between mining and factory work**

* Pale (due to lack of sunlight) bad air, poor health conditions (due to becoming habitual drunk and lack of sunlight)
* Heat: (the wringing out of trousers) and fatigue (stretched out on the pile of coal)
* Mechanical *'No more incentive, no more haste, we muddle along wearily, we are worn out and mindless.':* Lack of incentive for improvements, nothing but fatigue occupying their mind.
* Mental issues: *'The conscience of the individual degenerates'*

**Are the rules expressed in Berlin similar to anything you have experienced? Discuss the implications of term -- 'disciplined workforce'**

**SCHOOL**

Normal working day begins and ends by the bell. From 6 am to 7pm Lateness is punished by wage cuts.

Cannot prepare for departure before bell rings

If you are idling/irregular arrival or disobedient, you get dismissed.

Rules are similar to previous set of rules, tools kept properly, obedience paramount, no drink and tobacco, report on each other.

Disciplined workforce: to stick according a certain boundary, lack of camaraderie between workers, going by the bell to work, conditions are slightly better than previous set.

Honestly, other than morality, there isn't going much to the FOR argument at this rate… For the against argument, there's the regularization of work hours, and guaranteed restrictions unlike the laissez-faire style of agrarian workers.

**How do plantation owners ensure slaves pick a certain amount of cotton each day? How does this sort of disciplinary regime compare to that of the miners and factory workers?**

*The worker is whipped, and made to pick as fast as he can. When he weighed it for the first time, it is the subsequent standard, for if he were to take in less, he would be punished.*

This disciplinary regime is much more harsh, because of earlier/longer working hours, and lack of standard breaks between.

**In light of the comparison, can we call the policies for factory workers innovations? What does the proliferation of new rules for work tell us about the industrial revolution in general?**

There is better discipline, but at the same time better regulations. Because the industrial revolution brought about a greater mass of workforce, it led to enfranchisement and thus greater ownership over their previously short lives. Rules meant that the foremen could not step about their bounds, and unions (or worker organizations) meant pushing for better safety standards.

**What is the girls impression of the mill where she works?**

Pleasant at first, neat and tidy. Describes the work that each member does; praises the neatness of the whole place.

**Would you say her working conditions are bad as those of child laborers?**

Double Wages possible (and induced as a weaver), evenings off, and healthcare is of the same standard, because there are little risks in weaving as compared to the coal mines.

**Why can we justify long hours for adult women but not for children?**

They are above a certain age, therefore deemed able to make their own choices. Children could increase their value via schooling, but women are paid lower and thus have to work longer hours for the same pay as a man.

**What does the author think about women laborers?**

He thinks they make great workers, *'sedentary habits, the spirit of discipline, exactitude at work, loyalty'* as well as *'intelligence and dexterity'*.

**What does this reading tell us about the changing nature of the economy in Europe in the mid 19th century?**

Women weaved to supplement the family income in agrarian societies. Then, as the society industrialized, they are still used to make fabric, but in a much more complicated fashion.

**What is the writer's goal in publishing this article in a newspaper?**

Bringing awareness of the grueling conditions of the worker. Cobbett compares the factory workers in Britain to the condition of enslaved workers in the US, but thinks that industrial labor lead better lives than that of plantation slaves.

Emphasizes words such as GAS and the temperature of 80-84 degrees Fahrenheit, (26-28 degrees Celsius). Lifespan is short due to fatigue and illness, bring concern over to MPs.

**Is this fictional account of work in a mine more effective than the coal miner's account in expressing the conditions of their work? In what ways?**

Better; gives a person to look for rather than a creature or a typified species of worker. Gives emotions, rather than a robot.

**Smith: The Wealth of Nations:**

**In light of the aforementioned documentation of abuses in the factory system, do you think Adam Smith was unaware of its shortcomings or simply mired in Industrial Utopian dreams?**

**Komlos**

**….**"SO AGAINST": *This discovery, as well as the subsequent finding of a similar trend in life expectancy, called into question the common wisdom that the rapid expansion of the US economy during the antebellum decades brought about an unambiguous and monotonic improvement in condition':* People became shorter, led shorter lives and the Europeans modelled them at the onset of the Industrial Revolution.

**Why did people in the upper income brackets benefit more than Industrialization (783-785)**

Average increase in income counteracted the effect of income inequality, while Income Elasticity of Demand for Food < 1 (which means food consumption does not change as much with income changes) while Marginal Consumption of nutrients to human growth diminished with increasing food intake ) Meaning just an increase in food does not lead to proportional improvement in health.

People in upper income brackets include landowners, who benefited from the increasing demand from land, and because of the shift of income, there were less rich people in comparison to poor people, leading to poorer food consumption among a greater proportion of people.

**How did the poor make do with increases in the prices of food (785-787)**

Food prices increased due to the slowness of change in agrarian society compared to industrial society. Thus they budgeted more towards food, and more carbs than meats. Consumers weren't hungry, but changed their diet in response. There was thus decline in food output.

Those who were free made their food choices while those enslaved just ate whatever their masters wanted, and since the price of slaves rose in tandem with food, they were able to increase their food consumption.

**How did inelastic food prices affect the decision made by food producers (789-790)**

Food producers had to produce more food for larger populace despite lack of mechanization: Populations therefore experienced a downward pressure on their nutrition status

Previously subsistence farmers sold away more pricey stuff which was healthier in exchange for inexpensive carbs, leading to their children being less healthy.

**What does the phenomena of shrinking people and poor working conditions (from earlier readings) tell us about industrialization and the idea of progress? Does increased productivity always mean progress?**

Nope. Better working conditions than slaves, but still treated like indentured servants. Furthermore, lack of knowledge in younger populace (remember, not in church school or any education settlement means more illiterate labour)

**TONGUE: Social EFFECTS (This is basically SBQ ppl)**

Opening speech: There are problems with coming to a conclusion as to how the standard of living has changed.

1. Too many factors! Consumption? Nutrition? Public health? Records are taken from skilled workers, not the overall food basket of the workers.
2. Confusion: Standard of Living != Quality of Life. New working conditions or changes in life-style may seem to be a backward jump despite improvements in material comforts. Like the flush toilet. Or workplace regulations.
3. Which timespan? 1750-1850? Or the war period, or the first 50 years?
4. Marxist: denigration of workers by the capitalist system

Hardship to workers in short term

1. Britain was at war, rise in population, urbanization, plus poor harvests. All of them are external factors as to how the SOL has changed
2. All workers are not made equal.

So what are we certain of?

1. Good before 1770, no wars, better harvests.
2. Good after 1840: improvement in real wages until the 1870s, further acceleration as prices fell, with better working conditions and reduced hours. Safer environment, sanitary reforms

So this period, 1780-1840:

1. Long wars with France : Hyperinflation (remember, they're printing out military bonds to deal with the costs of war!)
2. Cycle of depressions: Remember that the finance industry is very weak to this compared to agrarian society! Gains were often wiped out
   1. Think of the kinds of unemployment! Structural is there due to the changeover of industries (no canals! No sheep farmers now!) Cyclical is exacerbated. We don't talk about Frictional.
3. Unskilled workers and semi-skilled suffered most, agriculture workers who can't swap to factory workers suffered. Skilled workers such as engineers benefitted from increased status. Large groups displaced as machines replaced workers, or industries suffered. Such as railways vs canals and coaching.

In other words, you can't generalize! Before 1840, bad. After 1840, good.

However, there are still better points

1. Better workplace safety/healthcare. Now it may seem that there were terrible working conditions, but we can see in so and so's report about the mill, the Lowry Mill Girl's account that things are improving in certain areas. Gives about greater enfranchisement, to have funds to sick fund rather than dying once you are unable to work
2. Collectivization; previously you are on your own. Now, you can have a better exchange for goods, are able to sell off your surplus produce (even if you don't think about health benefits) and if you think your work conditions are poor, then join a union! They became more powerful towards the end of the 19th century
3. Literacy! Previously, workers are unable to learn stuff due to back breaking work on the fields. But if you look at the number of rules, you see that there are more factory workers who are aware of their status, and who can enforce their form of rights. A bunch of angry workers is stronger than one after all

Counter points:

1. Yes, poor nutrition, stunting of height. Greater income inequality. These are all visible negatives to industrialization. But you can say it's part of the teething process, before greater awareness that is brought about by the industrial revolution helps to ameliorate that.
2. Incomes became more variable (less steady) and food prices shot up. However, who said that developments were even? Some had it better, some had it worse. Students and aristocrats were able to increase their nutrition, industrialization brought about changes in social-economic status.

Summary:

How do you measure the social benefits and costs of industrialization?

Optimists: Contemporaries regarded the cheapness and greater availability of some foodstuffs and cotton clothing as a triumph.

Pessimists: Articles are a source of degradation.

There is no firm evidence for an overall improvement in working-class standards of living between about 1780 and about 1820. So taking into account the harvest failures, growing population, war debts, distress of dislocation, we can see that standards of living fell.

1820 to 1840: That's difficult, because no evidence for a rise in real incomes, and we can't deduce the wide margin of error. Evidence of a fall in SOL rests either on presumptions that we cannot empirically check with information now accessible. Everything is based on circumstantial arguments.

So net changes? Slight changes, either way

But after 1840s, we see a much stronger evidence of an improvement in the average real incomes of the working class. A substantial and demonstrable rise in real wages of industrial workers did not occur until the 1850s and 1860s. So it was not until abou 1879 that real wages in agriculture began to rise.

Laborers were now treated with a sense of dignity, there was a decline in unemployment, greater regularity.

Agricultural laborers earn less than factory workers. Better technology led to rise in wages for people of equivalent skill. There is a fall in proportion of workers engaged in the low earning categories and a corresponding rise in the proportion of those in the high earning categories.

Compare to SG! We shifted from a colony to a manufacturing and then finance hub! We see rise in incomes!