01

2

the foundation of the “full employment” theory as expressed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Although full employment has been an important goal of U.S. policymakers since this concept was first introduced in the early 20th century, it has become more of a theoretical goal and benchmark than an actually observed state of the economy.

Many economists consider the labor market to be at full employment when the unemployment rate is at or below 4%. Economists attribute this 4% to forces that are unavoidable in a dynamic capitalist market such as frictional unemployment. Because of human choice there will always be frictional unemployment, which occurs when workers move from job to job or state to state in search of a new or different job. There is a need to acknowledge this phenomenon in the full employment numbers, but when we take a deeper look into the 4% that is the accepted number of unemployed, we notice that it’s not all frictional unemployment. The share of unemployed who are long-term unemployed reached historically high levels from 2007-2009. This number remained higher than during any previous recession five years after the great recession of 2008. The long term unemployed are people who have been looking for work for 27 weeks or longer. That number in 2010 reached a record 6.7 million or 45.1 percent of the unemployed. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020) This is why it is important to analyze the type of unemployment that occurs within the 4% “acceptable” unemployment rate at a deeper level when discussing full-employment.

There is also the question of discouraged workers and persons marginally pore atsok2 (e)4 (nt)-2 nu should be addressed separately from the 4% threshold if we are to understand labor underutilization.

The United States has the fourth largest labor market in the world consisting of 160 million people (“USA.” The World Factbook. Central Intelligence Agency, 2019), and 4% of 160 million is still a large number. If the unavoidable unemployment such as frictional unemployment is removed, the avoidable unemployment such as discouraged workers and long term unemployed still represents a large number of people who are potentially underserved by the U.S. labor market. The purpose of this paper is to address clearly and critically those marginally connected to the labor market from a historical perspective. Analyzing a historical perspective up to modern times, will highlight the unique dilemma of today’s marginally connected workers and suggest ways that government policy can help.

Definition of Unemployment

To policymakers, the importance of achieving a status of full employment is evidenced by the language used in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This historic document, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its third session on December 10th, 1948 as resolution 217, lists basic rights and fundamental freedoms to which all humans are entitled (United Nations 1948). For example, this article states that “Everyone has a right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being for him and his family including, food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services.” It also provides certain protections against circumstances that are out of one’s control such as involuntary unemployment. This provision being included in the language of the articles indicates that the framers recognized that a person had an absolute right to access to gainful employment (United Nations 1948).

Employment and unemployment are complex topics that are both subjective and objective in nature. For example, when unemployment rates are cited, these are based on hard numbers and objective data. In contrast, while one may be employed, the wages earned might not be livable, meaning that the amount of income earned is not enough to provide the basic staples of living such as food, shelter, clothing, and medicinal needs. Although full employment is considered the macroeconomic "gold standard", it does not address the nuances of unemployment. This issue may be better understood if we examine employment in tiers or layers. The first tier is undercompensated employment, which is defined here as having employment, but the income earned is not enough to maintain an employee's income to be equal to or above the federal poverty line (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2020). The second tier is compensated employment, which is defined here as having a job that allows the employee to be considered middle class. The third tier is undercompensated hyperemployment, which is defined here as working a inhumane amount of hours, in order to receive a livable wage

Relationship between Labor, Capital and Government

In the ever changing landscape of developing economies, labor, capital, and government's intertwining relationship is what shapes economic development worldwide. This sometimes hostile and contentious relationship is a critical determinant of the kind of economic development that evolves out of it. In order to achieve sustainable economic growth, labor, capital, and government must work together in a deliberate manner. The household's role is to provide labor for production and to use income from labor to provide a market for the economy's final goods and services. If profit is a "residual return" to capital (i.e. after labor is paid) then one can think of capital as the employer of labor as well as the producer of output for the market. The role of Government is to be a referee and policymaker that does not pick winners and losers. Although economic development is a team effort by capital labor, they often have conflicting agendas.

In 1933, the Wagner-Peyser Act was passed and established a nationwide system of public employment offices, known as the Employment Service (U.S. Department of Labor, 2020). The purpose of this legislation was to improve how U.S. labor markets functioned by integrating those who are seeking employment and those who are seeking to employ. Georgia responded to the Wagner-Peyser Act by passing the Georgia Employment Security Law in 1937, which mandates employers to pay unemployment insurance to workers who involuntarily lose their jobs (Georgia Department of Labor, 2020). As a result of the enactment of Georgia Employment Security Law, the Georgia Department of Labor (GADOL) was created. GADOL is charged with providing a wide range of services to job seekers and employers alike, but the mission statement and goals of this agency do not address full employment.

In Georgia, if full employment is mentioned, it is usually in reference to Georgia's state emplDOL goes against the statement, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which reads, “Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity,” When labor can negotiate as an organized entity it gains leverage, which allows for a more equitable negotiation. In Georgia “at will employment” laws allow employers to terminate an employee for any reason at all. Meanwhile “right to work” laws curtail the establishment of unions which in itself takes away protections of workers. The vast majority of employment in Georgia is not collectively bargained, which weakens the power of individual workers to negotiate just and favorable remuneration.

In Georgia’s quest toward globalization, these two laws that restrict unionizing have played a major part in the pitch to lure new companies to the state. This legislative push to enact these two specific laws has given Georgia’s labor a unique problem to grapple with. Right to work laws were envisioned as a means to allow non-union workers access to unionized workplaces. When coupled with “at will employment” laws, they effectively stripped workers of their rights detailed in the UN’s Declaration of Universal Human Rights. As such, it seems the term “right to” work way to stimulate economic growth, most U.S. policies concentrated on growth at the expense of the advancement of labor unions. (Meltzer, 2005) The limited economic growth contributed to the high unemployment rates while stimulus policies contributed to rising inflation rates creating a stagflation economy. Following the crisis in the 1970s, and as a way to stimulate economic growth, most U.S. policies concentrated on growth at the expense of the advancement of labor unions. After the election of Ronald Reagan, the government launched a major direct attack on unions, Reagan’s decision to fire all unionized air traffic controllers in 1981 during a strike early in his administration was the government's answer to unionized power (Wright, N. Chapter 21(August 2009)). The result was a steep decline of unions. Prior to the financial crisis, and Ronald Regan’s anti-union stance, states did not have a concentrated effort toward anti-union legislation. In fact the U.S. showed a willingness to fulfill the “right to work” mandate from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This was demonstrated by the U.S. passing legislation that led to each state creating its own Dept of Labor tasked with developing state specific policies to assist its labor (Maclaury, J. A Brief History: The US Dept of Labor 1998). Afterwards states would use the federal government’s stance on limiting labor’s power as a license to implement anti-union legislation. It’s not surprising that these laws took their strongest foothold in the southern states where weakening labor unions also meant denying African Americans power.

From Slave Labor to Share Cropping

To illustrate the point of the subjective nature of employment, we can look at what happened to the agricultural labor market post slavery. In 1863, President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, which freed slaves in the U.S. (National Archives, 2020), but even with the enactment of the Emancipation Proclamation, slavery continued to “legally” exist in some areas until the 13th Amendment was ratified on December 18, 1865 (“Black Codes” 2019).

For the 400,000 individuals enslaved in Georgia at the time, the Emancipation Proclamation laid the foundation for a new social order (“Emancipation Proclamation” 2013). Following the emancipation of slaves in the U.S., states, especially those like Georgia that had many slaves, had to adjust to the new labor market. By changing the mainstay of the agricultural labor market, which was previously slave labor, the Emancipation Proclamation brought permanent change to the structure of agriculture in Georgia. Former slave owners, who owned plantations, continued the plantation system by hiring freed slaves on annual wage contracts to work the fields in gangs supervised by an overseer. This system was not sustainable and was replaced by a mix of sharecropping, tenancy, and wage labor (Williamson, 1965).

Sharecropping, was a system that gave former slaves an opportunity to become tenant farmers in exchange for a share of the value of the crop they produced, minus the cost for things like tools, food, and living quarters (History.com, 2020). Sharecropping provided jobs to many people in the south. While sharecropping was advertised under the auspices of giving former slaves autonomy in their daily work, social lives, and free them from the gang-labor system that was a part of the slavery era, it often resulted in sharecroppers owing more to the landowner than the sharecroppers were earning. This structural change in the labor market kept former slaves effectively enslaved and kept many in a state of abject poverty even though they worked full time jobs. It also decreased agricultural productivity because sharecroppers were still effectively slaves to the lender, and many simply chose to work fewer hours (Irwin, 1994).

The most fundamental of all the changes to Georgia’s labor market was the change in the owner of labor after emancipation. The evolution of the state’s labor system from predominately supported by slavery, to a market-based labor system had broad implications for the development and modernization of the state. In an effort to answer the labor question that the new reality brought about, some advocated for an increased integration of industrial means and “labor saving machines.” James Dunwoody Tebow would advocate for this in his quarterly review called Debow’s Review. (B., E. Q. 1867) Several factors contributed to the “labor question” of the state: market forces, racism, and class just to name a few (Brundage, 1993).

The planter class controlled the labor market in Antebellum Georgia, which restricted the ability of Georgia to industrialize due to labor being “trapped” on plantations. Oftentimes in Antebellum Georgia, as stated by Historian Anthony Gene Cary, wealth meant political power (Carey, 1997). Georgia's constitution in 1798 states that one of the requirements of holding state office is land ownership. Due to the fact that only white men were allowed to own land at the time this eliminated anyone else from having any political power other than white men. The property requirements of holding office meant that only reasonably wealthy white men were elected to the Georgia legislature (King, S.B. 1966). Georgia's wealth was concentrated within Georgia’s wealthiest white men. In 1860 nearly half of Georgia's property was held by 6% of white people. They were overwhelmingly the planter class, who owned large plantations and labor in the form of slaves (Inscoe, J.C. 2010). These laws firmly placed control of the government into the hands of the planter class. Michael Woods puts the planter class mindset about business practices into context with this statement “Planters' commitment to the production and overseas sale of cotton shaped southern politics and business practices” (Woods M. E. 2012). This reality helped to contribute to the underdevelopment of Industrialization in Georgia. Planters did not encourage southern industry growth, but instead, as historians contend, planters used their power to oppose southern industry growth. Most labor in Georgia was in the form of slavery at this time. On the eve of the start of the civil war there were roughly 462,198 slaves and 591,550 whites within the state of Georgia. Every slave within the state except for small children was a part of the labor force.

react to innovation in real time. Previously it would take 25 years for the lifetime of new innovative capital to become replicated to the point that the first-mover advantage enjoyed by the company that introduced it became non-existent. Now that the lifetime of new capital has been drastically

Georgia’s increasing integration into the global market economy has exasperated the issues of inclusive growth and full employment within the state. While there has been exponential growth and development in certain sectors of the state’s economy, others have suffered or disappeared altogether. Georgia’s push to become the number one place to do business has led to quite a few changes in the state’s economic structures, affecting capital, labor, and politicians as well. Of these, the stakeholders that have seen the biggest negative effect have been labor.

The greatest impediment to labor unionizing worldwide to use their collective bargaining power to adjust to globalization’s volatility is the enforcement of national borders. The rules that govern labor on one side of the border wouldn’t apply to the other side of the border. Free trade agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement do little to level the playing field and don't provide substantive protections for labor (Level the Playing Field for Trade 2018). To avoid the winners and losers’ scenario that inevitably comes with protectionist policies, the policies must be geared toward human capital development for all labor. Any unionizing efforts across borders become suggestions only, due to the differing laws of countries and no uniformity of efforts. In Georgia, labor has been impacted by NAFTA in a myriad of ways. The regional trading block that was created when the U.S, Canada, and Mexico signed a treaty creating a free trade area has been a boon to the owners of capital (NAFTA Revisited 2004). There has been a loss of many high paying jobs replaced by the same jobs just at a much lower cost. There have been some higher paying jobs recovered but not at the same levels of the previous labor market levels (Hinkley 2019). Mexico's role has been to serve as a source of low-wage labor (NAFTA’s Legacy: Lost Jobs, Lower Wages, Increased Inequality 2018). The only concession to labor in the agreement is the so-called labor side agreement, which is an attempt that encourages members to promote, in its own way, a set of general principles on labor rights, standards, equal pay, health, and safety

(Aspinwall, 2017). A commission is set up to deal with complaints of abuse that has little to no enforcement power (Ross, 2000).

Globalization has left Georgia's labor market playing catch-up with capital without the benefit of its two most potent tools, mobility and unionization. When Georgia's textile market was hit hard just seven years following the implementation of NAFTA, there was nowhere to turn for those laborers worki

for less

all its residents benefit from globalization, or if the workers who become displaced throughout rural Georgia will be left to fend for themselves and suffer the negative effects of globalization in isolation.

The impact of globalization varies across Georgia’s counties, which have different types of labor, different costs of training and different levels of accessibility to skill acquisition. In Georgia, globalization compels individuals to learn a variety of skills needed to complete and facilitate cross border trade. Some counties have lower relative costs of learning a trade due to infrastructure that is already in place in that county. Counties with a more elastic supply of educational skills will benefit more from globalization. They experienced greater growth and development in both jobs and school enrollment. Consistent with this human capital response, they experienced larger increases in skilled wage premiums (Cole, Paulson, and Shastry, 2014). There are other counties that do not have infrastructure in place to prepare their workforce for globalization. This opening should be filled by Georgia’s Government who must step in to retrain workers in rural counties. Metropolitan counties in Georgia who have the infrastructure and ability to retrain workers have an extra burden placed on them, due to the inability of the rural counties in Georgia to produce the same level of human capital development.

CONCLUSION

Accepting the UN's declaration that labor has a “the right to work” then the government's obligation is to ensure that right. With market forces subject to global fluctuations this means if governments seek to ensure this right then they must prepare their citizens to adjust to these fluctuations. Labor has to be trained and retrained to deal with these new market forces. The fact that the new force is globalization complicates the matter even more. Solitary citizens cannot be expected to compete with globa

References

Aspinwall, M. Aug 10 2017 "Learning from the Experience of NAFTA Labor and Environmental Governance," https://www.forbes.com/sites/themexicoinstitute/2017/08/10/learning-from-the-experience-of-nafta-labor-and-environmental-governance/#3fe5ce97e9df

B., E. Q. (1867, Jul). ART VII.--IN LIEU OF LABOR. DeBow's Review, Devoted to the Blecker, R. 8 April 2014 The Mexican and U.S. Economies after Twenty Years of NAFTA http://fs2.american.edu/blecker/www/research/Blecker_NAFTA_2014.pdf

Carey, A.G. (1997) Parties, Slavery, and The Union in Antebellum Georgia, University of Georgia Press.

Chappelow, J. 2019. Full Employment. Investopedia. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/f/fullemployment.asp

Christian, S. (2007, December 06) The Great Migration (1915-1960). https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/great-migration-1915-1960/.

Chui, M. Manyika, J. Miremadi, M., November 2015 Four Fundamentals of Workplace Automation. Mckinsey Quarterly 2015 https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/four-fundamentals-of-workplace-automation.

Cole, Shawn A., Anna Paulson, and Gauri Kartini Shastry. "Smart Money? The Effect of Education on Financial Outcomes." Review of Financial Studies 27, no. 7 (July 2014): 2022–2051.

Crook, C. 2018. Quicktake: Full Employment https://www.bloomberg.com/quicktake/full-employment.

Faux, J. (December, 2013), NAFTA's Impact on U.S. Workers Economic Policy Institute https://www.epi.org/blog/naftas-impact-workers/

Georgia: Koinonia Farm in the 1950s. The Georgia Historical Quarterly, 89(4), 505-527. Georgia Historical Society/ A New Encounter Black Slaves in the South, Plantation Economy Retrieved. Feb. 24, 2019 https://georgiahistory.com/education-outreach/online-exhibits/online-exhibits/encounter-and-exchange/a-new-encounter-black-slaves-in-georgia/plantation-economy/

Giesen, James C. "Sharecropping." New Georgia Encyclopedia. 28 August 2019. Web. 18 February,2020.

Hinkley, S. (2019). A review of Money and Finance after the Crisis: Critical Thinking for Uncertain TimesEdited by BrettChristophers, Andrew Leyshon, and Geoff Mann., Economic Geography 95(2):204-206. March 2019. https://doi.org/10.1080/00130095.2018.1536857

History. 2020. https://www.history.com/topics/black-history/sharecropping.

History, Volume 99, Issue 2, September 2012, Pages 415–439, https://doi.org/10.1093/jahist/jas272.

Inscoe, J.C. 9/9/2012 Georgia in 1860 New Georgia Encyclopedia. University of Georgia
. https://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-

i.19662 eorgiaVE(i)-2 (c)4 (e)4 (s)-1 :ycm-2 (e)4 n(t)-2 aorHistor-14 yetD 8272

a(s)-1 (e)4 (,. M)-1 n., Le,n E00n7())3 2 dey and Eolyem-2 (e)4 nn(t)-2 (C)-3 ((al)-2 (l)-2 (e)4 ng(e)4 (s

NAFTA's Legacy: Lost Jobs, Lower Wages, Increased Inequality 2018 Citizens.org https://www.citizen.org/wp-content/uploads/nafta_factsheet_deficit_jobs_wages_feb_2018_final.pdf

National Archives. 2020 https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured-documents/emancipation-proclamation.

O'Connor, C. (2005). The Politics of Industrialization and Interracialism in Sumter County.

Philemon Kazimil Mzee (August 17th 2012). The Context of Globalization and Human Resource Need and Strategy for Developing Countries - The Case of African Countries, Globalization Education and Management Agendas, Hector Cuadra-Montiel, IntechOpen, DOI: 10.5772/45615. https://www.intechopen.com/books/globalization-education-and-management-agendas/the-context-of-globalization-and-human-resource-need-and-strategy-for-developing-countries-the-case.

Preyer, N. (1971). Why Did Industrialization Lag in the Old South? The Georgia Historical Quarterly, 55(3), 378-396.

Reeves, R. (2019). "Capitalism Used to Promise a Better Future. Can It Still Do That?" The Guardian.org https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/may/22/capitalism-broken-better-future-can-it-do-that.

Robert J. S. Ross 2000. NAFTA and THE NEW SWEATSHOPS: The Forces of Contradiction and Contention in the Emerging World Order http://www2.clarku.edu/~rross/Naftachap.htm.

Scott R. (2001). Fast Track to Lost Jobs. Economic Policy Institute, https://www.epi.org/publication/bp117/.

Scott R. (2019) What's good for Wall Street is often bad for American workers and manufacturing. Economic Policy Institute, https://www.epi.org/blog/what-good-for-wall-street-is-often-bad-for-american-workers-and-manufacturing-the-overvalued-dollar/.

Starobin, R. (1970). The Economics of Industrial Slavery in the Old South. The Business History Review, 44(2), 131-174.

The Editors Britannica of Encyclopaedia (2019, August 20). Black Code https://www.britannica.com/topic/black-code.

Today in Georgia History/ Emancipation Proclamation (2013, January 1) https://www.todayingeorgiahistory.org/content/emancipation-proclamation.

Wright, N. (2009) Contemporary American Society. Labor Unions Chapter 21, (2009 August) -29.07 -1.15 Td [(h)2 (ttp)2 (s)1 (://w)4 (w)4 y (nge)4 (or):BDC BT 0 0/ h.