

826 Views | 15 CrossRef citations to date | 0 Altmetric

Articles

David Ricardo: on the art of “elucidating economic principles” in the face of a “labyrinth of difficulties”

Heinz D. Kurz


Pages 818-851 | Published online: 11 Sep 2015

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/09672567.2015.1074713>

Check for updates

Sample our
Economics, Finance,
Business & Industry Journals

>> [Sign in here](#) to start your access to the latest two volumes for 14 days



- Full Article
- Figures & data
- References
- Citations
- Metrics
- Reprints & Permissions
- [Read this article](#)

Abstract

The paper
approach
forms of
in terms
progress
is ar
deal
writings

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 843 partners store and/or access information on a device, such as unique IDs in cookies to process personal data. You may accept or manage your choices by clicking below, including your right to object where legitimate interest is used, or at any time in the privacy policy page. These choices will be signaled to our partners and will not affect browsing data. [Privacy Policy](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device characteristics for identification. Store and/or access information on a device. Personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development.

[List of Partners \(vendors\)](#)

I Accept

Essential Only

Show Purpose

rn his
of different
le resources
cal
advantage. It
a great
as in his

foreign trade

Keyword

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Jérôme Boyer des Roches, Christian Gehrke, Gilbert Faccarello, Neri Salvadori, Bertram Schefold, Yoshinori Shiozawa, Ian Steedman, Katsuyoshi Watarai, Takashi Yagi and two anonymous referees for most useful comments and suggestions.

Notes

1 On the relationship between the theories of Walras, Wicksell and Schumpeter, on the one hand, and Ricardo, on the other hand, see Kurz ([2000](#)) and Kurz and Salvadori ([2002](#)).

2 Marshall's concern with presenting his own theory as a continuation of the objectivist cost-of-production theory of the classical authors, integrated into and amalgamated with the subjectivist marginal-utility theory, made him downplay and even not see fundamental differences between the two.

3 This assessment is foreshadowed in a statement of 1839 by Henry Lord Brougham, who called Ricardo's views often “abundantly theoretical, sometimes too refined for his audience, occasionally extravagant from his propensity to follow a right principle into all its consequences, without duly taking into account in practice the condition of things to which he was applying it, as if a mechanic were to construct an engine without taking into consideration the resistance of the air in which it was to work, or the strength and the weight and the friction of the parts of which it was to be made” (Works

V, p. xxx

L. Mallet

p. 152 n

4 It hard

Corres

scho

available

5 In the

Christian

entirely

× January 1820, J.

Works VIII,

ricardo

nice etc.

gether with

course,



6 As one commentator remarked, Ricardo “meets you upon every subject that he has studied with ... opinions in the nature of mathematical truths” (Works VIII, p. 152 n. 2).

7 While Ricardo typically assumed wages paid ante factum (i.e. at the beginning of the uniform period of production), Sraffa assumed wages paid post factum (i.e. at its end). However, as can easily be shown this difference does not substantially affect the general argument in the above.

8 Ricardo's basic intuition extended to the cases of fixed capital and scarce land, and also in these respects he can be said to have been on the right scent, deficiencies of his analysis notwithstanding: several of his basic ideas were later given a coherent form by V. K. Dmitriev, Ladislaus von Bortkiewicz, Paul A. Samuelson, Luigi Pasinetti and especially Piero Sraffa.

9 For the following, see also Kurz ([2011](#)).

10 Paul Samuelson once asked Sraffa, whether Ricardo held a labour theory of value. Sraffa is reported to have answered: “He did and he didn't.” What might at first sight be considered a sibylline response turns out to reflect properly Ricardo's point of view, which, for example, in the third edition of the Principles comes to the fore when Ricardo speaks “of labour as being the foundation of all value, and the relative quantity of labour as almost exclusively determining the relative value of commodities” (Works I, p. 20; emphasis added). The following note Sraffa wrote in November 1927 may be read as a comment on Ricardo's statement: “It is the whole process of production that must be called ‘human labour’, and thus causes all product and all values. Marx and Ricardo



manuscript on “Absolute Value and Exchangeable Value”, written in 1823 shortly before he passed away (see Works IV).

11 One should recall however that “corn” in Ricardo's early reasoning was a term designated to encompass all necessaries, like “bread” in the Bible (a meaning William Petty took up), and thus represented a bundle of commodities.

12 For the following, see Gehrke et al. ([2003](#)).

13 It is not difficult to rectify Ricardo's second numerical example and bring it into line with the first one without affecting the substance of what he says; see Gehrke et al. ([2003](#), p. 296).

14 Ricardo himself deplored his problems with “the difficult art of composition” (Works VII, p. 19). Indeed, as several commentators observed, the structure of the Principles leaves much to be desired and reflects the hurry in which it has been put together.

15 For the following, see Kurz and Salvadori ([2009](#), [2011](#)).

16 John Stuart Mill reiterated Ricardo's position, but went a step further. He insisted that the working of exhaustible resources is similar to the working of land (a resource that is taken to be inexhaustible); that in both kinds of activities there are two antagonistic forces at work – diminishing returns and technical progress; and that the potential for technical progress is larger in the mining and other extraction processes than in agriculture (see Mill, [1965](#), p. 495). But then he even opined that “the almost inevitable progress of human culture and improvement ... forbids us to consider [the

exhausti
Krautkra

17 For th

18 For a
Kurz

19 The r
Ricardo's
said to h
modern
rediscover

convincingly, Ruffin had difficulties, in Keynes's words, “to escape habitual modes of



thought and expression.” In interpreting the route via which Ricardo is supposed to have discovered the principle of comparative cost, Ruffin looked at him through the distorting lens of marginalist theory. For a complementary discussion of Ricardo's theory of foreign trade to the one given here, see Faccarello ([2015](#), in this volume) and Maneschi ([2015](#)).

20 There is no presumption that cloth and wine are the only commodities produced or consumed in the two countries. However, all other commodities remain in the background in Ricardo's analysis and will also do so here.

21 Some commentators took the first step of his analysis (reflecting his research method) wrongly for a factual statement about the unimportance of technical progress; see most recently Piketty ([2014](#), pp. 5–7). (For a criticism of this view, see the argument in previous sections and Kurz [2010](#).) The fact is that Ricardo was keen to abstain from speculating about future technical improvements, because no reliable knowledge on them was available. He stressed, however, that “it is no longer questioned” that improved machinery “has a decided tendency to raise the real wage of labour” (Works IV, p. 35; see also VIII, p. 171), without necessitating a fall in the rate of profits, and that there are no indications that capital accumulation will slow down because of a lack of profits.

22 According to Adam Smith's argument about the social division of labour, which Ricardo accepted, it even exhibits dynamically increasing returns. In Smith the invention of improved machines both results from and propels forward the division of labour (see [WN I i 8](#)). It is therefore interesting to note that when Ricardo discusses the factors of production, he does not mention machinery. He only refers to “the improvement of the arts, and by the increase of the number of hands” (Works IV, p. 34).

23 These arguments are also found in Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1790), where he discusses the division of labour in order to explain the division of labour in the home. He argues that the division of labour is not only a result of the division of labour, but also a result of the division of labour. He also discusses the division of labour in the home, but also the division of labour in the home.

24 This is a common argument, but it is not supported by the textual evidence he puts forward does not support his case; see Gehrke ([2015](#)).

25 The passage cited actually refers to the effect of technical progress in one line of production in one of the countries on the pattern of specialization (Works I, pp. 137-40). It has been adapted to the case we are concerned with.

Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by
15



Information for

- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up



✕