and

Summary. — 200 0 (A)

employment data. Rather the paper may usefully inform policy discussions in three ways.

First, this modeling approach provides a ceterus paribus

A A -
( )
( ), T
.
T . T1
-200 -200 ,
“ .” -
, T1 -
- A
, 2 3. -
T1 , T1
-
“ ” -
. T2
,
A 200 . V
- 2004
0 200 0
.
T2 -
A 200 . A T1, -
T2 ,
, ,

[illegible] 1 [illegible]

[illegible] 10.1 [illegible] 1.1% [illegible] 5.2% [illegible] 5. [illegible] .2 [illegible] 1 . % [illegible] 1 .1% [illegible] ,000 [illegible] 5,000 [illegible] ,000 [illegible] ,000 [illegible] .2% [illegible] . % [illegible]

[illegible] 41.5% [illegible] 42. % [illegible] 2

Table 2. Industry-level employment effects from trade for India: Scenario A (Type II multiplier).

Trade patterns for India and South Africa provide some support for the "compositional effect." For example, the three industries with the greatest drop in exports to the European Union and United States (taken together) can be classified as "postponable" consumer durable and investment goods. Indeed these are the same three industries in both countries: iron, steel and non-ferrous metals; non-electrical machinery; and misc. manufacturing (the last including jewelery and precision instruments).[6] Yet not all industries fit neatly into this pattern, for there were increases in exports of chemicals for both India and South Africa, and large declines in exports of agriculture and manufactured food products for India. Moreover, the effect of industry-level changes in exports on industry-level changes in employment is somewhat round-

2003 04 (1.0 % 1.10%).

(. % 2003 04),

(4.3%,

), (3. %),

(3.2%),

(3.2%), (3.1%).

(2).

4,000

241,000 11. % 2000

(, 2010). -

,

.

A ,

, -

. % 200 , .4% 200 .5%

[illegible], [illegible]. (200[illegible]). [illegible] ([illegible].), [illegible], [illegible], [illegible]. 1[illegible]14.

[illegible], [illegible]. (200[illegible]). [illegible]