

CO-RESPONSIBILITY IN INDUSTRY. Social Justice in Labour-Management Relations. By Jeremiah Newman. (Gill; 13s. 6d.)

The large modern industrial enterprise has modified the traditional concept of ownership. Whereas formerly the *fact* of possession and the *function* of administration were united in the one person of the owner-manager of the small firm, the position now is that the owners are the absentee shareholders and the administrators are the managers, and it is these latter who bear the responsibility for the day-to-day running of the firm. In recent years it has become more and more clear that to some degree the workers in an enterprise should have some share in this managerial responsibility. This was already demonstrated by Joint Consultation during the Second World War in England and reached its most extreme limit in the famous resolution on *Mitbestimmung* passed at Bochum in 1949, claiming co-partnership to be a natural right, which was subsequently stigmatized by Pope Pius XII as erroneous. It is by now an accepted part of Catholic social teaching that some degree of co-responsibility is desirable, both from the point of view of the common good and from the demands of the human personality of the workers in any given enterprise, but it is equally agreed that this cannot be imposed (except in a very general and enabling fashion) by government legislation.

The value of Dr Newman's book is that after setting forth the Catholic principles behind co-responsibility he shows in some detail what steps have been taken to make it a reality, first through co-management legislation in Germany and in Belgium, and through the methods of Joint Consultation which are practised, with varying degrees of success, in Britain. To this he has added some rather sketchy notes on the position regarding the Industry Council Plan in the U.S.A., and here his bibliography which is otherwise very extensive might have been strengthened by some reference to Eberdt and Schnepf's *Industrialism and the Popes*, and a most useful discussion of the Dutch Industrial Organization Act of 1950. Incidentally, as Professor Fogarty points out in his lively introduction, this act might be considered 'the ideal model, in the light both of practical experience and of what the Encyclicals have to say', of legislation which strikes a balance between imposing ready-made solutions and leaving experiment to become completely anarchic and individualistic.

Dr Newman has added a valuable contribution to the far too small English literature on the subject which will be appreciated by the student and which should be of practical and stimulating significance to the businessman and the trade unionist on whom lies the co-responsibility of turning it into practical politics.

JOHN FITZSIMONS