

specific proposals made by Tawney are now irrelevant. But the spirit pervading the writing seems to me of far more urgent importance and of far greater relevance than when he wrote. I dare say that most members of the Cabinet have read the book at some time. It would be of great advantage to the country if they (and the leaders of the Opposition) were to read it again with attention and humility.

It is typical of Tawney's approach to the problems of politics that when, at the end of *The Acquisitive Society*, he wishes to convey something of the spirit that should animate a decent social order, he turns, not to the dreams of nineteenth-century socialism, but to those lines of *La Divina Commedia* (*Paradiso*. Canto III. lines 70-90) in which Piccarda explains to Dante the happy inequalities of Paradise, lines which are 'a description of a complex and multiform society which is united by overmastering devotion to a common end'.

Frate, la nostra volontà quieta  
virtù di carità, che fa volerne  
sol quel ch'avemo, e d'altro non ci asseta.

Tawney would, no doubt, agree that no earthly society is likely to conform in all respects to the heavenly pattern, nor is it likely to conform adequately in any particular respect; yet, since we pray: *Thy kingdom come*, nothing less can really satisfy us.

J. M. CAMERON.

### 'THERE IS NO WEALTH BUT LIFE'

THERE was once a time when people who wanted to make the working life of the working man more tolerable called themselves socialists. Fourier was not concerned with industrial efficiency so much as with establishing conditions in which the worker could take a pride and pleasure in his work. Robert Owen at New Lanark was primarily concerned with improving the conditions under which his employees lived and worked, even though his expenditure on houses and schools for his workpeople may have reduced the output of his mills' per unit costs; that is, reduced their efficiency. In his projected Villages of Co-operation he wanted to replace the plough not by the gyrotiller but by the spade because he considered that the settlement of as many people as possible on the land raised their 'standard of living' in the literal sense of the words even though it might not always lead to the largest possible output of consumption goods per man per hour. In later years William Morris and others reaffirmed the view that the primary purpose of socialism was not to produce the largest possible quantity of goods but to change the

quality of the life of the nation, to place a full and satisfying life within the reach of all, to free the people from the narrow struggle for a living wage and teach them to value freedom and responsibility.

In our own day socialists usually give very different reasons for their advocacy of public ownership of the means of production. Mr Herbert Morrison, for instance, says that efficiency is the only standard by which any system of industrial relations should be judged. Nationalisation, he says, will be undertaken only where it will make industry more efficient and because it will do so; socialism is to be desired not because it is a more equitable system but because it is more efficient. Most modern socialists tend to think quantitatively in terms of output instead of qualitatively in terms of life. Yet they do not push the principle of efficiency to its logical conclusion. Maximum efficiency demands that employers should drive their workers as hard as they can and cut out all amenities which are not known to contribute to increased output. Yet most theoretical socialists support the Unions in their opposition to what the latter call a 'vicious speed-up' and in their demand for amenities such as pit-head baths. They are prepared to concede something in the way of amenities to make the working life of the industrial worker more tolerable, but not to humanise production by, for instance, reducing the scale of production or giving the worker as much variety and responsibility in his work as possible; efficiency demands large-scale production and mass-production methods and efficiency come first.

The socialists acquired this habit of thinking in terms of efficiency from the capitalists who seek first the largest possible return on capital. Those who talk about efficiency are thinking in terms of the profit motive. The capitalist differs from the socialist in that his first duty is to his shareholders; he is concerned not with the profit of the community as a whole but with that of his shareholders. Few modern capitalists, however, demand that everything should be sacrificed to efficiency; many are prepared to concede better working conditions than the law demands even at the price of an appreciable reduction of dividends. Yet it remains true that both capitalists and modern socialists are dominated by the idea of efficiency, of maximum output per man per hour.

Efficiency is the dominant criterion in industry under capitalism, primarily because industry is controlled by people other than those who bear the human costs of production. The mechanisation of men, the monotony, the pitiless urgency of capitalism is the fruit not so much of the machine as of the divorce of ownership from work. When men are bound to machines over which they have no control, when those who reap the rewards of industry are not the same as those who

pay the price in labour. when labour is treated as a cost, men will tend to be overworked when they are not out of work. Work will remain a means to life instead of becoming a part of life and life will remain mean and meaningless. When industry is controlled either by the capitalist or by the state or by the consumer, life will tend to be sacrificed to efficiency. Only where the worker exercises a direct and effective control over his own working life will the claims of efficiency be balanced by the claims of human dignity and freedom; only then will it be possible for work to take its rightful place at the centre of men's lives.

Too much leisure and luxury are as demoralising as too little. If work is reduced to a few hours' servitude a week and entertainment on the largest scale to keep the people happy for the rest of the time, there is a very real danger that leisure and culture in the pleasure state may become even more boring than work, as great a problem as unemployment under capitalism. Leisure is valued more highly if it is integrated with an active life of work, if labour becomes more leisurely. The most sublime pleasures are not those of consumption, of appreciation, but of production, of creation, which may, in some measure, be found in most work. In proportion as work is dehumanised by the march of mechanisation, leisure will tend to become more of a rest cure than recreation. In the brave new world men will tend to have their leisure as well as their work organised for them and the varnished vulgarity of organised pleasure is likely to prove wearying and stale because its purpose has been lost. A community, like an individual, may find some zest in the accumulation of wealth as the Russians are finding in the task of building socialism in one country. But when the chase is over and wealth has been achieved, life will have become empty because it will have lost its purpose. The pursuit of wealth can never satisfy a community any more than an individual because it is not an end in itself but a means to good living. The profit and wealth of the community as a whole may be a more worthy aim than the profit of a few wealthy individuals, but if we are to raise our standard of living in the literal sense of the words we must always remember that the accumulation of wealth should never be an end in itself.

## II

It is nearly a hundred years since Ruskin warned us that *there is no wealth but life*, but we are probably as completely dominated by the profit motive today as we were then, although today it is with the wealth of the community rather than that of a class that most of

us are concerned. If we are to think qualitatively in terms of life instead of quantitatively in terms of money and output it is above all things necessary that we should give the people effective control over their working lives. As about half men's waking lives are spent at work it is right that they should be in a position to choose how far they will sacrifice output or work longer hours to find satisfaction in their work. Increased output and efficiency may, of course, very often make the life of the worker more worth living; if he can find the technical means to increase his output without lowering the quality of his life he will do so. A new variety of apple of equal quality to any of its season but with a better crop and more resistant to disease, or a new tool, such as a disc harrow, which does an old job better than the old tools, will be welcomed by the worker. But men in control of their own working lives will not sacrifice everything to efficiency as financiers are tempted to do. They would recognise that a fairly small scale of production which they could comprehend as a whole, personal relationships with those directing their work and mechanisation below the maximum, might serve to reduce the human costs of production as effectively as welfare schemes. They might also find that variety and integration of work, an interchange of occupation and a reduction in the cruel tempo of capitalist production were very much worth while even at the cost of reduced output or longer hours. Many have found an open-air life in the Army more satisfying in some ways than the profitable paths of commerce. If the people are to seek the good life as they see it they must be able to exercise a direct and effective control over their working lives; their working hours must become part of their 'own time'. They must become owners of the things with which they work so that they can find roots in their work and become masters of their time.

It is sometimes suggested that to put the control of production chiefly into the hands of the worker would mean that he would exploit the community for his own benefit. Workers as a whole, of course, cannot exploit the community because they *are* the community. In practice various Unions have never had any very great difficulty in adjusting wage rates to their mutual satisfaction, and should not have great difficulty in reaching agreement on broader issues if they had the opportunity. There is no reason why the free producer should not have as well developed a sense of social responsibility as the state servant interested primarily in his career. Those whose rights are recognised are always more likely to recognise in turn their responsibilities. The free producer has an interest in his work which is not merely financial but also professional, whereas the official tends to be concerned primarily with output because he does

not understand quality. In practice it has been the producer, the worker and the peasant who have been exploited, who have been denied a fair share of the national income and there is little reason to believe that democracy in industry would be more dangerous than elsewhere. Industrial democracy means workers' control; if consumers' representation gives the consumer any kind of control over the process of production as distinct from the nature and quality of the product—it means that men are controlling other people's lives instead of their own, which is hardly democratic. Indeed there is no more justification for consumer control in industry than for British rule in Nigeria on the ground that we consume so much of what the country produces. Inasmuch as the comfortable classes consume a major share of the products of industry, capitalism might even be described as a kind of consumers' control. In any case consumer control can only be maintained at the cost of quality.

The doctors, for instance, do not seem very anxious to cooperate in a state medical service, and without their cooperation such a service must be inferior. They are unwilling to cooperate primarily because they are not given the major responsibility in organising and maintaining such a service, because they are to be made instruments of the state instead of free agents working in association. It is the same in industry. Unless we get workers' control we shall have to choose between totalitarianism and starvation, for men will not work freely much longer as instruments either of capitalism or of the state. We can get efficiency by totalitarian methods but unless we adopt these we must sacrifice output in some measure to the way of life of the worker. Free men simply will not tolerate the working conditions of industrial capitalism, even if they are working for the state or a public authority, unless they are forced to, in which case they are no longer free. Government and municipal enterprises have by no means been immune from strikes. Strikes by municipal transport workers are commonplace. Municipal gas workers are almost as ready as their fellows in private employment to come out. The strike last winter of a million French Government workers suggests that employment by the state is not always more satisfactory than private employment. Many dockers are employed by semi-public agencies yet they have not been slow in making their grievances known. Strikes are not uncommon among employees of consumers' cooperatives and there were suggestions not long ago that conditions of work were sometimes as bad as in private employment. The co-operative productive societies, on the other hand, have known no strikes during the sixty years of their existence. But in industry generally the workers are restless, weary of remote control and a

barren way of life. They will remain restless, even if the state takes over all industry, until such time as they find responsibility in work. They are tired of working as instruments in spite of technical efficiency achieved, tired of working with no purpose but profit, tired of the Song of the Wheels:

King Dives he was walking in his garden all alone,  
 Where the flowers are of iron and the trees are turned to stone,  
 The hives are full of thunder and the lightning leaps and kills,  
 The mills of God grind slowly, but he works with other mills.  
 Dives found a mighty silence and he missed the throb and leap,  
 The song of all the sleepless creatures singing him to sleep,  
 And he said, some screw has fallen or some bolt has slipped aside,  
 Some little thing has shifted; and the little things replied:  
 Call upon the Wheels, Master, call upon the Wheels.  
 We are taking rest, Master, finding how it feels,  
 Strict the law of mine and thine, theft we ever shun,  
 All the Wheels are *thine*, Master; tell the Wheels to run,  
 Yea the Wheels are mighty gods, set them running, then,  
 We are only men, Master; have you heard of men?

Were there space to quote any more of Chesterton's 'Song of the Wheels' it would show more eloquently than any argument the evils arising not from the machine but from its control by people other than those who live and work with it.

PAUL DERRICK

---



---

## DESTINIES OF ISRAEL

*Anti-Semitism is the most horrible blow our Lord has received in his Passion; it is everlasting, it is the most bloody and unforgivable, for he receives it on the face of his mother and from the hand of Christians.*—Léon Bloy.

**D**ESTINEES D'ISRAEL<sup>1</sup> was written during those war years when anti-Semitism reached a greater degree of virulence than Léon Bloy anticipated even in his most pessimistic prophecies; and he has foretold only too accurately the great disaster of our time. The Abbé Journet's book which completes and corrects the ideas set forth in the *Salut par les Juifs* offers an exhaustive theological explanation of the destinies of the chosen people.

'Salvation is of the Jews.' These are the words of Christ to the Samaritan woman. This race has been preferred to others by a mysterious choice, incomprehensible to human intelligence; consequently

<sup>1</sup> *Destinées d'Israel*, par M. l'Abbé Charles Journet. (Fribourg, Switzerland, 1946.)