PLAIN ORDINARY MAN

A VOLUME OF
THE NEW-WORLD SERIES
Edited by HUBERT WILLIAMS

Volumes in

THE NEW-WORLD SERIES

SOCIETY AND ENTERPRISE	by A. T. K. Grant
THE RÔLE OF MONEY	by Frederick Soddy
WOMEN IN THE CIVILIZED STATE	by John Presland
PLAIN ORDINARY MAN	by Arthur Radford
EDUCATION AND THE CITIZEN	by E. A. Loftus

To follow

PLANNING IN TOWN AND COUNTRY	by T. Alwyn Lloyd
MODERN TRADE UNIONISM	by J. T. Murphy
A REALLY HEALTHY NATION	by Drummond Shiels

Other volumes in preparation

PLAIN ORDINARY MAN

By

ARTHUR RADFORD

Senior Lecturer in Economics, University College, Nottingham.

LONDON

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE AND SONS, LTD.

BROADWAY HOUSE: 68–74 CARTER LANE, E.C.

1935

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LIMITED, HERTFORD.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

"PLAIN Ordinary Man," as the title of a book, is almost an impertinence. Who can claim that he has the right to speak on behalf of plain, ordinary people?

I make no such pretentious claims. I submit this book to my readers with humility, as a statement of what I think ordinary people think and feel about the social organization of which they are the largest part. I submit it in the hope that it will help in the formulation of a political and social faith without which there can be established no social order worthy of the name. Our political parties to-day have no real faith in the possibility of making a civilized society. Most of them are concerned with the working of some kind of social machine. A political faith must be expressed in human values. In the nineteenth century the liberal faith that dominated our policies was a faith in liberty. This was a statement in terms of human values but it has proved inadequate. A new faith requires to be stated and I think it will have to be expressed in some form that will make the opportunities for cultured living the central idea.

Political policies are merely the ways of attaining the ideal. They contain proposals for removing hindrances to the attainment of the ideal and proposals for the establishment of conditions that

actively help in its realization. In this book a slight survey has been made of the conditions under which ordinary men and women live and some attempt has been made to estimate their thoughts and feelings about these conditions. This has been done in the hope that something might be discovered which indicates the kind of proposal that must be included in the political and social policy that aims at the development of a civilized community.

No one is more conscious of the shortcomings of this book than I am myself. I have asked hundreds of plain, ordinary people—most of them in fact neither plain nor ordinary !—what they want and I have tried to remember all they have said. To one of these I am particularly indebted, my friend, R. M. Hewitt. I met him soon after the Editor of this series had commissioned me to write this book and I asked him what, as a plain, ordinary man, he wanted of this world. We were approaching his house and, indicating it with his hand, he said, " A small house, a garden full of artichokes, my own best girl : neither to despise nor to be despised." I thank him for this text and readers who peruse the following pages will know what credit is due to him and what shortcomings are mine.

I also wish to express my thanks to my friend, the Editor, who has helped me in many hours of discussion, both before and since this book was thought of ; to my friend, W. A. Brown, I owe thanks for the very thorough reading of

the manuscript; and to my wife, I owe an ocean of gratitude for the preparation of the manuscript in a legible form and ideas which she may not wish to claim as her own.

I have used a few figures in the course of the book and I wish to acknowledge the valuable assistance I have received in this connection from the *Survey of Merseyside*, and the *Social Survey of England and Wales* by Professor Carr-Saunders and Mr. Caradog Jones.

A. R.

NOTTINGHAM.

Chapter I

YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY

IN the eighteenth century, society was simple in structure. It was an affair of social "orders", the landed gentry, the yeomen, and the labourers. The town organization was somewhat different but England was rural, and in rural life the heirarchy was easily perceived and well understood. It was, in a sense, the ripe product of centuries of development.

Speaking generally, people knew their places: they "belonged" to one order or another. They knew their own places and they knew the places of all others. The order was "natural" and it was useless to quarrel with "nature"; they accepted it as wise men do accept natural phenomena.

The mark of social significance was real property ownership. The franchise was based on real property and a person's "stake in the country" was measured by the amount of it which he held. Property was the country and so the country really belonged to the property owners. Those who had no property depended upon those who had and their social significance was that of the "dependent": they really belonged to those who owned.

The social relationships were modified feudal relationships. Squire and villager were names that carried much of the significance of the older names of lord and serf. Time had softened some of the brutalities. The security of the owning and ruling orders allowed of certain freedoms of intercourse, but there was, however, no presumption.

The ruling orders ruled. Leslie Stephen, in his study of eighteenth century government, reveals the figures showing that in Parliament, Lords and Commons, on the Bench, of magistrates and bishops, in the Army and Navy, in all the positions of authority, the squirearchy were seated, exclusively. They administered the law; they made the law; the country was theirs and they disposed of it.

There was, doubtless, a good deal of kindliness. Richardson's "Sir Charles Grandison" was the perfect squire, full of solicitude for his people. To him and the best of the squires "property was a trust" and their lives were ordered on the rule of "noblesse oblige". These articles of faith are, however, only subscribed to by those who feel secure in their superiority of status and power, and in the eighteenth century the squires felt this security.

The lawyers could even speak of the equality of men before the law and the church could accept the doctrine of the equality of men before God: they could accept these as facts in a society

of rigid social inequality. The explanation, of course, is clear. These equalities simply meant that anyone who encroached upon another's legal right was endangering the social structure and all that was expected of a person was that he should live in such manner as fitted his station in life. The essence of the administration of law was and is the enforcement of the existing scheme of things.

Equality before the law is an essential ingredient in the administration of justice ; it is not, however, to be identified with justice. Justice is the will of the sovereign authority and the squires were the political sovereign in the eighteenth century. They made the law and then administered it equally—or roughly so.

In all small communities the inhabitants are familiar with the affairs of one another and a certain ease of communication between the various orders develops. The condition of this ease is the acceptance of a scheme of importance of men. In the eighteenth century, England was a congeries of small communities : there was a certain amount of travel but on the whole the life was parochial. The social orders were accepted and there was a respectful friendliness shown by the lower orders for the higher, and a paternal friendliness by the higher for the lower : there was in places a great deal of mutual respect and admiration of the members of one order by the members of another — within the scheme of accepted importances. All the

members of the village met together in church and sang :—

> The rich man in his castle,
> The poor man at his gate,
> He made them high or lowly,
> And ordered their estate."

With that as a general creed the world could go very well !

We have said that the social structure of the eighteenth century was a very solid thing and a very rigid thing. So far as any social order can be said to be rigid this statement is perfectly true. No social order is, however, absolutely rigid and it is doubtful if ever it can be. All that can be meant by such observations is that at times the *forces* determining the interrelationships of men are relatively *in equilibrium*, and the eighteenth century was a period of relative social equilibrium. The distribution of wealth and power was such that the line of least resistance, by those who had neither, was to accept the order we have described.

At the end of the century, however, circumstances arose which changed the general face of society. The development of manufacturing technique, of farming, and means of transportation gave an opportunity to men, whose social station had been inconsiderable, to amass large money fortunes and challenge the old estate owners in their claim to be regarded as the important element of the state. To the old landed gentry, the development of industry and trade was an

expansion of the importance of the old shopkeepers, craftsmen, and bagmen. Napoleon's contempt of a " nation of shopkeepers " was the contempt of one who thought in terms of an old social order. The new England produced by the Industrial Revolution was, to the old, merely a nation attempting to stand on its head and think with its feet : the landed aristocracy must have felt terribly snubbed when Napoleon lumped them with the new aristocracy, not distinguishing the aristocracy of profits from the aristocracy of rents !

The Industrial Revolution produced a new rich group, made rich by different methods from those practised by the old landlords. The latter inherited their wealth and their power: the former " made " their wealth and claimed the power which wealth gave. A great part of the political conflict of the nineteenth century was merely the conflict of these two groups—the old rich and the new rich—concerning the relative merits of the two ways of attaining importance.

Our interest in this book is in the influence of the Industrial Revolution on the social structure which was so definite in the eighteenth century. We are concerned to discover in particular what became of the status of the plain, ordinary man as a result of these economic changes.

One of the most outstanding features of the industrialization of this country was the tremendous development of town life. Industrialization and

urbanization were practically synonymous terms. The establishment of factories, warehouses, transport conveniences led to the agglomeration of industrialists and divided the population into two groups, urban and rural. This division is a most significant fact that must be considered in connection with the social classification problem. England, from being a predominantly rural country in the eighteenth century, became more and more urban—but she did not become wholly urban. This is a fact sometimes overlooked.

The industrial revolution destroyed the domestic handicraftsman of the villages. Factory production was cheaper and more voluminous so the village craftsman had to go to the town as a factory worker or coal miner or iron worker or railway worker. The technical changes in agriculture made the smallholding of the eighteenth century an unprofitable proposition, so the yeomen—the smaller of them—had to become labourers (if they did not go to the towns) of the tenant farmers farming on a large scale. The impact of the Industrial Revolution on the country, then, caused rural life to become more purely agricultural and ranged the persons occupied in agriculture into three groups, landlords, tenant farmers, and labourers. Tenant farmers of the well-to-do type, though in their economic relationships with labourers very much to be compared to the manufacturers in the towns, evolved a social status of a peculiar kind : they were known as " gentleman farmers ", a quaint term signifying

a mixture of two kinds of status, that of employer and that of the landed class. They were inferior to landlords for they lived on profit and not on rent, but they were treated respectfully by labourers because they were a sort of gentry: they indulged in the sports of the gentry and so appeared to be of the leisured class.

The changes in rural social relationships, due to the Industrial Revolution, were not, then, very marked. Even to-day, in some parts of the country, the eighteenth century conception of social orders persists, and those of us in middle life can recall the days when, of English country life in general, it could be said that the social structure was definitely of that earlier century. With the enfranchisement of the village labourer, his loyalty to the old order is made visible in the persistence with which the agricultural country constituencies return Conservative members of Parliament. The scion of the noble family, the local landlord, or one of his class, can still be fairly secure of his success in seeking Parliamentary honours, if he chooses a constituency sufficiently agricultural, for he stands for the order which the constituents know and accept, an order which mingles discipline and kindliness in parental proportions.

The effect of the Industrial Revolution on the towns was very different from that on the villages. The distribution of wealth and power, where industrialists congregated, was determined by the principle that a man was worth as much as he could acquire. Social structure was a thing that

must look after itself. Social well-being consisted of useful things and a man who made things often made much money, so the making of money and the production of social well-being were identified. Service to society was measured by the income a person received and the pauper who received nothing was, by implication, one who was worth nothing.

Life in the towns was an adventure. Social status was a thing to acquire. The mode of acquisition was to make money. To make money one needed to work hard, invent new methods, save and accumulate. " Heaven helped them that helped themselves," or, as Archbishop Whately put it, Heaven desired that " men should perceive their own interests clearly and pursue them steadfastly ". Business and philanthropy should be separated : business was a process of acquiring income and philanthropy was a process of spending it ; business success meant production success but philanthropy was consumption, the destruction of things produced. The way of progress was the way of freedom, of initiative and enterprise : the bar to progress was any social interference with individual freedom.

The nature of progress was the changing of things, not, as the Tory landlords urged, the maintenance of an established order. The new industrial order was vital, vigorous, and dynamic : the old social order was moribund, stiff, and static.

The supporters of the old order held that class

distinctions were natural and men were, therefore, by heavenly ordinance, different. Industrialism had shown, however, that men who, by this canon, were of lowly order, had ability to acquire property equal to that of the erst-while mighty. They proved—or considered they had proved—that "men are", as Adam Smith had said, "born much of a muchness." Energy, grit, and an eternal watchfulness for the opportunity—moral qualities in general—were the price of success. Individualism was morally sound and the social order that resulted from free and unfettered competition and individual enterprise could be no other than a moral order. Since men were endowed with talents more or less equally, by Nature, the tendency of freedom was towards equality of wealth and status.

Such was the theory of the new industrial order and the faith of those who were successful. Those who were "working" it did not realize that they were merely putting old wine into new bottles. They did not see the parallelism between the struggle for wealth, which they were maintaining as the condition of progress, and the struggle for power in the long past ages, when the settled social order, against which they tilted, was in the making. They did not realize that fighting with reserves of wealth against propertyless workers was the repetition of the old fights with up-to-date military weapons against bill hooks and scythes. In their demands for freedom from the shackles of state or social interference they asked

for a fair field and no favour thinking that a right order would emerge; they did not realize that they were merely asking that the social struggle should be transferred wholly to the "economic" field and withdrawn from the "political" field.

In the actual process of economic bargaining, however, there resulted a similar kind of grouping of men in industry to that which had existed before in the rural world. Some succeeded and others failed and there developed new industrial "magnates" and new industrial "serfs". The mass of plain, ordinary men became wage earners, employed by capitalists. There were small employers, as there had been small landed proprietors in the eighteenth century, but the general pattern was for one employer to employ many workers.

The sense of property possessed by the new rich was as strongly marked as the sense of property in the old aristocracy. They claimed, as the older ones claimed, the right to bequeathe their property to their issue and there developed all the attitudes and attributes of the older orders of property holders.

In the first place, they developed the idea that their capital maintained the workers and that the workers were their dependents. To employ a worker was an act of kindness for which the worker should be duly grateful: that a worker was employed because he was worth employing was not incorporated in the theory of wage determination until the third quarter of the

century. In the second place, they adopted, fairly widely, the idea that "property is a trust", and, after a time, they began to use a certain amount of their wealth for philanthropic purposes. In the third place, after one or two generations, they accepted the idea that the ideal of life was to attain a state of leisured independence of work, drawing interest on their investments and taking a share in the political control of the country, as the older landlords had done. The conception of the natural equality of capacity in men was gradually dropped and, to all intents and purposes, the landlords and capitalists became merged in one body.

The reactions of workers were varied. Living in large numbers, in close proximity, they naturally developed habits of mass thinking and mass action, but their attitude to the system showed considerable diversity. Some accepted the situation, seeing it, as their counterparts in agriculture saw it, as a natural order that there should be rich and poor, employers and employed. Some accepted it, fondly hoping that they or their children might be blessed with the same luck as the wealthy ones, sometime to push through to power and affluence. Some found consolations in religious hopes and had faith in the law of compensation, either here or hereafter. Others dreamed of a new social order, where men lived together in a community as equals—the early socialists of the century. Others, again, developed their group consciousness as trade unionists,

accepting the theory that economic organization was based on contract and that it was necessary to organize in defence of their rights. Expansion of trade, and slowly improving amenities of living, doubtless infused in most of them a certain amount of faith that in the long run the workers would win through to a reasonable status.

But there was one point, in the social theory used to justify the individualism of the new era, that developed a much more certain recognition than the doctrine of economic equality: this was the doctrine of political equality. The Tories of the old order saw no difference between political status and economic status: they frankly considered that in both spheres of life there must be inequality and they regarded high economic status with high political status and low economic status with low political status as the appropriate natural combinations of status. The philosophers of the new order, while recognizing that political status and economic status went hand in hand, believed that individualism would bring about equality in both spheres. They worked in the two fields for the individualist ideal. They failed in the economic field but they marched steadily forward in the political field, so far as the franchise could be regarded as a symbol of political significance.

The great achievement of the nineteenth century, so far as plain, ordinary man is concerned, was the gradual attainment of democracy. The movement is not quite complete as yet, but, practically, the position has been reached when it can be said

that our constitution recognizes that the mere qualification of being a man or woman of responsible age is sufficient for him or her to be accounted a full citizen. The vestiges of the old property qualification remain in the " business man's " vote, based on the occupation of premises, but the vast majority of the electorate consists of men whose sole claim to vote is their manhood.

Along with the franchise, the believers in individual liberty established an educational system intended " to educate the masters " and now we have arrived at a phase in history when all adults are formally recognized as of equal political significance and all are able to read and become aware of the happenings in society, and of suggestions for the right ordering of that society.

The logic of events in the industrial and commercial system has disproved the belief of the founders of modern democracy that, given freedom, individualism would lead to equality. Formal equality can be conferred in the political world by Act of Parliament, but equality is not attained in the economic and social sphere by the mere conferment of formal equality of freedom to bargain. The result of these two developments is a situation which presents a tremendous contrast to that of the eighteenth century. Economic freedom has produced a distribution of economic power that does not coincide, even roughly, with the distribution of formal political power, and a condition of tension has developed.

The tension is found chiefly in the industrial

areas and the evidence of it is seen, perhaps, most clearly in the distribution of political colours on the map of the country. The first great division in this political map is between the rural areas and urban areas, the Conservatives dominating in the former, and the Labour party in the latter. When towns are examined, constituency by constituency, and ward by ward, it is found again that Labour is strongest where the " working classes " are strongest, and there is clear evidence of the association of Labour strength with poverty. Liberals, interestingly enough, are found in the surburban areas chiefly ; they do, in fact, lie between the Conservatives and Labour in this respect.

Explanations may vary, but it would seem at least possible that this distribution of electoral strength is due to two main conditions. In the rural areas there is probably a stronger sense on the whole of the *community* ; there is a stronger feeling of the existence of a society with a definite hierarchical structure. The leaders of this society are " naturally " those who belong to the higher orders. In the urban areas there is a stronger sense of the group, a stronger feeling of being a *section* of the population, a part of the social organization which treats them badly.

Towns segregate various groups of their people, herding separately the slum population, the very poor, the poor, the better-off, and so on to the wealthy on the outer rings or in the country.

There is, as a general rule, no ordinary human intercourse between the inhabitants of the various quarters and all are left, to use a colloquialism, to "stew in their own juice". Proximity of similars develops a consciousness of unity and the poor, being similar in feelings of resentment against an organization which treats them unjustly, tend to move as a group in the direction of changing the nature of the general organization. To put it bluntly, if society does not care for them, then they do not care for society.

Social instability is, after all, the condition most to be expected, when, on the one hand, we state that men are politically of equal value and, on the other hand, that they are economically (in the market, in terms of money) of unequal value, some of them worth nothing at all. We cannot expect, in any society, that any group will accept this dual valuation when there is such an absurd difference in the two valuations.

Conditions prevailing since the Great War have served only to increase this tension. The extension of the numbers of people who have realized that their existence and well-being depend upon a turn in the market, who have realized it through their having at least dipped into the vast pool of unemployment (if they have not, indeed, been permanently immersed in it), has given strength to those who are interested in the overthrow of the system.

When tensions or strains in a machine pass a certain point, something breaks. So, in the

social system, if tensions go beyond a point of endurance, something will happen " with a bang ". A community must of its nature move towards an equilibrium of some kind—even if it has to pass through chaos to reach it. In some countries the breaking point seems to have been reached and there is no reason to think that Britain will not have the same experience, if the strains are not released. The policies of the various political groups that have arisen recently can only be understood if they are considered in relation to this condition of tension.

In the first place, there are those who seek equilibrium by trying to produce an attitude of mind similar to that which existed in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. These are the romantic ineffectuals who see something idyllic in the late Stuart times; they are interested in pageants and maypoles. Seconding these are those who concentrate on Burke and again try to induce the backward-looking tendency, to reflect on the " good old times " when life was simple and easily understood. Times of stress always produce these " escapists "; and, even among those who refuse to contemplate the society of centuries ago, there are many who sigh for " pre-War " days, as if they were days of no tension.

These writers and politicians are ineffective, and are doomed to be so, because conditions are fundamentally changed. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were times of the village

community in which all ranks were united by personal ties. Squirearchy was possible when village life was general but the workers of London, or any other manufacturing town of any considerable size, simply cannot be made excited and happy by a maypole dance on the village green, even if the squire comes to look on and brings his lady!

Then there are those who would solve the tension in our society by stiffening the steel element in the structure. These are for "discipline". They hold that democracy—in the form of universal suffrage—has failed, is failing, and is bound to fail: political equality is senseless and the only way of producing equilibrium is by a dictatorship, preferably by one (or a small group) who knows what the positions of the social orders should be.

Theerror made by these is that they confuse the appearance of order with a condition of free equilibrium; they might remove some stresses but they would certainly produce other strains which would seek to be released. The suppression of liberty does not bring peace.

The third group consists of those who would reorganize at a quick pace the whole economic structure, possibly with a dictatorship of some kind, producing a system under unified state control. These, like the last group, would inevitably need to rely on a large measure of "discipline", of regulations and interferences with liberty. Their error would seem to be that

of thinking it possible to organize a nation on a rational basis and keep the organization continuously up to concert pitch. The psychological strain of such a system would, in time, cause it to be modified in the direction of some sort of automatically operating economy. The Russian economy is still in a revolutionary stage but, when it has passed through this, it will probably develop into either a mechanical, routine, red-tape system or a system that can work with individual initiative and judgment as its motive power: it cannot be taken as a system in equilibrium at present, so we cannot say that, because a great national organization has been established there, it is necessarily wise for us to imitate it here. Russia has not established an equilibrium as yet and it is doubtful if she knows what sort of system she will develop.

These three groups of politically minded people are alike in this, that they envisage some particular kind of social organization which they regard as desirable. The first we have described as likely to be ineffectual since they merely wish to escape from problems and think backward in history instead of forward. The proposals of the second and third groups are inadequate because they disregard powerful dispositions in people, the chief of which is the disposition to be individually free. Other groups in the country—and it is the opinion of the writer that the immense majority of ordinary people are included in these—wish to preserve such liberties as they now have

and to move into greater liberty without the preliminary stage of dictatorship.

These groups may be classified into two main inclusive groups: those who wish to "get the present system going" and those who wish to "get it going to some end."

The politicians who are here regarded as concerned merely with "getting the system going" will probably resent being considered, by implication, as having no end in view. At the moment there is a general feeling in the country that the greatest trouble of our day is unemployment and a slowing down of industrial activity; to say that the removal of this condition is not a worthy end is, they doubtless think, at least a little ungracious. And so it would be if that were the intended implication, but it is not. The meaning of the statement that they have no end in view is that, granted the system is set going, they have no idea towards what end it will be allowed to work. They merely want it going and then, so far as one can gather, they wish to leave it "to go". In this sense, then, they are merely the supporters of the nineteenth century economic policies: they are, at heart, "*laisser-faire*".

The present is an abnormal situation: the aftermath of the Great War, with its international jealousies and hatreds, has prevented the system from settling down after the severe jolting of that war. The great technical advances amounting to a new and bigger "Industrial Revolution" have caused

dislocations and, since this revolution is world wide, it has led nations to protect their dislocated workers and industries against the protective devices of others. And so, bad conditions have begotten worse. The supporters of *laisser-faire* have turned into enthusiastic " planners " but their object is simply to plan for a period, in order that they may let well alone later. They are, then, simply concerned to " get the system going " with no ultimate social scheme in mind.

Here and there we find one of their number speaking of the future state as one which will have to find ways of utilizing leisure. Because there has been so great an increase in the productive capacity of men, it is believed that in this future state there will automatically be a large amount of time released. The idea seems to be that there will not be enough work to keep men busy. Long ago—nearly a century ago—John Stuart Mill made the sad observation that though men had been inventing labour-saving devices since the dawn of life they were still worked as hard and painfully as ever. We have made very great technical advances during the last generation but there were many made before that time, and there is no circumstance in the nature of things that leads us to expect that we shall have any more time on our hands in the future than our fathers had before us. The more we *can* do the more we *want* to do or the more the market requires us to do. Leisure will only come if it is definitely

desired and ensured by regulation or contract as it has come in the past: it is not inevitable.

The fundamental error of the members of this group—and it comprises the greater portion of one political party—is that they think the problem of living is the problem of producing *things*. They believe that the ills of our past societies have been due to their inability to rid themselves of the bogey of scarcity. Their position is an entirely materialistic one, reckoning progress in tons of goods and horse-power units of energy. In reality, progress should be reckoned in terms of freedom of the spirit and it is in the difference between these two conceptions of progress that the difference lies between those who want to "get the system going" and those who want "to get it going towards an end".

It must be always set down to the credit of the individualist philosophers of the early nineteenth century that they had their *social* ideal. They desired individual freedom, convinced that in the long run it would provide the "greatest happiness for the greatest number". They thought, at first, that economic freedom would work itself out to something comparable with the equal political status that universal suffrage represented in their minds. They were wrong in fact but they did not know it and, consequently, they could urge unfettered freedom—what has since been called "economic licence" — with a lofty motive.

There is no such virtue to be attributed to

modern supporters of *laisser-faire*, for they know perfectly well that it does not lead to reasonable social conditions. The biological doctrine of " survival of the fittest " is not a doctrine which Adam Smith, on the economic side, and Jeremy Bentham, on the political side, would have regarded as their social theory.

Now those who wish " to get the system going towards an end " lay stress on the importance of making the economic system morally satisfactory. They consider that, if individuals are left to " pursue their own interests ", there is no guarantee of this. The exchange system *per se* is non-moral. Morality must be imposed upon it and to a great extent must be imposed by the state.

The individualists' conception of the function of the state was that it should keep the ring: it should defend the sanctity of property, the sanctity of contract, preventing only those actions of people which encroached on others' property or personal rights, punishing theft, false pretences, " undue interference " or " restraint of trade ". This was their conception of morality to be imposed from the outside. They thought that by doing this they were giving all a chance to live. We know now that it has worked out badly and that it has produced an unstable society but we have to work out another conception corresponding to theirs. If we are to produce a stable society we shall have to discover the needs of ordinary plain men and women, discover the general conditions within which they can live their lives

in a reasonable manner with no feelings of resentment against the social structure.

The modern form of expression for this is that society must be so organized that men are allowed to develop their personalities: in this way they attain freedom of the spirit. Psychologists have presented a scientific case for this and, in fact, they have evolved the mode of expression itself. Social stability ultimately, they show. depends upon the proper development of the individual men and women composing society.

It is inevitable, when a formula of this kind is produced, that there will be those arise who imagine that they know the character of this personality which lies awaiting development and will set out to produce the organization which will develop it. The creation of the organization then becomes to them the obsession, and, if they are allowed to have their will, they will lead us to disaster as surely as the present " system " has brought us to a crisis. The personalities of men are infinite in variety and all " organizations " that are at all thorough-going savour of the " parade ground ", whether those in command are saints or sinners, and anything in the nature of enforced uniformity produces repressions and tendencies to disruption.

Since the ultimate equilibrium of society depends upon there being an equilibrium of minds, it is clear that our social objective must lie in the realm of the mind and this means that we must express our ideal in the form of a general cultural level. A cultured man is a free man and a free

man is a cultured man and the touchstone of all our social institutions must be their significance as aids or deterrents of culture amongst the general population.

To formulate a policy that will relieve the tension to which we have referred above (a tension due to the fact that the ordinary people of the country have the control of the legislative authority though they have not any great measure of economic freedom) it is necessary that we make some sort of survey of the conditions under which ordinary people live, of their freedom and lack of freedom to develop culturally. A political policy is a programme and the programme must be (*a*) the removal of barriers to cultural development and (*b*) the establishment of positive conditions of cultural development. With such a goal in mind we can make progress and in making progress the tension is relieved.

Chapter II

THE FAMILY UNIT

WHEN people are produced by a process of "decanting", as dreamed of by Mr. Aldous Huxley in his *Brave New World*, the family unit will lose some of its social significance. Such a time is probably very far distant and, when it does arrive, every scheme of social reorganization will need to be rewritten. In the meantime, population being a family product, the family institution must remain as the basic social unit and all schemes of social reform must take note of the fact.

The family unit has other significance besides that of producing children, though this other significance is related to it. It is quite certain that men and women are so constituted that it is only through the experience which family life affords that they can attain a right, healthy, physical and psychological development. The author of this book is not qualified to discuss this aspect of family life nor does he need to develop it. It is sufficient for his purpose that such experience is reckoned as necessary by those qualified to judge, as it is sufficent for him to accept the opinion of dietetic experts that vitamins are essential food ingredients.

An examination of a few figures relating to the family structure of our country will show the overwhelming significance of the family unit and convince us, that though some writers here and there may be justified in their speculations as to how we may live in the far distant future, the statesman of to-day, and of a considerable slice of the future, must reckon on a deeply rooted tendency in people to live in families. There may be many changes made with respect to the services performed within the home but it is unlikely that the home will disappear.

Of the total population in England and Wales in 1921 (37·9 millions), 37·2 millions lived in "private families". Though some of those entered as living in private families were servants and lodgers, the figures stand as an indication of the real significance of the unit. Many of those not entered as living in private families did, in actual fact, belong to families though they were registered as living in institutions and hotels.

The number of families into which this population was grouped was 8·74 millions but a figure which emphasizes again the significance of the family unit is that showing the number of dwellings occupied by them. By "dwellings" we mean places of residence structurally separated from one another. Seven millions of the families lived in their own homes, that is, lived separately from others; 1·73 million shared a house with one or more other families. A consideration of the great shortage of houses, of which complaint

was specially made in the years immediately following the War, will emphasize the point that the ambition of people in general is to live in families, separately.

A home normally implies marriage and the number of the population married when that census was taken was 15 millions. If we add to this the number of just over 2·25 millions of widowers and widows, we have 17·25 millions out of a total population of 37·9 who were actually, or had been, married. The 16·5 thousands who had been divorced do not alter the fact materially that people marry and settle down in some way or other to live together. The problem of divorce is no part of our problem in this book; we are merely concerned with the normal situation.

Seventeen and a quarter millions represents over 45 per cent of the total population but when we consider that 27·7 per cent of this population was under 15 years of age, it will be seen that of "marriageable" people the number married and widowed represents 62 per cent. This figure is not to be taken as indicating the percentage of people who marry; this is much higher because, though it is necessary for us to place the marriageable age low, to include the rare cases of early marriage, we know that most people do not consider marriage until they are much older than 15. The figures we have quoted indicate sufficiently that marriage and the setting up of a home represent the normal course of life through which people run and that is all for the time being that we are concerned to show.

We have noted above that there are two reasons for our attaching great importance to the family unit; in the first place, it is the child-producing institution and, in the second place, it is the institution which, more than any other, perhaps, is responsible for the general level of happiness and well-being in the community. It is customary in many places to regard the second of these with flippancy or sentimentality and the first as something which concerns parents alone. Psychologists have, in recent years, shown beyond any shadow of doubt that marriage is one of the most significant events and conditions in life and all who are interested in social affairs recognize that the production of children—their quality and quantity—and their training are facts of primary social importance. Nobody who is concerned with the organization of society on right lines can afford to neglect either of these aspects of the family institution.

Though it is possible, we are assured, for men and women to sublimate their instincts, find outlets for them that give healthy satisfaction, the fact is of some importance that, as things are at present, more women than men are called upon to discover this substitute outlet. The reason for this is very clear.

More boys are born in this country than girls: the numbers are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 105 to 100 respectively. In spite of this there are more females than males in the population as a whole, 1,096 to 1,000 in 1921. The cause of this

lies chiefly in the differential death rates. Emigration takes away more men than women but this has not been significant recently and, though the Great War reduced the number of men, the phenomenon is one which existed before that date. Boys die more rapidly than girls and men more rapidly than women.

The result of this differential death rate is that among children there are more boys than girls and the whole of the excess of females is in the ages above 15 or so. From the marriage point of view the excess of women is considerably greater than the sex ratio of the whole population would suggest. In 1921 the age distribution of males and females was such that there were 1,141 females per 1,000 males of 15 and over, 1,165 of 20 and over. Thus the apparent excess of 96 per 1,000 males is converted to a real excess of 141 at 15 and 165 at 20 years of age and over.

It may be, perhaps, that this disparity of numbers cannot be eliminated, that men are, after all, the frail sex and, if so, the normal course of marriage must apparently be taken by a smaller percentage of women than of men—unless, of course, we increase the average number of wives per man! There are conditions, however, which militate against the marriage of some women and some men that would not seem beyond the wit of man to alter.

One of the causes of disparity in numbers of the sexes is to be found in the distribution of employments. The sex ratio varies from area

to area. From some districts men migrate heavily and leave the women, and to others women migrate and swell the excess. From others women migrate and remove the excess or cause a deficiency and to others men migrate and produce the same effect. Thus the excess of women over men in the country does not represent the position everywhere; in some places men are in difficulties in finding wives and in others women are in much greater difficulties in finding husbands.

In some of the mining areas of the country, where the only industry is mining coal, there is an excess of males over females in the total population: the females migrate chiefly into domestic service. In parts of Scotland the dearth of males is very acute. Those areas maintain the best balance where industries are grouped which maintain a balanced demand for men and women. There is a tendency for industries employing female labour to migrate to the areas where male labour is heavily employed, as female labour is there relatively cheap, and the development of transport facilities widening the areas within which girls may work while living at home is, of course, reducing the evil.

At present it is still probably true that the distribution of population is determined primarily by male opportunities for work, since the normal breadwinner is the father of the family. The hesitancy of parents to allow daughters to leave home—a greater hesitancy than that displayed concerning sons—also plays its part, though this

is probably weakening with the growing equality of status of the sexes which reflects itself in a growing independence of girls. In any scheme of industrial planning the balancing of sex occupations is an important point to bear in mind.

There is another circumstance developing in some sections of the community which should be regarded with a certain amount of apprehension by those who regard the establishment of a home as a necessary part of a person's experience. This is the opposition, in professions and many other occupations, to the continuance of women in employment after marriage. Industry, trade, and all the professions have admitted single women and, in many cases, their incomes are such as to make their sacrifice on marriage very great unless they marry men whose incomes are considerably larger than their own. The result is seen particularly clearly in the public services.

It is obvious that men and women can only marry those whom they meet, and it is probably true to say that in the professional world there is a strong tendency for men and women in the same or allied occupations to marry each other. A teacher, for instance, will probably desire to marry a teacher, but with the salaries of women teachers not very much lower than those of men teachers, it is asking a great deal of a woman that she should give up her salary and share an income not very much greater than her own, involving a great fall in her standard of living.

This kind of situation requires to be dealt with

on straight social grounds. There are several matters to be considered and the solution is fairly clear when they are considered. We may examine the teaching profession as an example which helps in the solution of all.

In the first place, the idea that the continuance of women in teaching after marriage diminishes the opportunities for employment of other women is an instance of the old fallacy of the " work fund ", that there is a certain amount of work to be done and if one person does it another cannot. All that can happen is that the girls who do not enter the profession enter others. In times of dislocation, due perhaps to inventions, there are " surplus " workers in particular occupations but history shows that in the long run a new adjustment is made, the whole population being absorbed and the labour-saving machinery being employed along with it. The necessity for men keeping in employment after marriage because of their responsibilities has never been questioned on the ground that it keeps a ' single ' man out of occupation. If working when married upsets the labour market for women it ought to upset the labour market for men—but it does not.

In the second place, if it is advisable for men to specialize in the work they can best perform, it is equally true that women should do the same. If a woman continues her professional career she is able to pay for work she is otherwise made to do herself. It is no necessary condition of marital happiness that a wife should be compelled

to cook and wash—especially if she is inefficient at these things or more efficient in some other kind of work.

In the third place, the woman teacher who is refused permission to marry and continue at her work often refuses to marry and a large percentage of spinsters in the profession is the result. That is probably not good for the profession and is certainly not good for the women in many cases. A society has no right to induce unnatural living.

In the Civil Service the 'evils' of spinster administrative officers are not quite so serious as in the teaching of the young, but it is difficult to see how a community can claim, for instance, that it gains any advantage from making a trained doctor cease her professional work and undertake domestic duties. Of course, the illogicality of the situation is seen in the fact that the community which dismisses a woman employee on marriage employs a woman doctor in a private capacity, married or not, or buys from a shop run by a married woman or from a firm whose shareholders are married women.

We are only concerned with the effects on marriage of the rule forbidding married women to carry on with their careers. The right of women to select their work as freely as men select their work should no longer be recognized in the erratic manner in which it is recognized to-day; it should be granted fully.

From the point of view of domestic well-being it is further doubtful if the prevention of a woman

pursuing her professional interest can be regarded as a benefit. The choice should, however, be hers and her husband's.

The cases we have just discussed are concerned with a rule that makes marriage difficult, a rule which, in fact, tends to discourage marriage of certain groups of people. We have now to turn our attention to another aspect of this business of establishing homes, namely, the influences affecting the age of marriage.

It is not the purpose of this book to discuss the ideal age at which people should marry, but it is part of its purpose to direct attention to the factors that hasten or deter marriage and so interfere with the freedom of the individual to make his or her marriage association. Factors which lead to hasty marriages tend to lessen the chances of the parties making the most satisfactory selection, as well as to foist on them responsibilities that should be acquired at a later age. Again, factors which cause postponement of desired marriage are chiefly bad because of the psychological troubles that result from thwarting.

On the whole, the poor marry early and the very poor very early. In the recent Survey of Merseyside the investigators found that this was definitely so of Liverpool. Comparing Inner Liverpool (the poorer part) with Outer Liverpool (the relatively well-to-do area) the Report says :

> In Inner Liverpool, 29·5 per cent of the women of age 20–24 are married as compared with only 20·1 per cent in Outer Liverpool, while even in the age group 14–19

nearly 2 per cent of the women of Inner Liverpool are married. There are similar differences among men. (Volume I, p. 102.)

Care has to be taken in the interpretation of such figures as these. It is very easy to jump to the conclusion, as many social workers do, that poverty and low marriage age are associated because of the " improvidence " of the poor. Even if it were so, there is point in Mrs. Pember Reeves's statement that " If the poor were not improvident they would hardly dare to live their lives at all ". Other data show that there is a very strong correlation between the age of marriage and the age at which earnings are a maximum and this has nothing to do with poverty.

When population is classified occupationally it is found that the unskilled workers marry at the youngest average age, semi-skilled at the next higher age, then skilled, and so on to the professions of medicine and the bar. This fact would suggest that the tendency of most people is to marry young (somewhere, perhaps, between 20 and 25) but that they wait until they can marry and maintain their status or the status of their group. The unskilled on this account have not long to wait; they soon reach their maximum rates. ' Society ' and pictorial newspapers seem to show that in the ranks of those who are " born into maximum incomes " or incomes at least adequate to their social requirements the age at marriage approximates to that of the poor.

A rational ordering of society, viewed with

respect to the age at marriage, would seem to require that economic circumstances of the parties at the ideal age or age-period should be such as to enable them to marry. If the maximum earnings that are to be attained are reached—or approximately reached—at an age below the ideal, then marriage is unduly hastened ; if, on the other hand, they are reached at a later age, then marriage is unduly retarded.

In certain cases it may be said that the evils of retardation are to a great extent offset by the satisfactions derived from the gaining of high income and the attainment of social ambitions. The professional man, forging ahead in his career, finds solace for his postponement of marriage in the prospects of a larger income than he would perhaps attain if married, coupled with the prospect of a " good " marriage later. There are no compensations for those who are hastened into marriage because of their economic circumstances.

In a poor household an ordinary chick is soon regarded as a cuckoo too big for the nest. A man who is very poor may marry to escape the overcrowding of his parental home. He feels, like so many of the young, the desire to marry, but there is nothing to attract him away from marriage until the " ideal " age is reached. If someone should persuade him to wait, he probably would never marry.

There are people who argue that marriage should be put off by the poor until they have saved up enough to

secure their economic independence, and that it should not hurt young men on £1 a week to put off marriage till they are thirty, they, meantime, saving hard during those ten years. Should the poorly paid workman overcome his young impulse to marry the moment his wage reaches £1 a week, and should he remain a bachelor until thirty, it is quite certain that he would not marry at all. This may be a good thing or a bad thing, but it would be so. A man who for ten years had had the spending of 20*s.* a week—and it is a sum which is soon spent without providing luxuries—would not, at thirty, when perhaps cold reason would direct his impulse, feel inclined to share his £1 a week with an uncertain number of people. His present bent is towards married life. It provides him for the first year or two with attention to his comfort and with privacy and freedom for his personality, as well as satisfying his natural craving for sex relationship. Should he thwart that impulse, he, being an average, normal man, will have to find other ways of dealing with these desires of his. He is not likely to starve every instinct for ten years in order, perhaps, to save a sum which might bring in an income of a couple of shillings a week to add to his weekly wage. He would know, by the time he was thirty, that even 22*s.* a week does not guarantee a family against misery and want.[1]

One of the evils of increasing mechanization of industry is the tendency to increase the number of people who earn their maximum incomes—or nearly so—at an early age. During the recent depression there have been numerous cases of young persons—too young to marry—earning more than their parents. Of course depressions are abnormal but the tendency to increasing mechanization of industry is not and there are serious troubles in store for a community in which children earn as much as parents.

[1] *Round about a Pound a Week*, pp. 153–4.

To obviate the reaching of a maximum at too early an age it might be suggested that wages should bear some relationship to age, such a relationship as would make the desirable wage for marriage attainable at about the desirable age of marriage. This—assuming it could be done—would not, however, meet the whole situation. There are cases in which it practically happens, where experience, measured in years, qualifies for increments, but such a scheme has deterrent effects on marriage in other ways.

Salaried people, receiving periodical increments, are induced to wait for a period of time, but when they reach the ideal age they frequently realize, like Mrs. Pember-Reeves's thirty-year-old man on his pound a week, that marriage means a considerable sacrifice of satisfactions to which they have become accustomed. Permission for wives to continue at work might meet the difficulty in some cases but in others, where the wives leave their work—for instance, when the parties live in different parts of the country—it does not. A family allowance scheme, such as Miss Eleanor Rathbone urges, is essential to meet this difficulty.[1] The organization of the average person's home is such—and probably will long remain such—that the bulk of the women will undertake domestic work on marriage, and the establishment of some such scheme is necessary, therefore, over a wide field, over the whole field, of the employed population.

[1] *The Disinherited Family*, Eleanor Rathbone.

We have spoken of the necessities in a rightly organized society for the sexes to be so distributed in numbers of varying age groups that there is at least a possibility of marriage for all who wish it and for the various barriers to marriage at the right age to be removed. There remains one more aspect of the home-building activity for us to mention, namely, the opportunities which men and women enjoy of meeting one another and effecting a " right " association. Little has been done in the way of investigation of this matter : it is, for obvious reasons, a very difficult task.

Though the origin of marriage may be the primary instinct of man to propagate his species and though this function may be performed by almost any man mated to any woman, yet, among civilized people, the simple propagation of the race is not the sole gain from marriage. It is true that children can only be born—so far as we know at present—by the physical union of the sexes but this does not mean that the association of the sexes, and even their physical association, are only desired by man in order to reproduce. As Professor Crew says : " It is true that sexual activity commonly precedes, leads up to, and passes on to reproductive activity, but the relationship between sexuality and reproduction is such that one can as readily argue that the purpose of reproduction is the replacement of sexual individuals as to argue that the purpose of sexuality is to make reproduction possible."

The significance of this attitude towards sex

relationships in our present discussion is that the simple capacity of two people to reproduce is not a sufficient qualification for the marriage of any two particular people. It is probably true that lack of what we may call " physical adjustment " between a married pair is a fruitful cause of unhappiness, but it is also true that lack of other kinds of adjustment is a cause of marital trouble. Speaking the same language, possessing a similar scale of values, agreeing on the things that are to be regarded as wholesome and vulgar, decent and indecent, worth while and not worth while—in short, the possession of similar standards of culture and even the possession of similar prejudices—these are essential to a satisfactory married life of any man or woman. If this be agreed, then it follows that our social organization should be such as to allow of the right mating of young men and young women.

One of the strongest arguments in the opinion of the present writer for the continued cultural education of all young persons until they are 18 to 21 years of age is that it would be a means of enriching beyond measure the ordinary, everyday intercourse of the members of a family and expecially of the man and wife. The value of a study of literature, of art, of history, and the subjects generally described as the " humanities " is not merely that it enables people to meet and " talk pictures " or " talk novels " or " talk history " but that it enables them to select their wall decorations, their dresses, their meals, their

amusements together and talk about the thousand and one small details of ordinary living.

The home is the background of all social life and our educational system should provide a training in the art of living at home as well as outside. Young people who have been educated broadly and to an age when standards of taste and judgment are developed are more likely to discover their " affinities " than those who have not. There is no need to discuss the types of " societies " that might be founded " for the bringing of young people together "—they will found themselves as they do now.

We now turn our attention to the home as the child-producing institution. The production of children is important both from the social point of view and the individual family point of view. From the social point of view, the interest mainly attaches to the number and quality of the people; from the family point of view, the interest is mainly attached to the well-being of the parents and the influence of number-in-family on the well-being both of parents and children. There is social significance, of course, in the latter influence, too, for social well-being ultimately resolves itself partly into widely diffused family well-being.

Normally, people desire to have children. The desire for children is not simply the sex desire: it is a desire that fixes its attention on the presence of children in the home. To say that people normally desire children is not to say that those

who do not are sub-normal or super-normal; it is merely to say that they are different from the large majority of people. The absence of children where desired and, possibly, in many cases where the desire is stifled by a stronger desire for something else, probably causes psychological conditions that are not conducive to happiness. It is, therefore, probably true to say that in the majority of cases families of children exist in the first place because the parents desire them.

Parental " instincts " vary in intensity: some people seem happiest with crowds of children and others prefer the single child or two at most. These variations have probably very little to do with economic circumstances: they are found in all classes of society.

Children also seem to vary in their reactions to large and small families. Some perhaps are better in health and general well-being if they have the companionship of brothers and sisters: others perhaps are better if there are not many of their generation constantly about them. The psychological effects of families of various sizes on parents and children are not yet understood: all that we can say is that the ordinary person is probably happiest if he or she goes through the ordinary experience of marriage and parenthood and the ordinary child is probably happiest if he has brothers and sisters, but not too many!

Granted that, normally, people desire to become parents, there is abundance of evidence to show

that they also control the number of children in the family. The birth rate to-day is less than half the birth rate of fifty years ago. It has been argued by some authorities that the sizes of families—due to changing birth rate—are related to the optimum number required by the community or, in other words, the tendency of population is to grow towards the number that will yield the highest average standard of living for society as a whole. At any given moment, with given resources and given knowledge, it is held that there is an ideal number that will give this highest standard or average real income per head, and the tendency of the population is to approach it.

If this theory is correct it means either that society has some method of urging effectively the expansion or contraction of birth rates according to requirements, or that married couples " automatically " adjust the " supply " of children to the " social demand " for them. As regards the first, there is no doubt that society does operate on the minds of married people in such a way as to encourage or discourage large or small families: but it is difficult to estimate the degree of effectiveness.

Certain religious denominations—notably the Roman Catholic Church—view with approval the " quiver full ". Those political groups interested in world power urge large numbers of " soldiers ". On the other hand, there is a general feeling that, from the point of view of " income ", numbers are already as large as necessary—possibly too

large—and those who feel this urge reductions. In many sections of the community the parent of a large family is regarded with a mixture of pity and disapproval as one who is unaware of his social obligations or, worse still, as one who has not the necessary standard of self-control or intelligence.

As regards the second, the reaction to " social demand " voluntarily made by married persons, it seems to the writer of this book that all that this can mean is that the social demand is met if it happens to coincide with the desires of the persons themselves. To assume that the control of births exercised for the benefit of the individual family brings about the ideal population from the " social " point of view is to put a faith in *laisser-faire* that is a little touching !

As a matter of fact, all classes please themselves in the matter of marriage age and size of family ; there is little evidence of " social duty ". At one end of the scale of incomes the largest families are found and this is attributed to lack of intelligence ; at the other end of the scale the smallest families are found and this is ascribed to the possession of more than average intelligence. Between the extremes are groups graded in incomes whose families vary in size inversely with their incomes.

In the examination of 1,924 elementary school children in the Isle of Wight a negative correlation of 0·218 was found between the intelligence of families and the size of family showing that

" the more intelligent parents, intelligence being estimated in various ways, make a smaller contribution to the next generation than the less intelligent parents ".[1]

The Registrar General also contributes to our knowledge the fact that when the population is graded into social classes (really occupational groups) there is found a definite diminution of size of family with enhancement of social status. His figures are given below (taken from *Social Structure of England and Wales*, p. 237).

Description of Class.	*1911. Births per 1,000 married men under 55 years of age.*	*1921. Births per 1,000 married men under 55 years of age.*
I. Upper and Middle Class	119	98
II. Intermediate	132	105
III. Skilled Workmen	153	134
IV. Intermediate	158	153
V. Unskilled Workmen	213	178
VI. Textile Workers (not included above)	125	110
VII. Miners (not included above)	230	202
VIII. Agricultural Labourers (not included above)	161	155
III–VIII. Working Classes	175	152
All classes	162	141

We have already pointed out that the age at marriage varies from occupation to occupation. This is important in the study of sizes of families.

[1] *Social Structure of England and Wales*, Carr-Saunders and Caradog Jones.

Not only does the postponement of marriage reduce the duration of marriage and consequently the period during which children may be born, but it definitely reduces women's chances of bearing children. The earlier years of a woman's life are the most fecund. "A year's delay when the woman is aged 20 to 25 averages 0·45 of a child, 0·37 when she is aged from 25 to 30, 0·32 when she is aged from 30 to 35, 0·29 when she is aged from 35 to 40, and 0·19 when she is aged from 40 to 45." [1] In the professional groups and similar groups women marry at a later age than in the labouring groups and this difference of age makes a difference in size of family: apart from control, the possibility of child bearing diminishes with age.

With men the variation in fecundity is not by any means so marked: "It requires a delay of about 40 years on the part of the husband to decrease the number of children by one child" (ibid. p. 103). Postponement of marriage on account of professional conditions is most noticeable in the case of men but it should be remembered that, though men over twenty-one tend to marry women younger than themselves, the older they are at marriage the older their brides tend to be and that fact accounts for their lower families in part.

Thus we have three important statistical facts presented to us by social statisticians; (1) that the lesser intelligent groups tend to have larger

[1] *The Population Problem*, Carr-Saunders, p. 103.

families than the more intelligent, (2) that the wealthier groups have smaller families than the poorer groups, and (3) that the later marriages are less fertile than the earlier. Later marriages are found in the wealthier groups and the two factors, therefore, reinforce each other; also, perhaps, the less intelligent tend to marry early and so produce large families.

Now it is the easiest thing in the world to jump to conclusions and in this matter of population numbers there is a good deal of such jumping practised. The popular press—one section especially—is fond of pointing out these statistical generalizations and suggesting that lack of intelligence, poverty, and early marriages are synonymous while intelligence, wealth, and postponement of marriage are also synonymous. In all cases the implication seems to be that bearing a family is the habit only of the poor, young, and unintelligent and presumably if we could abolish poverty, youth, and stupidity there would be no population problem to trouble us, since the population would disappear!

It is very difficult to draw any unimpeachable conclusions from statistics and in any case the detailed discussion of the matter is outside the scope of this book. Here we must content ourselves with a few observations that occur to the plain, ordinary man with the suggestion that our social policy must be based upon them.

In the first place, we have to accept the fact that, from a social point of view, there is importance

in the quantity and quality of the race and that population must, therefore, be regulated in these two respects. A country can be overpopulated and it can be underpopulated and the departure from the optimum is a thing that must be avoided as far as possible.

In the second place, we have to accept the fact that particular married couples, in so far as they control the numbers of their offspring, control them in the pursuit of what they consider to be their own, their children's, or their " family's " interest, in the main. Very few may be regarded as having children or not having children " in the interests of public policy ".

In the third place, it will be difficult to discover groups who will admit that they are not of the type who should reproduce. This does not apply to those who suffer from some physical trouble which they consider as heritable, but it does apply to those who are of unsatisfactory mental or moral calibre. A person will admit that he is physically ill but he will not, generally, admit that he is mentally deficient or morally undesirable.

In the fourth place, there is, doubtless, throughout society, (if we exclude the mentally deficient) a desire to be able to control numbers. The pathetic concern of parents when a third or fourth or fifth child is appearing is very general amongst those groups who find any difficulty in bringing up their children according to a desired standard. Most people desire a family, but few desire a larger

family than they can cope with, physically or economically

In the fifth place, there is a section of society which definitely places the bearing of children as an alternative mode of living to that which their wealth enables them to pursue. The demands of " social life ", the desire to keep a car (which is the same thing as a lower grade of income), are definite competitors with children in many homes, where means and health do not forbid them.

In the sixth place, most people marry, in all grades of society, more or less as soon as they are approaching their maximum income. They marry, not merely that they may produce families, but for the sake of all that marriage companionship means. And when they have married, there is, in all classes of society, the same desire to enjoy sex life apart from its relationship to reproduction. They desire it, and it would seem to be generally agreed, by psychologists and those moralists who pay any attention to psychological well-being, that it is a necessary part of an ordinary person's living.

If these general observations are accepted as reasonable, then the population policy of a country is fairly clear :

(1) The country must adopt some definite attitude towards the numbers and quality of the people desired. At the present moment, the birth rate is such that in a short time the number of children will be falling seriously and the average age of the population will be mounting owing to

this reduction of young members. In measurable time our total number will be at a maximum and then we shall enter a period of falling total. What number do we require ? Unless some lead is given by a public authority, individuals cannot act intelligently from the social point of view, no matter how intelligently they act from the individual point of view.

(2) With regard to quality, there is little that can be said except that there are certain types of deficiency the reproduction of which should be stopped. This is a difficult matter, but it should not be beyond the capacity of psychologists and medical men and other kindred experts to evolve a method of identifying the undesirables and a method of making reproduction impossible.

When we leave this grade the matter becomes more difficult but the difficulties are exaggerated by some writers on the subject. There is a tendency on the part of some " social scientists " to regard the test of desirability of a family as the frequency in the family tree of deans, bishops, lawyers, and such types. Many of them make the mistake of thinking that the tree read backwards into history is the tree read forwards into the future. They all too frequently climb along a single line of genealogy instead of climbing up all ; it is difficult to climb along all, it is admitted, but a true genealogy reveals all family connections. The great mixture revealed, when a few generations have been traversed, might upset the theories.

The probability is that most of the apparent differences in intelligence suggested by the frequency of some particular "occupational status" in family trees are due merely to environment and have nothing particularly to do with biological quality. This is not to deny the biological theory of inheritance but merely to argue that the difference in status and salary between a bishop and an archdeacon is not a measure of the difference in their "quality". Nor is the difference in quality between a family that throws up a millionaire and one that throws up a highly skilled cabinet maker to be measured in terms of the incomes of these products. A certain amount of work has been done on the intelligence quotients of different groups but the results are not such as to enable us to act upon them. Psychologists do not really know yet what intelligence is, let alone how to measure it with certitude.

All kinds of people are required in the world and though to some a race of super-intellectuals is their heart's desire, the ordinary person still thinks that he wants a world in which houses can be built by bricklayers who can lay bricks, his furniture can be made by people who can carve, and so on. True, machinery will enable us to do many things better than men do them by skill, but a world of a kind worth living in requires many types of mind and aptitude. There is no reason to think that the ordinary people of the world, the working classes in general, do not

possess the desired qualities in their blood to as great an extent as any other group. The idea that there is a group of supermen in our midst from whom we can breed supermen is at present a rather fantastic one, and it is much more likely that the supermen we have in our midst are outsizes amongst average stock than that they are a different species. Eliminating undesirable elements in the race is one thing but selecting the desirable stock is another. So far as regulating quality is concerned we need not trouble at all for a good length of time, except in the cases which are a proved social menace.

(3) Since it is generally accepted that there is a population number which we can pronounce the optimum, it follows that there must be population control. Control does not necessarily mean limitation; it may mean, at times, expansion. We cannot be said, however, to possess control unless birth control knowledge is in the hands of all, so that the right numbers and the right spacing of children in families can be attained. Since control is a social necessity it is a social duty to teach the methods of control and to investigate the methods which are best. The importance of sex life and the responsibilities of parenthood is such that no civilized community can afford to ignore it.

(4) When we come to the relationship between income and the limitation of size of family, the problem seems to fall into two parts. In some cases the limitation is effected because of poverty,

in other cases because of wealth, and the two problems need to be treated differently.

That the families of artisans are larger than the families of the more highly paid professions is not due to the former's improvidence in general. It is, as we have seen, due to earlier marriage and probably, to a certain extent, the expense of the means of control: also, in many cases it is due to ignorance—probably much more widespread than most of us realize. The size of his family is a very real problem to an artisan and to accuse him of improvidence is to offend him gratuitously.

When we come from the artisan to the professional groups, the lack of means is found to be a great deterrent. It must be recognized that standards of living are forced upon people by their social group and in the so-called "middle classes" the pressure is very great. They are definitely of a type whose reproduction is desirable, but, like the desired artisans, they cannot afford to perform their social duty.

Higher in the income scale we reach groups who do not limit their families because of lack of means, but rather because child bearing and child rearing are tiresome. The members of these groups are of a type that should persist but they simply do not reproduce themselves. Those groups which cannot afford to produce and maintain desirable children should be helped: those which will not, though they can afford to do so, should help. The present system

of income-tax relief is ludicrously inadequate, and is based on no principle of population control at all, being something in the nature of a little relief, a sort of charity.

It is doubtful if the present income-tax relief has persuaded any parents in the country to produce a single child. It is certainly a relief once the child is there, but it is not an inducement. Even those who are at the lower end of the income-tax paying scale will not incur the responsibility of a child for the sake of receiving a relief to the extent of 2*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound on £50 for a first and £40 for a second child. Five pounds to the poorest income-tax payer has no power to attract him into an expenditure of several times that amount in infancy and many times that amount later. To the higher range of income-tax payers the relief is but a taxation curiosity.

A financial policy to be effective in controlling numbers must be such as will be felt, and such as will make parents consider their family undertakings. Thus, logically, if those who pay income-tax are to be induced to produce more children by reliefs from income-tax, or by family bounties, their assistance must be graduated according to income. A certain income should be decided upon, above which the limitation of family is considered not to be due to poverty. It would not be a single income figure but one varying with the size of family. Thus it may be considered that at £500 a family could keep

one child but not two, at £750 two but not three, and so on.

If the maintenance of a certain population is necessary for social reasons, then society, including those who have no children, should share in the cost. In the case of employees the system of family allowances referred to before could be employed as a substitute, the above method being used for those working on their own account and those living on income from property.

Of course, one expects the old Malthusian bogy to be thrown upon the discussion screen: all who have suggested schemes of family assistance have been shown this picture. The suggestion is not, however, that child production should be made into an industry on which profit can be made: it is a suggestion simply intended to make possible, at one and the same time, homes that give people the opportunity for all round wholesome living, freed from undue anxiety, and to provide the nation with the population it requires.

Chapter III

WEALTH AND POVERTY

WE have called attention to the family as a personal association. In this chapter we shall consider the family organization from another point of view: we shall regard it as an administrative unit. By this we mean that we shall view the ordinary household as an institution in which work is done and things are used.

The general plan of a household economy is that the husband and father goes out to some business occupation and brings in money—the means of purchasing things required: the wife and mother stays at home, works, and spends the money. If there are children of working age they usually go out to work and bring in contributory earnings, the girls—more so than the boys—helping at home in addition.

This is the ordinary home of England.

In some cases income is derived from property: it has been calculated, however, that in 1921, three-quarters of the population of working age had property valued at *less* than £100. Property income is not then a characteristic of the English home; wage income (or salary) is the only source of significance in the vast majority of cases. The authority who calculated this figure also showed

that 0·85 per cent, less than 1 per cent, of the population held two-thirds of all the capital in the country, 99·15 per cent owning the remaining third. The average man—the plain, ordinary man—of this country is a wage earner, a member of the " working class ".

The wife of the working man is a working woman. There are between 7 and 8 million married women in this country and the vast majority run independent homes. Further, they run them, for the most part, singlehanded. Home running is the largest single industry in the country and the home units which are run are very small affairs on the whole.

This chapter might be regarded as a study of ordinary working woman, what she does, what she aims at, what she attains, and where she fails. The condition of the home, the success of home running is, as we hinted in the last chapter, the test condition of any society's ordering of things, and since home running is the recognized business of a woman, rather than of a man, it follows that the study of home running is chiefly the study of woman's work.

Three-quarters of the population of this country lives in houses of five rooms or less, one-half living in four-roomed houses or smaller ones. The typical income of the breadwinner in a family living in these houses is probably between 30*s*. and 70*s*. a week. These figures are given so that we may have in mind a clear picture of the homes of England, the places where English

children are reared. The "stately homes of England" that stand "beautifully" in their "ancestral lands" are *not* England: England is the homes of the people who live in the rows upon rows, streets upon streets, of three-, four-, and five-roomed houses, where all the work of the house is done by one woman and where all the money at her disposal is two or three pounds a week.

These homes, as we have said, are run by the ordinary women of this country and they are run single-handed. It would be unfair to say that social reformers do not direct their attention to the way in which these homes are run and especially untrue in these latter years of feminist agitation. There is probably nowadays a clearer appreciation of the problems which face an ordinary woman than there has ever been before, but it is the opinion of the present writer that the study of home economy has not passed beyond the slightest beginning as yet and the conscience of the country has scarcely been pricked over the sweating, drudgery, and dullness of the average working woman's life.

It is the province of another volume in this series to discuss the status of women as compared with that of men, but there is a certain widespread idea, partly associated with this question of status, to which we must draw attention. This idea is that the average wife of the community is maintained by her husband, that she is kept.

The reply to this suggestion that a man "keeps"

his wife came to the author in a rather humorous way some years ago. He was conducting a class of working women and men in the study of economics. As a piece of homework he asked the members of the class to make an estimate of the money value of their wives' services to their homes, reckoning the prices of services as those they would need to pay if their wives were ill or died. One of the members of the class was a wife herself, the wife of a man who earned £3 a week. When the exercises were examined in class, the product of this lady was the one which attracted all the attention; it caused, in fact, great excitement. It must be admitted that she was an extraordinary woman, but her estimate was scrutinized with a care that could only just be considered fair by the men; they yielded, however, and were forced to admit that she contributed £6 *a week* to her home establishment.

The extraordinary elements were that she kept the home in fruit and vegetables from an allotment which *she* cultivated; she kept it in bacon of pigs which *she* reared; she kept it in poultry and eggs which *she* produced. She was also a splendid needlewoman. The proof of the truth of her calculation, however, was that she maintained two boys in their middle teens at a local secondary school and received no grants in aid or scholarship assistance. And all admitted that her home was of a standard that showed that her contribution must be of this order.

This woman was, of course, of outstanding

ability, but it is obvious that the ordinary household work performed by any woman in any house would have to be paid for or not be performed if she died or fell ill. The fact that a woman *gives* her services in a home is not to be construed as showing that her services are not worth anything. She gives her work and her work keeps her husband—as her husband gives his work (or its product) to his wife. The world's work is still performed, as it was when " Adam delved and Eve span ", one-half by men and one-half (or more) by women. The Divorce Court admits this when assessing the loss to a man due to his wife being taken away from him and is, economically speaking, quite sound in its admission.

The peculiar significance that attaches to the money earnings of a husband lies in the fact that it is the only means available—normally—whereby the material things can be acquired that are needed by the wife upon which to exercise her labour. The wife contributes labour and the husband contributes other resources.

Arising out of this fact that men and women are joint contributors to the family income, there is a matter which needs consideration in any reasonably organized society that at present is practically ignored. In all grades of society the illness or loss of a wife is a serious human loss, but in some grades the economic loss is more serious than in others. It is obvious to all that the loss of the " breadwinner ", as the father of a family is usually called, is a circumstance

that plunges the family into poverty : it is not so generally realized that the loss of the mother of a family produces a similar result.

The only recognitions of this fact made at law are that to which we have referred above in the Divorce Court and the allowance made by the Inland Revenue authorities for the employment by a widower of a housekeeper. In the latter case, the allowance is made subject to the condition that the housekeeper is a relative. This is an absurd and inadequate recognition of a serious handicap. To a worker on small wages the loss of a wife is a tragedy of the first economic order ; it means a complete breakdown of any reasonable living or, alternatively, forcing him to marry merely to obtain a free contribution to the family income. The remedy would seem to be fairly clear, even if somewhat difficult to administer, namely the granting of a widower's pension to poorer families, where there are children, and the granting of the income-tax allowance in all similar cases (when the widower pays income-tax) regardless of the relationship of the housekeeper to the family. This is by the way, however : our concern in this chapter is with the position of the ordinary woman keeping her house.

There are two aspects of this question which we shall need to survey. In the first place, we must consider the competence with which the work of housekeeping is normally performed, and, in the second place, the cost which the average woman incurs in the performance of her task.

The competence with which the domestic work of the country is done is a matter of profound social importance: it is this which largely determines the well-being of the community, both in its influence directly on individuals themselves and indirectly on the standard of efficiency of all that is done outside the home. The cost which the average woman incurs is of importance directly to her and is, therefore, of social significance since housekeepers compose so large a percentage of the population. It is a matter of social importance also since the mothers of the country have probably the greatest influence on the young generation, physically and culturally.

The competence with which the work of domestic administration is performed depends on three factors (*a*) the competence of the woman, (*b*) the means at her disposal, and (*c*) the end at which she aims. The last two circumstances are, of course, one, in a sense, since the adequacy of means depends upon the end which is desired. Also, in a sense, the competence of a woman depends upon the last two since a woman may be incompetent, if she is aiming at ends that cannot be attained with the resources at her disposal. It is worth stating the case, however, under these three heads because each throws into relief an important element in the whole situation.

That women vary in personal efficiency, their aptitude for the various tasks they are called upon to perform, in their capacity to value resources and ends, in their strength and stamina, and in

their moral fibre, goes without saying. In this they are like men. That these personal qualities of women vary in all classes also goes without saying. There are incompetent and very competent women in all grades of income from the poor to the well-to-do.

There are no statistics, known to the author, which enables us to say, however, whether the competence of the woman of one class is greater that that of the woman of another. It may be assumed that men and women of more or less similar calibre tend to marry, but this is not to say that they do so invariably and there is no very convincing evidence that men are graded in any clear way socially according to intelligence or capacity. Since intelligence and general ability have something to do with a person acquiring an income, it is doubtless true that amongst those who attain to considerable incomes there is a higher level of ability than there is amongst those who do not; and certainly the people of least intelligence in society tend to receive small earnings on their own account. When property has been inherited, however, circumstances are different, and there is a probability that the intelligence of the inheritors of property tends to approximate more to the normal of the community than does the intelligence of those who have made good in their own lifetime.

Whatever may be the truth with respect to the possibility of boys, born of poor parents, driving through to affluence if they have the ability, it seems to the author that there is less chance

for a girl to do so. One reads in the romantic stories, of geniuses who have done well in the world, as judged by income, but it is a curious fact that there are very few of these who are women. Women may be carried up the income grade by their husbands; there are, here and there in certain professions, women who attain to higher social rank than that from which they spring, but, on the whole, lacking any specific evidence on the point, one would be inclined to say that the so-called convectional movements from social class to social class are chiefly to be found amongst men. In this case—and certainly this was true till very recently—and since women have effects on their offspring comparable to those of men, it is quite likely that general intelligence and capacity are fairly evenly distributed amongst the various classes.

In the lowest grade of the scale there is, almost certainly, a dysgenic tendency, but in other grades there is probably none at all. In the present state of our knowledge it is best to say that there is probably very little difference in average native ability of the women of the various social and income groups; the wife of a man earning £1,000 or £10,000 a year is probably not much different in natural capacity from the wife of a man of £150 a year. Social experiments are impossible and scientific investigation is non-existent.

One thing, however, is certain, namely, that the apparent competence of women in various social

classes differs, but this is mainly due to differences in income. Incompetence is not so serious in the wealthy classes—except, of course, social incompetence—but in poor homes incompetence is visited harshly upon the members of the family. In wealthy homes, competence can be hired but in poorer homes, this is not possible.

Apropos of this, it is important to appreciate in some measure the kind of competence that is required in an ordinary home. The wife of an ordinary man, whom we are here chiefly considering, is expected to possess an amazing all-round ability of such a type as is expected of few men except those in most responsible posts. She is expected to be a competent nurse for her children, enlightened in the best ways of feeding them, skilled in treating minor ailments, a competent cook, of meats and sweets, for healthy people and invalids, an expert in diet, a laundrywoman, and a needlewoman, providing anything from a pair of breeches for a little boy to an evening dress for herself, strong to scrub and lift furniture in spring cleaning, an amateur house decorator, and, finally, she must be fit to work at all hours of the day and suffer the loss of sleep that ordinary family life entails and be at her post the following day. In addition to this she must ordinarily undergo the periodical strain of bearing children. Nature is partly responsible for some of these burdens, which she has to carry, but there is no doubt that the strength Nature seems to give to women to perform these biological functions

is pretty well exploited by the society in which she lives. When to all the special "trade" capacities the working housewife is required to possess, she has presented to her the task of administering the income of the home, which requires that she shall be an expert buyer, her tasks do seem indeed formidable. She is, in fact, the sole worker and manager of a multiple product business.

In the homes of the wealthy the advantages of specialization and division of labour can be realized—to the extent that the wealth allows. Money will hire housekeepers, nurses, cooks, parlourmaids, kitchenmaids, dressmakers, and the thousand and one others who render essential services. The establishments are much bigger, but they are more competently run, doubtless on account of the organization possible. After all, a woman may be a genius in cooking or needlework or any other particular activity or very capable in administering money, but there are few who can be expected to have all-round excellent capacity. She may, of course, have little ability, to say nothing of interest, in any of the ordinary day-to-day work she is called upon to perform: her ability may be of the kind that would show best in work outside the home.

In industry, it is commonly pointed out that the psychological reactions of performing uncongenial work are serious and efforts are being made to discover ways of selecting the right person

for a particular kind of work and the right kind of work for a particular person. There are means available for making physical and psychological tests that will reduce, it is hoped, the evils that result from bad adjustment in this respect. That the same conditions might arise in connection with domestic work does not seem to attract so much attention and yet, so far as one can see, such might be expected. There is, of course, an advantage in the variety of domestic occupations and this is doubtless the reason for the apparent lack of interest and for the apparent lack of trouble. The most serious cases are those, perhaps, in which women have strong desires to engage in particular occupations and are prevented by some rule against married women working for wages. The price we pay for forcing women into the multiple occupation of domestic management is chiefly that the particular kinds of work are performed with uneven efficiency.

The first and, in some ways, the greatest task which the ordinary housewife has to perform is that of making ends meet. If she fails in this task she falls into debt and to continue in a position of increasing indebtedness is not possible beyond a certain point. On the other hand, she may make ends meet but fail to attain her desired standard. The task is a double one, attaining a desired standard of living and attaining it within the means available.

Difficulty in making ends meet is, to the person finding the difficulty, a condition of poverty.

Veblen, the American sociologist, states that there is a general tendency in all grades of society to ape the higher grade. If this is so, then poverty is general except in the highest income grade of all where there is no grade to ape. Conversation with friends at various income levels certainly seems to bear out the inference from Veblen's theory for there is no doubt that one finds very few who will admit that they are not poor !

The poverty of the social climber, however, is not a kind of poverty over which we are inclined to shed many tears, but there is another kind of poverty, at what are not usually regarded as poor levels of income, which is very real. This is the poverty which is due to a person's income being less than that which is necessary to maintain the standard of his group.

We all belong to groups,—professional groups, business groups, groups to which we must belong because of our work. It is inevitable that these groups will hammer out a scheme of living which will be regarded as the standard of that group. All of us are imitative and only the strongest minded can resist the tendency to spend as others spend in the group. This produces a variety of results.

To those whose incomes are above the normal of the group and to those whose obligations are *below* the normal, the group standard is attainable with something to spare for saving or extra spending of an individual character. To those whose incomes are below the normal or whose

obligations are above the normal, the standard is really unattainable and so they are poor. To those whose incomes and obligations are normal, the standard is attainable, but only just so. These, while they can make ends meet, have no freedom in the administration of their incomes : relatively to their standards, they are not poor, but they are not rich as those in the first category are.

The categories of poor, solvent, and well-off are to be found in all the moderate income grades from the artisan classes to those whose incomes are several hundreds a year—and, as we have hinted, even in the higher grades. There are those who will urge that poverty on a thousand a year is not a poverty that need cause worry, but it is here contended that poverty which is not due to the individual's own fault is a cause of worry anywhere, and if the conditions that cause the poverty can be removed they should be removed. We cannot, in a reasonably organized society, expect any person to defy the customs and habits of the group to which he inevitably belongs. The main cause of this kind of poverty is the uneven distribution of children in the group, and the application of the principle of family allowances would remove the major portion of it.

Though we have stated that a condition of poverty exists when a person cannot meet the expenditure necessary to maintain the standard of his group, the general practice of thinking of poverty in terms of low incomes, that is, of regarding those at the lower end of the scale as

the poorest members of society, is undoubtedly sound. It is necessary, however, to make the general definition of poverty as we have made it in order that we may appreciate the position of those whose incomes are not such as to place them in what is usually called the category of the primary poor or the submerged of society. Poverty is not a condition into which people fall when their incomes are below a certain rigid line, nor is its incidence adequately appreciated if an additional 10 per cent or 30 per cent is added to this poverty line. Poverty is a condition in which those at the lower end of the income scale are most deeply immersed, and from which the others gradually emerge, as the income rises, but from which they are not free until they have passed into the realm of several hundreds a year. At the lowest levels none is well off; as we climb the scale the numbers who can make ends meet increase, and so do those who have a surplus, but we have to travel a very considerable distance before we come to groups who do not "know the pinch".

In order to gauge the quantity of poverty in the country, however, it is necessary to employ some definite standard of income below which it can be said that all are, with absolute certainty, poor. It is the practice of all who have made social surveys to take as their standard income one which they calculate as the barest minimum on which health can be maintained. The calculations are made by reference to the quantities of

food of various kinds required according to dietary experts, the minimum quantities of clothing, the rents that must be paid, and so on, no allowance being made for variations in ability to administer, all being reckoned as perfect administrators, making no mistakes, spending nothing on frivolities but one hundred per cent on necessaries. All social investigators work on such a " line " as standard and the results are then acceptable by everybody.

The Merseyside Survey investigators calculated as their " poverty line " :—

27/7 for a family of father, mother, and 1 infant ;

37/7 " " " 1 infant and 2 schoolchildren.

These investigators, however, made one extremely significant analysis of the incomes and expenditures of a group of workers in their area. Taking a sample week's income and expenditure they published results from which the following figures are taken :—

Income	26/8	30/-	32/-	33/-	34/-	35/-	36/-	38/2	40/-	40/-
Expenditure	27/9	29/4	33/7½	35/11	34/6	39/0½	37/-	39/6½	40/11	39/9½
Excess (+) or Deficiency (−)	−1/1	+8*d.*	−1/7½	−2/11	−6*d.*	−4/0½	−1/-	−1/4½	−11*d.*	+2½*d.*
Income	40/-	44/-	45/-	49/-	51/4	57/4	62/-	70/6	77/6	100/-
Expenditure	41/10	42/10	41/3	47/5	47/8	55/8½	56/8½	60/2½	67/9	89/11½
Excess (+) or Deficiency (−)	−1/10	−1/2	−2/3	+1/7	+3/8	+1/8	+5/3½	+9/8½	+9/9	+10/0½

It will be noticed in these cases[1] all (except two) whose incomes are 45*s.* or less are on the wrong side in their weekly balancing. The returns, of course, are only for a week—a sample week—

[1] *The figures given here are the medians of groups given in the Survey and this table is the present author's abbreviations.*

and the same persons would probably provide other figures in another week, but the survey shows definitely that in this sample those who are below 45*s*. a week have a tendency to run into debt.[1]

In the whole of Merseyside (Liverpool, Bootle, Birkenhead, and Wallasey) the social surveyors discovered that of nearly 7,000 families examined there were 16 per cent who received less than the " poverty line " income. As we have said, this income is a scientifically determined minimum, and assumes the capacity to administer of trained administrators. No wonder that 45*s*. was about the *practical* lower limit !

To indicate a figure below which people tend to run into debt is only to present one feature of the situation. Making ends meet in a financial sense is, unfortunately, attainable by making them *not* meet in another sense, and a consideration of this other sense reveals the real tragedy of poverty : it also shows that the percentage below the poverty line gives a seriously inadequate impression of the amount of real poverty.

It should be taken as a sign of difficulty in making a satisfactory allocation of the week's income if a rise in the income causes a considerable rise in the amount devoted to food. The Merseyside Survey (and all other similar surveys) shows that amongst the working classes the food problem

[1] *It is interesting to note that Mr. Colin Clark estimated that the average worker in* 1928 *received* £116 *p.a. This is about* 45/- *a week. The figure is interesting only as an indicator in connection with our present discussion. It is not a family income.*

is the great problem. The table below is constructed from figures given in this survey and shows the percentages of income given devoted to the various items of expenditure. (The figures given are the percentages allocated by the median case in each group. This means it is a kind of average—it is the middle case when all in the group are arranged in the order of family income size.)

PROPORTIONAL EXPENDITURE

	Weekly Income.	*Food.*	*Rent and Rates.*	*Fuel, Light.*	*Clothing.*	*Mis.*
		%	%	%	%	%
Group I.	27/– to 40/–	50·6	27·7	11·5	4·6	7·6
II.	30/– to 45/–	50·4	20·4	10·5	8·1	10·2
III.	34/– to 60/–	50·6	21·0	9·8	8·3	10·3
IV.	50/– to 100/–	50·6	19·4	9·4	5·7	14·9

The percentage expended on food remains steady throughout the series but a steady percentage on a rising income means an increasing amount of actual expenditure. Of course it is possible that a certain amount of increased expenditure may be devoted to luxury foods but examination of actual budgets reveals that this is not the explanation. The changes that take place in food purchases are changes in quantity and changes in the proportions of *necessary* elements of a dietary. This means that the workers *eat more* and extend the purchases of certain necessaries when they are provided with more means.

SUMMARY OF 1,944 WORKING CLASS BUDGETS, 1904. FOOD CONSUMPTION ONLY. UNITED KINGDOM. URBAN DISTRICTS.

Income.	*Under 25/-.*	*25/- and less than 30/-.*	*30/- and less than 35/-.*	*35/- and less than 40/-.*	*40/- and over.*	*All.*
No. of returns	261	289	416	382	596	1,944
Average family income	21/4½	26/11½	31/11½	36/6½	52/0½	36/10
Average No. of children at home	3·1	3·3	3·2	3·4	4·4	3·6
lb. bread and flour	28·44	29·97	29·44	29·99	37·76	32·04
lb. meat	4·44	5·33	6·26	6·43	8·19	6·50
lb. bacon	9·94	1·11	1·19	1·38	1·88	1·38
pts. milk (fresh)	5·54	7·72	9·85	10·34	12·63	9·91
lb. cheese	·67	·70	·79	·77	1·12	·83
lb. butter	1·10	1·50	1·69	1·89	2·78	1·96
lb. potatoes	14·05	15·84	16·11	15·87	19·93	16·92
lb. currants and raisins	·42	·50	·62	·80	·91	·70
lb. rice, tapioca, oatmeal	2·54	2·64	2·93	2·55	3·38	2·95
lb. tea	·48	·55	·57	·59	·72	·60
lb. coffee and cocoa	·15	·18	·20	·33	·29	·22
lb. sugar	3·87	4·62	4·79	5·21	6·70	5·31
Expenditure on other meats, fish, eggs	1/1½	1/5½	1/9	2/-	2/8½	1/11½
Expenditure on vegetables, fruit	4½*d.*	7*d.*	10*d.*	11½*d.*	1/3½	11*d.*
Expenditure on pickles, jams, extras	1/6½	1/11½	2/3½	2/8½	3/7½	2/7½
Percentage of income spent on food	67·3	66·2	65·0	61·0	57·0	61·1

The table given immediately above shows the features of these budgets which we have in mind. The figures were collected by the Board of Trade in 1904 and they are the average *quantities* of the different kinds of food consumed by the members of the stated income groups. (The sample here given is of urban districts.) The purpose of the survey was to collect data for the construction of the Cost of Living Index Number.

MEAN VARIATION (PER CENT) OF QUANTITIES OF SPECIFIC FOODS CONSUMED BY INCOME GROUPS

Bread	9·8	Tea	11·55	Sugar	19·58
Rice	10·7	Cheese	14·41	Milk	19·13
Potatoes	10·97	Meat	16·23	Coffee, cocoa	19·77
Bacon	20·2	Currants	24·8		
Jams	24·4	Butter	26·4		
Meat, fish, eggs	24·6	Vegetables, fruit	30·3		

It will be seen that in certain cases the amount of food consumed by the different income groups is fairly constant and in others there is a fairly large variation. In order to show the differences in this respect, the average variations of the separate income groups, from the average of all groups, have been calculated and arranged in order of magnitude above.

The order in which these variations occurs is very instructive. The greatest variations show the articles of diet on which the increase of income produces the greatest results: those with least deviations are the foods which are bought pretty well in the same quantities throughout all income groups. It is interesting to note that the first five items are bread and flour, rice, potatoes, tea, and cheese; the last five groups are jams, etc., meat (cooked, pastes, etc.), fish and eggs, dried fruits, butter, vegetables and fruit.

There have been certain changes in dietaries since 1904 but the position still remains substantially the same. The fact is that there are certain kinds of foods that do not enter adequately into the budgets of some workers according to all known principles of dietetics. This is what we mean by saying that housewives make ends meet in a financial sense but not in another sense: they can, in many cases, keep financially solvent but they do not maintain a minimum standard of satisfactory living. On Merseyside apparently there are about 16 per cent of the workers sampled

in this plight; they either drift into debt or do not live up to this minimum standard or fail in both respects.

The reason for this failure is, of course, the lack of means. Below a certain level of income it is impossible to attain the minimum. No amount of intelligence, no amount of wisdom, will make 20*s*. buy 30*s*. worth of goods. Further, when the income is inadequate to such a minimum standard so that rational administration is bound to fail, the reaction is not likely to be a bold effort: it is much more likely to be sheer carelessness, erratic and impulsive spending and behaviour.

But for a considerable income range above this minimum standard, where, by scientifically precise administration, things can just be done, there is another serious situation and this is probably the lot of most workers.

An income which is just adequate to a certain minimum standard must needs be administered with a deadly monotony. There is no room for experiment, no room for special jollifications, no room for departure from the fixed track. One is not long in discovering that in the large majority of workers' homes a fixed dietary and routine of living has developed, a routine which is as fixed as that of a boarding school.

The tragedy of this condition is the lack of freedom. We speak very easily of people *spending* their incomes but, in actual fact, there is very little free spending amongst the workers of the country. Every housewife of these grades of

income says that her money is spent before it is received—" mortgaged " is the expression commonly employed. The feeling of being bound, hand and foot, the feeling of being merely an automatic machine, spending according to a plan that cannot be altered, is a feeling that tends to take away the dignity of living. A person cannot very well swell with pride of being " mistress of her soul " when she dare not swerve from a predetermined path.

In actual fact, of course, many of them do swerve and indulge in expenditure that tends to shock a certain type of social worker : they call it extravagant and wasteful. The explanation of a good deal of what is regarded as irrational spending is that it is merely an expression of resentment or rebellion against the rigid control of circumstances. No one can retain his sanity if he is not allowed a certain degree of freedom, so, in order to preserve this sanity, the poor simply " break out " at times. They have their high teas on Saturdays and Sundays, they go to the cinema and football matches, they revel at their periodical fairs, they spend carelessly as an unconscious protest. It " does them good " to spend on things they cannot afford : it is an " escape ". There is a large amount of this " escape expenditure " among the ordinary people of the country and the cure for it is not to make it impossible, or frown upon it, but to see that the incomes they receive give the freedom whose seeking it represents. There is much more

justification for the " beanos " of the poor than for the extravagant banquets of the rich.

The routine living of the great majority of workers is a characteristic of many groups whose incomes are on a higher level. Even on several hundreds a year there is a beaten track, though it is not so narrowly beaten. There is, however, a large percentage fixed by the dictates of the group, such as expenditure on rent, domestic assistance, the education of children, for example. Variety is found in the running of cars, attendance at concerts, entertaining and social meetings. The routine, however, on the higher grades is a routine of " quality " rather than a routine of quantity and kind, and it is not so soul-destroying.

We have discussed the difficulty of administering incomes of low level. There are other qualities of wages, however, which have serious effects on the business of administering them, the most notable of which is their variability. It is commonly said by the wives of workers that they would like steady incomes. Wages in general vary directly with the amount of work performed ; any slackness of work means lack of employment—unemployment or short time—and this means loss of pay. Not only does lack of work available cause loss of wages but sickness, accidents, etc., and any holiday which a worker may take by way of a respite, causes the same loss of income. This close fitting of the flow of income to the flow of work, which must necessarily be somewhat fluctuating in

volume, presents a problem to the housewife which causes a vast amount of harassment.

It is true, of course, that there are unemployment benefits and sickness insurance benefits, and compensation benefits for accidents, but they are not usually, to the housewife, adequate substitution receipts for the wages lost. And for holidays there is usually no payment. This variability of income throws upon the housewife the necessity for making her own insurance funds, " saving " up for rainy days during the times of relative prosperity. On low incomes this kind of " insurance " administration is, frankly, beyond the capacity of most women ; the only way of dealing with the times of low income is to " go without things " and the husband has to " go without " his holidays, unless his firm closes down for a period.

Where the expenditure is allocated in advance to the last penny it is more than human nature can ordinarily accomplish to restrain spending on ordinary necessaries and comforts. The " divi " which accumulates at the co-operative stores is an automatic way of making a small provision in some cases and there is no doubt that the strength of the desire to distribute dividends at these stores rather than sell at lower prices is largely due to the necessity of most workers to effect these automatic savings. Some women are strong minded enough to do their own saving. A very intelligent woman whose husband earns 50*s*. when he is fully employed, but who is

occasionally on short time, explained her system to the author as follows: she keeps a series of envelopes marked with items such as "rent", "rates", "clothing and burial clubs", "coal", etc. Immediately the weekly allowance is received, the allocations are put into the appropriate envelopes and the amount spent on food is the balance and *no more*. She spends a fixed and unalterable sum at the grocer's each week, and an effort is made to save small amounts of dry goods, such as flour, sugar, rice, etc., each week as well as a minute quantity of coal. These stores can then be drawn on when the husband is on short time. This woman recognizes the fact that her income is not what it seems to be in the full working weeks.

To those on the higher income grades a certain amount of variation is perhaps no disadvantage. If the lower rates of income are adequate for the ordinary demands of the budget then anything above these may be saved or spent on the less urgent needs or even on excusable luxuries. The fluctuations in these cases are "windfalls" and give a sense of freedom: but on the low income grades fluctuations are deprivations and give a sense of wants thwarted, and may even mean hunger.

Another circumstance that causes poverty in the home of the worker is that to which we have already referred in the chapter on personal relationships. The normal working-class family—and the normal family living on considerably

higher income levels—passes through a period of poverty as the children grow older until they begin to earn for themselves. Mr. Rowntree in his survey of York thirty years ago showed that the course of "wealth" and "poverty" is fairly well-marked in all workers' homes. Parents at the age of somewhere between thirty and forty-five years simply descend into 'the pit'. Their children are, about then, eating as much as adults, wearing out clothes even more rapidly and, if any of them are being kept at school or apprenticed to some trade, the expense is enhanced and prolonged.

Over the field of this ordinary harassing administration of wages there hang the clouds of possible disaster in the form of disablement or permanent illness of the breadwinner or his wife. There are certain state provisions for some of these disasters but no one would suggest that they are at all adequate and no one so far as the writer is aware has thought of the plight of the widower with his family of children. A certain amount of provision is made in most homes for some of these eventualities but the report of the Parmoor Committee that the average 'insured amount' in industrial insurance is £10 or £11 and the average premium is 2½*d.* a week shows the scale upon which such provision is made. Little is provided for save a few weeks of illness in the fortunate cases and a decent burial in most. A civilized community would see that a widow was not reduced in

circumstances an iota; the practice of forcing a woman to go out to work and run her home in addition—for the 10*s.* widow's pension and the orphan allowances do not prevent this—is simply beyond discussion.

Poverty is usually thought of in terms of budgets of expenditure and there is a general tendency to consider that it implies merely a lack of things. There is one aspect of poverty, however, which does not reveal a lack but, instead, a very heavy amount, namely, work. The less the husband earns the more the wife has to work. She may, in some cases, work outside the home to increase the money earnings but the ordinary working woman does not; she finds far more than enough to do at home. A systematic survey of the total hours worked and an analysis of the time showing the ways in which the time is allocated would provide a startling revelation. Very little has been done in this respect because of the obvious difficulty of collecting the data.

In a group of miners' homes of which the present writer obtained particulars the figures showed a wide variation from 7 hours to 17 a day. The case in which the lowest occurred was one in which a young wife with one child and her husband lived with her parents who were not very old themselves. The mother and grandmother found life very easy. The case in which 17 hours were worked was one in which there were six children under 13 years of age and the income, less rent, was 24*s.* a week; they lived

in a house with one room downstairs and two bedrooms. The average working day was round about 12 a day with rather less on Sundays but more on Mondays or whatever day was wash-day.

The really startling figure was that which showed that about 45 to 50 per cent of the time was spent in preparing, eating, and " washing up " after meals. Food takes the money and the time, apparently. At the time the collieries were working on several shifts a day but in the sample taken there was no case in which father and son worked on different shifts. The effect of working times of men differing from the school times of children seem to be devastating on the wife's time table as will be seen from the following facts :—

6 a.m.	Husband breakfasts.
7 a.m.	Wife breakfasts.
8 a.m.	Children breakfast.
12.15 p.m.	Wife and children dine.
3 p.m.	Husband dines.
5 p.m.	All have tea.
7 p.m.	Children have supper.
8.30 p.m.	Parents have supper.

In some cases a boy or girl was at a secondary school a bus ride away or worked in a neighbouring town so causing an extra meal to be placed on the table at 6 or 6.30 p.m. Some of the homes of these miners seemed to have the meals going literally from dawn till bed time. Every meal required some special task performed, either cooking of a dinner for the man or tea to be made for a girl, so that the wives were, also literally, hovering between cooking range, pantry, and table

all day long except for an hour or two in the morning and an hour in the afternoon. It requires little imagination to realize that if something were done in regulating men's times of starting and leaving work, so as to fit into a reasonable meal time scheme at home, this burden on women could be relieved.

One of the greatest bugbears to a woman running a house is the washing of clothes. The work is heavy and there is much of it. In addition to this it is of such a nature that with limited house room, in an uncertain climate like ours, the clothes in many of the poorer homes are frequently hanging about in the living room or lying in baskets and cluttering up the family's movements.

The heavy work and overfull occupation of a woman's time are very decisive factors in the determination of the kinds of meals and the expenditure on food. There is much scoffing at the " fish and chips " supper of the workers : there is much good advice doled out on the marvellous dishes made from a bone, a little potato, and a frilly paper ! The fact is, of course, that time and energy shortage dictates the " fish and chips " and throws away the bone. When a woman has been " on her legs all day long " she cannot, in thousands of cases, perform one unnecessary or avoidable task in the late evening. Also, so much time is spent in connection with food that it is the only allocation in which a reduction produces any real effect.

It is difficult to see how every home could be provided with adequate domestic service, though it is perfectly clear that the average housewife has more to do than she can possibly manage. There are certain times, when she is ill and children are coming or are very small, when her day's work becomes a frantic nightmare, or is given up in despair. In some towns there is a service arranged for such times but it should be made more general.

There is a question, however, as to whether the home, as we know it now, is really the last word in social organization. Much work has already passed from the domestic to the industrial system and much more will need to go. Domestic felicity, as we have already said, does not really depend upon a wife scrubbing on her hands and knees, toiling at a washtub, or even cooking a meal.

The cure of the ill of overworked wives is, however, the cure of poverty. Poverty means want and overwork and bad quality of service and goods. It is not merely low earnings—it is what low earnings mean. When one considers the advantages of large-scale organization in industry one cannot help feeling that the seven million married women would be much better off if they could spend a part of their time at least in such organizations doing co-operatively their washing and cooking, and, when at home, using labour saving devices for cleaning. It is a sad reflection that, at the present moment,

there are, in certain countries, those who think that they are grasping the nettle of social disorganization when they drive women, *en masse*, back to the kitchen, cooking, and children. They are, in fact, driving their society back to primitive conditions and poverty. If clothes can be better made in tailoring establishments, if furniture can be better made in furniture factories, there seems to be no reason why cooking and washing also should not be transferred. Men are more productive in industry than they would be cultivating cabbage patches and women would be better off if homes were converted to places of peaceful living rather than places of sweating. There is, of course, one way in which they can, under present conditions, relieve the pressure upon them, namely by reducing the sizes of their families. That, however, would raise great social problems, though it would make life in other respects more tolerable.

Poverty is physically painful, and the problem of coping with it is mentally painful : the feeling of poverty in a world which could produce sufficient to lift all out of its grasp is, in addition, degrading. When the poor are with the poor they do not, perhaps, feel the disgrace so acutely, but when a person is aware of her poverty in a group not so oppressed as herself, she is usually ashamed of it. It leads her to keep to herself, not to leave her home, to eliminate entertaining—to become immured and immersed in the daily round of never ending work.

Chapter IV

THE COG IN THE WHEEL

IN our previous chapter we have emphasized the fact that the ordinary woman of our country feels continuously through her life, and especially during certain periods, that she is bound completely by the fixed budget of her expenditure and the fixed time-table of her work. She lacks freedom of spirit and freedom to administer her resources because the things she has to administer are so scanty. We have written as if it is primarily a woman's problem to combat with poverty because in the majority of cases it is the woman who has the task of " controlling " the expenditure. The husband is saved a good deal of the harassment—the painful harassment—of denying the legitimate demands of the family, but, of course, he suffers the rigid discipline imposed by scarcity of means just as his wife and children do. The husband, however, has his own special worries and these are associated with the earning of the income. If the wife is harassed with the problem of making ends meet, he is harassed with the problem of finding the strings for her to tie and he, like his wife, in the spending, finds that his freedom to acquire income is very strictly limited.

The theory of our economic system is that a person draws an income by virtue of his selling or hiring some kind of service or resource into the market and that the amount is determined by the " higgling of the market ". Every person is free to sell or not to sell his property or labour, and, in theory, he only sells if he sees an advantage in so doing. The fact is, however, that very few workers have any sense of freedom at all in the choice of occupation which they follow and they treat the formal freedom to sell their labour or not as a hollow freedom. Those who, like the writer, have tried to convince working men in economics classes that they enjoy this freedom will agree with him that it is most difficult. Workers feel that they are, in almost every " choice " which they make, bound by the system from which they draw their incomes. The choice is " Hobson's choice ".

It is a firmly rooted belief of the ordinary man that, in an economic system such as ours, he has no real freedom at all to make what he would like of his living but that, on the contrary, he is driven into his place by forces which are beyond his power to control. He will admit that some, being brighter than the rest, may see their way through from poverty to wealth but such cases are exceptional and the normal man must go where he is pushed. Rightly or wrongly this is his opinion and he can bring evidence in abundance to prove it.

The first pressure of forces that tend to place

him in the lowly status of wage earner begins at home and is exerted by those who are most solicitous for his well-being, his parents. They, belonging to a social group which holds on to life precariously, are very anxious lest their children attempt too much and fail. A child may be brilliant and the parents may be sure he is brilliant but they feel that security, the condition they have never enjoyed, should be the first consideration. The "higher" walks of life are, to them, an unknown world and instinctively they hesitate to encourage their children to attempt to scale the heights. To them the heights seem fraught with risks that are too great. This attitude of parents is to a slight extent changing but it is still widespread, as any teacher will bear witness.

In the second place, as is quite natural, the normal child will set himself as his ambition in life, to be something like his father or uncle or neighbour. Here and there may be one who will "hitch his wagon to a star" but the firmament of most of them is studded with "stars" of low altitude. Even in the schools he finds himself surrounded by those who aim at the same humble ends and teachers who take for granted that the bulk of their children, excepting the very brilliant ones, will drift into the ordinary walks of life, as indeed they do and must. In the homes of the wealthy the children grow up accustomed to the idea that they themselves will occupy good positions; they know that their

fathers can place them and the schools to which they go are filled with boys who act on the same assumptions, and teachers who know that the assumptions are right, so far as the majority are concerned. There is a Public School atmosphere and there is a public school atmosphere!

In the third place, the child of working-class parents, brought up in a home where money is scarce, develops a sense of its tremendous importance. Not being gifted with very great foresight, he desires at a very early age to earn money for himself. Five or six shillings a week seems to such a child a large amount of money and his parents also regard it as a very considerable amount, as it is, to them, with their own low incomes. The money gives ease in the home, comparatively, and both child and parent are anxious to acquire it. The parents are under pressure and the child is under pressure to choose a job early and take the maximum immediate earnings, no matter whether the work be "blind alley" or work with prospects.

The majority of ordinary men's children, then, leave school at 14 or 15 years of age. Before they are out of childhood they are embarked on a career. Immature physically and mentally, imperfectly trained in any faculty, they enter industrial life, where they are hammered into form while still malleable. The malleability of children is, in fact, used as a justification for starting them in industry at an early date. It is commonly held by employers in businesses which

require skill that the best days to begin a trade are the young days. Some would like to take them at 12, but many consider 14 to be the latest age. There is possibly something in the claim that fingers trained in immaturity are more deft than fingers trained when stiff with age but it is possible to train digital agility in school as well as in a factory; indeed, metal and woodwork classes are very common in elementary schools. The care with which the claim should be examined is indicated by records of past claims for young children in industry. A century ago, when a Commissioner investigated the conditions of child labour in the lace trade in Nottingham, he found an old lady with a group of infants from two years of age upwards teaching them the industrial art of "scalloping". The Commissioner asked if it was worth while employing children of two and the simple old thing replied that though they did not produce sufficient to justify their employment at two they acquired skill in the use of the scissors and at four they were quite useful!

The point we are making here, however, is that, if a child of fourteen is put into industry and converted into a particular kind of worker, the likelihood is that he will stay in that particular occupation, or one closely related to it, for the rest of his life. The people he meets in his work influence him and mould him into replicas of themselves. There are exceptions, of course, but the rule is our present concern and this

rule is that men, caught young, can be made into working men—or ruling classes ! And if they are " made " they do not make themselves.

The particular kind of worker into which a child is made is, largely, a matter of accident, which means, of course, that it depends upon the particular conditions that rule when he is leaving school. In the first place his career is determined by the particular industry or industries that are located about his home : this is necessarily so, since he must go to a job near his home. Further, he must go to a job where and when there is a vacancy, and he must go to a job that brings in money rather than one which requires financial assistance in the way of premiums.

What we may call industrial opportunities vary from area to area. The industrial system, in its pursuit of economy, has developed the principle of specialization and one aspect of this is the localization of industries. Every town and village has its main industries though some are more " lopsided " in their industrial structure than others. In point of fact, besides a tendency to localization making the industrial structure lopsided, concentration of industries tends to restore the balance. In large towns, such as London, Glasgow, Manchester, there is a very wide variety of industries, but in some areas, notably mining and agricultural areas, there is an extremely small variety ; some of them are practically single-industry areas. Children born

in the towns, where variety of industry exists, are fortunate in that they have greater freedom of choice, but those who are born in single-industry areas drift into that industry, whether they like it or not.

From the point of view of those who, in the nineteenth century, held that human welfare was more or less proportional to the quantity of things produced and judged the excellence of the economic system by this quantity of stuff, there is a certain advantage in having a population that is " born " into specialized aptitudes. It is said that a Lancashire child is almost a born spinner or weaver, and the children of the South Wales coalfields are born miners. That they know a good deal of the conditions under which the workers of their district work is perfectly true but that the child of a miner is desirous of being a miner or is specially suited for it or the child of a spinner is specially suited to spinning is largely nonsense. They become miners and spinners because mining and spinning are the industries of their home districts.

Of course, every industry offers a variety of occupation, from unskilled to high grade technical and administrative, but they vary in the variety which they offer and especially in the proportions of the different classes of work demanded. In most of the industries, however, there is a great preponderance of demand for manual work, skilled or unskilled. In the Census of 1921 it was stated that in manufacturing and mining

industries the " occupied " persons fall into the classes shown below :—

	Manufacturing, per cent.	*Mining, per cent.*
Owners, agents, managers . .	4·5	0·8
Foremen, subordinate superintendents	2·7	4·0
Skilled workers	76·1	73·5
Other workers, mainly unskilled .	16·7	21·7
	100	100

Every year children pour out of the elementary schools and want work. Every year, normally, there is a demand for new child labour. In the bigger towns Juvenile Employment Committees do good work in bringing together the pools of jobs and pools of children and fitting the children to the most suitable kind of work. The variety of job there is possibly fairly near to the variety of desires and aptitudes of the children, but in the small single-industry area there is a very poor " matching " of supply and demand. A child may desire to be a clerk and find himself driven to become a messenger boy or he may desire to go to a shop and find himself driven to a colliery to work on a surface " belt " sorting coal. Once he is started, the ordinary man's tendency is to " stay put ".

The lack of financial ability to pay premiums in some occupations acts as a serious controlling factor and, in some cases, in addition to the limitation imposed by money shortage there is the limitation of entrants. Certain professional people do not admit more than a rigidly controlled number of articled pupils. There is no

need to emphasize the significance of this factor in forcing the masses of people into the " lower " grades of work : it is too obvious.

We have referred to the tendency towards specialization in industry and have shown how the localization of industries restricts freedom of choice of occupation. Specialization in the sense of specialized skill and knowledge is also a serious factor in restricting men. A special ability, trade, or professional skill or knowledge gives " freedom " in that particular calling but when a person is once trained he finds himself, as a rule, rigidly fixed in that trade, and, as the years pass, his mobility grows less and less. Economic theory of the last century contemplated a general move from low-paid to highly-paid occupations, but, of course, when any industrial change takes place these specialized workers, like specialized machines, suddenly lose their value or gain considerable value. The point in which we are interested is that specialization introduces a rigid element into the occupational structure of a society.

The various forms of restriction, to which we have referred hitherto, are specific kinds of which an individual person is definitely conscious. He would like to go into manufacturing but must go into farming ; he would like to be a clerk but must become a joiner ; he would like to be an accountant but cannot pay the premium ; he is an expert lace designer and would like to be something else. These experiences are

common and real and there are many workers who go through life with a regret that they were not able to be something other than they are; the regret is not that they made a mistake in choosing an occupation but that circumstances made it impossible for them to do other than they did. There is no doubt that even in the best regulated societies there would be a certain amount of this thwarting; it is difficult to think that the numbers and kinds of jobs which would be required in any society would be the same as the numbers and kinds of first preferences which people would wish to exercise, but the mode of distribution to-day is such that it leaves very much less freedom than it might. It is possible to convert a "second" preference to a "first" preference if compensating conditions are introduced but these compensating conditions are not generally granted in our present system.

One can talk to any ordinary working man and ask him why he is doing the work he is doing and in the vast majority of cases he will give an explanation in some such words as we have written above. He will say that he is where he is because he could not help himself. There are some who will say, with a sense of their own superiority perhaps, that the average man has no ambition and that, lacking this virtue, he cannot expect to do well. This implies, of course, that if a person works hard, saves, keeps his eye open for opportunities and generally applies the virtues extolled by Samuel Smiles, he is

sure to succeed. Logically, this is based on the fallacy of composition which argues that what applies in an individual case applies all round. If it were true that virtuous conduct would bring everybody success, if it were true that every soldier carried a field marshal's baton in his knapsack, then a world of virtuous people would be most embarrassing, for everybody would be richer than his fellows and armies would be composed of battalions of field marshals. The virtuous, it would seem, should reward the non-virtuous for giving them their opportunities!

The fact of the matter is, of course, that the economic structure is such that it cannot provide every person with a senior command. Inequality lies implicit in the nature of the system and the system pushes us into the places which we occupy —in the main. Granted that those who do attain wealth and power and, therefore, some forms of freedom, do exercise the above-mentioned virtues, there are many who exercise them to no avail and, apparently, must inevitably do so. Granted that idleness and incapacity can lead a person nowhere but downwards in the scale of occupations, there are many who occupy these lowly places who are neither idle nor incapable.

Ambition is a very common attribute of the young. Every year the thousands of young people who enrol in evening continuation classes, polytechnics, and correspondence institutions bear witness to the hopefulness of youth in its attempt to climb the occupational ladder. Boys and

girls study their vocational subjects for years with remarkable energy and at the cost of much of what might be regarded as legitimate ease and enjoyment. At one time, perhaps, such work in youth often led to " success " but one has a feeling to-day that the competition is becoming so keen that very early in the course of study these young people realize that their attendance is important chiefly in order that they may " hold their jobs down ". Those who win through are still drawn, without doubt, chiefly from the ranks of these ambitious young workers, but a growing percentage works with very little hope of attaining very much ; they work to keep their heads above water. The increasing number of occupations which are converting themselves into " professional " bodies, forming institutes of this, that, and the other, granting certificates qualifying their holders to practise their various callings, is a sign of the strength of the system in asserting its structure. The numbers of workers who must " have passed Matriculation " as a condition of entry to an occupation is a sign of the general advance of educational standards, but it is a proof also of the extent to which people are pushed into their places.

If all people were equal in natural abilities and the world offered similar opportunities for all there is no doubt that they would all be equally free or not free as we care to express it. But in a world in which people are not equal in ability, where the resources of the earth offer different

opportunities, where accumulated property and vested interests in certain positions are maintained, to speak of people possessing freedom to make their own careers is simply mockery. A system of private enterprise can only settle down to an equilibrium in which some have much freedom and others have little or none. The " submerged tenth " have none and those of whom we are speaking in this book, the plain, ordinary people of the country, have very, very little.

After all, it is part of the meaning of poverty that there is little freedom. We have so accustomed ourselves to consider poverty as the lack of food and clothing that we tend to overlook the simple fact that what causes a person to receive inadequate means of physical sustenance is the same force or group of forces that causes him to have no freedom in the choice of occupation. The one is the other.

There is a growing realization among the workers of this and other countries that the distribution of income in an individualist " free enterprise " system conforms to something in the nature of a " natural law ", conferring small incomes on a large number and large incomes on a small number, no matter what the general efficiency may be. This is the teaching of Marxist economics and it is not disproved but rather, it may almost be said, accepted by " orthodox " theory (the writer's preference). If we liken the race for wealth to an ordinary race for a prize we realize

that it is not the general speed at which the racers go that determines the result but the difference in their speeds, and the prizes go to the swiftest. When the American yacht *Rainbow* beat the English yacht *Endeavour* in the race for the America's Cup, the trophy went to the swifter boat in the races but one never heard it said that the *Endeavour* was anything but a magnificent boat.

In the economic system, however, there is a tendency to say that if a person does not win a prize he is a " poor sort of man ". There is, however, nothing in economic theory to suggest that if every person in the country could matriculate there would be any difference of great significance in the distribution of income. Presumably there would be none who would be unable to do anything, but those who held matriculation only would be the hewers of wood and drawers of water, or their modern equivalent, machine minders; their wages would be correspondingly low.

(Some writers have attempted to show that there is less inequality in these days than there was a century ago. Equality and inequality are very difficult to measure, but we can certainly say that there is to-day a much wider difference between the lowest and the highest incomes than there has ever been since the industrial system, as we know it, developed. Where in the old days there were millionaires, to-day there are multi-millionaires but the poorest " earnings " are

still approximately zero. Increasing industrialization while it may become more efficient in production would seem to make greater differences of income.)

Along with the growing realization that human lives are determined by the needs of the great machine of exchange there has grown a further terror, namely that any individual worker is, to the machine, quite dispensable at any moment. The engine driver tearing along at 60 or 80 miles an hour with a train load of passengers may doubtless feel himself, while on the move, a man of some significance: a slip on his part may cause untold suffering, but the responsibility heightens his sense of personal significance. When he comes down from his footplate he knows, however, that there are many others who can take his place, and his kingly pride suffers a deflation. A clerk may have served his firm faithfully and well for a quarter of a century: he may have been a "key" man trusted with the secrets of the business, helping in the moulding of the policy: a turn of trade and he is out of work, out of pay, his life shattered. A musician may have been an accomplished artist, making a steady diary of appointments, earning a comfortable income, maintaining his family in comfort: an expansion of broadcasting cuts away his appointments and he is reduced to beggary. This kind of thing has taken place on a colossal scale in recent years and throughout the whole group of ordinary people there has grown the

haunting dread of unemployment. No one feels, in the ranks of the employed, that he is indispensable.

Even in times of prosperity, in the days before the Great War, for instance, the individual worker did not enjoy security of tenure. He was, in the great majority of cases, easily replaced by another and though in those days he was tolerably sure of finding some other appointment—if he was not "too old at forty"—he was always sure of the possibility of his being torn up by the roots if he should, for any reason, fall into the disfavour of his employer.

At the present time inquiries of workers, as to what they regard as their most urgent desire, hardly ever fail to elicit the reply "Security". They are, literally, terrified at the thought of losing a job. Low wages cause them much harassment but the possibility of being ejected harasses them infinitely more. The medical officer of health of an industrial firm, a little while ago, said that he had had cases of workers suffering the pains and showing the symptoms of appendicitis through no other cause than their having been told that they must see the head of the department, maybe on some routine matter; they have feared that they have done something meriting dismissal, though they have known perfectly well that they have done nothing of the sort, when they can be persuaded to think over the matter calmly.

Insecurity, dispensability, the feeling that one's livelihood and that of one's family hangs by a thin thread, takes away the dignity of a man. He behaves humbly, he seeks to ingratiate himself, he gives away his liberties and his rights if there is any possibility of his being " found out " in some activity disliked by his employer. It is a powerful " discipline ", but it breeds craven souls and much resentment. In these days the average man indulges in a certain amount of reasoning about the situation : his reasoning is simple but it is direct.

In the first place, he lays it down as an elementary " fact " that he has *a right to live*. The concept of " right " in this connection has given rise to much subtle reasoning in political science treatises, but it is reasoning that leaves the average man quite unmoved ; to him there is no subtlety needed. He thinks of this right as something that lies implicit in the code of behaviour which society requires him to observe. He is expected to respect the laws of property, he is expected not to disturb other people's peace of mind and sense of security ; in return he expects that these others will not see him want or prevent him living a reasonably free life. He argues that he has no more responsibility for his own birth than any others who have been born, and he sees no reason at all why he should have so much less freedom than they. If he is religiously inclined he says that the " earth is the Lord's " and claims that this means that all have equal rights to use

natural resources. If he is not religiously inclined he says the same thing in other words.

In the second place, the average man does not claim that he has the right to live on other people's efforts, if he is capable of working himself; that is, he interprets the right to live as the right to be allowed to provide himself and his family with their living. This he often expresses in the claim to the *right to work.* Again he supports his claim with the biblical assertion that " if a man will not work, neither shall he eat ".

In the third place, he holds to the simple rule of charity that if a person cannot help himself he should be helped, and charity, to a working man, means helping with a certain degree of generosity. The poor are very well-practised in the art of giving to one another and they cannot understand why all should not be willing to help, as they are willing to help. They do not expect the rich man to sell all that he has and give to the poor, but they do expect the rule to be observed " Do unto others as you would be done by ". Charity, also, does not mean to an ordinary person the mere purchase of gratitude.

Charity, of course, is a moral duty and, in some ways, seems to be tarnished if it is converted from a " duty to give " into a " right to receive ". In an organized community, however, rights must be made to imply duties and duties must be made to imply rights: there is no other way of running a society as distinct from a cockpit. When, therefore, we interpret charity as a right

we can put the claims of ordinary people in the form of an assertion of one single right, the right to live, regarding the right to work or the right to maintenance as the "derived" rights.

In stating the rights which men claim, we have, in each case, used some biblical expression. This is deliberate. The average person is an ordinary decent person who recognizes the simple rule of "live and let live", and he thinks of moral principles in biblical language because he has acquired them through religious teaching. These are the words that the ordinary person employs when he discusses social problems—and it is difficult for anyone to deny that they express the fundamental requirements of a reasonably decent society.

Having stated what he regards as the basic principle of social organization, the ordinary man then proceeds to analyse the causes of their not being recognized. Why, he asks, are not all men given freedom to live and work? He gives various answers.

Sometimes his answer is that the cause of injustice is the selfishness of men. This selfishness he regards as general, and he sees no hope until some kind of moral regeneration takes place. He has a vague idea that if people would not drive hard bargains things would come right of their own accord. This is a marvellously powerful argument for those who possess freedom in plenty and wish to retain it; it certainly puts off the evil day of a morally ordered society!

The workers who give this answer are shrinking rapidly in numbers. They have begun to realize that a system of exchange is based on property and is actuated by people " attending to their own affairs " ; they have given up hope that an uncontrolled exchange system can ever bring about a just distribution.

Sometimes his answer is that there is some particular group of persons who make a just system impossible ; they think, in short, that there is some devil or group of devils in the piece. A century ago the devil was the landlord ; later he was the capitalist employer and to-day he is the banker. Every generation defines its own devil and then there are movements set afoot to deal with him.

In a certain sense this answer contains some truth. In every generation there seems to be a group which is most powerful and urges that its own interests are the interests of all. The landlords at one time urged that rents were a measure of a country's prosperity and favoured tariffs on corn to increase the rents. The capitalist at another time urged that profits were the sign of prosperity and demanded freedom from all restrictions on their production. To-day the depression is generally ascribed to monetary factors, and so the bankers are regarded as the cause of the trouble ; they are envisaged as people who create money for their own profit and disregard the social reactions of their policy.

The third answer which the worker gives is

that the evil lies in the system. He envisages this system as one which compels men to be self-seeking and prevents their being generous beyond a certain limited extent. This is the answer which the increasing majority gives. His experience of pressure, to which we have already referred, his realization of the impotence of his employer, of the impotence of all who buy and sell, to give or charge "fair" prices or wages, makes the ordinary man feel that virtue on the part of the individual is limited in opportunity. He suggests, therefore, that society must organize the goodwill that exists, limit the opportunities for bad will, and establish such institutions as will make self-seeking as little harmful as possible.

A buying and selling organization, as complicated as ours is, in which everything that is produced is exchanged innumerable times along its course of production, is necessarily a machine. The iron ore is sold from the quarry to the furnace, iron from the furnace to the mill, steel knives from the mill to the shopkeeper who sells them to the customer, and at every stage a person or firm can give for his purchases no more than he receives from his sales; at each stage every party is fixed in his selling policy or buying policy by a price scheme that is not of his making and to which he must conform or go down.

A machine is, by its very nature, non-moral, and a non-moral "social institution" is by its nature intolerable. The plain, ordinary man,

therefore demands that some moral principle should be introduced; he demands that the machine should be directed towards all-round freedom to live decently.

In the rough and tumble of political controversy —for it is through social action alone that morality can be imported into the system—the demand for a moral principle as the guiding principle of the exchange system is always met by the claims of "property", and these claims of property mean simply that the claims of those who possess freedom shall suffer no limitations. People speak of their rights of property as something absolute and preach eloquently about their sanctity. The sanctity of property and the sanctity of contract are urged as the basic conditions of social stability and an apparent conflict is presented between morality or justice and social stability.

The settlement of this apparent conflict between justice for all and the sanctity of property is one of the greatest needs of our time. The greatest event in social organization in our generation, if not in all time, has been the Russian Revolution, and one hears it claimed on all hands that the pursuit of freedom as conceived by the Russian revolutionaries has involved the overthrow of property; some acclaim it as a triumph of the rights of man over the rights of the machine and others declaim it as a triumph of thieves over rightful possessors. It would seem, however, that both of these groups are wrong: property

has not been overthrown nor can it be overthrown in any society which has any stability: all that can be done is to destroy one scheme of property distribution and replace it by another. This is what has happened in Russia, and the property distribution which has been established there has been as rigorously enforced by the law court as it was in this and other countries when it was a capital offence to steal a sheep.

The sanctity of property means only one thing, namely, that no individual has the right to take what society has declared to be another's. Every society must effect a distribution of property in some way and, in order that men may use things towards the production of their desired ends, this distribution of property must be enforced. But that is all there is in it. If society decrees that some other distribution shall be made, then it must enforce this new distribution. The attainment of justice is to be sought in the distribution and redistribution of property, and there is no conflict between justice and the institution of property.

To leave a scheme of property untouched, that is, to pursue a policy of never redistributing property, is a sure and certain way to social instability. We have shown that in an ordinary exchange system there is a tendency towards a situation in which many people have little or nothing and a few have very much. This is in itself a condition of instability if the very little which the many have makes living difficult beyond

a certain degree. The settlement of the fictitious dispute between sanctity of property and social stability is, then, to be found by declaring that no scheme of property distribution is regarded as sacrosanct *by the community*, but all schemes allowed by society must be regarded as sacrosanct *by the individual*; the condition imposed on the individual is only possible, however, if he considers the scheme just or, alternatively, he can be forced to accept it.

We may now pass in review what we have stated in this chapter and put down our conclusions in the form of suggestions for the framing of a social policy. In the first place, it is necessary that all parties in the country shall frankly admit that the "economic system" is an institution that exists for the benefit of man and to deny that man exists for the benefit of the "economic system". The writer is under no illusion that this will be easy of accomplishment. It implies that property rights are not absolute but that, on the contrary, they must be accepted as contingent on the needs of social stability or justice. Further, it implies the formulation of a positive social policy. By this is meant that society must establish certain definite ends at which it will aim, ends which are included in the general aim of establishing the freedom of men to live.

In the first place, there must be a determination to eliminate altogether the terror as well as the actual fact of *want* in the form of food, clothing and housing. This must be attained by the

establishment of minimum wages and minimum standards of quality of foodstuffs, clothing, materials, and houses. For those who cannot earn these minima, incomes should be provided, but along with this provision there must, of course, be conditions imposed to compel the small percentage of idlers to make their contributions.

In the second place, there must be a determined effort to give all young members of society as free a choice of occupation as possible. This, again, the writer is aware, will not be accepted at once. It is, however, an essential condition of a free society that men and women shall have freedom in this, one of the most significant things of their lives. We shall refer to it later in Chapter VI, for it is clear that to give all the maximum freedom in this way will involve a very considerable reorganization of our educational system.

Chapter V

LEISURE AND FREEDOM IN WORK

THE happiest people on earth are those whose days are most fully occupied. From childhood to old age, happiness and activity are bound together. When, for any reason, people cannot work, they are miserable. Sickness, besides its positive pain, produces boredom. Artists, lawyers, scientific workers, politicians, administrators, work at full pressure and enjoy life; business men never let go their work.

The other day, the wife of an unemployed worker wrote to the Press that one of the greatest burdens of her poverty was the idleness which it imposed on her. She could not afford to buy wool to knit or cloth to sew; she had to sit still for want of means with which to work. Old people forced into retirement die off quickly for lack of work. Idleness produces mischief, boredom, flabbiness of body, mind, and soul; it is the most deadly of all conditions.

At the same time, it is the age-long moan of man that he has to earn his bread in the sweat of his brow. Adam Smith, working out the theory of value, argued that the cost of producing the things we need is labour and the cost of labour is the

" sacrifice of ease, liberty and happiness ". The mark of social dignity is to live without work and the prize of industry is retirement. Treading a mill is punishment, " sweating " is a social vice. Work, unceasing, can be most deadly dull, cramping the body, destroying the mind, anæsthetizing the soul.

There is nothing paradoxical in this. The joy of living is activity; the boredom of living is the lack of freedom in choosing activities and the lack of freedom in those activities. Retirement is good because it gives this freedom; it is bad when men have no activities to choose. The housewife is in a sad condition because she has no freedom from work: the unemployed woman mentioned above was in an equally sad condition because she had no freedom to work. The artist enjoys life because his mind is free; the business man enjoys his overwork because he is attaining what he wants to attain. The miner does not thrill with joy in his work because he is of a piece with the machinery that turns out coal.

Writers of Utopias, such as William Morris in *News from Nowhere*, dream of a world in which men are free to do the things they want to do and all have the means to employ in the pursuit of their desires. There is no distinction in these realms of fancy between work and leisure: all work is leisure, being free, and all leisure is work, being activity.

" Nowhere " is nowhere and is not likely to be anywhere in the world of reality, and for this

reason it is the fashion in some quarters to reject such dreams as futilities. The value of a Utopian dream does not, however, lie in its being a " blue print " of a desirable world : it lies in its being an expression of some of the basic needs of men and, viewed in this light, Morris was right and justified in showing the need for work and the need for freedom. We have the work : we need to introduce the freedom.

It will help us in our attempt to discover how this freedom can be introduced if, in the first place, we note one or two of the necessities of a social economic system. We can make no progress if we attempt the impossible, and certainly it is impossible to pursue ends which are physically incompatible with one another.

In the first place, a life which is to possess any richness is only attainable when men organize themselves on the principle of division of labour. We must specialize and the product of industry must be the product of all of us co-operatively. This means that men must inevitably work on fixed time-tables at particular processes. The size of the organization and the minuteness of the division of work makes the demands on labour extremely rigid and what we may call the " slavery " of the industrial machine must to some extent be tolerated. Men cannot " wander " to work when they like, they cannot go from post to post as they like, they cannot work at any speed they like or turn out any quality of work they like. The necessities of the machine, the

necessities of large production, impose disciplined activity, activity, that is, disciplined from without.

In the second place, in the subdivision of work, the processes allocated to different men must, of necessity, vary in what we may call their " intrinsic " qualities. Some work must consist of the pushing of levers, watching of indicators, noting the bubbles on boiling rubber, swinging hammers, handling noisome materials : on the other hand, some work must be of the planning kind, initiating, making decisions, organizing.

Some work is of so simple a nature that any person can perform it with a few hours' practice ; some is of so difficult a nature that excellence can only be attained by limited numbers after long and arduous training. In all societies which aim at a high standard of living this kind of work distribution must take place. Much work is of a type that may be considered " intrinsically " boring and much is " intrinsically " interesting.

As new discoveries are made in the arts of production the demands for these different kinds of employments vary. Skilled work is replaced by unskilled work on a machine ; one kind of skill is replaced by another kind of skill : new and more exacting kinds of work become necessary and the easier kinds are eliminated. One thing is certain, however, that there must be hewers of wood and drawers of water and there must be men " in authority " doing what seems to them best.

From this it follows that in an economic system

such as we demand because of its production, there must be some workers who find a great deal of liberty in their work : to these the Utopians' dream of work and leisure being one is not far from realization. On the other hand, there are some who, performing some simple task, maybe even an arduous task, working at a pace set by some mechanism that controls the whole plant, find no freedom at all ; these, then, make a sharp distinction between work and leisure. A little while ago, one of our picturesque ecclesiastical dignitaries, commenting on the workèrs' demand for a reduction of hours, said that the demand was unreasonable and coupled with this criticism the statement that he himself worked eight hours a day in his study. The remark showed considerable obtuseness of understanding : to work eight hours a day, at a study—say, of philosophy—of something that fascinates, is one thing, but to lie on one's back chipping the support from a coal face or to hold an automatic drill eight hours a day is another. We must have philosophers and we must allow them to specialize in philosophy : in doing their work they are rendering service to the community, but we must not allow ourselves to be humbugged into thinking that the " work " of philosophical study is not also the " leisure " occupation of a philosopher. We must have coal and we must have specialist miners, but we must not humbug ourselves into thinking that the social service of hewing coal is also the leisure occupation most desired by coal miners.

The degree to which a person feels his work irksome depends, of course, not only on the " intrinsic " qualities of the work but on the degree to which he feels he is making a contribution to some significant end. Men are ordinarily regarded as disliking work that is arduous, continuous over long periods, or disagreeable through contacts with noisome conditions. In actual fact, however, when men are aware of the necessity of their working under such conditions they rarely feel the irksomeness : it is when they feel that such work is not very urgent that they resent it.

No one can say that the work of a surgeon is intrinsically pleasant. It is a popular form of poking fun at surgeons to say that they love to carve their patients and, possibly, pride of craft overcomes in some cases a man's ordinary desire not to embark on what is, strictly speaking, something akin to a " nasty piece of butchering ". But the work is necessary, it relieves pain, it causes happiness—besides bringing in fees and honour.

During the Great War the work done by soldiers was arduous, dangerous, long continued, noisome, and everything else that would ordinarily be regarded as repellent and revolting : it was thought to be necessary, even a matter of vital necessity, to the community, and men suffered with relatively little complaint. There was a general feeling that every person engaged in the work was significant and even the discipline of the army

was borne relatively cheerfully by all who were under it.

The work of the scavenger and road sweeper is essential to the health of the community. All of us are dependent on it and much significance is attached to the work in general. But the individual has little honour conferred upon him, his reward is extremely modest and he is not made to feel that much depends upon him. Economic theory can explain quite competently why he does not receive a large income and it can throw some light on the reason for his not being regarded as, individually, very significant. We cannot have it both ways, however. If we tell a certain worker he is not very important we cannot expect him to delight in doing the work with a high sense of social service. He makes a very sharp distinction between work and leisure.

The position then, in general, is that many of the people of this and other countries, in fact, the vast majority of plain, ordinary men and women make this distinction between work and leisure and, if any attempt is to be made to introduce freedom into their lives, we have to recognize this distinction at once. The economic machine, as we have said before, must be put in its place as a machine and controlled in such manner that men do attain a reasonable freedom. The lines of approach mark themselves out for those who are willing to see them.

The first objective which we must envisage

is the reduction as far as possible of the " intrinsically bad " elements and the increase of the " intrinsically good " elements in work, and the second is that we must aim at presenting workers with leisure and the means whereby the leisure time can be employed in free activity of a desirable character. It must be realized that a man's lifetime consists of his work time plus his leisure time, and the enriching of his life means a greater liberty in both.

One of the most beneficent means of reducing the irksomeness of work is obviously the wider employment of machinery and mechanical devices. Mechanical inventions can remove the necessity for much work which is of a disagreeable characters: water carriage and scientific disposal of sewage have eliminated in towns one of the most " disgusting " types of employment, though there are still wanting means of eliminating some kinds of work associated therewith. Coalcutting machinery and mechanical conveyors have reduced considerably the work that twists the bodies of coal miners; mechanical ploughs and reaping machines have reduced the heavy manual work of farm labourers. The ubiquitous power of electricity has made possible all kinds of smaller machines in factories and homes, reducing the amount of muscular effort that men and women must exert, thus leaving them with more energy for free activity.

The capacity of mechanical production has been described in a thousand books *ad nauseam*,

and we need not weary the flesh by reiterating these accounts. We must, however, note the tragic fact that machines, substitutes for human effort, eliminators of physical fatigue, are regarded in this and most other countries, as enemies of those whom they should befriend. From the Luddites down to those who wish for a " holiday from invention ", there have always been those who have opposed the introduction of machines on the grounds of its throwing men out of work. It is, indeed, opposed for doing effectively that which it is intended to do.

The Russians, on the other hand, adopt an entirely different attitude. Their economy is so organized that the introduction of machinery is regarded as what it is, the ally of the workers and the " Lady Bountiful " of society. There may be objections to their economy on other grounds, but on this point they are absolutely sound. One of the tests of the soundness of a system should surely be its capacity to absorb the " free labour " of mechanical things, to employ the increasing knowledge of man for the benefit of man. It may be replied that the Western system does absorb machinery and has done so very considerably, and that the only objection to it is the rapidity with which it operates and dislocates. The feeling is general, however, that mechanical aid is by no means employed as it ought to be employed, and the fact is that it cannot be employed at present without causing serious suffering.

If the use of machinery is to be encouraged within our present industrial system, which derives its driving force from the attractiveness of profits, it is clear that the profitableness of mechanical production must be stimulated. This can only be done by the device of making the employment of machinery cheaper, relatively, than the employment of labour. Machines and men are substitutes: if labour is made dear machinery will be employed in its stead. This does not mean that labour will be dispensed with but that it will be employed to a greater extent in the production of machines and so it will become more productive. To make labour " dear " means that the state must decree a reasonable minimum standard of wages and support this with a reasonable unemployment benefit. The unemployment benefit must be recognized for what it virtually is, a reserve price on labour, and industry must be forced to attract workers by better wages or go without it: in striving to avoid high labour costs it will increase its efficiency.

The increasing use of machinery brings with it, however, certain strains and evils of its own, one of the greatest of which is, probably, the control which it exerts over the movements of the workers. A certain amount of externally regulated effort probably does no one much harm, but conducted for long hours or at excessive speed it has the effect of reducing vitality, both in work and in leisure. In recent years there has been a considerable movement on the part of the

best firms to deal with these unsatisfactory reactions of machine work.

As we have said above, in a highly organized system it is impossible to allow every individual to " gang his ain gait "; there must be co-ordination of movements and to prevent co-ordination would be to destroy the organization. Firms have adopted various ways, under the guidance of what is generally known as " scientific management ", of taking cognizance of the fact that men are human and machines are not. Some have taken the line of regulating the general speed continuously through the shifts so that in the performance of their tasks workers are not under strain in observing their work or in making their movements. Others have instituted rest periods and so have preferred to make bigger pace during working periods interspersed with periods of recuperation. Clearly the particular method of adjusting men and machines depends upon the nature of the industrial unit and the kinds of work involved : what is best in one firm is not necessarily best in another.

We must not, however, consider the improvements in industrial life as merely the surmounting of the evils introduced by machinery. The freedom of men and women in works and offices can be increased in multitudinous ways and, in fact, the leading firms in most civilized countries are doing something in this direction. A completely new attitude on the part of employers towards the workers is now developing.

It is broadly true to say that during the nineteenth century the attitude of the average employer towards his employees was that of the slave owner towards his slaves ; in fact, one can go so far as to say that he treated them in many cases worse than an intelligent slave owner did, for the simple reason that they were not his property while slaves were the valuable property of their owners. Though the law stated that men could not be bought and sold as property there was fairly complete liberty for employers to make what bargains they could. On the whole, this meant that there was a general disregard of the fact that a worker was a human being with rights to a reasonable living. The change of attitude is due partly to a development of the philanthropic propensities of men, partly to simple business acumen, and partly to a wider understanding of the social organization among the new generation of educated employers.

Even before the War there was a measure of welfare work performed in certain well-known firms, but during the War a great impetus was given to it by the example of the Government munitions works and others working on Government contracts. This impetus derived its force from the need to obtain maximum output and the need also to preserve a buoyant spirit in all who were taking part in the prosecution of the War. A feeling was generated that after the War there would be a new world, and this showed itself in a rather wide adoption of the idea that it

was the duty of firms to provide social amenities and pleasant conditions. The new world, however, did not eventuate, and there was considerable backsliding in this respect. The depressions and uncertainties of trade caused many firms to retrench, and in some cases the retrenchment took the form of reducing these " unproductive " expenditures.

The realization that welfare work increased labour efficiency caused many firms, however, to retain their welfare departments, and this new conception of the profitability of good conditions has caused the " welfare " movement to change. To-day, welfare workers are known generally as labour managers, personnel managers, etc., and they are regarded as an integral part of the ordinary machinery of business administration. The uncertainty that attached to welfare work is not attached in the same degree to personnel management for the simple reason that welfare work connotes philanthropy and labour management connotes business efficiency.

Industrial fatigue and industrial disease were formerly regarded as the concern of the workers alone. It was unfortunate that work made men tired; it was unfortunate that some types of occupation produced disease, blindness, and other physical defects, but—well, one could not make omelettes without breaking eggs and, after all, there were other workers to take their places. The increased study of human reactions to working conditions has revealed the fact that fatigue and industrial disease are serious long before they

reach the point of making a worker not worth employment. The fact has been discovered that mortality is not an ill that stands alone, but that when mortality is high morbidity is high; and so with respect to industrial infirmities, the conditions that produce crocks definitely recognizable as such also produce general inefficiency in others who are not crocks, and no amount of new recruitment can make good this loss of efficiency. Expenditure on the reduction of fatigue and accidents is justified financially.

A visit to a modern factory under enlightened management reveals some remarkable advances in arrangements and contrivances designed for the comfort and ease of movement of workers at their work. Space, light, ventilation, removal of dust and rubbish; warmth and quiet; colour and order; all these conditions, acting on the subconscious minds of the workers, and on their bodies, introduce into their work activities a cheerfulness, a joy of living which reacts upon their output to the advantage of the firm. There must be many young men and women in these factories who find the conditions under which they work far superior to the physical conditions of their homes. Working under such conditions does indeed give a feeling of freedom because at least it reduces the irksomeness of work and that in itself is freedom.

It is becoming increasingly realized that there is profit even in a right attitude of mind on the part of workers, a right attitude, that is, both to

the work and the firm. There has always been, among workers, a tendency towards " loyalty to the firm ". All who have come into contact with them know how ready they are to prove the superiority of their " own works " over the works of other firms, if they have the chance. One sees the look of " pity " on their faces when they talk to one who is not so fortunate as themselves, and there is a feeling of shame if they cannot speak well of their own employers. This loyalty is probably something which they cannot help. The prisoner of Chillon was supposed to have grown fond of his chains, so it may be that its cause is mere familiarity ! It is, however, there, and whatever the cause employers would seem to be short-sighted who do not attempt to win and increase it. The best firms do.

This right attitude of mind can be developed in the first place by the provision of facilities which are a recognition of the humanness of people. The obvious things are the provision of sports fields, club facilities, medical service, holidays with pay, etc., but there are other ways that may involve less expenditure. The chief of these is the development of right personal relationships between the directorate and the workers.

In the first place, an interest in the worker's adjustment to his own particular job can go a long way. Young boys and girls enter firms and are given certain work to do which they may find they do not like or are not so efficient in performing as they would like to be. They may

even feel that they would like to enter another department. Many firms are capable of making these adjustments but do not take the trouble; again, the best firms do: their personnel manager makes it her business. In many cases, young people wish to undertake courses of study at local technical or commercial institutes, but their hours are such that they cannot; providing facilities of this kind brings its own reward.

In the second place, workers appreciate a square deal. They are, perforce, in their ordinary routine, under the authority of managers and undermanagers, but there may be petty injustices under which they suffer but which they cannot get redressed. The remedy for this is the right of appeal through the whole chain of command. In one of the most prominent firms in the Midlands this right of appeal lies to the chairman of directors himself, and the workers, in consequence, have immense confidence in their contracts being respected. Further, there is nothing that so detracts from the dignity of a man as his feeling that he can be thrown aside as unwanted without any word of regret or concern on the part of those in authority. In times of stress or through reorganization, workers at times become redundant, and the sad necessity of their being dispensed with arises. A courteous note, expressing regret and offering assistance with testimonials and references helps to soften the tragedy to the unlucky man or woman. To be greeted with a notice nailed on a wall that certain groups of workers are no

longer required—as is done by a firm known to the writer—is one of the most humiliating experiences a human being can suffer.

In the third place, the status of workers should be recognized by their having the right to negotiate through their representatives, not merely representatives in their own works but representatives of trade unions to which they choose to affiliate themselves. It is generally understood that trade unionism is an accepted institution, but recently there have been inroads upon its rights. There are difficulties, perhaps, in the grouping of workers in appropriate unions, but there is no doubt that collective bargaining is essential in an organization where workers acting singly have so little power in dealing with employers who have the greater resisting strength. The principles of trade union action require to be reformulated : there seems a strong *prima facie* case for the firm which gives the square deal not being liable to disturbance because of the evil doings of firms which do not, but there is a very strong case indeed for the workers having the right guaranteed to select their own negotiators.

One of the most hopeful features of modern business organization in respect of this freedom in working conditions is, undoubtedly, the increase in the number of men of culture who are taking control. In some businesses, where the control is more or less in the hands of a family, there is a tendency for the " heirs to authority " to be more widely educated than formerly and to be

given some knowledge, during their training, of economics and social science. In others, large joint stock organizations, the control is passing to the salariat, people who are themselves employees and, in increasing numbers, they are, like those mentioned above, men of culture and training in general economics. These men are administrators rather than capitalists, and their tendency will in general be to hold the balance between "good administration and profits". It is by these that we shall expect experiments to be tried and, in fact, it is by these that experiments are being tried. They are men who have insight and understand the complex of forces which go to make a business; having greater knowledge they have greater courage. One of the most outstanding examples of the courage to which we refer is the recent experiment carried out by Messrs. Boots, the manufacturing chemists, in the establishment of a five-day week in their factory. When one thinks of the toil and sweat that humanitarians exerted through the nineteenth century to win reductions of hours from their ridiculously unproductive days it is indeed hopeful that a firm can pronounce a reduction from five and a half to five days a week (with no increase of hours on other days and no reduction of wages) a financial success.[1]

[1] "The working of the five-days' working week inaugurated on 30th April, 1934, and terminating on the 29th September, 1934, has proved an unqualified success both from the business point of view and that of the employees, and I am satisfied that if continued over the winter months will prove equally satisfactory."—Sir Richard Redmayne's *Review of the Experimental Working of the Five-Days' Week by Boots Pure Drug Company at Nottingham.*

There is a limit, however, to the reforms which can be expected in these voluntary ways since, at all times, there are incompetent firms and firms which will not put themselves into voluntary liquidation in the attempt to keep pace with the larger and more competent ones. The way of reform is, however, the elimination of units which cannot maintain reasonable standards, and it is the business of the State to generalize the reasonable standards. The art of government is not to stand by and refuse to move until some crisis occurs; it is to keep a vigilant eye on possibilities of advance and make the advances that are possible, recognizing the fact that vested interests will always stand in the way. The right to live is every man's right, but the power to employ is not a right unless it can be exercised properly, any more than a worker's right to live means that he has a right to be employed in any job he cares to select.

In the regulation of factory conditions the state does take a large share: it imposes minimum conditions and stimulates the institution of devices designed to improve the comfort and well-being of workers. It has in its staff of factory inspectors an extremely efficient body of workers whose knowledge of conditions and possibilities should be much more generously used than at present. Their field of supervision is, however, far from being the whole of industry.

One of the serious deficiencies in this respect

is the almost complete lack of supervision of the conditions under which clerical staffs work. In recent years the employment of girls as typists has expanded enormously and clerical work has reached the dimensions of an industry. The factory inspectors have no right of entry into the offices of a firm.

The conditions under which thousands of girls work, in London especially, are a disgrace to any decent community. Small, overcrowded rooms, in basements even several stories deep, badly lighted, badly ventilated, inadequately provided with sanitary conveniences, they are tolerated on account of the cost of reorganization. The passion for crowding business houses in a square mile or two leads to a competition for land that fixes rents at such figures as make the only " economy " possible the sacrifice of the girls' well-being. The conveniences of telephone and motor transport apparently have not dispersed these offices and there is no alternative to compulsion.

The cynicism of some employers in this matter is illustrated by two cases reported to the writer. In the one, a factory inspector complained that a room was not satisfactorily lighted for the workers under her jurisdiction, so the management put the office there and moved the factory girls to the well-lighted office ! In the other case, a firm which exhibits its manufacturing rooms as a " show place " in up-to-date conditions had offices that were unspeakable. Part of the profit

of welfare work is apparently derived from its advertisement value !

More difficult to deal with are the cases of tyranny which exists in the industrial world in the matter of expression of opinion on political, social, and industrial affairs. In some areas this is a particularly serious deprivation of men's rights. Again, it is to be expected that an improvement in the standards of real culture of some sections of employers will lead to the disappearance of this evil, but there is no doubt that in a decently organized society freedom of opinion will not be regarded as something which employers can stifle at will. The writer knows of cases where workers are watched even in their educational activities, where membership of certain classes is regarded with suspicion and men join them knowing that they run the risks of being marked for observation in their work. Admittedly, feeling runs high on industrial affairs in these districts, but such repression cannot be regarded with equanimity by those who desire to see a race of men who hold their heads erect with the dignity men should possess. There is an argument in these cases for the establishment of a " court of honour " where men could state their grievances against those they regard as repressing them and where some opinion could be stated which represented the feeling of the ordinary man.

To some readers the opinions here expressed will perhaps appeal as a meek and mild expression of hope for men to be reasonable. They will

feel that the proper line would be to suggest some root and branch reorganization. It must be observed, however, that all the conditions of freedom in work which we have here discussed would need to be carefully observed in *any* social organization. Even in a Communist society like Russia, the establishment of satisfactory physical and psychological conditions of work constitutes a problem and the maintenance of freedom of opinion along with freedom of working conditions is probably equally difficult. Ultimately, in all societies, it is a matter of organizing goodwill and making it prevail.

When all has been done that scientific management and welfare work can do in making the right physical and psychological adjustment to work and the right personal adjustments between employees and managers and others, there is still an adjustment required of the length of time that workers should be subject to the discipline of the industrial system and the length of time that they can spend in their own unfettered way. In other words, there is still the necessity to adjust working hours and leisure hours.

As we have pointed out above, there is a measure of reduction of hours that can be expected from the growth amongst employers of enlightenment in the art of management. At present this particular kind of understanding is the possession of a few only; the majority of employers are content to do as others do and perpetuate the evil of overwork, simply through their inability to consider

what can be done. It is assumed that reduction of hours means, as a matter of course, a reduction of output.

The author remembers when he was a boy a certain contractor in a coal mine (a " butty " as such men are called) who was reputed to have a saying to the daymen working for him, " Don't speak while you work. Every word means a blow lost." One remembers such a thing because of its cruelty at first, but as one grows older one remembers it for its amazing stupidity. These " butties " were notoriously slave drivers and the saying is the saying of the real dyed-in-the-wood slave driver.

To-day, investigators have established, on observation, that the work done by a worker does not vary in proportion to the time worked nor does it always fall when certain rest periods are introduced. It is known, as a fact, that workers vary in efficiency throughout the day, warming up from low efficiency in the morning and falling to low efficiency at the end of the day. It is known also that men vary in efficiency from day to day during the week, the Monday morning feeling being statistically revealed in low output and the best days being in the middle of the week.

Many employers, who have not considered the subject seriously, have realized that overtime is expensive even apart from the extra rates of pay which it entails. At ordinary rates it is more expensive because tired work is slow work and, if errors can be made, they are made more

frequently then than during ordinary hours. In addition, it was established during the War in munition factories, and it has been emphasized later by other observations, that overtime, repeatedly worked, produces low general efficiency through cumulative fatigue. Observation has also shown that accidents are more frequent before workers are warmed to their work and at the end of the shifts when fatigue has set in. Overtime is simply work in excess of ordinary time, and if it is true that overtime in general, as a constant practice, does not pay, it is more than likely that in many works the actual hours are really in excess of the best number. It is rare that one finds, in discussion of the length of hours, any employer who can say that he has experimented to discover this best period or has even worked out any figures beyond the crude reduction of output by a percentage equal to the percentage reduction of hours under consideration.

Something can be hoped for, as we have said above, from the increase amongst employers of a knowledge of their work, but in the meantime a good deal of legislation is required to force the incompetent ones to organize on more profitable lines. But even if hours were arranged so as to be most profitable there would still be the case to present that they must be arranged in part to make possible reasonable liberty in leisure time occupation.

The Merseyside Survey, in its sample investigation into leisure time available amongst the

workers of various groups, found that, on the average, men have something like six and a half hours a day and women something like six. These hours are calculated by deducting from the twenty-four hours of each day, (*a*) the time spent in bed, (*b*) the time spent in personal attention, (washing, dressing, etc.), (*c*) the time spent in work, and (*d*) the time spent in travelling. It will be noted that the leisure includes meal time. A little imagination will fill in the day of the average person who has six hours a day leisure, including meals.

The day consists of (*a*) rising, (*b*) breakfast, (*c*) travel to work, (*d*) work, (*e*) travel home, (*f*) leisure period, (*g*) going to bed and sleeping. We may say, without qualification, that the average person's leisure does not begin until he reaches home in the evening. Particulars are not given of the actual day's occupation, but we can fill it in with cases we know in our own experience. The railways, 'bus, and tram peak load periods give an indication of the time when leisure is approaching—somewhere between 5 and 7. Where factories cease work at 5 we may say that the workers are at home from 5.15 to 6, or even later, according to the length of time travelling home; offices usually close at 6 making the arrival home from 6.30 to 7.30. In London, the "leisure time" cannot be said to begin much earlier than 7. It ends on going to bed, and this varies according to the time when work begins. Those who begin work at 6 or 7 a.m. cannot keep out of bed

much later than 10 p.m. (Many miners who arrive home at 3 p.m. or so retire to bed at 8.30, 9, or 9.30.) When a supper meal is deducted and, in some cases a late tea-meal, there is not much left for free disposal.

But we cannot say that the time left even when meals are deducted is leisure time. In the first place, most girls find " little things to do " in the house ; they help their mothers, wash their stockings, mend their clothes. Men will usually find a few things that have to be done, though they escape more than the girls. In the second place, however, there is an allowance to be made for recuperation. The average person arrives home tired and he (and she) must sit for a considerable time to recover.

The leisure occupations tell the same story—the story of tired workers seeking relief. Young workers will frequently show a certain amount of vitality—the typist in tennis for instance—but the " vitality " pastimes are usually indulged in by sedentary workers. Those who work hard physically during the day take refuge in " indoor " pastimes.

A tired worker who reads, reads the evening paper or a slight, sentimental story ; if he reads a serious piece of literature he falls asleep. The author has been told this scores of times by workers. They tell the fact as if there is something peculiar in their type of mind ! They do not realize that they are resting when they read and sleep comes naturally. A tired worker goes to

the picture house. Here he can sit, often more comfortably than at home; he hears music, he sees something that requires no effort; he takes his pleasure without work as a balancing of the day's work without pleasure. In colliery districts one sees miners crouching at street corners, near village lamps, round their front doors: in some districts they "hang about" in this way unwashed even; they are so tired that they postpone their washing, though with the development of pit-head baths and the more general institution of baths in their homes this picturesque mode of passing their leisure time is disappearing.

It is common to regard the poor standard of literature, the poor standard of films and music-hall entertainment indulged in by workers, the loafing about, wandering up and down the streets, the gathering in social clubs, as marks of poor intelligence or poor taste or poor education or all three. The keen interest in football, racing, and suchlike events is also regarded as a proof of their simple and even primitive natures. To some extent—the lack of education for instance—these statements are true, but to a far larger extent than is usually understood, the simple, crude forms of enjoyment and the enjoyment of mass amusements are the reactions of men and women who have no energy for initiating their own activities and none for the higher intellectual things.

It is sometimes urged as a justification of a wealthy, leisured aristocracy that their wealth and leisure and independence provide them

with the opportunities to develop the highest standards of cultured living. Poise of mind and body, easy, restrained behaviour and speech, gentleness of manners, the appreciation of the arts, enlightened conversation—all the virtues have a chance to grow when pressure of economic circumstances and dependence on others are absent. Their social value, it is claimed, is that of something which the other orders can imitate.

Our argument here is that what is good for one section of the population is good for all. It is true that for the development of the critical powers in the arts, the power of appreciating music, literature, pictures, for the development of grace in speech and behaviour, for the development of the power to sustain thought and argument, it is essential that men shall be free economically and have time at their disposal. The intellectual and æsthetic powers require energy. A cultivated race, as distinct from a cultivated group, demands that the race shall have means and time. Perhaps, in old times, when methods of production were very simple and ineffective, the attainment of any considerable standard of culture was not an all round or general possibility, it may have been possible to state a case for the establishment of a small section who could specialize in living while others served them. To-day there is no such difficulty or necessity. The powers of production are enormous and a high standard is possible for all; all could be provided with means and leisure.

We need not turn aside from our line of discussion to show that the existence of a wealthy, leisured group to-day does not always produce the high standard that the above argument assumes. There are many cultured members of the wealthier groups, but we also know that too much substance and leisure can produce distinctly undesirable types—which suggests, of course, the cultural need for discipline. It is, however, very much to the point of our argument to state that there is abundance of evidence to show that the cultural possibilities of the poor and unleisured are immense.

Let it be granted that the masses of people live on a very humble level of culture. Let it be granted that their taste in " music "—such as crooning—is execrable, that their tastes in films, drama, literature, and sports are also beyond the pale ; it should be observed, however, how much good taste, good manners, poise, and enlightenment exist. We need not consider the geniuses of art, science, politics, commerce, who have risen from their midst to commanding positions in the " highest " social grades ; we need only to give our attention to the activities of the ordinary men and women who do not " rise in the world ".

In the first place, we should consider the excellence of the standard of order and cleanliness in the ordinary homes of our workers, where, daily, miracles are performed on the slightest means. To judge of their quality of housekeeping

we must not take as standard the homes of the wealthy, where the workers of the country, employed as servants, by specialization in domestic processes, attain the highest standards. The excellence of the result must be judged in the light of opportunities, and judged in this light the working women of this country equal the women of any grade in society.

In the second place, we should consider the excellence of the work performed by the ordinary skilled workers of this country. Where they have the opportunity to show their skill, the pride of craftsmanship is very intense and on all hands they are regarded as justified in their pride. It is an old saying that when one is talking to a skilled worker about his craft one is talking to an aristocrat.

Turning from their work to their leisure we find them again showing their innate possibilities and attainments. The choirs of churches, choral societies, brass bands, orchestras witness to their efforts in the musical sphere ; the success of the Courtauld-Sargent concerts shows their interest in the best musical productions, and the wide development of folk dancing and country dancing again bears witness to their joy in music and rhythm. The general taste in drama may be low, but the extensive dramatic society movement shows the force of their desire to produce and enjoy this form of art. In women's institutes and girls' clubs there is again abundant evidence of the capacities, executive and appreciative, in

the arts of pottery, needlework, and hosts of other similar arts.

On the purely intellectual side the attendance at adult education courses, in literature, musical appreciation, philosophy, social, and natural sciences proves the wide existence of the desire for knowledge and understanding—in many cases a keener desire than is felt by those who have the leisure.

We need not mention the vast attendance of young people at evening institutes, for their main interests in these places are vocational, but they do show, what is of interest to us here, the general desire that exists amongst workers for opportunities to enjoy the things of the mind.

To detail the evidence that workers are decent human beings, with the instincts and propensities of men and women who are capable of high cultural attainment is, however, to anyone who knows them intimately a simple insult. They are just ordinary men and women. There are feeble minded ones amongst them and those who cannot fit into the social system for some reason or other which we do not understand—but so are there in the leisured classes. There are some of the poorer classes whom we do not want married and reproduced because of their lowering the standard of the race, and there are in the upper grades of society some whose marriages are also dysgenic. These are to be found everywhere. The average man and the average woman, however, of the ordinary working classes are of the same stuff as other men and other women,

showing the same wide differences in capacity, physical, intellectual, moral, æsthetic. The *general* differences in cultural development are wholly due to differences in opportunity. Overworked, underpaid, they have no freedom to develop: as flowers need food and space, so men need means and leisure.

The claim for a general reduction in the hours of work, or, to put it positively, the claim for an increase in the hours of leisure is based on man's need for opportunities of cultural development. The change of hours required is not by any means to be regarded as the change which industry can "afford". If reduction of hours will increase working efficiency and so reduce labour costs it is just ordinary stupidity not to effect the reduction, but the reduction which working efficiency commands may quite possibly and quite probably be less than "leisure occupation efficiency" requires. In short, the hours of work must be determined in part by the hours of leisure which workers need.

Clearly, to reduce hours beyond the so-called "economic" limit would involve changes in costs and prices. That fact must be accepted and, further, it must be accepted that employers will not and cannot reduce hours voluntarily below a certain point. It cannot be expected that they will increase their costs and prices and reduce their sales returns and profits. The reduction of hours for "human" ends must, therefore, be effected by the State.

Sudden reductions of hours, like sudden increases of wages or sudden increases of interest rates or sudden increases in income tax or any sudden and large changes in the system at all, would cause serious dislocations. Dislocations are always troublesome and cause suffering in many directions, but the trouble and suffering can be reduced to negligible proportions if the movement towards increased leisure is gradual. This means, therefore, that it *should begin at once.*

There are some who state that the increase of leisure should not be granted until the workers know how to employ it. If our argument has been of any avail it will be realized that the " misuse " of leisure in which they indulge to-day is largely the effect of their having no energy for the proper use of it and, what is equally important, their having no means to employ in leisure pursuits. Hours of work and rates of pay are but two aspects of the same problem. Poverty means low income and small leisure normally, and the relief of poverty therefore means the increase of income *and* the increase of leisure : also it means an extension of the facilities for training in the art of living, but that will be considered later.

There is one aspect of this leisure problem that should be mentioned for those who have any regard for the stability of the State. Men who are too tired to think, to read, to discuss a question with sustained interest, naturally turn to the easy substitutes for these things. They become the

prey of suggestion and emotional appeal, and are at the mercy of the demagogues, warmongers, and the sensational press. Democratic government assumes intelligent and cultured people as the electors : men can only develop their intelligence and become cultured if they have the means, the time, and security.

Chapter VI

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS

MUCH has been written on what is meant by "social class", but sociologists still find great difficulty in making their definition. Everybody "feels" it is a real thing in society, but everybody finds trouble in identifying the qualities that put men and women into their various places, ranks, orders of precedence, etc. Class distinction is a subtle thing that runs through society from top to bottom; there are innumerable grades of people, and the old classification of upper, middle, and lower classes is generally held to be no longer valid even if such a classification ever existed in this simple form.

One thing is certain and that is, that a statistician cannot possibly make a classification table and enter the number of people in each social class for the simple reason that there is no single quality on which the classification can be made, nor are there two or three such qualities. The Registrar-General in 1911 attempted such a thing, but he produced nothing more than a modified occupational table. Some authorities suggest that because classes cannot be statistically determined they do not exist, but such a conclusion is absurd on the face of it. Everybody knows that the population is socially classified in fact.

Not only does everybody know that the population is divided into social classes, but most people are able to identify those who belong to their own class and those who do not, and of those who do not they are able to say whether they are of a higher or lower class. For this is another fairly well understood thing, that classes are arranged in vertical order ; we find classes higher and lower but not on the same horizontal plane ; men and women look out of their classes upwards or downwards.

It is not so difficult to say in general terms what are the things that put people into the same class as it is to say what arranges the order of the classes. People belonging to the same class are those who speak the same language, have the same habits, manners, mannerisms, the same standard of morality, the same family background, the same school background, the same attitude towards inferiors, and the same attitude towards superiors. In short, they have the same standards of values. Members of the same class may marry without comment, for no intrusion is thereby effected and the children will be of the same order : " mixed " marriages are always occasion for comment, friendly or unfriendly. A social class tends to treat newcomers as foreigners, with caution and even with suspicion : it dislikes the person who departs for another class when he assimilates the attitude of the class of adoption towards the class of origin.

When a person is with members of his own

class he is at ease : when he is with members of another class he is not at ease. Nobody can possibly live his life thinking out exactly what he is to say, how he is to behave during every moment ; he must be able to speak and act without any thought of whether " it is done " or not. The vast majority of the things we say and the things we do in the course of the day are said and done by a kind of automatic reaction to the circumstances of the moment, and it is in these reactions that a person's " quality " or class is revealed. A person who moves from one class to another, upwards or downwards, carries with him the reactions of his original class and they are liable to mark him out as a stranger. Members of " higher " classes who try to mix with members of " lower class " know how terribly conscious they must be of every movement they make ; members of the " lower classes " who mix with members of the " higher classes " also know how terribly careful they have to be lest they " give themselves away ". There is no feeling of embarrassment when two people meet whose knowledge of some art or science differs widely, but there certainly is embarrassment when modes of behaviour and speech and standards of morals and tastes differ. Differences of opinion, of judgment, of skill, of knowledge, while they may be the origins of groups, are not the causes of differences of class.

The surest way to acquire the " automatic reactions " of any class is to be born into it.

Men and women can move from one class to another and acquire the ways of the new class so that they may be assimilated, but it usually requires a period of conscious effort until habit becomes second nature. Birth is generally regarded as the first index of a person's " quality ". It is not, however, the only index, for every class has its institutional background—school, church, professional—and if the associations with these are satisfactory they will qualify for membership in spite of birth, just as birth will qualify if some of these associations are not satisfactory.

If people are to have the same kind of reaction it would seem that, in general, they must live similar kinds of lives, and this means that, in general, they must have similar incomes and similar freedom in the matter of time and necessity to work, similar freedom from external controls, and similar bondages to external controls. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that social status is very largely a matter of economic status. But what do we mean by economic status ?

It is doubtful if the term " economic status " used in the strictest sense is a valid term at all. One can look through economic treatises from cover to cover and look in vain for any reference to it.

The nearest approach one finds is in references to exchange value. A person of high economic status is simply one who has high exchange value, that is, draws a large income either from his labour or from his property or from both.

There is no doubt that the size of income has something to do with the placing of a person in a certain rank but social rank implies a good deal more than income. Status is a relationship of precedence, of respect, of honour, authority; it is a relationship of superiority and inferiority between men. In an exchange the buyer and seller are "economically" of equal status in that both are supposedly free exchanging parties with law behind them guaranteeing their rights equally, whether the exchange be of a hat over a counter or of labour on a farm. Socially, however, the relationship has a different significance.

It is the opinion of the present writer that the conception of status arises out of the feeling of dependence or independence which a person feels with respect to a particular bargain or contract. He who feels dependent on the other person is of a lower status and he who feels independent is of a higher status. To be dependent is to be in the other person's hands for good or ill; to be independent is to be free. The dependency of one person on another makes the relationship of servant and master and this is perhaps the commonest relationship between classes.

The possession of professional or craftsman's skill can produce in those who depend upon its exercise the feeling of dependence. Medical men and lawyers derive their status largely from this. The skilled worker is not so independent as the medical man but, in comparison with the unskilled worker, he has the feeling that society

depends more upon himself than upon the other. The possession of property is again a measure of personal independence or of the dependence of others upon the one possessing the property. A great landlord possesses this independence and enjoys the dependence of others upon himself to a greater extent than a small landlord. An employer of labour also has the feeling of the dependence of the workers upon himself. The greatest measure of independence is attained by large property owners receiving income independently of any personal service they may render.

Ampleness of means derived under such circumstances that the recipient feels independent or others feel dependent, is not, however, sufficient to give the full flavour of class distinction. For this it is necessary to belong to a family which has enjoyed this status for more than one generation. The pride of lineage is a really significant element in class feelings. Even among the poorer grades of society this pride of family is found and the skilled worker or overseer who can point out that he is holding the status which his father and grandfather held is proud of the fact. This makes assurance doubly sure that the present holder of the rank is worthy of it : it is the stamp or guarantee that the clay of which he is made is good. Further, inherited property and inherited rank make a person feel that he is in some peculiar way an essential feature of society, an integral part of it, a very significant member. As Mr. T. H.

Marshall, in a recent brilliant essay on social class, says of property, it cultivates " a sense of proprietorship in a civilization ".[1]

The distribution of this " sense of proprietorship in a civilization " is, in fact, the most important social phenomenon to which we have to give our attention when we are considering what a properly organized society should be. The feeling that one is a proprietor of civilization, an heir to the social heritage, that one is free to enjoy the products of his ancestors, free to mould the world that he must hand on to his children, the feeling that one is independent of other men's whims and arbitrary decisions, is the feeling that gives dignity to man. A properly organized society is one which has the greatest number of people who feel this dignity : class distinctions, however, tend to increase the number of those who do not possess it.

The evil of social classification is its exclusiveness. A strongly knit social class strives hard to keep out newcomers. It uses every device that comes to its hand capable of rendering the service of closing the door. In social intercourse it uses the devices of visiting list, of tea-taking list, of marrying list, and so on. These devices, however, are of small account for they are a mere expression of what is meant by social class. The most important socially disintegrating devices are those which it employs in the political, economic, and legal institutions of the country. These institutions are concerned with the creation

[1] " Social Class," *Sociological Review*, 1934.

of the walls and barriers that enclose the areas within which the members of a social class move freely with a sense of equality.

It is said that the pride of our legal system is its impartiality as between rich and poor, higher and lower social classes. Everybody knows, however, that in fact the rich have a better chance before the courts than the poor. In the first place, the rich are able to procure efficient and expensive defence and, except in certain cases where the defendant is provided with legal assistance, the poor have not this opportunity: in the matter of appeals, wealth counts more heavily still. In some cases, a person may suffer the infringement of his rights by an employer but he dare not take his case to the courts for, though he might win in the courts, he knows he would lose afterwards. The alternative of a fine or imprisonment favours those with means as compared with those who have none. In taxation, the principle of taxation according to ability to pay is accepted as a fair principle but its counterpart in punishment is not accepted: the fine which a person is called upon to pay is not graded according to means and, consequently, the alternative of payment or imprisonment is not an alternative fairly presented to all. A fine of so many pence or shillings in the pound of income would, in many offences, make this alternative just. It may be admitted that the sensitiveness to disgrace varies from individual to individual but the ability to pay also varies and should be recognized.

In the ordinary economic spheres of life the force of class is still very powerful. It is to be expected that those in authority, having the gift of places of authority or good remuneration, will, other things being equal or even considerably less than equal, make their gifts to their own relatives and associates. The transmission of industrial control from father to son was a characteristic of nineteenth century industrial administration and was understandable. With the advent of the joint stock company the appointment of professional administrators has broken this line of descent considerably, but the influence of class still shows itself in the making of appointments. This, again, is easily understood since it is quite natural for people to select those with whom intercourse may be easy.

In public institutions, such as certain branches of the civil service and the state church, there is not the slightest doubt that origin and background are regarded as essential elements in a person's qualifications for preferment. Occasionally, the tremendous personal force of an individual man will carry him against all social barriers but, in the main, in certain spheres, the social class in occupation supplies its own new entrants.

Again, it is quite natural that this should be so. There is no doubt that for many posts something other than intellectual force is required: the subtle thing called personality and its twin quality, "bearing," are extremely important. It is essential, in many of the superior positions,

that certain modes of behaviour should be rigidly observed. Originality and individuality may even at times cause trouble : the required person may be a certain type. A *faux pas* may, in some cases, be fatal. It is a mistake to think that because a person is highly qualified in the sense that he possesses many diplomas and certificates of specialized competence, he is, therefore, capable of carrying the responsibilities or performing the functions of any post in which these qualifications are required. The tendency in equalitarian democracy is to emphasize these qualifications and underestimate personality, a quality which cannot be tested very easily except by the rather rough and ready method of discovering how a person " appeals " to those who have to make the appointment.

Of course it should be remembered that it is not class alone which causes preferment to be made along the crooked path of favour. Any common experience, common association between those who appoint and the candidates for appointment may serve. Membership of a particular society, birth in the same area, common membership of a race—and some races are very clannish—may lead to a more than fair proportion of appointments being given to members of these groups. " Other things being equal, of course, one would give the job to a . . . ." is a common attitude of mind everywhere in society.

The fact that exclusiveness is " natural " in the sense that all people tend to draw to themselves

those of their own kind, does not, however, reduce the feeling of resentment in those who are excluded and especially keenly is this resentment felt, when the exclusion is based on some quality whose distribution is determined by circumstances over which the individual man or woman has no control, as, for example, birth and the benefits derived from inherited wealth. There is something very final in a person's birth and when it is a handicap he feels that he has a grievance against life itself. That a child is the offspring of his parents inheriting the qualities of his ancestors is not a thing that society can control, but that his environment is something which his parents alone determine is a position for which society must take responsibility. It is not fair that a boy or girl should find himself or herself cold-shouldered, excluded, handicapped because of some institutional arrangement. Institutions can be modified and it is the function of society to modify them so that all children shall be socially free to move from group to group.

The organ through which society can express its will effectively is the state and it is the duty of the state to make a frontal attack on all those institutions which divide man from man. This does not mean that, by law, all appointments should be made on the possession of some " paper qualification ", that personality should not be considered, that language, bearing, manners should be disregarded. To attempt an organization of society in which such things count for nothing would be ridiculous. It does mean, however, that

so far as is humanly possible an attempt should be made to produce a high general level of culture, a capacity for free and equal intercourse, amongst all members of society. In other words, an attempt should be made to produce a *race* of people who have a sense of proprietorship in their civilization, a race of men and women whose dignity is not impaired by their being in any degree "untouchable".

All that we have said previously regarding poverty, overwork, leisure, liberty, and security derives its significance from the desire to produce a society of cultured people. Class consciousness must, for the same purpose, be eliminated as far as possible. It is difficult to conceive that a person can be really cultured if he suffers from a sense of inferiority; to be cultured is to be acceptable, and to be unacceptable and acquiesce in the situation is to accept somebody's ruling that one's culture is inferior. The position is untenable and the person who feels his behaviour and standards inferior tries to improve them or tries perpetually to avoid the presence of the superior ones.

It is difficult also to see how real culture can coexist with a sense of personal superiority. A person may dislike a mode of living and dislike the standards of others but, surely if he is a cultivated person, he will strive to understand why others accept the low standards and he will most certainly not object to their being given cultural opportunities. To deny the right of others to be cultured is to be a barbarian.

The relationship of leader and follower is not

a relationship that engenders the feelings of superiority and inferiority that we find in class consciousness. It is a natural impulse to follow a leader and it is a natural impulse on the part of leaders to lead; it is not natural for anyone to say that he himself is of inferior clay, and stability in a class system implies his saying this. All-round culture of any considerable degree is incompatible with a class system and a class system is incompatible with general all-round culture.

This analysis of the relationship between culture and the social classification of men indicates the first general line along which our public administration should travel; it is in the direction of establishing an educational system whose first objective is the production of cultivated people. Our present educational system is not this: culture is not its first objective though it may be accounted one objective.

The educational systems in this and most other countries have a variety of objectives and this variety is a reflection of the variety of "interests" which control them. An examination of some of these will indicate the tangled skein it is our business to reduce to order.

In the first place, there are the interests of the parents. For the most part parents desire that their children shall be educated to play their part in life as they themselves imagine it will be. The parents of Public School children send their children to these schools to be trained,

primarily, in the traditions of their class, and, secondarily, to be trained generally in such matters as will enable them to do whatever work they may be called upon to do. Traditions, class culture, and vocational training are the educational ends desired and probably they are desired in this order. The parents of children who attend public elementary and secondary schools probably desire first and foremost that vocational ends be served. These parents, harassed by insecurity themselves, and fearful of the insecurity that may await their children, are anxious that all educational work shall be directed to its removal. They have no objection to very young children (far from the time they must decide on a job) being given an education of cultural significance, but when their children are growing into their early teens the " anxiety complex " takes hold of them and they want all work at school directed towards its allaying.

In the second place, the educational authorities in the form of education committees, expressing the will of the general public, demand that the education provided shall suit the ends of the groups who have political influence. The worker, in general, as we have said, desires vocational ends to be served; the employers of children leaving school, again, in general, make the same demand. If " cultural subjects " are useful as qualifications for possible professions there is no objection to their being studied, but if they are not, then they are " frills " which should be

supplied in small measure. "After all," one frequently hears it said, "the really important things are the three R's"—with, as a rule, an additional subject that would be useful in some particular occupation the speaker has in mind. In agricultural areas, education should have an agricultural bias, in commercial centres, it should have a commercial bias; though, of course, if a boy is to be a clergyman or a teacher, literature and the classics might be given to him. Girls, of course, should be taught housewifery and cooking!

In the third place, the educational authorities in the form of professional educationists, administrators, and teachers, have their conception of what the educational ends should be. Their ends are not quite so simple to define since they are, perhaps, more varied. Being interested in the actual business of teaching, they realize that the education should be suited to the capacity and interests of the children: they, therefore, usually define as one of their ends the development of the children's faculties. The pursuit of this end is, in itself, not necessarily identical with the pursuit of the particular vocational ends of parents or other public "interests". To develop a child's faculties is not necessarily the same thing as to produce a farm labourer, a clerk, or a housewife. There is no reason to think, however, that all round development of faculties is destructive of the capacity to be any of these things but it may, of course, awaken

the child's mind to the possibility of his being something else. Attention to a child's capacities involves attention to general culture and teachers especially are alive to culture as the primary end of education, though there are some who are deflected somewhat in their aims towards conciliating parents and public interests. The development of the curriculum in schools from the very simple thing that existed in earlier days is due almost wholly to the teachers and enlightened administrative officers, including state school inspectors.

There are dangers in allowing the professional educationists to dominate schools, however, and one of these is their tendency to think that the perfect educational system produces professional educationists! Education is a general preparation for life and to mould the school curricula and activities with the end in view of producing university dons and other kinds of teachers is to mould them with a vocational bias. That this is, in actual fact, a real danger is seen in the tendency of schools to plan their work to the end of matriculating for a university.

Another danger which professional educationists introduce into the system is that which arises from the tendency of headmasters to consider that culture is synonymous with the study of some particular subject. Thus, in many places, it is not realized that though classical training is cultural, culture is not classics; nor is it, as some seem to think, science in the form

of physics and chemistry. When culture is the end of education, the subjects whose study will contribute to this end are very numerous.

One group of subjects tends to be very largely disregarded; we refer to the social sciences. Certain arguments are brought against their inclusion in school curricula on the grounds that they are beyond the comprehension of the young or that there is danger of their being treated by schoolmasters and mistresses with a certain amount of bias. There is, perhaps, something to be said for the first of these arguments in respect of certain parts of such studies as economics and politics but it does not amount to sufficient argument to warrant their exclusion. One cannot avoid feeling that the real objection is one which, to the present writer at least, appears to be a form of social fear. History, we are told, ends in this country about 1832 and after that it becomes politics; so the thought is suggested that it is felt to be " safe " to discuss the virtues and vices of past ages but we must withhold our judgments on the modern modes of life. Schools cannot, of course, be converted into fighting arenas over political or social questions nor can they be permitted to be places of instruction in the particular social doctrines of particular teachers but there is much that can be done without the introduction of harmful bias.

A peculiar value attaches to the training of the young in the social sciences. In the first place, it is essential that they should realize that our

social organization is a developing one and that it is developing now as it always has done before. In the second place—a much more important matter —they should be trained, as Mr. C. E. M. Joad has said, in scepticism. Our modern communities are subject to a constant bombardment of suggestion by people who have special interests to serve, through the press, the platform, and broadcasting. It is necessary to protect the community against these institutions and this can only be effected by training the young to the thought that social affairs can be considered scientifically, just as matters of health and technique in manufacturing can be so considered.

Cultural training is not, however, to be identified with intellectual training though, of course, this plays an enormous part in it. Culture, as we have suggested above, is a matter of standards of values, standards of taste, etc., and the culture of a class implies an appreciation of the things that are done and not done. Training in intellectual activity and training in the art of maintaining physical fitness are both essential elements in a cultural training but training in the things " done and not done " is also essential.

Public schools train their pupils in the standards of behaviour of a certain class. The schools of the ordinary people should train their pupils in the standards of behaviour of a uni-class society. The Public Schools perform their own function well and the schools of ordinary children should aim at the same degree of perfection in this matter.

One point that needs particular attention is the matter of spoken speech. The ordinary men and women of this country do not speak the same language. The writer on one occasion, during his time in the Army, had the strange experience of acting as interpreter between two groups of soldiers, one from the Tyneside and the other from London: "Cockney" and "Tyneside" are two extremes, it will be admitted, but there are hosts of variants in the language whose sole effect seems to be to divide those who should not be divided. Differences in speech divide even members of one "class" from one another, but there is a universal speech, the speech of the educated groups, which makes the provincial "brogues" appear as marks of inferiority.

Speech is at once one of the greatest dividing forces and one of the greatest forces making for classlessness. There are some who think a general culture possible through the medium of a variety of "provincial" speeches, but they are usually those who speak the universal language understood, if not spoken, by all! It is surely a dilletante culture that aims at the perpetuation of these differences. That they have a class significance is evident in the fact that those who aspire to enter the "ruling" classes try to acquire the ruling class language and, also, by the fact that there is a general tendency amongst the ordinary people of the country to treat with suspicion, or something worse, those of their fellows

(including their own children) who, as the Northerners express it, " talk well-off."

If all men and women spoke with one accent—the universal speech of educated people is the obvious standard to adopt—a great cause of the feelings of inferiority and superiority, so destructive of dignity in human relationships, would be removed. The " coom ", " oop ", and " nowt ", of the North, the " cam ", " ap ", and " nuffin " of London, like the " refaned " speech of some clerics, are modes of pronunciation that cannot do other than make a group of people otherwise willing to be friendly feel aware of differences.

To remove these differences in pronunciation is a very difficult task, difficult because there are so many forces at work in opposition to the change; some people hate the thought that they may be regarded as speaking the " inferior " language, others hate the thought that they will lose an easy mark of distinction from the generality of men. There is no doubt that in some schools a great effort is made by certain enthusiastic teachers, but on the whole there is equally no doubt that an easy tolerance of these differences is common. If all could agree to attach no significance to the accents of their fellows all would be well, but it would seem to be a general practice of most people to form their opinions of others from more or less unconsciously observed behaviour and, this being the case, the only hope lies in all being taught to speak one language.

If we are to make schools effective institutions for the production of a cultivated race of people we shall need to consider other things besides curricula. One of the most important of these is the matter of school-leaving age and another is the matter of supplementary work performed by school children.

Long ago, some divine said, " Give me a child until he is seven and you may do what you will afterwards." To-day we think that this was a most optimistic remark. The attitudes towards life may, in some ways, be determined by influence of very early childhood, but there are many attitudes which are acquired in later years. Children are very impressionable, are in the plastic stage in some ways until they are about twenty-one years of age, and they are very plastic indeed to the age of fifteen or sixteen. No one who can afford to keep his child at school till he is sixteen, even if he has no professional objective, ever dreams of allowing him to leave below that age, except for reasons of health or some mental defect. All admit that there is much to acquire after the ordinary school-leaving age of fourteen is reached. Most of those who can afford to do so allow their children to remain at school till eighteen years of age and many allow them to proceed thereafter to a university.

At present the great majority of children leave school at fourteen or thereabouts. Just as they are reaching the stage at which the work of the earlier years is to bear its first real fruits, they are

taken away. All who have taught very young boys and girls know the great change in the social attitudes and aptitudes for work that takes place between fourteen and sixteen. These two years are the threshold of life. Before fourteen, children play at living, but at this age they begin to adopt the point of view of responsible little citizens. They are interested in human institutions; they begin to show their ambitions; they appreciate the significance of manners and bearing. Plunged into industrial or commercial life at this stage, they put on the airs of the older people with whom they come in contact, their fancies concerning their own importance are fed on the mannerisms of the older ones and they miss the opportunity of growing naturally into easy and dignified modes of adult life. Children at these years should not be put into the "forcing house" of factory, office, or mine: they should grow up with their contemporaries mainly, trying their wits against their equals in experience. "Give me a child till he is sixteen and you may do what you will afterwards" is a much more reasonable remark than the one quoted above.

Industry and commerce have no right to mould children into parts of a mechanism. Children are young people and they should be trained as such. To the age of fifteen or sixteen the present writer would urge that the sole objective of schools should be the development of their faculties and the production of standards of value and standards of taste. The vocational requirements

should be excluded from consideration until this age.

Personal aptitudes, manual and intellectual, must needs be borne in mind in cultural education, and many of the forms of intellectual training have vocational value later, but there should be no warping of a young child for the sake of his being prepared for an occupation that his father selects for him, or even for one that he himself selects because of some immediate satisfaction that allures him.

The energy which a child consumes in the business of growing up in school is as much as he has available. In his work and games his consumption is such that there is none left for supplementary work, such as newspaper-delivery or running errands before and after school for some grocer or butcher. We read of the weariness of children in the hideous early days of factory work and we preen ourselves on our humanity in forbidding child labour. It should not be forgotten, however, that we send our children to school and that they perform a full day's work there. They can easily be induced to do extra work—especially if they can thereby earn a few coppers for themselves and make a contribution to the domestic till—for children, unless they are ill, abound in the desire to be active. But they can easily be overworked, and it is the universal experience of teachers that the unfortunate children who run about with newspapers in the early hours of the day come to school half wearied

before their real day's work begins. It does not give them a chance : they enter the race with weights of lead on their feet.

The work and games of public schools are regarded as quite sufficient strain on the growing children who attend them. Those schools recognize the need for energy in children's leisure : they recognize that free time is an essential part of a child's daily timetable as it is of the adult's. What is good or necessary for one group of children is equally good and necessary for other groups. The parents of public school children, of course, have no interest in making them work for money, but the parents of some of the elementary school children have such an interest and, consequently, the suggestion that supplementary work should be forbidden is likely to raise objections. In actual fact, it is forbidden to a large extent already, but the newspaper nuisance still remains with us under a licensing system. The appeal put forward on the ground that the earnings are useful should not be allowed : the method of dealing with poverty is not to grind money out of children. This remark also applies to the same appeal made against raising the school age. If family allowances were established generally, the age of the children to be maintained would be adjusted to meet the strain on slender earnings.

After sixteen the educational system must necessarily be modified, it would seem, to meet the needs of the children's vocations. In many cases it might be urged that the work to which

children will go is of the unskilled or semi-skilled type needing little or no vocational training. In others, of course, much training is required. For all the professions and all the skilled occupations the next few years must be regarded as apprenticeship. In some cases—the professions chiefly—the early stages of apprenticeship are of the nature of a continuation of school work with a certain amount of specialization. In others, a certain amount of office or workshop experience may be necessary. A country which really values its workers will see that these early apprenticeship years are properly spent: that is, apprenticeship will be regarded as part of the educational system. In some areas (notably London) there are trade schools: these should be more general, and where they are impracticable there should be some public supervision of young people's training, as for instance is done in some cases by the Juvenile Employment Committee.

One thing is very definitely desired at this stage of a young person's life, namely, that he should not have the strain under which he works to-day. It is painful to see the young boys and girls of sixteen to twenty-one rushing from their day's work at 6 o'clock or thereabouts to evening institutes where they can acquire the necessary training for their professional examinations. The pressure on the ambitious, even on those who merely wish to retain their jobs or make normal progress, is to-day as heavy as it has ever been in the past. At these years,

certainly from sixteen to eighteen, all young persons should be employed in industrial or commercial work for no more than half time and the rest should be devoted to school work, cultural, or in some cases, vocational.

This plea for curtailing the work required of young people is no plea for the encouragement of idleness. It is merely a plea for their lives to be lightened by the removal of chains and drags. The pressure is such that their efficiency, from the purely utilitarian point of view, is not as great as it could be, and, from the point of view of training a race of cultured people, it is all wrong. It is true that the ambitious are happy when they are making progress with their professional work, and there is no desire here to damp down their enthusiasm; there is only the intention of making their best progress possible. At the present moment an Act stands on the statute book intended to deal with these adolescent years, through Day Continuation Schools, but it is, with certain notable exceptions, a dead letter; it should be revivified.

One more aspect of educational administration remains to be dealt with in this chapter. There are other factors in the development of a cultured community with which we shall be concerned in the next chapter, but there is one which we must consider here: we refer to the provision of school buildings and equipment which are appropriate to their high function.

Great strides are being made by some local

education authorities in this respect and a race of school architects of high merit has arisen. Light, air, cleanliness, spaciousness, colour are to-day receiving attention such as was never given before in planning school premises. The school is the great institution in a child's life ; to develop his habits in a place where work and play are associated with beauty and order and space is one way of producing a race of cultivated adults. That the world is a lovely place in which to live is surely one of the greatest convictions to implant in a child's mind, and one can imagine no greater proof of a country's determination to see that its children shall grow into a race of civilized beings than the erection of schools in every town and rural district that are themselves the expression of cultured minds.

Chapter VII

THE STATE AS THE GUARDIAN OF HUMAN DIGNITY

IN our previous chapter we have shown that the industrial and commercial system distributes work, leisure, and means of living with a considerable degree of inequality, and we have attempted to show what this means to the plain, ordinary man or woman in lack of freedom and lack of cultural opportunities. Further, we have shown that this variation in the allocation of income, work, and leisure corresponds to a variation in the social status accorded to men. Lack of means and leisure is a condition that ordinarily signifies low social status, and the possession of great means and plenty of leisure signifies high social status. Our social stratification, then, gives all above the lowest ranks the opportunities to indulge their sense of superiority, and all but the highest ranks occasions on which to feel their inferiority; consciousness of social dignity implies a consciousness of somebody else's inferiority.

The most civilized people it will be agreed are those who can move from one social class to another and rouse no resentment: their culture is such that they command confidence. These

people possess the power of speaking to a man as a man, stripping him of the trappings that distinguish him from others. There are limits to the intercourse, however, due to the fact that though they may behave in such ways as to disarm all hostility in ordinary intercourse there are wide fields in which there would be considerable difficulty. Such a person as we have in mind can meet members of lower social rank on certain grounds but he cannot live perpetually with them, for his standard of values is not the same as theirs. He has, however, no objection to others being cultured; he does not consider it a condition of his well-being that others should be in an inferior position.

It is useless to expect members of different social classes to mingle socially by encouraging them to be "nice and friendly"! In the main, the freedom of the 'higher' classes in mixing with the 'lower' classes is a form of patronage, and the freedom which the members of lower classes pretend when mixing with the higher classes tends to be aggressive or fawning. The only way to produce real contact is to extend the higher culture to wider groups—until the whole of society is one group.

We have, therefore, suggested that the extension of educational facilities should be one of the main objectives of our State authorities. If we produce a general culture of fairly high quality, class distinctions will automatically disappear. But the extension of educational facilities is not enough.

Attention needs to be directed also to other institutions and other conditions.

The abolition of poverty and the increase of leisure we have already urged as necessary steps in the production of a satisfied community, but the plain ordinary man has a particular objection to what he regards as the status of property as compared with the status of men. By this we do not mean that he has a real objection to the payment of interest on money or rents of other kinds of resources but rather that he objects to the power which some people have through the possession of large quantities of inherited wealth. There are some of course—many perhaps—who think that interest is in some way or other wrong, having acquired the ancient ideas of moral philosophy and religion, but most people think little about it except when they meet it as a large payment to someone who has never done anything at all in his life to earn it. They appreciate the point that a person might be rewarded for saving or that he might be compensated for taking risks—that is, he should be allowed the gains if he takes the losses—but they do not appreciate any reason that may be given for the inheritance of large property putting a man beyond the necessity to work. If their own security were greater than it normally is at present, they might be prepared to overlook inheritance, but as things are they feel themselves to be reduced in status below others through circumstances over which they have no

control and over which no individual born can conceivably have had any control. The taxation of property on the death of the property owner is, therefore, to the ordinary man a form of taxation which he does not justify on fiscal grounds but, rather, on grounds of fairness in the distribution of wealth.

When Mr. (now Lord) Snowden, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech on the second Budget of 1931, stated that taxation of the very rich had reached its limit because, with income tax and the insurance premium against death duties, some of them were paying out more than their incomes amounted to, he left the average man of this country stone cold. The object of death duties to the ordinary man is to reduce the large estates and the insurance premium against the duties appears, therefore, largely as an unnecessary payment.

Along with the objection to the transmission of large estates to those who have not contributed work or other sacrifice, goes the general objection also to the establishment of perpetual status through the conferment of hereditary titles. The ordinary person has not the slightest objection to the honouring of any person who renders distinctive service to the community—he generally approves of it—but he sees no reason for this honour to be transmitted to a line of descendants, most of whom will, when they inherit, be just ordinary plain men and women, so far as work of social significance is concerned. Hereditary

status and hereditary incomes stand as challenges to any ordinary person's sense of his own dignity and his resentment is not to be dismissed as simple envy.

This must not be taken to imply that the ordinary man objects to a person leaving any property to his wife and children, or even his grand-children, nor is it to be taken as implying that he objects to a person reflecting to some extent the glory his father has earned. His objection is to the perpetuation of a status that does not require a continuance of the effort that led to its first attainment. Some form of limited inheritance would probably be generally accepted—provided it did not carry with it anything in the nature of hereditary ruling power. The average man is not a " leveller "; he is rather one who wants a fair chance, and great inheritance strikes him as peculiarly unfair.

The writer is aware of the arguments that may be marshalled against the ordinary man on this point. From the point of view of social stability it is urged that the presence of permanent institutions such as the hereditary ruling and possessing classes is good; it imposes a form of discipline. " All Englishmen love a lord," it is said, and Bagehot, writing of the machinery of government, urged that there should always be present in the political institutions of the country what he called the " dignified " element. This dignified element, he claimed, commands spontaneous respect for authority. There is

great strength in the claim, but hereditary authority is not the only form which commands people's unconscious acceptance; those who are not too young to have read Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* will be able to think of others. A " wig and gown " go a long way!

The cruder forms of " government by impressiveness " naturally become less and less important as the level of culture in a community is raised, and what may have been necessary in the early stages of social development tends to become anachronistic. In any case institutions may be perpetuated and their functions performed without the personnel conducting them enjoying hereditary right. No one, for instance, thinks that a Lord Chancellor loses in dignity because he is selected on the grounds of his being an efficient lawyer: it is not the fact that he is created a hereditary peer that gives him authority. Ordinary men and women probably love pomp and ritual and they love those forms in particular which are of long lineage: what they do not care for is the thought that those who take part in the great ceremonies do so because of hereditary right.

At the present moment there is doubtless no very acute feeling with regard to hereditary titles. Other grievances are much more pronounced and probably, on the whole, this is the one which actively irritates less than any other. If, however, any suggestion were made that the power of a hereditary class should be strengthened in the

actual conduct of affairs, the ordinary man would immediately express his opinion, and what he regards to-day with tolerance—even perhaps with kindly tolerance—he would overthrow with joy.

The case in which he considers the status of property as improperly set above the status of man is the case in which an employer is what he calls a " bad employer ". The old-fashioned capitalist employer is declining in importance, as we have said above, and his place is being taken by the administrator in the form of directors and managing directors. So far as the workers are concerned, however, these new persons are their employers and the power they wield is the power of the firm's property. There is a strong feeling amongst workers that their employers should be subject to some kind of supervision as regards their justice in administration and their efficiency. It is difficult to suggest any definite machinery that should be established, but there is no doubt that some firms are managed in a manner that is agreed by all ordinary men, employers and employees, as " beyond the pale ". There are directors and managers who are not fit to be in charge of men and there should be means of removing them. The ordinary forces of the market are not sufficient to effect their removal by the reduction of their profits and the law must needs be invoked.

We now come to an aspect of the distribution of the amenities of life which we have not hitherto

considered. It is our common practice to regard poverty as a shortage of means and, of course, the practice is sound, but, almost as serious as the quantitative aspect of poverty is the qualitative aspect. In a sense, of course, they are the same things, for, in the administration of limited resources we all find ourselves weighing quantity against quality. Those whose incomes are very small show this balancing in a way that is very striking.

At one end of the income scale in our community we find abundance of the good things: at the other end we find a paucity of the poor things. The contrast between rich and poor is as startling in the quality of goods as in their quantity. The marks of the poorest standards of living are poor clothes, poor furnishings, poor food, poor housing; the marks of the poorest quarters in which the submerged of our population live are mean streets, mean shops. In a large city, such as London, where the sections of the population are segregated, a visit to the poor districts is depressing beyond measure, even if one does not enter the homes. The display of old clothes, old furniture, broken biscuits, cast-out sweets, bruised fruit—in fact, everything displayed—witnesses to the fact that our distribution of wealth is such that we have at the lower end of the social scale people who literally live on the dustbins and refuse heaps of society. The day has gone when our humanity could tolerate the sight of children picking up the

scraps of food thrown down in the streets—the only survival of this is, perhaps, the old men who pick up the ends of cigarettes lying about—but, though we have abolished this, we have not altered the scheme of distribution itself; the poorest still buy refuse over counters.

Not only do the poorest buy the refuse but, in the name of charity, we organize the collection of cast-off clothes and distribute them to the poor. There is refuse and refuse, of course. Many things which are discarded by the well-to-do have much service left in them, and it is not reasonable, in a way, to say that this service should be wasted when there are those about who would gladly enjoy it. There is, however, something particularly saddening in the reflection that there is a section of the people which lives on the things dropped aside by others. A dispassionate examination of the situation reveals the fact, we know, that here we have merely an extreme and peculiarly pathetic example of what is done throughout society. It is common in business for people to buy second-hand machinery and so on; from bottom to top of business organization and domestic organization we find the variation of quality of resources employed. Even in the very comfortable classes the qualities of things used are not equal to the qualities used by the wealthiest classes and one must accept the fact that it cannot be otherwise. This is the meaning of wealth and poverty; there cannot be an abundance of the best, in the

nature of things. There is a limit, however, below which it is intolerable in a human society.

Veblen, in his theory of a leisure class, denounces our social system very heavily on this account. He claims that the characteristic of our social system is that social distinction depends on indulgence in what he calls " conspicuous waste ". The wealthiest of all prove their wealthiness by wasting—spending lavishly and extravagantly on petty ends : the obverse of this is that the poor parade their poverty by spending meanly on important ends and thus producing tawdry results. His bitter invective is not quite a " theory " of our social organization, but there is so much truth in his contention that a society which claims to be civilized should take heed. A cultured race desires neither extravagance nor tawdriness : both are the marks of vulgarity and yet, when tawdriness is but the attempt of those without means to introduce colour into their lives it is rather harsh to condemn those who display it as vulgar.

With improved incomes, increased leisure, and better general education the extreme cases in which the standard of living is attained by a combination of the ugliest and nastiest of materials would be removed, but there is a general feeling throughout the community of ordinary people that there should be established by the State a far more extensive system of controls over the qualities of things produced. Business competition aims chiefly at the winning of markets by low

prices, and in the process it often leads to the degradation of quality; in the market for low quality goods it shows itself as the offer of inferior goods masquerading as superior goods at lower prices. The commercial principle *caveat emptor* throws the responsibility for judging the quality on to the purchaser.

An organization in which producers are specialists in a single or a few commodities and purchasers are, of necessity, not specialists in purchasing, gives power to the producers to use all the means which science places at their disposal for the purpose of deceiving. Recently there has been a concentration by business men on what is known as the art of salesmanship. It is true that the best types of business men have laid it down as a sound principle that firms should render satisfactory service to their customers, satisfactory personal attention and satisfactory qualities of goods. It must be remembered, however, that successful salesmanship ultimately is judged by returns of profit and, therefore, there is no guarantee that standards of goods will not, even with excellent salesmanship, fall to a low level where it pays. After all, the satisfactoriness of quality of service can only be judged by reference to price paid, and if price is low, quality may be low and yet service may be good! Salesmanship is not, by itself, a sufficient guarantee that purchasers will be properly served.

One might be tempted to suggest that the teaching of the art of salesmanship should be

balanced somewhat by instruction in the art of purchasing! Something might be done in this direction by the establishment of centres at which people are taught the methods of testing commodities or of judging them for quality. The battering of advertisement hoardings, the allurement of beautifully coloured pictures of things, the elegantly phrased description of goods in magazines, the " scientific " opinions expressed in newspapers under the gentle inspiration of advertisement revenue, produce an exchange atmosphere in which buyers of goods are hypnotized. We live in a scientific age, in which the special qualities of things or the special processes to which goods are subject are described in highly technical language: the ordinary man and woman knows nothing of the qualities of the various vitamins contained in food, knows nothing of the quantities of these things that he requires, knows nothing at all of the properties of ultra violet rays or infra-red rays but, under the smoke cloud of this technical jargon, he goes cheerfully to the counter and pays for what he does not know. In an age where we believe that almost any natural product can be artificially produced, " synthetically produced " becomes a term of recommendation: a " substitute ", that used to be regarded as " something worse ", is elevated to the dignity of an equal and, in some cases, even a superior.

To make all buyers proof against the expert producer and expert salesman would, in fact,

require that our population should be given a scientific education at least to the age of twenty-one. It cannot be done. Society, therefore, has to produce its own defensive measures. Something can be done by the wide dissemination of simple scientific knowledge by impartial teachers as, for instance, under the Board of Education's schemes for adult education, but this is inadequate. The Home Office must be given far wider powers than it possesses at present to call upon business firms to justify their own description of their goods. When foods are advertised as equal in certain ways to other well-known foods, when it is claimed that certain processes produce certain results, they should be made to show in what ways they are equal or in what ways they have been improved, and they should be compelled to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Home Office experts that what they claim to be true is true in fact. It is the expert alone who can check the expert, and the State must employ him. Everybody is aware of the fact that advertisements always praise, and everybody at times makes a conscious effort to resist the seductive appeals, but everybody weakens and yields in time unless he is rich enough to employ an expert, has leisure to become an expert, or can afford to buy the best qualities in which competition leads to improved qualities.

We have already, of course, control of the sale of poisons and we have legislation against false pretences, but the law needs to be made

considerably more strict. There are difficulties in carrying such suggestions into effect and there must always be a borderland between lies and truth, but there are vast areas in which effort by experts could be successfully made to classify the statements of advertisements at present issued.

Besides controlling the modes of appeal by advertisement, that is, besides making some attempt to suppress the subtle lie, the State should prevent the production of certain commodities below a certain standard quality. In the matter of foods one important minimum standard should be cleanliness. Much has been done by modern manufacturers of food stuffs to produce clean foods, but much remains to be done in the regulation, especially of the sales of unpacked foods in the filthy little shops that besmirch all the areas in which the poor live. Unclean food-stuffs are, we admit, cheaper as a rule than clean foods—as witness, for example, the difference in price between clean milk and dirty milk—but the poor should not be exposed to the temptation to choose. It is a strange world that makes it possible for business to claim cleanliness as a merit.

There is one commodity sold and hired in the market, which in connection with our present discussion, has a peculiar significance : we refer to housing. Sir Hilton Young has made a statement on this which will be famous for many a long year to come. " It is as wrong to sell bad housing as it is to sell tainted meat."

The house in which a family lives is a thing of fundamental importance. It is the stage on which the greater part of ordinary living is played ; it is the framework within which ordinary people are enclosed in the intimate relationships that are most precious. If the house is cramped for space it makes the presence of those it is otherwise a joy to be with a source of irritation ; it drives men and women out of the one place in the world where they should be able to find peace and quiet. A human being is a social being, but he can only be a satisfactory social being if he can withdraw at times to a secure solitude. To be for ever with others, to be for ever incapable of avoiding others, is to some a perpetual cause of conscious misery and to the remainder a perpetual cause of subconscious unrest and fidgeting.

That houses should be sanitary in the physical sense, everybody admits ; but to make all houses sanitary is not an ideal. In these days, the sanitariness of houses, like the cleanliness of food, should be accepted as a condition to which we do not refer ; anyone who objects to making houses sanitary that are insanitary ought, by now, to be regarded as a social " outsider ". When we speak of minimum housing conditions we should think in terms of internal room space, the number of rooms and the external garden space in which a house is set : we should also think in terms of the ease and convenience with which they can be managed.

There has been since the War, and owing

to the acute shortage of houses caused by the War, a very general widening of interest in this matter of the housing of ordinary people. There has, without doubt, been a considerable force of opinion behind the limitations on the number of houses per acre that public authorities have built and have allowed to be built. There has, however, not been so much eagerness to make sure of space provision within the houses and there is a real danger that we shall produce large quantities of houses that will, in a few years, be regarded as totally inadequate. It was a strange lack of understanding of our economic system that led successive governments to subsidize the building of houses below a certain maximum size; maximum sizes can be trusted always to look after themselves and it is minimum sizes alone that must be regulated.

In all the great periods of architecture—feudal, ecclesiastical, wealthy domestic—the characteristic of the work has been generosity of treatment and ampleness: in our present generation we see the same qualities in industrial and commercial architecture, but in the provision of houses the quality seems to be, in some ways, the precise opposite. In an age when productive capacity is phenomenal, we build the homes of people on what we are pleased to call economical lines but which, in reality, are niggardly lines. The difficulty which the middle and upper classes find in obtaining the cheap and abundant domestic service of old times has led to a concentration

of inventiveness on the means of dispensing with service, and this has had the effect of turning men's minds towards the discovery of the minimum space in which the maximum number of things can be done. This is no loss at all in the houses of the comfortably provided classes, but it is a dangerous principle on which to act when houses of the poorer and most numerous classes are being considered.

" Cute " little bedrooms that are too small for a doll, " cuter " little coal houses that hold no more than a bag of coal, " cutest " little tool sheds that hold no tools at all for the garden, come very near to being ridiculous. The other day, one of the greater newspapers issued a special housing " supplement ". Devoted chiefly to the housing of the few, rather than the many, it showed in one of its articles how rooms could be dispensed with in town flats. The writer, justifying the omission of the library, made the remark, " The library consists of three library tickets ! " It would seem that the principle of the " library ticket " has caught the imagination of some of our housing authorities—so far, that is, as the omission of space is concerned. If the idea were completely worked out to the point of providing the facilities by means of the ticket it would not matter, but there are limits to what can be done in this way. If houses are to be homes there should be ample space.

When the " stately homes " of England were

built, care was taken to set them in the midst of lovely scenery. Great parks were enclosed and lovely sylvan vistas were arranged. It was appreciated by those who built them that the glory of a house consisted in part in the glory of the setting. The desire for seclusion played its part, but it is clear from those which we have in the country at present that the desire for beautiful surroundings was the main objective. These houses are disappearing and there are those who moan over their departure.

Their disappearance is, to a large extent, inevitable: that is, as homes of the wealthy, they must disappear. The problem of the future, however, is to meet the need which so few hitherto have been able to satisfy, namely, the setting of the homes of ordinary people in beautiful surroundings. Castles and parks are not possible for all, since space and means are inadequate, but it is possible to design our towns so that our homes are set in beauty, and it is possible to preserve some of the glories of nature for the common enjoyment of all.

The "stately homes" of England housed those who were, in effect, the society of their days. They alone were the people who mattered and, in a peculiar way, their homes *were* England. All the rest was but a setting for their glory. To-day our society consists of all and the homes which are to be provided with a beautiful setting are the homes of all. This new conception of society involves us in a new conception of

house-building, a conception which is not simply of house-building but of town building.

In those old days the " park " contained the great house, the farm buildings, the labourers' homes, and the church. The places of work were tucked away as were the labourers' cottages, or they were designed so that they would add to the beauty of the " hall ". In these days the " cottages " assume a new importance and the " hall " must be regarded as a place which gives beauty to the cottage as the cottage does to the hall: they have both become of co-ordinate importance. The community is no longer the ' family ' with the ' people ' as dependents: the community is the people mutually dependent. There is no longer a single home which can be regarded as the pivot of society: society consists of all the homes. Your home must beautify my home and my home must beautify your home. The pivot of society is the community itself. We live in towns and not on estates.

The estate had the merit of unity and the town has unity. The estate was the eighteenth century conception and the town is the twentieth century conception. The nineteenth century was a period in which the ties that bound the people and their homes into estates were broken. Here and there were found signs of the new consciousness of town but, on the whole, the nineteenth century built with no sense of community. Town halls were built for the housing of officials: Government was necessary and offices had to

be found and these buildings suggested to some that they might be regarded as the embodiment of the corporate spirit. It is only recently, however, that we have seen attempts to embody the corporate spirit in the town itself.

A town, to us in the twentieth century, should not be regarded as a solid block of buildings, confined within the "walls" of a narrowly drawn boundary line. It should be regarded as an area including wide expanses of country. In the nineteenth century our local government areas developed into urban and rural districts. When a population centre became dense a line was drawn about it and it became a local government unit. To-day swift transport has converted the town into the centre of business activities but the community which the town was supposed to represent has spread itself far into the surrounding rural areas. The time has come when this fact must be recognized and the areas of local government should be made to coincide with the areas in which various local communities live. There should be no local government area that does not exercise authority over some part of the "country" around it. As an individual requires space, so does a community, and space means light, air, and distance.

It is an essential condition of a cultivated race that its towns should possess wide, green, open spaces; that its approaches should be broad tree-lined ways; its streets should show expanses of sky. Every town should be compelled at once

to prepare its plans of development and its plans of reconstruction for the future. The industrial areas should be marked out in advance, its shopping centres delimited and placed in convenient places. Sites for schools and churches should be indicated with a view to convenience and their designs approved with a view to the general scheme being made a thing of beauty.

In every town there should be ample provision of educational institutions, of art galleries, museums, assembly halls, recreation fields, and public gardens. The community is the macrocosmic individual and the individual's needs should find institutional expression in the community. In churches, men worship together; in art galleries, they admire the things of beauty together; in assembly halls, they talk together; in recreation fields, they play together; in educational institutions, they pursue knowledge together. In their own homes they do these things alone or with members of their families and their own particular friends. In the open spaces they may go alone or with their kind.

The industrial and commercial system in which everything is bought and sold, in which everything is private property, is a negation of the tendencies in men to be social beings. It simply is not true that men cannot enjoy things that are not their own personal and exclusive property. In any case a universal application of the "buying and selling" mode of obtaining access to things which men need results in a wide stripping of

men's opportunities for living. In some of our industrial areas the opportunities for social intercourse of a reasonable kind are absolutely lacking. The local public house, the cinema, the miserable working men's clubs with their dull ping-pong, darts, and billiard tables are the only alternatives to loafing in the streets. This lack of facilities is not due to lack of desires, it is not due even to the lack of conscious desires; it is due to the working of the industrial system.

Town planning or, rather, regional planning is an urgent need in a community which aims at producing a high level of culture. It is essential as a background. The beauty of a town or region must to some extent soak through the walls of the houses in which people live and accustom all to a certain standard. The conscious effort of a community is a stimulus to all the members of the community: they can all be made partners in the work of producing an effective result. We cannot take a person and "cultivate" him by putting him through a course of reading or a course of lectures; people are cultivated through contact with things that are beautiful. A community can, however, pursue a standard of culture quite deliberately, the effects of which on the individual are not consciously felt.

. . . . . .

And this is the burden of the story we have attempted to tell in this book. We have tried to show how the plain, ordinary man of our society

is prevented from growing to his full stature as a cultured person. The forces that prevent him doing so are strengthened by their success in preventing him. Poverty, overwork, lack of leisure, produce stunted lives, and these stunted lives are the cause of those who live them being prevented from acquiring the means and leisure to grow. Institutions have developed in our society tending to make the classification of men rigid and the wide differences of culture and manners have been used as evidence of some deep-seated biological differences in men. We are told that the successes and failures in industrial and commercial life are merely the expression of the working of the law of " survival of the fittest ". This book is a protest against that theory.

There are differences in men, there are even great differences in men, but there is no evidence to prove that there has been any significant " breeding out " of different species of men in our own particular race. Our social hierarchy is a social product and has no biological significance whatsoever, except, perhaps at the very extreme end of mental incapacity. As Professor J. B. S. Haldane recently expressed it, " There is no reason to think that if the rich had larger families the average intelligence would be raised." Nor is there any reason to think that there would be any enhancement of average moral standards of the race. Adam Smith stated that men are " much of a muchness " and he was probably wrong in the light of modern observation, but

the tendency of people to approach an average, unless there is some conscious or selective breeding—which there is not—is a fact which makes it imperative to act in many ways as if men were very similar.

Those who are honest with themselves are perfectly well aware of the fact that the plain ordinary man in all the general qualities of men is very much like the men who are in some particular way extraordinary. He has the same affection for his wife and for his children. He has the same joy in his friends. In the face of all the great mysteries of life and death he has the same amount of real understanding, lack of understanding, and awe.

When he is hungry he feels the pangs of hunger ; when he is hurt he feels the pains of his wounds. If hunger and wounds are the things he must suffer in some great endeavour he suffers them with the same resignation and cheerfulness that others do. If he makes endeavours as honestly as others he does not see why he should want when others do not.

He takes pride in work well done : he appreciates praise when he has attained success. His sense of shame is as acute as any other's and he hates anything in the nature of unmerited scorn. He knows the difference between a lie and truth as nearly as any of us ; he knows the difference between ugly and beautiful ; he knows what is meant by playing the game and he knows the meaning of a foul.

Ordinary men are not saints; nor are extraordinary men. And ordinary men are not sinners any more than are the extraordinary ones. They are saint and sinner, black and white, or just ordinary grey as most men are.

When they are removed a stage from the cramping effects of poverty by an income which is slightly in excess of the standard of their group they show the same tendencies that others show in the higher income groups: some are extravagant, but many develop the urbane and generous qualities we associate with the cultivated rich. When working men and working women have passed through the age when their families are dependent upon them they tend on the whole to settle into a quiet, cultured way of living; the everlasting worry and pinch of their middle and vigorous years produces in some an aggressiveness which is a natural response to a thwarting environment.

Speaking generally, plain, ordinary men and women are capable of very high levels of cultural attainment. There is a continual stream of young persons issuing from their ranks who do, in fact, attain the highest levels. This stream is not a wide one because the channel through which it flows to the income levels where they are possible is not a wide one. Given the leisure and the means they would, in general, produce the same standards of living as the more financially successful ones do to-day.

If this is so, then the conclusion is obvious.

The economic organization which produces and distributes the means of living must be made to operate so that a high standard of general culture can be attained. If our society is to be a society in reality as well as in name then all of its members must be recognized as eligible to the benefits of full membership.

An unfettered exchange system cannot bring this condition of things into existence. The State must interfere and establish the framework within which freedom to live can be determined by every individual himself. The State cannot do all, since the condition of any person's happiness is freedom, but the State can do much more than it is doing at present.

The State in fact, of course, is doing much, but a greater faith in its works is necessary. We have already decreed that men shall not starve and we have made provision in measure against the accidents of sickness and unemployment. We have old age pensions and pensions for widows and orphans. The conditions of work are regulated in factories, shops, and mines and there are certain provisions for securing the freedom of men to combine for the joint defence of their industrial rights. The principle of minimum standards is admitted in the laws ensuring the sanitariness of houses and the sale of untainted foods. In some industries the minimum wages are laid down and in others changes in wages are only possible through statutory boards. We have some regulation of hours of work.

Elementary education is provided free for all to the age of fourteen, secondary school education for some to the age of sixteen, and scholarships are granted to a small percentage to go on further to the universities, technical institutes, and schools of art of various kinds.

Town planning powers and facilities exist, libraries, museums, and art galleries exist in many towns and public parks, gardens, recreation grounds and such like institutions are familiar to most of the population of the country.

The beginnings have been made, but they have been made in grudging spirit. The time has come when some measure of generosity must be introduced. Plain, ordinary man has reached such a level of understanding of the physical possibilities of production that he demands a greater freedom to live. Standing as he does, day by day, beside the machines which pour forth goods hundreds of times as rapidly as ever man could do in early days, it is not to be wondered at that he asks that this power shall contribute more to his own betterment than it does.

The writer of this book does not believe that the ordinary man is enamoured of gigantic State organizations in which he becomes a civilian soldier of industry : nor does he believe that the ordinary man desires to take any definite part in the administration of industry, if his own particular function is something else. He desires, on the whole, a society whose foundation lies in individual freedom, but he desires that the State shall give

him an assurance that with a fair contribution of honest effort he shall attain a reasonable standard of living and shall be able to attain a social status which does not involve his being treated by others with any measure of contempt.

This measure of security and comfort, this level of social status, will require, however, a vast extension of what is ordinarily regarded as State interference with some liberties and a vast curtailment of what is ordinarily regarded as property rights. Rights of property and individual freedom have, then, to be regarded in a different way from that in which they have hitherto been regarded.

They need to be interpreted in the light of the general level of culture which they make possible.

To those who, standing by their vested interests, the curtailment of their freedom to bargain seems to be a curtailment of their natural rights, we must say that all morality is fundamentally a curtailment of freedom. Every moral code from the Decalogue to the Golden Rule imposes restraints. The social good demands them and the refusal to accept the restraints is a denial of the rights of society. The opposition to social reformers who propose these curtailments is the opposition which every minister of religion meets when he descends from the discussion of the undesirability of sin in general to the discussion of the undesirability of particular sins. We all agree that it is wrong to do wrong; we disagree about what is wrong.

Here we claim that the greatest social wrong is committed when men are not allowed to be men.

To those who speak of property rights as natural rights we must say that all rights are socially sanctioned freedoms to use resources. There is no absolute right of property in anything. We only enjoy those freedoms which are not regarded as destructive of society; no society can tolerate the freedom of an individual or a group of individuals to thwart its own freedom. The State is not a police authority concerned only with the preservation of those rights which individuals have hitherto enjoyed; it is the administrator of justice. Justice is not that which is declared in law courts; judges merely administer the law. Justice is declared in Parliament, in the councils of State; it is legislation and the high purpose of legislation is to preserve the stability of the social organization which is to preserve the well-being of the body corporate. This it can only do when it presides over such orderings of the social resources that a man is free to live in comfort, security, and peace and is able to walk the earth unconscious of his dignity or his lack of it, since it is not challenged by other men.

THE END