

**TEXT FLY WITHIN
THE BOOK ONLY**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_152604

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Osmania University Library

Call No. 378.99

Accession No. 1385

Author L 67 P

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE

BY THE SAME AUTHORS

The English Middle Classes

PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE

by

ROY LEWIS
& *ANGUS MAUDE*



PHOENIX HOUSE LTD
LONDON

*This book is copyright
in all countries signatory to the Berne
Convention. It may not be reproduced either whole or
in part without written permission. Application
should be made in the first place to
Phoenix House.*

Made 1952 in Great Britain
Printed at Bristol by Western Printing Services Limited
for *Phoenix House Limited*, 38 William IV Street,
Charing Cross, London WC2
First published 1952

CONTENTS

Chapter

I. WHAT IS HAPPENING?	
1. The Age of the Expert	2
2. Effect on Professions	4
3. New Professions for Old?	7
4. What lies ahead?	9
II. FROM CLERIC TO EXPERT	
1. Doctor, Priest, Lawyer, Architect	14
2. Professions grow as the Church declines	17
3. Growth of Professional Institutions	19
4. Industrial Revolution: Victorian Reform	23
5. The Servants of Gradgrind and Dombey	28
6. The Coming of Examinations	31
III. WE'RE ALL SPECIALISTS NOW	
1. Psychology and Technology	34
2. The Scientists arrive	35
3. The Engineers specialize	37
4. Doctors and the Hospitals	39
5. The Management Movement	43
6. Growth of Professional Trade Unionism	46
7. Rising in the World	48
IV. WHAT IS A PROFESSION?	
1. The Basis of a Profession	53
2. Attributes of the Professional	55
3. The Meaning of Professional Ethics	58
4. The Professional Organization	64
5. The Threat to Independence	69
V. THE ECONOMICS OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	
1. Plans and Planners	75
2. The Cost	77
3. State Intervention	79
4. 'Social Justice'	82
5. Economic Effects	87
VI. THE STATE AS CLIENT	
1. The Services	92
2. The Anatomy of Frustration	94
3. Professionals at County Hall	100

VII. PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE IN BUSINESS	
1. Profit and Trade in Professional Life	107
2. Civilizing Business Life	110
3. Is Management a Profession?	115
4. Training for Enterprise	118
VIII. THE IMPACT OF NATIONALIZATION	
1. Professions at the Mercy of Monopoly	125
2. Centralization, Trade Unionism, and Morale	128
3. The Chance for the Administrative Type	134
IX. THE DISAPPEARING CLERGY	
1. The Anglican Church	138
2. Dilemma of the Church	141
3. Priest and Congregation	142
4. Church Mice	144
5. Quality and Quantity	146
6. Church and Welfare	148
X. THE INDIVIDUALIST IN TROUBLE	
1. Artist and Patron	152
2. Overcrowding and Unemployment	156
3. Commercial Patronage	161
4. Individualists' Trade Unions	163
5. Trusting to Luck	167
XI. THE SOCIALIZED PROFESSIONS	
1. The Essence of 'Socialization'	173
2. The National Health Service	175
3. Dentists	186
4. Opticians	189
5. Pharmacists	194
6. Medical Auxiliaries	196
7. Nurses	198
8. Schoolteachers	200
9. Lawyers	206
XII. EDUCATING THE EXPERT	
1. The Failure of Technical Specialization	211
2. Technologists and Technicians	216
3. University or Institute?	220
4. Wanted—Administrators	222
5. Needed—Teachers	225

XIII. REWARDS AND COSTS

1. Cost of University	233
2. Training Costs	236
3. Salaries and Incomes	239
4. Professional Earnings	242
5. Are they enough?	250
6. Expenses	252
7. Old Age and Retirement	255

XIV. PROSPECT

1. Full Employment for Technologists	260
2. The Tradition of Private Practice	261
3. The Preservation of Private Practice	265
4. The Challenge of Administration	270
5. Working Together	272

Appendix	275
----------	-----

Index	278
-------	-----

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are deeply indebted to officials of many of the professional institutions and organizations mentioned in this book or listed in the appendix for generously accorded advice and information, as well as to many professional men and women who discussed their problems with us in a private capacity. Neither institutions nor individuals, of course, are in any degree responsible for the opinions expressed in this book which are entirely those of the authors. It would be invidious to mention the names of those who have helped us, but we must record our special debt to Dr H. J. T. Ellingham for permission to use the diagram on pp. 240-1, first published in the Journal of the Royal Institute of Chemistry, Part IV, August 1949, and to Col. Alan H. Maude for reading the proofs and Mr E. I. Lewis for preparing the index.

London, August 1952

R.L.
A.M.

CHAPTER I

What is Happening?

'The fact of progress is written plain and large on the page of history; but progress is not a law of nature. The ground gained by one generation may be lost by another.'

H. A. L. FISHER, *History of Europe*

'While on the one side we accurately estimate the danger with which we are threatened . . . , we must recollect on the other hand what it is we have at stake, what it is we have to contend for. It is for our property, it is for our liberty, it is for our independence. . . .'

WILLIAM PITT (1803)

'To crush what is spiritual, moral, human . . . in man, by specializing him; to form mere wheels of the great social machine, instead of perfect individuals; to make society and not conscience the centre of life—this is the dominant drift of our epoch.'

HENRI AMIEL

TO BE A PROFESSIONAL man or woman to-day is to live with uncertainty. For those who, progressing from secondary school to technical, training, or correspondence college, have achieved recognized professional status from a family background of manual labour, this uncertainty may be blended with the hope that drew them on. But for others, and in particular for that almost hereditary professional aristocracy which is a peculiarly British institution, the dominant component is uneasiness, if not actual fear.

This fear is not simply for the future standing and material comfort of professional men themselves and their children. Other and greater possessions are at stake: a valued culture; complicated or subtle techniques, whose development and intensive application require peculiar incentives and particular conditions of life; a tradition of self-examining integrity and self-forgetful service which is believed to be irreplaceable.

This heritage can be held to be of no great account. The culture may be thought too exclusive, if not wholly irrelevant to the harsh needs of a faltering economy. The formerly sheltered upper-middle class existence may be represented as an intolerable affront to the 'under-privileged'. Evidence that the professional tradition has been

neither universally followed nor invariably conducive to progress may lead to its dismissal as a pious fraud—and to even more pious promises of a finer tradition of bureaucratic ‘service to the community’. The propagation of such arguments deepens the uneasiness of the professions; and indeed it is hard to believe that this is no part of the intention of the propagators. The ostentatious whetting of a knife will often produce a change of heart in the intended victim which makes the use of the instrument unnecessary.

This study, however, is intended neither as a political essay nor as a plea for the victims of real or imaginary wrongs. The professions face problems which may be harder to solve than those of the levelling effects of redistributive taxation and the slow or sudden dissolution of patrimony by capital levy, death duties, or inflation. Indeed, it may be that the over-riding problem of the professions is no less than that of western economies and modern societies themselves.

1. THE AGE OF THE EXPERT

Our community is ‘run’ by specialists and experts. While their prime task is to keep the machine running, they also seek, by inventions and by technical and administrative refinements, to increase its efficiency. In this they are not uniformly successful. Their teamwork is spasmodic, so that frequently the energies of one group of experts have to be directed to palliating the secondary effects of actions taken by another group. A community, a social organization, is very different from a machine. As machines are improved, they may also be simplified; their problems are studied as a whole, and their designers examine in detail every possibility of bettering their performance. But the concerted efforts of the experts who ‘run’ society rarely tend towards any simplification or even standardization; they result continually in greater size and complexity.

The ‘common man’, to the gratification of whose desires the organization is now directed, becomes less and less able to understand it; dependent on the experts, his attitude is a mixture of imitation and mistrust. The extension and complication of the machine provokes a search for more and more professional and managerial men and women; and, since the population of western countries is no longer rising rapidly, the effect is to engage in professional occupations an ever higher proportion of the people. In Britain this proportion is probably five times as great as it was a hundred years ago.

The economy is called on to deliver an ever-higher ‘standard of life’,

mainly thought of in terms of the material things which modern technology and production engineering can create. These are put into the hands not of a small circle of prosperous, educated, and comparatively cultured people, but of the masses in industrial conurbations.¹ This 'standard of life' includes not only food and raiment, and all else that can be displayed behind plate-glass windows, but health (as far as medical care and scientific treatment can secure it), longevity, education, and information. Some measure of safety must also be provided, through the arming of the nation against its enemies.

Yet the imperious demands for 'progress' insist that these requirements be met without the necessity of harder or longer periods of manual work. Indeed, except during times of national crisis so acute that the dangers are plain to all, the prevailing demand is for still more leisure. The individual, however, is disinclined to exert himself to any active effort for the employment of his leisure. He remains avid of new sensations, but his attitude appears to become increasingly passive. The experts hasten to see that he is distracted, soothed, and when necessary psychologically 'adjusted'. On top of a vast machine for creating wealth and leisure there is superimposed another for using up that leisure.

The result is a demand for more and more experts: scientists, technologists, administrators, instructors—even such unscientific people as artists and writers have a certain place in the scheme of things. Before the second world war there were times when employment could not be found for all the professional people who were being trained. To-day demand outruns supply.

Can this process continue indefinitely? In the past it has been assumed, perhaps too lightly, that it could. It has been thought that a continual increase in the proportion of scientific, technical, and administrative staffs—that is to say, of 'on-cost' workers, both in government and in industry—would always result in an increase in labour productivity sufficient to enable a smaller proportion of manual workers to produce more goods and services in a shorter time. It was also believed (nor was there, before the war, any particular reason to doubt it) that the reserve of young men and women sufficiently intelligent to be trained for the professions or administration was large enough to take care of any likely increase in demand.

To-day it is open to question whether increasing complexity in the administration and organization of society, at least in Britain, will of itself result in (or even be accompanied by) an increase in productivity adequate to sustain the enlarged superstructure. Even if it were, it is

open to doubt if the available brainpower will run to it. In Britain, a hundred years ago, there were more than a dozen men and women of working age for each one over 65. To-day there are but six, and in 1975 there will be only four.¹ At the same time, more of the individual's working life is consumed by specialist training. While many boys, for example, take the equivalent of the First M.B. at their secondary schools, they may not become fully qualified medical specialists until they are over 30 (though doing useful work during the latter years of the training period). There is not only an absolute shortage of physicists, so that many grammar schools cannot secure physics teachers at all, but there is also a shortage of first-rate men for top research jobs; this is at least partly due to the increasing length and difficulty of the training, which will in turn diminish the supply of teachers at every level. Finally, an absolute limit is set to the field of recruitment by the normal human intelligence curve.* Before the war it could be statistically 'proved'² that our reserves of intelligent young people capable of profiting from a university education were large enough to provide four or five times as many students as were then finding places. To-day, when the 1939 student population has not even been doubled, doubts are being expressed as to whether the quality of students is good enough.

The fact is that our qualified experts are recruited from the upper quartile of the nation's brainpower, and we have no means of increasing the proportion of young people with high intelligence. On the contrary, Sir Cyril Burt and Sir Godfrey Thomson have been urging us to face the prospect that the differences in fertility between different social classes and 'occupational groups' may be tending to reduce it.³

2. EFFECT ON PROFESSIONS

So far, it might appear that the law of supply and demand would be operating to the economic advantage of the professional and managerial classes. On the whole, however, this has not been the case, the reason being the twentieth-century political trend towards collectivism—a process immensely accelerated during six years of war and six more of Socialist government. For Socialism, while it tends greatly to increase the demand for experts, also results in a deterioration of their economic position. There is first, of course, the deliberate fiscal redistribution of income; but there is also a less obvious, though very real,

* This is a Gaussian or 'cocked-hat' curve for both sexes, though flatter for men than for women.

effect. In theory, when Socialism has resulted in a demand for administrators and other professional people which exceeds the available supply, the supply should be stimulated by an increase in the rewards offered for the jobs. But, beyond a certain point, this is just what Socialists cannot offer. For one thing, their doctrine makes them averse from aggravating differences of income; even more important, the money available to the state is limited. Yet, when financial stringency sets an upper limit to the amount which can be spent on doctors, or teachers, or scientists, Socialist administrators do not then proceed to limit their recruitment to the numbers of first-class professional men and women who can be secured at a given total cost; they cannot do this, because to do so would be to limit the range of benefits promised to the public. Their solution is to provide the promised quantity of benefits, but of a rather lower quality than had been expected; and the method of economizing is to lower the real salaries—and therefore the qualifications—of their professional employees. This is done, of course, not by actually reducing money salaries but by allowing them to lag gradually farther and farther behind the rising cost of living.

Thus, in order to allow the proportion of 'experts' in the country to go on rising, we have to recruit them from lower and lower levels of intelligence. Even so, it is still necessary to try to increase the educational facilities available for training them. As a result, since schools and training colleges are fighting a losing battle for teacher recruits against the higher salaries offered by industry and government departments, more and more children and young people tend to receive an education of slightly declining quality.

With every growth in the complication of government and of economic and social organization, new bodies of administrators have to be formed, in addition to the numbers of professional advisers and other experts. Sometimes a professional man scarcely knows whether he is a civil servant or not. There are the nationalized industries and a whole range of government and semi-government enterprises employing technologists, engineers, scientists, accountants, and lawyers. There is a Professional and a Scientific Civil Service; as we shall see, however, the State's arm reaches far beyond them now.

'At present . . . the distinction between this new-style civil service and the old is not merely academic. It is real enough, but the difficulty is to define the limits of the two. Clearly the pit boy and the Permanent Secretary to the Treasury belong to different professions, but who could say as confidently that the work of the high official at the Transport Commission and that of the assistant secretary at the Ministry of Trans-

port is so different, or justify the title "civil servant" to the clerk in the Ministry of Fuel and Power, but not to his brother in the Coal Board?"⁴

As long as the state employs only a proportion of the members of a profession, its powers to depress its standards, increase its numbers, or control its organization are limited; but these developments have, in the last dozen years, given the state power over the professions of medicine, social work, and natural science such as it never had; it has vastly increased its grip on school-teaching, and is rapidly extending its control over the livelihoods of many types of engineer and technologist. Every extension may tend to weaken the alternative, and weaken the collective strength of the profession—and thence, perhaps, of every other profession.

So much effort goes into the business of making the organization of society more complex (partly because of the cult of 'Bigness' in industry and government, and partly because more and more services to the community are provided on an organized communal basis), that there are fewer and fewer people left with the time and the intellectual equipment needed to enable them to stand back from the organization and to examine it dispassionately with a view to influencing or guiding the whole direction of its development. Thus the immense complication of society proceeds virtually unchallenged. Churches, universities, politicians, newspapers, and reviews are alike preoccupied with immediate and specific problems. There is always a crisis, demanding an *ad hoc* solution and obscuring the possibility of a long view ahead.

Have we perhaps already created a form of society which is beyond the power of people of average ability to run, without mastering the technique (if there is one) of increasing the proportion of the population with more than the present average of ability? Professor Collingwood wrote of the government of the late Roman Empire,

'... where all executive power had been transferred to the officials of the centralized and bureaucratic state, to the suppression of local initiative and civic spirit. Early Roman history has been described as the history of ordinary people doing extraordinary things. In the late empire it took an extraordinary man to do anything at all, except carry on a routine; and ... the empire had for centuries devoted itself to the breeding and training of ordinary men. . .'⁵

This is surely the problem of post-war Britain, where the cult of Bigness has been superimposed on the age of the Common Man. Rockefeller once said that 'it is the task of management to enable

ordinary men to do the work of extraordinary men', and one of the most pronounced features of the present-day professional situation is the attempt to train managers capable of the feats of organizing genius now needed. The dilemma confronting almost every profession is whether its members shall concentrate on 'strictly professional' work and lose their power to direct it, or learn administration so as to be able to remain in control of it, thus losing the time to practise it. Administration is devouring professional talent at a phenomenal rate: every profession faces the problem of producing enough managers and organizers.

In these conditions, the ever-growing employment of women is not surprising. Women are wanted on the factory floor to replace scarce manpower and in the offices to 'keep the paper moving', but also to do professional chores. But for the tapping of the female labour-market, it is hard to see whence the needed brainpower would have come. Even so, the supply of young women is falling off. There are not enough women teachers; in nursing, the shortage of women capable of training to the levels needed by modern medical science has not only limited the National Health Service, but has made it advisable to introduce the 'assistant nurse'.

The greater part of the auxiliary work of the health service is done by women. Few professions remain in which women are not readily accepted if they can 'make the grade'—and there is a growing range of routine, supervisory, or assistant grades in science, in the various hybrid technologies, even in engineering. The idea has grown up that it is a waste of an intelligent girl for her to illuminate a home and a large family with her intelligence, when it is so badly needed in the office, consulting-room or lab. And it is a waste—if social services are all-important, while motherhood and housewifery are menial jobs for the untalented.

3. NEW PROFESSIONS FOR OLD?

Many of the women's professional jobs are, in fact, highly specialized. So, too, is a growing range of semi-professional functions, performed by people who are more (yet, in a real sense, less) than skilled workmen, but wholly lack the academic background of lawyer, doctor, or scientist. They merge with the professions, and desire to be professional. The common man, despite the extravagant idolatry of his worshippers, is not content to remain common, if he sees a chance of something better. He is anxious to reserve a seat on the band-waggon of the managerial revolution. The social urge towards the 'respectability' of

a white-collar job is now reinforced by a desire to become a member of the new ruling (because so largely official-paid) class. But everyone is not clever enough, well-enough educated, or possessed of enough capital (either of finance or of patience) to qualify as a member of a learned profession. The next best thing is to upgrade whatever job one happens to be doing to the *formal* status of a profession. This involves setting up an institute or association, with a printed list of aims and objects, including always a reference to the need to raise the status of the calling and protect the public from incompetent or unscrupulous practitioners; an examination (which is, to begin with, voluntary); and an assortment of letters designate, for attachment to the names of those who feel aspiring enough to pay a few guineas subscription for them. We may yet see a Bill presented to Parliament for the establishment of a British Hairdressing Board, with compulsory registration of hairdressing technicians. In fact, many functions with only very little more intellectual content do pass themselves off as professional. Even so, in the fullness of time, may Jno. Smith, Chimney Sweep, become John Smith, A.I.D.D.*

This spread of professionalism was accorded a warm welcome by Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders and Mr P. A. Wilson twenty years ago. They believed that not only would all those doing specialized intellectual work, from statistics to librarianship, achieve professional status, but that business administration, though a generalized technique, was destined to become a profession, as personal concern with profit diminished in proportion as organizations grew in size. They added, 'It may be that, while the extension of professionalism upwards and outwards will be fairly rapid, its extension downwards, though gradual and almost imperceptible, will be continuous. Thus, taking the long view, the extension of professionalism over the whole field seems in the end not impossible.'⁶ They saw this process as full of promise for education, co-operation, and the leadership of a democracy. But to-day, it may be questioned whether the growth of the outward forms of professionalism has been accompanied by the cultivation of the professional spirit; whether the trend towards replacement of independent practitioners by salaried employees or expert civil servants has not weakened the influence for good which the professions can exert in national life; whether a narrow vocational specialism has not usurped the true nature of a 'learned profession', and lowered the respect accorded to professional men, besides cheapening the word profession itself; whether nationalization of industry has promoted,

* Associate of the Institution of Domestic Decarbonizers.

and not retarded, professional interests in the several callings which nationalized industries now engross or largely control; whether, as state power grows, it is not rather the professional trade union than the professional institution which becomes the more important organ of collective opinion—the emphasis having shifted decisively from what we give to what we get.

In these circumstances, it is necessary to re-examine the attributes and demarcations of a genuine profession. It can no longer be assumed that the adoption of professional status and organization by a body of workers will necessarily be in their own long-term interests, while it can often be plausibly argued that the public interest is bound to suffer. This is particularly the case where the calling is of a largely commercial nature—which in the past has been thought to preclude professional status. Though the adoption of professional organization is advocated on the grounds that the ruling body will be better able to regulate the conduct and qualifications of members, to improve the service to the public, the prime motives are generally the desire to raise status and increase remuneration by some measure of restriction. It is a question whether further restrictions in our commercial life are in the public interest. Does anyone doubt that one quality pre-eminently needed in our national life to-day is the quality of enterprise? that, lacking it, we cannot sustain 50,000,000 people on these islands, living, as we do, upon trading and manufacturing margins? But what profession can provide it, what examination test it, what syllabus train it, what association makes rules for it? Do we not need the positive and negative of professionalism *and* commercialism? Might not too much of the one—or of the other—ruin our precarious economy?

4. WHAT LIES AHEAD?

The spread of professionalism is a phenomenon which members of old and established professions can no longer ignore; and indeed it is evident that the question of what constitutes a profession, and what place any profession takes in the professional hierarchy, is one of great interest to-day. It is at least as possible that the status, and indeed competence, of the senior professions will be impaired, as that their influence will improve the quality of the newer 'professions'. Specialization and fragmentation of intellectual techniques may have the same tendency. There have already been complaints about the 'dilution' of individual professions, a process which is liable to end in economic disadvantage to their members, as well as loss of status.

But may not the dilution of the whole body of professions, by the ferment of professional status on a host of callings which neither conform to the requirements of professional organization nor can show a long record of public service, devalue all that is most worthy—and to-day most threatened—in professional tradition?

Are professional people destined to be regarded—as Mr Bevan made it clear that he regarded doctors—simply as workers with special skills, more elaborate than, but not different in kind from, the skills of lathe-setters and draughtsmen? Is medicine, for example, to be relegated to the fourteenth-century craft status of surgery, whose practitioners' gild merged with that of the barbers and marched in procession with those of the masons, shoe-makers, and glaziers? Is the solicitor to be thought of as carrying on a trade in principle no different from that of the corn-chandler or cobbler? Alternatively, are they to become simply officials (or even, in some cases, super-officials), using their techniques to modify the conduct, and experiment with the reactions, of the salariat and proletariat? Or are they the guardians of a tradition, humane and Christian, of study and service to their fellows, whether this be based on a confidential and fiduciary relationship with individual clients or on the voluntary sacrifice of extra monetary gain in the interests of the community?

If so, if a peculiar virtue resides in the professional tradition, and some finer, fuller quality of life and service is to be expected in return for the enjoyment of professional standing, then more thought should be devoted to the question of how that tradition can be upheld and that standing protected. If the standing is degraded, will the same quality of service be evoked? Does it accord with professional status that a doctor's patients should be able to bully him with threats of appeals to Regional Hospital Boards and official Executive Councils if he does not unhesitatingly provide particular drugs or certificates of illness? when a colliery manager, legally responsible for men's safety in a dangerous undertaking, dismisses a miner for striking him only to find the insubordinate worker reinstated by Divisional Headquarters 'to avoid a dispute'? when a Merchant Navy officer, similarly responsible for life, finds a deckhand who strikes him on duty is let off with a ten-shilling fine? If this status is so degraded, will it be possible to entrust grave legal responsibilities to professional men?

How important is professional tradition, and what does it achieve, even in terms of 'productivity'? If it is all-important, callings with no recognizable body of tradition cannot properly be accorded professional status. If it is not, if a doctor's altruism, a lawyer's integrity, a clergy-

man's selflessness, a soldier's devotion, an engineer's thoroughness are 'all my eye' and window-dressing, then may not this status be profitably granted to any and every calling? To foremen in factories, to advertising agents, to private detectives, to certificated grocers, to firemen, to policemen, to beauticians, to farmers and horticulturalists with B.Ags., to anyone who has served any sort of apprenticeship in any skill from welding to armature-winding? In the hope that professional organization will improve the quality of their work, the respectability of their private lives, and their reluctance to use the strike weapon or social blackmail to swell their pay-packets, why should we not accord professional status and organization to all of them?

If there is a valuable tradition, important qualities of service and trust to be safeguarded in medicine and the law, how far is it possible to discover the same things in engineering and technology? If, in any vocation, these elements are barely recognizable, ought we to accord it a professional status at all? Is the portrait or landscape painter a professional person? or the sculptor? They may work to commission, but they may (and usually do) produce works 'on spec.' Does calling the shop a gallery make the artist a professional man rather than a craftsman? If the sculptor is an artist and therefore professional, what of the goldsmith, who designs and executes his own work? If the goldsmith, why not the blacksmith, turning out wrought-iron gates? The architect was once a master-mason, and now is often the employee of a building-firm, or a chartered structural engineer straddling various worlds of art, craftsmanship, technology, and administration. Is it only the R.I.B.A. and the Architects' Registration Council which make him a professional man? If dealing in stocks and shares is a professional calling, why not dealing in fish? Or, to put it more plausibly, if the Stock Exchange secured a charter, would stockbrokers be professional men, while rubber brokers remained traders? The bank manager has a confidential and fiduciary relationship to his clients: is he professional? He calls them his customers, and deals in money for profit in a subordinate capacity for a joint-stock company which distributes dividends to stockholders.

To the worried doctor or lawyer, some of these questions may seem remote from immediate professional anxieties. But the doctor or lawyer feels his status in society is threatened: is he sure what his rightful status is? It cannot be a matter of indifference to him what other bodies of men lay claim to comparable status; nor can the grounds on which they base their claims, or what they mean by that status. What problems has he in common with other professions,

and what joint action is possible? If several professions can co-operate to lay before the Millard Tucker Committee evidence on the effect of present-day taxation on the reserves of professional partnerships, ought there not to be many other forms of joint action? What can the engineers learn from the organized measures which the surveyors have taken to preserve the unity of their profession in the face of increasing specialization? What can the doctors, struggling with bureaucracy in the Health Service, learn from the experiences of the school teachers? Have both, perhaps, a message of warning and advice to give to the legal profession, now working out a state service of legal aid?

Are all these people 'experts', to be fitted by the state administrator like jigsaw pieces into a pre-destined pattern of social and economic welfare services? Have they brought this impression of their nature on themselves, or on one another? To what extent should their tradition of public service compel them to acquiesce in the seemingly endless process of income redistribution and inflation? If the dentists or opticians can enjoy a windfall profit from a sudden excess of demand over supply, would other professions be justified in restricting entry to create a similar situation? If dentists and miners can exploit similar situations in identical ways, and the actors may enforce a closed shop while the Durham County Council may not, would the doctors be justified if they threatened to react to their grievances in the same way as dockers do to theirs? How far should monopoly be sought, and how far exploited? What should be the attitude of professional people, with their growing battery of wage-bargaining bodies, towards the narrowing of income differentials within and between various callings? Are schoolteachers, whose task it is to prepare children for useful lives, justified in their indignation at the higher starting wages of policemen, who preserve the children's lives in the streets, and, if need be, in the homes of drunken or vicious parents?

To these questions we shall seek answers, or at least partial answers, by tracing common causes in the development of our society, leading to comparable results in different professions. Nobody who studies the history of the professions can doubt the influence which they have had in moulding society, but it is doubtful whether to-day they are exerting any conscious directing influence. Times have changed, and methods must change with them. If professional people stand aside from politics, refusing to find means of playing their immensely important part in developing the structure (as distinct from the detailed organization) of society, they may find their professions at the mercy of society—or, worse still, of a secular and authoritarian state.

Professional people cannot ignore the problems with which they are faced; they must seek solutions to them. Those who claim to possess something of vital importance to the community should be prepared, not only to state clearly what it is, but also to fight to preserve it for the community's good. It is not unimportant that what is best in the tradition of British justice, in the ideal of the family doctor, and in the boasted integrity of British banking, should be preserved. What ideals and attitudes to right and wrong will the next generation of professional people inherit from parents and seniors? Does that not depend upon what those parents and seniors, together with university and technical college teachers, are doing and thinking now? If every profession's work is to become a technical routine, exercised by a craftsman for a wage, or even by a state functionary, specialized as an ant, will it matter? If it does matter, whose will be the fault?

The first step in answering these questions is to see how we came to the present pass, good or bad. Most professional people know—they certainly *should* know—the history of their own profession. But it is necessary to know, briefly, how the professions grew and influenced the organization of society together; this synoptic history we shall try to give briefly in the next two chapters.⁹

NOTES

1. Cf. *Report of Royal Commission on Population*, H.M.S.O., 1949, pp. 85–8.
2. E.g. Grace Leybourne and Kenneth White, *Education and the Birth-Rate*, 1940.
3. Cyril Burt, 'Family Size, Intelligence, and Social Class', in *Population Studies*, September 1947; G. H. Thomson, *The Trend of National Intelligence*, 1947.
4. T. A. Critchley, *The Civil Service Today*, 1951, p. 141.
5. R. G. Collingwood, *Roman Britain*, 1932, p. 307.
6. Alexander Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, 1933, pp. 493–4.
7. Cf. *British Medical Journal*, 28 April and 30 June 1951.
8. Acton Society Trust, *The Extent of Centralization*, 1951, Pt. II, p. 36.
9. A general study of the professions' part in history has yet to be written in the fullness that the subject deserves; for the individual history of each profession, *The Professions*, by Carr-Saunders and Wilson, is the standard work.

CHAPTER II

From Cleric to Expert

'We trust our health to the physician, our fortune and sometimes our life and reputation to the lawyer and attorney. Such confidence could not safely be reposed in people of a very mean or low condition. Their reward must be such as may give them that rank in the society which so important a trust requires.'

ADAM SMITH, *Wealth of Nations*

'One figure is even more important than all the energy of master men that make cities grow out of the ground and alter the landscape . . . the Engineer, the priest of the Machine, the man who knows it. The very existence of industry depends upon the existence of a hundred thousand talented rigorously schooled brains that command the technique and develop it onward and onward. . . . When, and only when the crop of recruits for this army fails . . . industry must flicker out in spite of all that managerial energy and the workers can do.'

SPENGLER, *The Decline of the West*

THE HISTORY of the professions is the history of specialization—and of the realization that breadth of experience, liberality of education, and an understanding of fundamentals must somehow be preserved in professional training if the specialist is to be adequate to his task. It is a chapter in social history which opens with the voice of the Church relating every human activity and technique to the spiritual theme; it closes (if it can yet be said to have closed) with a babel of experts trying to find a common theme to impart unity and purpose to their varied efforts. It starts with the experts in awe of the Church, passes through a period in which the Church is in awe of the experts, and now seems to be reaching a point at which the professional sociologist is beginning to talk to the experts as the Church once did.

1. DOCTOR, PRIEST, LAWYER, ARCHITECT

It is usually said that the professions have arisen out of the technological prowess and complexity of modern civilization; professional people are the executives of applied science. That is true of most of the professions as we know them now. But some have a longer lineage than the Church, if not than religion, and have always enjoyed inde-

pendence of it. Though it is supposed that in the early middle ages Norman monks supplemented the Saxon herbal with Galen's prescriptions and Aristotle's physiology, Dr Coulton¹ warns us that 'the belief that the monks and friars were the doctors of the Middle Ages is a gigantic delusion'. We early meet the English physician as a recognizable character, with some of the learning of the mediaeval university behind him, and instructed by his textbooks how to deport himself before patients, Mother Church, and professional colleagues: 'First it behoveth him that will profit in this craft that he will set God afore evermore in all his works, and evermore call meekly with heart and mouth his help; and sometime help from his earnings poor men after his might, that they by their prayers may get him grace by the Holy Ghost. And that he be not temerarious or boastful in his sayings or deeds; and abstain he from much speech, and most among great men; and answer he slyly to things asked, that he be not y-take [caught out] in his words.'²

Already physicians and surgeons were specialized; the former could cast up their eyes to Heaven when the worst unaccountably occurred, but the latter were discountenanced by the Church for 'blood-shedding'. Nonetheless the barbers and surgeons were organized in a craft guild to prosecute untrained men from practising 'to the scandal of such skilful and discreet men as practise the art of surgery'.³ All guilds, whether of barber-surgeons or fishmongers, sought to enforce the 'closed shop'; professional people and their associations have long racial memories of the desirability of exclusiveness and self-government in the organization of their mysteries. On the sea, men have always escaped to some degree from social control, but even the venerable profession of master-mariners was organized in the Middle Ages; indeed navigation and discipline were already subject to statutory regulation. Among Richard I's regulations was that he who 'gave but a blow with his fist without bloodshedding . . . should be plunged several times over head and ears in the water'.⁴

Writers, alone, were unprotected by any guild, and accordingly entered from the first into onerous contracts: 'The same Robert hath promised by his faith that, if he should desist from writing, continuing and finishing the work aforesaid, he shall be kept in prison and in iron bonds . . . never to go forth until the said work shall have been altogether completed'.⁵ The secular professional writer—author, poet, and journalist—is first discernible in the clerks who, while taking the minor orders, did not proceed to the priesthood; if there was no benefice available to them they could marry and continue as lay parish

clerks (often more learned than the vicars they served); or go into the civil service (like Chaucer and Hoccleve); or live on the patronage of some feudal superior. But by 1313 the public's patronage was large enough to support the profession of acting, for in that year it is recorded that the Bishop of Salisbury warned playgoers that 'all commit mortal sin who give any of their goods to buffoon or jester or aforesaid play-actors; for to give to play-actors is no other than to throw our money away'.⁶

Thus the professions began to grow partly from within the Church, partly out of the craft guilds. Architects appear early in the twelfth century as master-masons of such renown that they pocketed fees which took them right out of the class of masons, and indeed they were awarded precedence in the medieval order.⁷ Surveying and estate management began in the monasteries, and surveyors of the King's Work are mentioned in state papers as early as 1100.⁸ The secular legal profession, on the other hand, arose not from guilds, but out of the growth of the common law courts and the Court of Chancery. Quickly the law men entrenched themselves behind procedure and technicality, made themselves indispensable, and set themselves to widen their practices at the expense of the canon lawyers.⁹ 'Lawe is so lordlich and loth to maken ende', complained Langland; but from the outset the legal, like the medical, profession threw up humane practitioners ready to help the poor at the expense of the rich. 'Robin-hooding' goes a long way back. 'He that spendeth his speche and speketh for the pore, shall fere no devel at his deth-day', commended Langland.¹⁰

As long as payment was mainly in kind, or by the gift of benefices, it was difficult to establish professional practices; this awaited the evolution of commerce, the loosening of feudal ties, the wider currency of coin. The establishment of a middle class of merchants, manufacturers, rich gildmen, and well-to-do farmers provided a market for professional services, so that it was no longer necessary for a professional man to be a retainer or a cleric. The merchants fee'd doctors to keep them and their heirs alive (though it was rare for a business to be carried on by a grandson of the founder, such was the mortality of medieval London)¹¹ and they fee'd lawyers to see that their testamentary dispositions were in order. In the circumstances, the lawyers did better than the doctors (who might be sued for non-completion of contract) and their numbers increased with such rapidity, as the network of contractual relationships spread, that a Statute was made in 1455 to limit the number of attorneys in East Anglia, on the ground that they fomented litigation

'more of evil will and malice than the truth of the thing'.¹² The middle classes, too, fee'd architects to design churches and houses, provided endowments for schools with provision for teachers, and became the patrons of writers and artists.

2. PROFESSIONS GROW AS THE CHURCH DECLINES

The small group of professional people was thus well placed to strengthen its position in society when the Reformation* freed it from most of the remaining clerical controls, and scientific advances provided it with a wider range and more attractive kind of intellectual wares to sell. The parish clergy were themselves not averse from the change. The Church may have been landed and wealthy, but the proportion of her tithes and dues which went into the pockets of her parish priests and into the community alms-chest had fallen far below the two quarters ordered in the canon. Parliament had already had to step in and enforce the Church's obligations to administer the social services.¹³ The parson, in his role as a professional parish organizer, was already underpaid. He generally accepted Henry VIII's revolution, and the final change of faith under Elizabeth, with considerable equanimity, even though 'the loss of consequence involved for the ordinary clergyman by the substitution of the pastoral for the sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry can hardly be overstated.'¹⁴ The clergy were drastically reduced in number and in function. Almost the only secular profession left for clerics to practise was education. The physicians prohibited any man in orders from practising medicine; clerics disappeared in a couple of generations from the Civil Service, estate management, and surveying; Laud terminated on the scaffold in 1645 the long succession of ecclesiastical Ministers of State. The last cleric to hold a diplomatic post (Robinson) died in 1745.

The College of Physicians was founded in 1518; the Company of Barber-Surgeons in 1540. But despite the renaissance of learning and science, neither found itself well-equipped with training facilities, still less with facilities for research; for a hundred years and more the best doctors qualified abroad at Bologna, Leyden, and Basle. The lawyers had been beforehand in this matter, and owed their standing to it. By the fifteenth century, the Inns of Court constituted the first 'technical university'. They were giving a legal education to barristers, and for a time to attorneys as well: it was due to their competence and good organization that in England the judges were promoted from the

* In the redistribution of church lands, surveyors played an important part

Inn-trained Bar, rather than created (as abroad) into a special branch of the Civil Service under the state. Just as the physicians looked down on the barber-surgeons, the barristers, serjeants, and judges looked down on the attorneys, or general legal agents, who attended the various courts; and presently they ejected these underlings from the Inns; whereupon the attorneys, (dubbed 'pettifoggers' in the Elizabethan drama) drew together; they took their name, solicitors, from the attorneys whose profit it was to 'solicit' the Court of Chancery to abate its extreme 'loth to maken ende' of its litigants' affairs. By 1650 the Court of Chancery had 23,000 causes, of from five to thirty years' continuance, undetermined; so that it is not surprising that the solicitors prospered, and worked out plans for the proper legal training of 'The Compleat Solicitor', as a textbook entitled him in 1668.¹⁵ In 1729, an act for the 'better regulation of attorneys and solicitors' compelled the would-be lawyer to enter into articles as part of a contract. Thus was created, in the words of Pickwick: 'the Articled Clerk, who has paid a premium, and is an attorney in perspective, who runs a tailor's bill, receives invitations to parties, goes out of town every Long Vacation to see his father, who keeps live horses innumerable; and who is, in short, the very aristocrat of clerks.' So recruited, it was inevitable that a corporate society of gentleman-solicitors should be founded and incorporated to uphold the dignity by regulating the conduct of the profession. This happened in 1739. Though the lawyers did well out of the law, it is important to note that it was in their interest to develop and support the common law and equity against canon law and Roman law (which served absolutist kings abroad) and against the prerogative courts like the Star Chamber.

The profession of letters and journalism was the joint product of the Reformation and of a new technique—the printing press. It was some time before it could rival the pulpit as the instrument by which public opinion was chiefly influenced. For a long time, even talented authors were heavily dependent on patrons, some of whom specialized—Leicester and Essex paying the poets, while Burghley interested himself only in solid contributions to economics and politics: Sir Philip Sidney and Sir Francis Walsingham promoted the publication of theology, history, and travel.¹⁶ Bacon deplored the economics of publishing and authorship, 'for that books ought to have no patrons but truth and reason', a situation only approximately reached when the reading public was large enough, by the eighteenth century, to make writing pay. It was then possible for the journalist to declare, 'the last summer I paid a large debt for brandy and tobacco by a

wonderful description of a fiery dragon, and lived for ten days together on a whale and a mermaid. From November last to January I lived solely on murders; and have, since that time, had a comfortable subsistence from a plague and a famine.'¹⁷ But a popular press also meant the dissemination of news: and news is vital to free institutions of government.

Actors, like playwrights, also required patronage; under the statute of 1572, strolling players could be taken up as vagabonds. The Long Parliament attempted to suppress the entire profession and its art, but what the Bishop of Salisbury could not achieve in 1313, Praise-God Barebones and Company were doomed to fail in. The theatre survived, because the public in a commercial country was prepared to pay for entertainment as well as for cleansing by 'pity and terror'; the actor's equivocal status, at once the idol and bond-servant of his public, developed. With the Restoration, the stage as a career was thrown open to women, though for some decades actresses' relations with persons in 'respectable' society approximated rather to poor Luisa's with Boswell than to Fanny Kemble's with George Stephenson.

One profession made little progress. The Reformation dissolved 750 charitable foundations, and was a disaster educationally for the poor. The reformed Church was too busy with doctrine to build an educational system adequate to the changed times. 'There is scarce any profession in the commonwealth more necessary which is so slightly performed', wrote Thomas Fuller in 1630.¹⁸ 'Young scholars make this calling their refuge; yea, perchance before they have taken any degree in the University, commence schoolmaster, as if nothing else were required to set up this profession but only a rod and ferula. . . . Others, who are able, use it only as a passage to preferment, to patch the rents in their present fortune . . . Thirdly they are disheartened from doing their best with the miserable reward which in some places they receive, being masters of the children and slaves to the parents.' There was no lack of educational theory from Ascham on, but the principle acted upon was that ignorance in the lower orders was a barrier to rebellion. There were, of course, exceptions; but the general picture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is one of schools, universities, and Inns of Court all decaying together.

3. GROWTH OF PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The decay of education had some important consequences. Deprived of a lead from schoolmaster or professor, the growing professions

created not only their own courses of technical training, but also their own institutions, charged with the duty of regulating the profession, keeping up its standard of proficiency, advancing its science or art, and striving for that higher status for its members from which improved remuneration would follow. In time, some of the institutions, together with the educational efforts of the dissenting bodies, had much to do with the founding of the new universities, of which University College, 'that Godless institution in Gower Street', was the first. But their interest in status gave the institutions a tendency to premature exclusiveness, which bred snobbery, which in turn bred rival institutions. The inadequacies of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons provided the opportunity of the apothecaries; the decline of the Inns developed the prestige of the Society of Solicitors, presently the Law Society. There is some parallel in the rivalry of Church and Dissent. The process of monopoly, secession, and challenge has been reproduced in other professions repeatedly; but the result has been the creation of a galaxy of self-governing corporate bodies, organizing various cadres of professions and experts, and cultivating a tenacious independence and jealousy of interference which in the long run has been mainly to the advantage of the country, and which has provided it with professional services unrivalled elsewhere—and a professional class unequalled in social influence.

But looking at the state of higher education in 1700, few observers would have picked England as the scene of the greatest technical advances mankind has ever experienced. The Royal Society was famous, and Newton was a world figure; and plenty of independent gentlemen were experimenting, patenting peculiar contrivances, and generally behaving like the character described in the *Tatler*—'When I married this gentleman he had a very handsome estate, but upon buying a set of microscopes he was chosen a Fellow of the Royal Society from which time I do not remember ever to have heard him talk in a manner that any of his family could understand'. Swift depicted these theorists in the Academy of Projectors in *Gulliver's Travels*. English physicians continued to be regularly trained in Bologna or Padua (like Harvey) before they returned and went through the solemn farce of being incorporated at Oxford or Cambridge; only the apothecaries, part tradesmen, part leeches, developed their art at home. English architects began going abroad to study in Elizabeth's reign; Shute, Inigo Jones, John Thorpe all duly returned with their taste 'purified' and set against the English building tradition of the craft guilds of masons, glaziers, plumbers, and carpenters. Even the early civil engineers, if,

like Smeaton, they desired to read up mechanics and hydraulics, found it advisable to learn French and Italian, in which the best textbooks were written. They found more impressive engineering works to study in Holland than along the banks of the Thames.

But England's lead in the eighteenth century was no unaccountable accident. In the first place capitalism was established, to no small degree as the result of the development of the art of double-entry book-keeping and accountancy, so that the money was available for investment in transport and machinery when the engineers came forward with practicable ideas. Secondly, engineering was destined to arise out of a craft rather than from theoretical science; as in surgery, what was wanted was men with quick hands as well as good brains, workers in wood and metals, familiar with the traditional tools and methods, but with their traditionalism of mentality dissolved by the scientific and enquiring spirit of the time. Thirdly, the older professions had cleared the way for freedom of experiment: the Law had in the hands of lawyers and Parliamentarians become supreme, and the particular guardian of contract and property; the Clergy had fought themselves into a living demonstration of toleration and of the right of all men to try all things before deciding their good; the profession of letters had created a periodical press to watch over the freedom thus gained, and to form channels of communication which were to be of great use to technologists. Differences, in fact, were settled in Parliamentary debate, in Court, in the press, or by laboratory demonstration: above all, the land had peace.

Finally, the Act of Union had opened a highroad to the talents between England and Scotland. What England lacked in educational institutions, Scotland supplied. Under an Act of James I, every Scottish parish had to create a school and find a dominie for it.¹⁹ Scotland's system of national education was crowned with universities at Glasgow and Edinburgh which had up-to-date faculties of medicine, chemistry, physics, and metallurgy. They drew the best brains of the nation unscreened by social disability or the need to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles.²⁰ Men like Watt and Rennie took their genius southwards, to find practical English business men like Matthew Boulton ready to back them commercially; they found also a surveying tradition based on the Act of Henry VIII which created a Court of Surveyors and a detailed professional code,²¹ and a cadre of English millwrights and mechanics with the skill to turn their projects and models into machinery. 'There is no end of millwrights once you give them leave to set about what they call machinery', wailed Watt. 'Here they have

multiplied wheels until it [the engine] has now almost as many as an orrery.'²² Out of this collaboration, nonetheless, mechanical engineering and the profession of mechanical engineer were born.

By 1800 the professional skill of civil and mechanical engineers was made manifest in canals, in a road system for the first time comparable with that of the Romans, lighthouses, harbours, horse-drawn railways, a few hundred steam-engines, and one or two prototype locomotives. To the professional chemist could be attributed many important discoveries, from which farming, textiles, and other industries had benefited. The doctors had less to show. An English doctor had invented the obstetric forceps, but kept them as a trade secret, as did his son and grandson. Still, technique was improving, and so was public health, even if Richard Mead's *Short Discourse on Pestilential Contagion* remained unrecognized as a masterpiece of hygiene. The old treatments—bleeding, purging, blistering, amputations—still reigned, and it was possible as late as 1724 for the Royal Society to be solemnly advised that swallowing of leaden bullets cured 'that miserable *Distemper* which they call the *Twisting of the Guts*'. 'Tis an easy thing for a man of parts to be a surgeon', says a character in Brown's *The Dispensary*, 'do but buy a lancet, Forceps, Saw; talk a little of Contusions, Fractures, Compress and Bandage . . . I myself have turn'd several doctors out of families because they would not prescribe Physick *plentifully* and in large quantities. I have persuaded my Patients, that they did not well understand their distemper; so have brought in another who has *swingingly dos'd'm*.' A well founded distrust of doctors put money in the pockets of quacks.

Indeed, physiology and pathology were retarded by the deceptively simple success of mechanics, mathematics, and astronomy;²³ doctors were in too much hurry to find a simple synthesis, too slow to see that they had to build up a body of clinical facts, based on observation and experiment. But experiment led to Hunter's cure for aneurism, and Jenner's cowpox vaccination. The profession improved both organization and training. The surgeons in 1745 separated from the barbers (who thereafter might only pull teeth and supply wigs and dentures); anatomy, which had actually been made compulsory for medical students in 1562, was studied as regularly as the supply of cadavers from the gallows would permit. The apothecaries, who had secured their separation from the grocers in 1617, had developed their claim to be regarded as medical practitioners, partly because their training was every bit as good as the physicians', partly because they filled a gap the physicians left. Adam Smith described them as 'the physicians to the

poor at all times, and to the rich whenever the distress and danger is not great'. By the end of the eighteenth century they had shed their function as druggists as completely as earlier they shed the grocery department; and pharmacy as such had begun its history as another and separate modern profession.²⁴

It is impossible to be precise as to the relative strengths of the professions at the end of the eighteenth century. But they were growing fast, perhaps at times faster than the market for their services. Writing of the 'three great professions of divinity, law and physic', the *Spectator* declared that all were 'overburdened with practitioners and filled with multitudes of Ingenious Gentlemen that starve one another'. Before the nation's brains could be exercised in the technical professions, there was, possibly, a shortage of professional outlets. Officering the Army and Navy had become important professions (despite national distrust of a professional standing army) for the younger sons of the landed gentry, great and small, and for the sons of gentlemen engaged in 'the great professions'. They needed, of course, the capital to buy a commission, though the formation of the Engineers and Artillery first introduced the idea of a serious training for the profession with promotion by merit.²⁵

Though the professions were graded between those that were fit for a gentleman and those that were practised by tradesmen (apothecaries, dentists, veterinary surgeons) or mechanics (engineers and scientists), in fact distinctions were steadily blurred by the application of science to many of them, and by the growing demand for scientific services which brought prosperity for those purveying them. The aristocracy, moreover, was the patron of all—of the professions and the crafts alike. Architects and surveyors (often combined in the same person) were building the great houses and laying out the big farms; land agents were running estates; noblemen called in engineers and consorted with inventors; and, finally, artists, actors, and writers enjoyed, along with master-craftsmen, a period of discriminating appreciation which gave good hope of advancement, fat commissions, wealth, and dignities to those of more than average talent.

4. INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION: VICTORIAN REFORM

The nineteenth century saw the rapid growth in numbers, skill, and organization of the professions based on technology; but technology and science transformed those professions that were not so based. Journalism was changed by continuous paper-making, the rotary press,

and the electric telegraph; art was changed by photography; teaching had to digest science; the law had to digest technology; the clergy had to digest a variety of things ranging from sanitary statistics to Darwin—but what most changed the clergy's task was the swing of their parishioners' interest from the excitements of the next world to the excitements of this. Nonetheless, there were other no less important developments, chief of which was qualification by training tested by examination. The professions organized themselves to sell qualified services; the market for those services depended less on the landed aristocracy, increasingly on the rising middle-class and the business world, and in the latter half of the century on the whole community organized to provide every citizen with the advantages of expert and specialist services.

The period was dominated by the doctor and the engineer. The organizations of the two professions took different courses, but they were alike in the steady growth of specialization within each profession. The doctors became scientific and centralized; the engineers became scientific and decentralized. The doctors found and drew a line between the qualified and the unqualified, between the profession and the auxiliaries; the engineers never did. Yet art and empiricism remained in medicine, while engineering became a matter of ever smaller tolerances and ever more precisely calculated stresses and strains. Doctors found out more and more about the same material; engineers used more and more materials for ever more diverse purposes. The foundation of both professions was the same—training, scientific method, and professional discussion. Many important specialist journals, such as *The Lancet*, were started early in the century. By the end of it—and more particularly to-day—almost every profession was overwhelmed by the number of journals, British and foreign, pouring forth facts, figures, theories, and discoveries so that the practitioner or salaried man found it well nigh impossible to keep up with even his own speciality.

It took over fifty years to organize the medical profession. Doctors were of every variety, their knowledge gained from walking the hospitals or attending medical schools, their licence to practise issued by a variety of bodies arranged in a hierarchy of social or professional esteem. (It was only in 1793 that the Army required its surgeons to have a diploma.) The apothecaries led the way by promoting in 1815 the Apothecaries Act, which introduced stricter rules for qualification. But for many years, 'in spite of venerable colleges which used great efforts to secure purity of knowledge by making it scarce, and to exclude error by a

rigid exclusiveness in relation to fees and appointments, it happened that very ignorant young gentlemen were promoted in town, and many more got a legal right to practise over large areas in the country. Also, the high standard held up to the public mind by the College of Physicians which gave its peculiar sanction to the expensive and highly rarefied medical instruction obtained by graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, did not hinder quackery from having an excellent time of it.' Hence it was not surprising that Mr Lydgate, an ambitious young surgeon trained in Paris who set up practice in Middlemarch, should be told by Bulstrode the Banker, 'the standard of the profession is low in Middlemarch . . . I mean in knowledge and skill; not in social status, for our medical men are most of them connected with respectable townspeople here.' But reform was in the air; and in the same year that the Reform Bill went through, the association of doctors was formed in Worcester which became in 1856 the British Medical Association. The good effects of the Apothecaries Act were now clear; as the result of it a generation of competent 'general practitioners' had arisen, and it was time to apply the same principles to the whole profession.

The Act of 1858 unified the medical profession and gave it the monopoly so long enjoyed by the legal profession. It was hated by many medical vested interests at the time, but has succeeded so well that few professions have not, at one time or another, considered how far a similar measure could be applied to themselves. Its primary purpose was to protect the public; in achieving this it reformed the profession. It created the General Medical Council, representing the 'venerable colleges', the medical corporations of the United Kingdom and Ireland, the profession, and the Crown. Qualified men were on the new register kept by the G.M.C.—quacks might practise, it being a free country, but might neither sign death certificates nor sue for their fees. The line between the professional and the unprofessional was decisively drawn. It took all Queen Victoria's powers of persuasion to get Sir William Jenner to call on her dying Dizzy, who had allowed a noted homoeopathist to attend his bedside.²⁸

The G.M.C. in future determined the *minimum* qualifications a doctor must possess to be put on the register, and wielded control over the teaching bodies, whether universities, medical schools, or hospitals. But while the basic standards were fixed, individual bodies continued to prescribe higher qualifications and hold examinations in which a high proportion of the candidates were failed as a matter of course. Higher posts needed higher degrees; ambition was harnessed to medical competence; and the only British doctors who needed to take degrees

abroad were women. As every field of science made its contribution to medicine, and medicine broadened, the specialist doctor began to appear in Harley and Wimpole Streets. The eye surgeon came first, then orthopaedic surgery; aural surgery in 1830 and laryngology in 1860.²⁷ Mackenzie's work on the heart produced the heart specialist early in the new century. One speciality which failed to establish itself was psychiatry. It was the 'machine age' of medicine. Early in the century Elliotson and Braid anticipated the psycho-somatic era with their experiments in mesmerism; but professional opposition, which in vain ridiculed anaesthesia in the 'forties or antisepsis in the 'fifties, easily disposed of phenomena which did not fit in with mechanistic theories of mind and body. The territory gained was left for Charcot and Freud to occupy, and the Victorians were spared the psycho-analyst during their lifetimes. The *post mortem*, however, has been exceptionally thorough.

The auxiliary medical professions were slow in coming into existence. As late as 1878, the British Medical Journal could declare 'Medicine is a profession, dentistry is largely a business'.²⁸ A few dentists were trained and received licences from the Royal College of Surgeons, and from these a reform movement was born, but not until 1878 was the Dental Act passed along lines similar to the Act of 1858; not till 1921 was the door finally closed to the unqualified. Pharmacy also remained for long merely a business, until, indeed, attention was drawn to the ease with which the public was obtaining lethal quantities of opium and other poisonous drugs. The Pharmaceutical Society was formed in 1841 and put science into a lore which retained not a few of the Saxon leeches' pharmaceutical recipes; the Pharmacy Acts of 1851 and 1868 created a qualified and trained profession for the first time, and closed the sale of poisons to outsiders. The opticians remained tradesmen* until the 1930's.

Nursing affords the most dramatic story of medical reform in the nineteenth century. The profession was Florence Nightingale's creation, for even after she and her nurses had returned from the Crimea, the public concluded that the heroism displayed, and the endurance of the daily horrors inseparable from the civil as well as military hospitals of the time, demanded women with a religious vocation. Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic nurses had been the mainstay of Florence Nightingale's mission to Scutari, and Archbishop Manning had been at pains to focus attention on the success of the latter. The idea that

* The contribution to science of the English spectacle-makers—formed into a worshipful company in 1629—is outstanding.

nurses—that *ladies*—might be paid for such work, as though they were so many Sarah Gamps and Betsy Prigs, seemed strange. But Miss Nightingale declared, ‘I would far rather than establish a religious order, open a career highly paid. My principle has always been that we should give the best training we could to any woman, of any class, of any sect, “paid” or unpaid, who had the requisite qualifications, moral, intellectual and physical, for the vocation of a nurse. Unquestionably the educated will be more likely to rise to the post of superintendent, but *not* because they are ladies, but because they are *educated*.’²⁹ It was on this basis that she developed hospital, private, and district nursing in thirty years of devoted work, and when the question of registration and examination for the nursing profession as for the other medical professions arose, she opposed it. ‘Nursing has to nurse living bodies and spirits. It cannot be tested by public examination,’ she wrote³⁰; but she had herself proved that it could be secular, and examination and registration were the inevitable sequel. Florence Nightingale also tried to reform the ancient profession of midwifery. Midwives had petitioned for incorporation as early as the seventeenth century, but mainly to keep doctors out of a woman’s preserve. It was not till 1902 that training and certification were made obligatory.

Alongside the general practitioner, the specialist, and the medical auxiliaries, a new type of doctor came into existence—a reformed version of Crabbe’s ‘consequential apothecary who gave impatient attention to these abodes of misery’, the poor houses. The salaried doctor, the Medical Officer of Health, was largely the creation of Edwin Chadwick, who introduced the idea to the profession that some of their number should be responsible not to an individual patient but to the whole community. It was resisted at first, and the Royal College of Physicians complained that the Board of Health were infringing on their field; much as, indeed, the lawyers were complaining that provisions in Chadwick’s Public Health Act which enabled a town to obtain its sewage scheme or waterworks without promoting a private Bill through the law firms equipped to promote private Bills, were infringing *their* preserves. But the simple arrangements for professional services which had been adequate to the eighteenth century were hopelessly inefficient in the overgrown and insanitary towns of the nineteenth; the march of the specialists could not be stopped. It was significant that community doctors were from the first called *officers*.

5. THE SERVANTS OF GRADGRIND AND DOMBEY

The engineers grew as fast in number and skill as the doctors, reformed their systems of training and qualifications as determinedly, and introduced ultimately the all-deciding examination; but they never achieved unity or monopoly. The numbers of consulting engineers became a steadily smaller proportion of the profession as railways and other big firms appointed salaried men to engineers' and managerial posts. Many engineers, like Robert Stephenson, ran big businesses for profit. The Institution of Civil Engineers was founded in 1818, and purported to represent the profession, requiring as a pre-requisite to election that members should show that they had been apprenticed to qualified engineers and provide evidence of their competence. Its dignity became an early obsession; perhaps because engineers still had the reek of craftsmen about them. When Telford put in a bill for seven guineas for a day's consultation at the War office, General Brownrigg complained that it was equal to the pay of a Field Marshal. By the time George Stephenson ventured to apply for membership, the Institution requested the designer of the 'Rocket' to prove that he had been properly trained and to supply details of his civil engineering career. Instead of submitting, George Stephenson became the first president of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, which was born in a meeting of railway engineers 'talking over the affronts put upon them by the senior body' while sheltering from the rain in a plate-layer's hut. That was in 1847; but in 1860, because the problems of iron ship construction and propulsion were not being adequately discussed and catered for by the 'Mechanicals', the engineers specializing in this new department of shipbuilding formed the Institution of Naval Architects. Twelve years later, Faraday's discoveries having some time since brought into existence a group of men whose interest in telecommunications, and whose dreams of electric traction were pooh-poohed by all the existing institutions, there was founded the body which presently became the Institution of Electrical Engineers. In the same year (1872), public misgivings over the long series of colliery disasters forced the Government to pass an Act requiring all collieries to be in charge of certificated managers; the profession of mining engineer, which had been provided with technical training by the Royal College of Mines in 1851, was now made a closed profession by the state. But the specialization of engineers and engineering institutions was by no means complete. Gas, water, and municipal engineers were

planning organizations, examinations, and self-government for themselves; and the internal combustion engine was about to revolutionize a dozen branches of engineering.

The rapid growth of the towns, producing professional problems and packing together professional custom in a small area, made big changes. The growth of suburban property induced the rapid growth of estate agents, valuers, and auctioneers as an offshoot of the legal profession; it settled down to occupy an uncomfortable, but profitable, position between business and professional status: the Institution of Surveyors was formed out of the associations which preceded it to reorganize the professional code in 1868. But before the suburbs could be bought and sold, rented or let, they had to be built, and the profession of architect grew rapidly. The Combination Acts had killed the ancient craft guilds of masons, glaziers, and carpenters, men who could undertake details of design; henceforth they were mere workmen. By the nineteenth century the architect was fully professional;³¹ that is, he designed buildings and arbitrated between the contractor and the client; architects' professional codes were adopted by the early civil engineers. The Institute of British Architects was formed in 1837 and gradually came to represent the profession, absorbing rival bodies, but imposing no fixed standards and not introducing examinations until 1882, a year after the surveyors got their first examination. Building, notwithstanding the Crystal Palace, remained traditional in method and materials, and there was little specialization in types of construction. Controversies about *design* absorbed the profession. 'I have had indirect influence on nearly every cheap villa builder between this and Bromley, and there is scarcely a public house near the Crystal Palace but sells its bitters under pseudo-Gothic capitals copied from the Church of the Madonna of Health or of the Miracles', cried Ruskin in despair; and certainly the Victorian architects were active. 'In the main the best Victorian decoration took its form from the designs of leading architects . . . the interiors of the London clubs were designed by the architects, and so were the theatres . . . The majority of architects were likewise engaged on the routine work of the period, namely, banks, insurance offices, railway stations, workhouses, warehouses and shops. The architects who were Church specialists were working at top pressure; the great building firms such as Cubitts employed their own draughtsmen, and the lesser speculative builders could obtain plans from young architects struggling for a place.'³²

Victorian business was a large employer of all the professions, both traditional and new; and it created several. Brokers and bankers laid

claim to be regarded as professional people before the end of the nineteenth century, and though they did not evolve the same training and examination systems as the other professions, they adopted some principles* beyond the simple *caveat emptor* which served the Victorian business man for trading decalogue; in so doing they received, and still receive, some recognition of professional status—and built up the reputation of the City as the world's banker and broker. This was a case of collective professional morals.

Insurance, beginning with friendly societies, brought the actuarial profession into existence in mid-century, and soon afterwards the accountants organized themselves. Like the estate agents and the patent agents, the accountants branched off from the legal profession; but their rise to power was due to regulations compelling public companies to have independent auditors of their accounts. The art of book-keeping itself goes back at least to Paciolo's *De Computis et Scripturis*, but it was mainly practised by merchants, lawyers, and contractors themselves with the aid of many excellent textbooks; but book-keepers were also employed by some of them—it was a job often taken up by schoolmasters or even professors of mathematics. But after the Companies Act of 1856, the practice of accountancy—diagnosis of the financial situation of a firm or corporation from its records—grew rapidly in importance and dignity. In 1853 associations of accountants were created in Glasgow and Edinburgh, and in 1862 the Institute was formed which in 1880 received a Royal Charter in Britain. These bodies regulated and examined trainees who were articled to firms of practitioners; but meanwhile many accountants were being trained in local government and a further society was created to regulate their professional qualifications—the Incorporated Society of Accountants and Auditors—in 1890. Finally, in 1891, a further association was formed to regulate yet another business profession, the secretaries of public companies and large public bodies. Inasmuch as there was considerable overlapping of functions between bankers, accountants, solicitors, and secretaries, none of the business professions found it practicable to introduce any sort of closed shop. Besides, their numbers were still small; the main thing was to create a preference for the qualified man as against the unqualified, and to maintain professional standards which could be recognized in statutes prescribing rules for the conduct of business.

* Respectable stockbrokers refused to deal in early railway shares, as utterly derogatory to the dignity as well as interests of themselves or their clients. For at least a century after the foundation of the Stock Exchange, its members continued to regard 'the Funds' as the staple of their trade.

6. THE COMING OF EXAMINATIONS

Reform: train: examine: inspect: these were the Victorian precepts which created a self-reproducing cadre of experts more impressive in many ways than the material gear of technical civilization which they created and operated. 'Look out, gentlemen, the schoolmaster is abroad', Lord Brougham warned the Mechanics Institute in the 'thirties, and by the 'eighties Robert Lowe could remark: 'Who takes the lead in this country? Those who in early life have shared in contests and examinations.' No profession was left untouched by this zeal. The Civil Service as we know it was created by Sir Charles Trevelyan's report on competitive entrance in 1855, which Gladstone adopted in 1870. Before the Crimean War the Army, even the officers, was rarely trained in anything but parade-ground evolutions and constabulary duties, though those who served in India underwent some sort of an apprenticeship to war, and certain regiments and brigades were trained for particular campaigns.* Nonetheless the Duke of Cambridge expressed a prevailing view when he inveighed against Prussian cadet-schools with the observation that the 'British Officer should be a gentleman first and an officer second'. Twenty years later, thanks to Cardwell, subalterns were sitting exams in fortifications, military law, tactics and topography. Steam power forced the Navy into training and specialization considerably earlier. In 1825 Cobbett warned emigrants to choose an American ship, as captains of English merchant ships were liable to be drunk on duty; in 1850 masters and navigators had to be examined and certificated by Act of Parliament. Until considerably later technological education was done at the bench and the drawing board; not till the Paris exhibition of 1867 showed how fast British goods were being outclassed in design and excellence did technical colleges begin to proliferate.

From this educational movement not even the law could hold aloof. Up to 1836 'the clerk whose articles had expired went to the judge in chambers with an affidavit proving his service as a clerk; and he, and generally his principal, were introduced to the judge. The judge asked a few questions and granted his fiat for the applicant's admission.'³³ From then on, the Law Society began to insist on more thorough testing of would-be solicitors' knowledge. In 1846, a committee of the House of Commons recommended that there should be a preliminary

* Thus Moore trained the Light Infantry Brigade at Shorncliffe in 1795 before the Peninsular Campaign (cf. A. Bryant, *Years of Victory*, p. 232-9).

examination to ensure that lawyers knew a little Latin, Geography, History, Arithmetic, and Ethics; in 1854 some Science and Literature were added: and in 1860 the Solicitors Act provided that legal specialists should, in fact, have a liberal education as well as a legal training.

The arts and literature remained unregulated. The Board of Education early established art schools in the hope of creating both marketable design and great art; but these merely enabled manufacturers to issue catalogues offering 'a coffee service in the Grecian style; a wine cooler in the Roman ditto; a dinner service in the Flemish ditto; claret jug in the Louis Quatorze ditto.'⁸⁴ However, there was no shortage of great and well-paid art (at least in the competent estimation of Mr Ruskin) under the patronage of steelmasters and railway magnates, as well as landed proprietors. Meanwhile, journalists and writers had done as much as blue books and sanitary commissions to get the public behind Reform.

Yet the whole imposing structure of arts, sciences, technologies, rested upon education; and education in the nineteenth century still rested mainly on the clergy. The clergy, newly inspired by evangelicalism, the Oxford movement, the growth of Wesleyism and other forms of dissent, the challenge of science, and the high seriousness of the time, had done much. Secondary and higher education for the upper and middle classes had been remodelled, but a complete national education for the nation the Church could not provide. It could not get enough teachers, and it could not meet the cost of schooling the rapidly expanding child population. The wealth of the Church aroused Radical rage early in the century; but in terms of the vast growth of the national wealth in the middle and later Victorian era, its endowments produced an ever smaller proportion of the national income. Education now needed state money if it was to compare with that of European countries, and in 1870 the state at last created—as cheaply as possible—that system of education which was later to enable elementary schooling to be made compulsory; it thus created another great profession for women. Its confidence in the integrity of the profession thus remodelled, secularized, and paid was shown in the creation of another to watch over its integrity—H.M. Inspectors of Schools. In 1880 the National Union of Teachers was founded—but not as a purely professional organization. The N.U.T was 'neither an incorporated professional institute nor a Trade Union, but it combines the best features of each, with certain functions peculiarly its own.' The poor pay and low status accorded to this state-made profession rendered such an organization inevitable; it was from the first clear that even a

body as interested in the material aspect of professional dignity as the B.M.A. would not suffice the teachers: they must bargain hard and bargain directly with their paymaster—the state, alias the ratepayer and taxpayer. Though it was not realized at the time, the N.U.T. made professional history with the drafting of its articles of association. Trade unionism entered the professions about the time that the state started creating professions and professional qualifications.

NOTES

- 1. G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Panorama*, 1923, p. 447.
2. John Arderne in 1380, quoted by Coulton, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
3. G. G. Coulton, *Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation*, 1938, p. 505.
4. R. B. Morgan, *Readings in English Social History*, 1916, p. 96.
5. G. G. Coulton, *Social Life in Britain*, 1938, p. 102.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 404.
7. Cf. John Harvey, *Gothic England*, 1947.
8. Anthony Clapham, F.R.I.C.S., *A Short History of the Surveyor's Profession*, The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, 1949.
9. R. M. Jackson, *The Machinery of Justice in England*, 1940, p. 6.
10. D. Chadwick, *Social Life in the Days of Piers Plowman*, 1922, p. 45.
11. Sylvia L. Thrupp, *The Merchant Class of Medieval London*, 1949, pp. 200–1.
12. H. S. Bennett, *The Pastons and Their England*, 1932, p. 171.
13. G. G. Coulton, *Social Life in Britain*, p. 162.
14. H. H. Henson, *The Church of England*, 1939, p. 153.
15. E. B. V. Christian, *A Short History of Solicitors*, 1896, p. 85.
16. O.U.P., *Life in Shakespeare's England*, 1916, Vol. I, p. 182.
17. J. Ashton, *Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne*, 1882, Vol. I, p. 63.
18. Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 375.
19. P. D. Thomson, *Parish and Parish Church*, Baird Lecture, 1948, p. 208.
20. For the importance of the Scottish contribution in detail to the industrial revolution, see H. Hamilton, *History of the Homeland*, 1947, p. 278 ff.
21. Clapham, *op. cit.*
22. S. Smiles, *Lives of the Engineers*, 1874, Vol. II.
23. R. H. Shrylock, *The Development of Modern Medicine*, 1936, p. 29.
24. C. J. S. Thompson, *The Mystery and Art of the Apothecary*, 1929, pp. 272–282.
25. Cf. J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 1906, Vol. II, p. 587; J. A. Schumpeter, *Imperialism and Social Classes*, 1951, p. 22.
26. Harley Williams, *The Healing Touch*, 1949, p. 111.
27. H. D. Trail, *Social England*, 1895, Vol. IX, p. 330.
28. Quoted by Carr-Saunders and Wilson, *The Professions*, 1933, p. 113.
29. Cecil Woodham Smith, *Florence Nightingale*, 1951, p. 483.
30. *Ibid.*, loc. cit.
31. Eric L. Bird, M.C., A.R.I.B.A., 'The Architectural Profession', in the *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Institute of Chemistry*, Pt. I, 1949; cf. *The Cambridge Journal*, Sept. 1951.
32. G. M. Young, *Early Victorian England*, 1938, p. 238.
33. Christian, *op. cit.*, p. 181.
34. Trail *op. cit.*, p. 518.

CHAPTER III

We're All Specialists Now

'And now you've got to do something and do it soon. Make a world which will make me happy. Get together, you important people down there, and try to be really important for once. Talk it over with each other, and talk real stuff.'

H. G. WELLS, *The Man Who Could Work Miracles*

'Life is increasingly specialized and complex. Each specialization, financial, economic, scientific or administrative, has developed its own language and symbols . . . a few specialists can read some of them, but they cannot communicate with other specialists across the boundaries of their specialization.'

CHARLES MORGAN: *Liberties of the Mind*

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY bred technologies and techniques, sciences and pseudo-sciences, systems and know-hows, at an accelerating rate. It became the age of the man who 'knew more and more about less and less until he knew absolutely everything about practically nothing'—the twentieth century's own wry definition of the specialist. For this, the growth and ramification of the exact sciences have not alone been responsible; everything, in an inelegant but expressive phrase, has progressively been 'scienced up'. Where the exact sciences left off, the social sciences took over.

1. PSYCHOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGY

From that 'little string of raw facts' which was Professor William James's candid inventory of psychology at the end of the nineteenth century, there burgeoned an array of theories and a crop of techniques which began in the 'twenties to affect many professions; the school-master had to come to terms with Spearman, the magistrate and advocate were gradually forced to take Freud seriously, accountants and engineers had to think about Myers and Mayo.¹ Doctors acquired a satellite train of auxiliaries to treat the mind and adjust the environment of their patients; nurses had to adjust themselves to the pretensions of social workers. Statisticians, sociologists and 'case-workers' over the years imparted a meaning to the Welfare State which now reaches far beyond the mechanistic egalitarian socialism of the early

Fabians; the marriage guidance expert, the psychiatric social worker, the dietitian and the children's officer, beginning in the early 'thirties, have laboured to put family life on a satisfactory scientific footing. While the social worker explained how the house should be run at the front door, at the back the market research enquirer or state snooper gathered on roneo'd questionnaires the data upon which fresh advances in social science could be based.

Specialization has favoured the growth of state power, for increasingly the state alone could afford to bring the work of batteries of experts to bear upon the needs of simple individuals: the labours of experts also provided the state with the means for detailed control of citizens' lives, which did not exist before the first world war, ranging from Gallup sampling techniques to cost accounting and punched-card machines. With the growth of state control, three main influences can be distinguished in professional development. The first is the emergence of the Scientist, part seer, part leader, as the most respected and therefore imitated figure in the community. The second is the growing desire, in almost all classes, for a professional status which should derive some of its strength from the obvious essentiality of the 'scientific' brainworker to the community; the third is the partial or complete degradation of many professional organizations into wage-negotiating bodies. 'Professionalization' generally preceded 'trade-unionization'; but some callings, such as acting, were organized only for the purpose of achieving crudely trade unionist objectives.

As the social revolution went on, the *bourgeoisie* busily converted itself into indispensable scientific brainworkers and organizers. Politically, culturally, the masses triumphed; their material welfare became the sole objective of polity and statecraft; but rank and privilege remained—for those who served mass-welfare, and possessed the mysterious know-how of mass-production.

2. THE SCIENTISTS ARRIVE

The nineteenth-century scientist conducted his researches at a university, or, if a moneyed amateur, in his own laboratory. Though honoured when successful, he remained an obscure figure in a social pattern dominated still by aristocracy, class distinction, and ambition. The word 'scientist' did not become general until the 'seventies. The technicians, mainly engineers, applied the findings of science to industry and thence to everyday life. The scientist was concerned mainly with knowledge for its own sake, and his influence was intellectual and

indirect. It was a long time before Mr Gradgrind had a salaried post for him, though leading business men occasionally paid fees for scientific advice. Geologists, deciphering the Record of the Rocks, were a terror to the Church long before their work was of 'practical' importance; not till the twentieth century did the geologist at last become a professional man, helping to find oil or advising the General Staff on the best sites for landing on the Normandy coast. Only late in the nineteenth century did the Great Scientist emerge as an idealized, indeed apotheosized figure; H. G. Wells was his prophet. His prestige thereafter grew steadily; his was the light men steered by, or thought they ought to steer by, in everything down to the smallest.

'Science is no cosmic prophesy', wrote Lancelot Hogben in the 'thirties.² 'True science, in the words of Robert Boyle, is "such knowledge as hath tendency to use." A scientific law embodies a recipe for doing something, and its final validation rests in the domain of action . . . This is not the age of pamphleteers, it is the age of engineers. The spark-gap is mightier than the pen. Democracy will not be salvaged by men who talk fluently, debate forcefully and quote aptly.'

The chemists led the way from the ivory tower into factories and offices. 'Chemistry is the basis of everything and nothing escapes it,' said Kelvin, and the work of geniuses like Brunner, Mond, and Perkins created a need for trained chemists in industry. In this, Germany was far ahead of Britain, and it was not until 1877 that the Institute of Chemistry was founded by practising chemists to establish 'an organization for the profession of chemistry analogous to those representing law, medicine and pharmacy.'³ Very gradually it became impossible for the brewer, dyer, leather processor or paint manufacturer to do his own chemistry, and the profession grew; in 1881 the Society of Chemical Industry was founded. But not until the twentieth century did science-teaching in schools—notably in Oundle—and in universities begin to be arranged with the idea of specific careers in chemistry. The first generation born of this awakening to the importance of chemistry went mainly into teaching. The second, between the wars, found its most profitable and exciting place in industry, especially in the making of new synthetic textiles, plastics, and other raw materials. By the late 'thirties, government departments found they could not carry out their multifarious activities, from preparing our defences to advising farmers how to farm, without more and more chemists; the third generation of chemists looked very largely to government employ for the exercise of their talents. In some respects this epitomizes the period: from pedagogue to public servant in three generations.

Physics remained longer in its ivory tower. The profession, indeed, was organized round the Institute of Physics in 1918, but physicists did not begin to enter industry in numbers until the late 'twenties and early 'thirties, gravitating to the research laboratories of the radio and scientific instrument firms. At first (as in the case of chemistry) there was employment only for the first-class research mind; but soon there was a routine job for the run-of-the-mill physicist, especially if he had a grounding in mechanical engineering. He became a recognized figure when the work of giants like the Curies and Rutherford flowered into atomic physics—a development which drew most professional physicists into government service. The remaining categories of professional scientists, too, have mainly found jobs in the public services. The metallurgists, who organized themselves into a profession only in 1948, have, it is true, gone mainly into the iron and steel industry—duly to be nationalized; but biologists have gone into scientific agriculture behind their desks in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, in the Colonial Service, and in the National Agricultural Advisory Service; though some entomologists, for instance, have found a profitable field to cultivate in firms specializing in the control of plant disease and insect pests.

3. THE ENGINEERS SPECIALIZE

The work of the scientists in education, in government, and in industry has of course profoundly influenced other professions, especially engineering and medicine. In both of these, science has aided the specialist at the expense of the general practitioner. The main difference between engineering and medicine has been one of organization: formally the medical profession has remained unified, whereas engineering has become still more Balkanized than in the later nineteenth century. New engineering institutions have sprung up like mushrooms; the older institutions have noticeably failed to provide scope for new techniques.

Snobbery and conservatism have had something to do with this failure; the attempt to fix educational standards contributed to it. The desire of engineers for status and recognition based on an existing and understood engineering set-up made it impossible to keep engineers under one umbrella. So far from the qualifications of the older bodies proving a prerequisite for the discovery of new engineering techniques, it was often self-trained men, or men from scientific professions, who took the lead. Before the first world war, the motor industry was created by bench-taught men rather than M.I.Mech.E's; Lord Nuffield

graduated from bicycles to 'cars, and Mr William Lyons in the 'twenties from side-cars to Jaguars. Many of the early aircraft builders were untrained engineers, sometimes mathematicians. Chemists, again, had a major share in the creation of the body of knowledge known as chemical engineering. Moreover, apparently inconsiderable minor manufacturing methods created new bodies of engineers who became, especially in the 'twenties and 'thirties, self-consciously expert in their own departments, and quite good at proving that the qualifications provided by the older institutions for those specialities were inadequate and obsolete. Thus the outcrop of concrete and steel construction between the wars brought into being the structural engineers, who presently claimed to be doing most of the work of the civil engineers, only better—and a large part of the job of the architects too. The work of the physicist made electronics possible, and the outcome was a new type—the radio engineer who lived in a far more rarefied atmosphere than the M.I.E.E., and who did not see why he should learn to construct electric locomotives when he intended to work exclusively with physicists and mathematicians in building electronic brains—or even television sets.

The first world war brought mass-production to British industry, and subsequently to the masses. Hitherto, craftsmanship had been the basis and the method of nearly all British manufactures; the war grafted onto factory routine the idea of the 'long run' of standardized, interchangeable substances and component parts for conveyor-line assembly, from rifles to plum-and-apple jam. The professional mechanical engineer, absorbed in problems of design, did not take kindly to production problems. The Institution of Mechanical Engineers refused, in 1919, to make any special provision for those interested in American factory methods. So the new specialist, the Production Engineer, had to make his own way, and successfully did so, creating his own institution and technical journalism. All the new specialities and their institutions—of Radio Engineers, of Structural Engineers, of Production Engineers, of Chemical Engineers, together with the Royal Aeronautical Society—strove, however, after the self-same respectability and authority that characterized the older institutions; as soon as they had gathered a sizeable membership they set examinations and prescribed courses of practical training. But by the 'thirties a new 'lower-middle class' of semi-engineer began to appear: the engineering technician who had learned his specialized routine at an institute. As industry was 'scienced up', the plastics, textiles, rubber, oil, and paint industries required men and women trained in the elements of the

process, and this presently required a modest grounding in engineering and science (mainly chemistry). These routine workers became conscious of professional solidarity in the 'thirties, and, rapidly increased in numbers as well as to some extent in learning, began during and after the second world war to hanker after equality with professional engineers and scientists. They felt 'as good as anybody else', a feeling which sprang less from a sober evaluation of their educational attainments and their cultural maturity than from the spirit of the times—the desire to enjoy status. In the 'thirties, the older institutions took fright at the multiplying species of engineers, and tried to put a stop to the process. The Mechanical Engineers successfully cannibalized the Institution of Automobile Engineers, and the 'Big Three' together began blocking the issue of further royal charters; but the opportunity for a unified engineering profession, if it ever existed, had gone. The specialist, claiming to be fully professional in culture as well as in proficiency, dominated technology.

4. DOCTORS AND THE HOSPITALS

Medicine, still concerned with the human engine,* remained formally united as a profession, but year by year it was more deeply split by specialization and the hospitals. The modern hospital was made possible by the nursing profession, which not only operated it in accordance with sanitary^o science, but, by means of the probationer system in training, provided a cheap domestic staff. Welfare and democracy made the well-run hospital a social necessity, for only by the aid of hospitals could the poor be treated speedily and cheaply with reasonable care—and in 1886 the working man got the vote; in 1918 and 1928 the women got it. But it was science which made the hospital the centre of health and medicine in the fifty years following 1900; only in large organizations could science, with its array of specialists and costly equipment, be effectively focused upon the individual 'case', passing through in a directed stream of cases. The Act of 1911 was founded on the principle that all citizens must have access to good

* 'This engine, its capacity one tenth of one horse-power, weighing on the average from 150 to 200 pounds, is extremely economical in its fuel demands. Its boiler burns fuel at a very low temperature. While it requires about ten hours to get up steam in a ship and three or four on a locomotive, this motor is ready for work at almost a moment's notice . . . It works at constant pressure. It automatically informs the operator when the fuel is exhausted. It contains about 250 bearings, all of which are automatically lubricated. Despite its enormously complicated mechanism, it wears well . . . ' (*A.B.C. of Technocracy*, Hamish Hamilton, 1933). Even writing tongue in cheek, it required a scientific, specialist age to produce such a definition of the Thinking Reed.

medical care. The Medical Officer of Health became an ever more important functionary as state health grew up through the 'twenties and 'thirties, and particularly as the result of the Local Government Act of 1929. The specialist became still more important in the old Voluntary and new Municipal Hospitals and in Harley Street (or its provincial equivalents). A third Royal College, that of the Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, was added in 1932, and no doubt there would by now have followed a fourth, that of the Psychiatrists, if the practising psychiatrists could have decided who was and who wasn't a charlatan. The ear, nose, and throat specialist suffered something of an eclipse as the result of the coming of sulfa drugs and penicillin; but all other specialities flourished and sub-divided. The doctor's vision, declared Dawson in the 'thirties, 'hitherto focused on the individual, will extend its range so as to embrace the community. Professions, like individuals, have their phases of development. In the medical profession to-day we see the dawn of the civic conscience.⁴

This may have been true; but with it went the eclipse of the general practitioner. Before Poor Law Medicine, he was the only doctor; and even when he had to share the profession with specialists, at least he had much to do with the recommendation of specialist to patient. The boom in specialization created, in the inter-war years, the 'specialoid'—a man not quite good enough to hold a hospital appointment, but who had capital enough to maintain a Harley Street brass plate, and bedside manner enough to fill his consulting room with indiscriminating rich patients. But state medicine became important to the G.P. By the 'thirties, nearly forty per cent of the average G.P.'s income came from the Panel.⁵ His prestige declined; his social function appeared increasingly to be to act as a clearing-house for hospital cases, and his medical concern only with the less serious common diseases. As the kindly family doctor, he was sometimes the hero of a sentimental film; but the great doctor-scientist usually stalked off with the real glory. It awaited only the National Health Service Act to complete the G.P.'s dethronement.

The development of hospitals, and the hospital professions, was speeded by two other factors: the redistribution of incomes and the discovery of psycho-somatic medicine. 'The hospitals used to be for the sick poor', Dawson remarked in the 'twenties. 'Now we are all poor and sometimes sick.'⁶ Only in hospitals could the new poor, and indeed the *nouveaux riches*, get the best scientific medicine. Dental and eye care were increasingly part of the state's concern for school children; this, and the impact of science on dentistry—now dental

science—and on ophthalmology, led at long last in 1921 to the organization of the dentists, and in 1936 (under the Health Act of that year) of the opticians. They became qualified professions allied to medicine. The treatment of the nation's feet remained in unqualified and unregistered hands longer; though the Society of Chiropody was formed in 1912, it was not until 1938 that qualified chiropodists created their own miniature G.M.C., the Joint Council of Chiropody. The ancient art of massage and manipulative surgery was put upon a scientific basis and produced the physiotherapists. In this large field, a number of professional bodies and letters-designate came into being. More obviously the result of scientific medicine has been the growth of numbers of trained radiologists, concerned with X-ray photography and (though these are usually also doctors) with radium curative treatment; likewise the laboratory technicians, who formed their own institute as early as 1912. The increase in the numbers of technicians and medical auxiliaries in hospitals has been astonishing; hospitals which had perhaps a dozen (excluding nurses) in the 'thirties now have fifty to a hundred. Hospital administration was consolidated as a profession, complete with exams, institute and professional journal, in 1945; and since then it has manoeuvred to become almost as much a closed profession as medicine. The day of the retired army officer, using his organizing powers and his understanding of discipline to run a hospital, is over. The administrators have arrived.

The new professions which deal with mental and emotional, as opposed to physical, health are the offspring of the welfare state and of psychology. Social workers evolved out of the ministrants sent forth by the Charity Organization Society, which was started by Edward Denison in 1869 with 'a social science policy' aimed at 'using for the purposes of imperial, national, municipal and individual life the great stores of knowledge in every department of philosophy and science, which the mental activity of the last half-century has created and accumulated, but which have not yet been employed to diminish the sufferings and increase the happiness of humanity at large.' As a matter of fact, it quickly proved that no such stores of 'know-how' existed, and the lucubrations of Spencer or Galton had produced very little practical knowledge that C.O.S. workers could deploy against slumdom and juvenile delinquency; the knowledge was gained, in the event, from the systematized study of what poverty involved made by the family 'case-workers' whom Denison sent out. Indeed the functions of social workers split off from some of the functions already carried out by clergy, general medical practitioners and medical

officers of health, and lawyers; many of the early case-workers were in holy orders.

Clerical 'police court missionaries' had begun their activities in 1887 (the idea of binding-over first offenders goes back still further); as probation officers they received distinct professional status in the Probation of Offenders Act, 1907. The first hospital almoner was appointed in 1895, but until the 'twenties the main work of almoners was to assess what poor patients could pay for treatment at the hospitals and only gradually were almoners able to put first the work of following up the treatment into the patients' homes. Criminal psychology was already of very modest assistance to Courts and their servants, the probation officers, before the first world war, but not until the end of the war did medical psychology, neurology, intelligence measurement, and above all the psycho-analytic schools, with their theories and case studies, provide social workers with a technique, a yardstick for measuring human behaviour—and a jargon. The whole area bounded on one side by the hospitals and by state medicine, on the second by the law, on the third by education, and on the fourth by the family (revealed by Freud in all its primitive rawness as an emotional battlefield) was now occupied by psychiatry and psychology, and by social workers.

Social workers were particularly important in bringing the citizen into contact with all the agencies of state welfare set up in increasing numbers. Psychiatric social workers, with a full professional organization, grew in numbers from the late 'twenties; children's officers became a full-fledged profession only after the second world war; marriage guidance counsellors are still a rather hybrid group, though their professional destiny seems inescapable. The growing body of psychiatric case histories, and their vigorous theoretical polemics, provide social workers with a body of specialized knowledge of human relations, and a sharpened professional self-consciousness which have put them at pains to deny the lay view that 'the good sensible woman (or still more man) who has travelled the world a bit is just as valuable, if not more so, than the qualified social worker.'⁸ The second world war enormously increased their scope. True, the psychiatrists proved hopelessly wrong in all their forecasts of the effects of bombing on civilian mental health; but the upheavals caused by the evacuation of 2,000,000 children and mothers from danger areas in 1939 and again in 1944, and the wartime break-up of family life, called social workers to man hostels, to distribute largesse, and to act as shock workers in the voluntary civil defence effort. The war stimulated further advances in the scope

of state welfare which affected all the professions concerned with health and education. 'By the end of the second world war the Government had, through the agency of newly established or existing services, assumed and developed a measure of direct concern for the health and well being of the population which, by contrast with the role of Government in the nineteenth century, was little short of remarkable.'⁹ This assumption of responsibility was extended in the six years of Labour government which followed the war; in particular, by the Children's Act of 1948, parenthood was put further into professional hands, though to a degree considered by the professional children's officer as still no more than an instalment of what is necessary, if children are to be brought up in the way science teaches them they should go.¹⁰

5. THE MANAGEMENT MOVEMENT

Trade and industry employed more specialists as the individual firm increased in size from the 'eighties onwards,¹¹ and as products and processes themselves became more specialized. 'We specialize in . . . ' became the exordium of every manufacturer's catalogue or announcement. The 'business professions' increased in step with the growth of commercial activity. Stockbroking became, if possible, still more respectable, as the landed interest declined; and any loss of business incurred by the break-up of large fortunes was far outdone by the commissions produced by legions of small and medium investors, as well as the 'institutional investors' such as insurance companies and building societies who were founding vast enterprises on the prudence of the expanding middle classes. Accountancy developed rapidly. The Companies Act made audit by qualified public accountants compulsory for public companies in 1867; and proper audit steadily became the hallmark of all reputable concerns, public and private. It extended to local authorities and voluntary organizations, and, as the incidence of income tax increased during and after the first world war, to private individuals and estates.¹² Firms and partnerships of chartered accountants became prosperous, and the distinction 'A.C.A.' was coveted. Chartered accountants began before the first world war to enter industry as directors or managers in significant numbers.

But many men who were unable to afford articles were learning and performing the work of accountants; for them there arose the Incorporated Society, which accepted training in local government and technical colleges. In the nineteenth century book-keeping and costing had been alike of the simplest, even for considerable concerns; growing

employment of accountants in firms quickly revealed the value of costing as a guide to control of production. Between the wars, the cost accountant, developing systems of standard costing and budgetary control, became important, and it was not long before a professional society and a system of training was evolved to suit his needs. The influence of accountants on industry was marked, and some said it was bad, for finance rather than technology informed the outlook of the board-room in consequence. Accountants had no solution for the problems which beset industry in the inter-war period, and in particular they could see no reason to scrap machinery and equipment before the books showed that it was fully depreciated; on the other hand, they became adept at fixing up mergers, amalgamations, cartels and price-fixing arrangements. Moreover, the chartered or incorporated accountants in senior positions did not always give the cost accountant his due—they were finance-minded, rather than truly cost-minded. Nonetheless, without the accountant the great business organizations needed to bring the full advantages of technological specialization into full play could not have been created: engineer, scientist, and accountant advanced together, bickering at times, but absolutely necessary to one another.

The creation of the large firms produced special jobs for managers—the sales department, for example, branched off fairly early in the century, as Britain felt the impact of foreign, especially German, competition, and a minority of firms organized to meet it. Sales managers were made self-conscious by their relation to the simple commercial traveller, and by the rapid growth of publicity and advertising. Three years after H. G. Wells's *Tono-Bungay* appeared, the Sales Managers' Association was founded—in 1911. Between the wars, publicity and advertising became a major industry, and the absolute necessity to learn American methods of salesmanship produced a boom in sales managers: the purchasing officer, on the other hand, came into his own only when, with the onset of the second world war, procurement of materials and substitutes became, and for years after the war remained, the major business headache; the result was a flourishing Purchasing Officers Association, set up in 1945. Many other types of 'functional' management came into existence in the 'twenties and 'thirties, however. From about 1925 on, the 'management movement' began to make itself felt: it was the result of many forces—the growing size of organizations and hence the remoteness of central command; the growing power of organized labour and hence the importance of dealing with disputes promptly and fairly; the growth of new pro-

duction techniques, mainly imported from America, of which F. W. Taylor's 'scientific management' was the forerunner; the whole conception of welfare; the conception of day-to-day costing. At the lower level, personnel management emerged, inspired by ideas that go back to Owen and Cadbury and concerned mainly with conditions of work, selection, and training; at the higher level, the conception of industrial administration developed as cartels and mergers turned some businesses into units as large as government departments—and sometimes as much enveloped in red tape.

The second world war provided as great a fillip to the business professions as it did to the social workers. Profit-making became simply cost-plus; but manpower was short, labour had to be cosseted, government had to be supplied with reams of returns, and there was money to burn; in these conditions the professional manager thrived. Personnel managers in 1939 numbered 1,800; in 1943, 5,759.¹³ The management movement emerged from the war strong, and enjoying prestige with Socialists. In the war, managers had worked well with civil servants, with trade union leaders and social workers of all sorts; management was now seen as a respectable function in a Socialist, not to say managerial, revolution. Management must merely become more scientific, more sociological and less proprietorial, and, of course, efficient—like the Americans. Upon this basis of thought, management training was encouraged, the British Institute of Management was founded, working parties and productivity teams set to work, and various experiments in the management of nationalized industry were set on foot.

Managers and business men at last felt the impact of the state, as other professions had done over the previous twenty or thirty years. An observer writing in 1936 had noted that 'one of the numerous social changes effected by our many social services has . . . been the silent growth of new professions and the subtle transformations of old ones . . . all alike have this one new characteristic: they are becoming salaried servants of the community instead of fee-taking advisers of individuals. . . . The newer professions have marked themselves out by rigid specialization, restrictions on recruitment, and a bias against transfer from one watertight compartment to another.'¹⁴ Business was the last calling to feel this process; but by the middle 'forties it had become marked even in industry.

6. GROWTH OF PROFESSIONAL TRADE UNIONISM

Hardly a year can have passed between the wars without the forming of some new professional association. The motives were many. The secretary of the new organization got a job out of it, and jobs were scarce. The publishers of the professional journal got a guaranteed subscription list upon which to build advertising—and not a few publishers of technical journals have actively encouraged the creation of professional and quasi-professional bodies for that reason; then there are the examination fees, the conference get-togethers, and the paraphernalia of letters-designate. But basically, the formation of such a body was a defensive move. It is true that professional associations set in the forefront of their articles the extension of the science or art involved, and the raising of standards of practice; and this the new professional bodies, whether of sales managers, psychiatric social workers, or production engineers, have done, if with varying degrees of success. But even in this the newer professions have been somewhat concerned to prove that there *was* an art or science to profess.

But in the main the newer professional bodies, like the older, have been anxious to draw a distinction between the trained and untrained practitioner, which should be reflected in conditions of employment—and possibly, at some stage, to drive the untrained person right out of the field. Twentieth-century influences favoured this development. In the first two or three decades, the strong desire to rise out of the masses and achieve professional status as part of the effort to become middle-class was important, and letters-designate and the membership of some body seemed useful to that end. It accounted for much support given to the less exalted accountancy bodies, for example, and to the steady recruitment to the ill-paid jobs of schoolmastering or nursing. 'Anyone who has been, as I have been, a professional teacher in England for forty years, and who has studied the position of English teachers for the last century, must recognize the enormous benefits which the teachers and the community have gained from the recent growth of professional organization. The private school "usher", clinging to the rags of his gentility with the wages and independence of a footman, has the chance of becoming a man when he joins the Association of Assistant Masters; the sweated schoolmistresses have successfully claimed the wages of a skilled occupation; some "public school" masters have been drawn out of their attitude of elderly boyhood; the whole profession has gained in intellectual independence, as against clerical

"managers", capitalist governors and the politicians on the local education authority', wrote Graham Wallas in 1921.¹⁵ In more recent decades, the ever-stronger organization of workpeople and factory operatives has imparted, especially in times of inflationary price rises, an urge to the professions to bargain likewise, to uphold or to increase the status—the wage differential—of their members.

The importance of this is illustrated in reverse by the unorganized professions. Artists and authors have suffered when other professions have held their ground; and the need to organize has driven professions hitherto composed of ingrained individualists to join together in unwonted solidarity. The depression of the 'thirties exposed the weakness of those who were unable to bargain. The result among actors and actresses was the formation of what is more like a trade union than a professional organization—Equity, with a comparable body for the Variety Artists. Journalists, though less successful (because it is harder for a group of writers to hold a newspaper or magazine to ransom than for a cast to hold up a theatre management in the middle of rehearsals), achieved something similar in the N.U.J. Between the wars, officers of the Merchant Navy, though hard hit by unemployment, were slow to join an association: but their association was a Trade Union—and to-day enjoys a large membership. Visual artists have found it harder still to combine, but after the second world war those who found most of their custom among industrial firms, government departments, or publicity organizations, formed the Society of Industrial Artists for the same purpose.

The change in other professional bodies has been steady. The weaker professions have sought to strengthen themselves in order to bargain; the stronger have sought to apply the closed shop, even when the untrained practitioner has offered no special menace to society. Architects, after a long and difficult struggle, unified their profession, and secured registration of architects by Act of Parliament in 1931 and 1938;¹⁶ their strongest opponents in this were the engineers, who had more or less given up hope of unifying themselves at that time. But after the second world war, we find engineers becoming as anxious to protect the word 'engineer'¹⁷ as architects have been to confine their designation to a trained man or woman. 'Unity', declared the President of the Electrical Engineers in 1946, 'is needed on a level above specialization to provide the safeguards of professional independence and the instruments of public influence without which the engineer cannot fulfil his role of trusteeship in Modern Society.'¹⁸ Throughout the 'thirties the N.U.T. did good service in shoring up the defences of

the overstocked and underpaid teaching profession. After the second world war, almost all professional bodies found themselves forced into a position of bargaining with state or local authorities as the major employers of their members; but it was a position which built itself up slowly between the wars for many professions. The spectacle of the B.M.A. threatening the state that doctors in the N.H.S. may strike unless pay is raised ¹⁹ is the culmination of a process which is found in an earlier stage, with the formation of the Engineers' Guild to do the bargaining over pay which the older chartered institutions of engineering are precluded by charter from fulfilling.

7. RISING IN THE WORLD

It would, however, be over-simplifying history to see the growth of professionalism and specialism simply as a means of bargaining for better salaries or working conditions. The social revolution of the twentieth century brought a sudden change to professional status. Hitherto, it had taken time—even hundreds of years—to establish a profession as fit for a gentleman; the newer professions—such as accountants or estate agents—could merely hope to establish respectable middle-class status. Trollope perhaps exaggerated the class-consciousness of gentfolk in the mid-Victorian era when he wrote of Mrs Marrable:

‘She always addressed an attorney by letter* as mister, raising up her eyebrows when appealed to on the matter and explaining that an attorney was not an esquire. She had an idea that the son of a gentleman, if he intended to maintain his rank as a gentleman, should earn his income as a clergyman, or as a barrister, or as a soldier or as a sailor. Those were the professions intended for gentlemen. She would not absolutely say that a physician was not a gentleman or even a surgeon; but she would never allow to physic the same absolute privilege which, in her eyes, belong to the law and the Church. There might also possibly be doubt about the Civil Service and Civil Engineering, but she had no doubt whatever that when a man touched trade or commerce in any way he was doing that which was not the work of a gentleman.’

But as long as the landed interest mainly prevailed in social matters—and that is to say up to 1914—some of this feeling persisted. ‘Even medicine and law were looked on as demeaning occupations for members of a County Family, and though a famous K.C. might be admitted to one’s table, the solicitor, like the doctor, entered the country gentleman’s house at the back door. Deedes actually remembers the solicitor

who came to Saltwood on estate business ringing the bell at the tradesmen's entrance.'²⁰

Gradually, however, professional people moved upwards in the scale. Top-rankers in almost all professions were socially acceptable by the early twentieth century, as well as anyone who had done anything remarkable in his calling. Moreover, some professions which had been beyond the pale rose rapidly in social estimation for special reasons. In the nineteenth century, artists and actors in particular (if at all successful) pretended to Respectability; but in the 'nineties and in Edwardian days, the stage became admired because it broke the taboos of the dying age. It was not merely that a levelling-down process was taking place, but that a moral revolution was beginning.

The first world war destroyed many of the landed families, and death duties and high income-tax and surtax steadily continued the process. As the older class structure disintegrated, the pressure of Socialist ideas produced a feeling of insecurity in which everybody felt called on to justify his existence. Before the stern judgment of the left-wing intelligentsia it was necessary to prove that you were earning your keep, especially if it were a substantial keep. There were many curious manifestations of this feeling—duchesses running dress shops and earls' sons selling cars, when the diplomatic posts would not go round. More noticeably, upper- and middle-class women poured into the labour market, most of them looking for professions other than nursing or schoolteaching. 'Among women of the middle classes after the war, daughters were expected to take up business careers or at least *do something* . . . doing something often meant taking up music and art. Music was the harder and sterner profession, so art schools had a tremendous membership, which did not sensibly decrease throughout the peace. By 1939 it was calculated that there were at least 200,000 self-styled artists in England, of whom the great majority were women, but fewer than 200, mostly men, lived wholly by their art.'²¹ Women flooded art and journalism; but they entered all professions in large or small numbers after the passing of the Sex Disqualification Act of 1919. The first female barrister was called to the bar in 1921.

To be a drone had become socially unacceptable—and to be a squire was now to be included among the drones. Besides, the middle and to some extent the upper classes had developed a deep and complex sense of guilt;²² to take up a profession was one way of relieving it. A profession gave one a position, a group-membership, which was lacking when social position, either hereditary or acquired by money-making, became suspect. When hereditary privilege could no longer

be defended, justification by works might save; the only defensible privilege was professional privilege. It may not be too much to speak of a flight into professionalism—even into ill-paid or pseudo-professions. As Socialism grew in strength, and Marxist theories were propagated, even though nationalization was still a matter of crank resolutions, business itself was not proof against the spirit of the time. The depression shook the complacency and wounded the self-esteem of business men. The 'Captains of Industry' had made a sorry showing; almost as bad as the wretched economists. They hastened to become professional managers. In the 'thirties businesses prated more and more of their 'service'* and 'trusteeship' and talked of themselves less as companies and more as 'organizations' (even, in exalted moments as institutions). Brokers and bankers thought of themselves as fully professional; the advertising men coveted the same standing, and created the Institute of Incorporated Practitioners in Advertising. Industrial consultants claimed the same position, and the whole 'management movement' derived strength from the feeling. House agents joined in growing numbers less exacting bodies than the Chartred Auctioneers' and Estate Agents' Institute.

There was, in short, a growing demand for professions as such: inevitably professions to supply the demand were manufactured. But the motive was psychological as well as economic. Behind guilt lurks fear, and professionalism was in part a reaction to the growing strength of the working-class movement. Workpeople are inconsistent in their reactions to the brain-worker. Jack Cade's men hanged every scrivener they met, with his inkhorn about his neck. Some of the deep-seated resentment of the 'clever people' remains, and Marx, in his first statements of labour value, took no account of the work of inventors or organizers: the belief that only manual work is real work lingered.²³ On the other hand snobbery penetrates deep, and the professional ethic is akin to the craft ethic. The skilled worker, holding himself a cut above the labourer, could see that professional training should be rewarded by the 'rate for the job', and could respect the doctor, engineer, and scientist because they 'got results' visibly. Much less respect was accorded other professions such as that of the lawyers, whose reputation was based on the rough justice of the Police Court,²⁴ or the clergy, whom working people reckoned as having the softest of soft jobs.²⁵ The more, therefore, that a profession could claim to produce 'results', like the technologists or scientists, the better; and this

* A crudely frank American business man about this time was heard to remark: 'The *** Corporation is darned right to say it's a regular public service. It serves the Californian public as regularly as a bull does a cow.'

was not without its effect on the younger professions. The young women flooding into them absorbed pseudo-science and jargon like sponges.

These tendencies were inevitably reinforced by the second world war. The remnants of the gentry were greatly impoverished, and the differential between classes—including that between skilled and unskilled workers—was further narrowed. The state became a still larger employer of professional talent. Trade unionism was strengthened and the growth of collective bargaining forced almost everybody to be represented in some way on Whitley Councils or other bodies. The war, moreover, gave impetus to new forms of specialization, and when it was over it became obvious that larger numbers of technologists and experts of every kind were required; the expansion of professional training became the most urgent task of the peace. Under Socialism, for the first time, very clear attempts were made to reconcile the working class to the existence of masses of specialists—and specialized administrators. The specialist, the bureaucrat, existed, enjoyed his privileges (including staff cars for higher grades) because he was the servant of the masses. Upon his efforts—especially in the increase of productivity—the standard of life depended. Workers were not, in all cases, satisfied that new area manager or technical adviser was not old boss writ large. But, informally perhaps, it seemed that an understanding was reached: provided they delivered the goods, in terms of ever larger returns for easier labour, the experts, and especially the boffins, might stay—an *élite* on trial. •

The size of this *élite* had greatly increased, but was still a small proportion of the nation. The number engaged in professional services was about two and a half per cent of all occupied people in 1851; in 1938 it was over four per cent. If civil servants, quasi-professions, and managers are added, it was probably over six per cent. In 1951 it had increased further, probably to nine or ten per cent. But taking professional people with administrative and executive civil servants and senior business executives, the number was probably about a million or somewhat more.²⁶ Upon this million, trained in its varied disciplines and practice, organized in its diverse associations, furnished with such vision and wisdom as its vocational education vouchsafed, the leadership of the nation devolved.

NOTES

1. Cf. Graham Wallas, *Our Social Heritage*, 1921, p. 125: 'I myself, for instance, was working a few years ago at a problem of human "purpose", and it occurred to me that I might get help from the current literature of jurisprudence. Lawyers, on and off the Bench, spend part of their lives in examining instances of human conduct, and in arguing whether acts are or are not "intentional" or "wilful", or

whether the doer is or is not responsible for them. Their textbooks might, I thought, contain a stock of carefully analysed experience as to human motive. I therefore wrote to the ablest and most learned professor of law whom I know, one of the very few who have preserved freshness of mind throughout an English legal training. He replied that I would find "the generally accepted view as to intention and motive" in Stephen, "but", he added, "I don't think you will find that the English lawyers have realised that there are any serious psychological difficulties; they don't need to, as you can generally shunt really difficult questions on to the jury." I understood my friend's statement when I looked up Stephen's *History of the Criminal Law in England*. . . . Our modern lawyers, finding that Benthamism as expounded and simplified by Austin and Stephen is both easy to learn and easy to reproduce in professional examinations or in Court, have been satisfied with it ever since.' This view was slowly modified in the 'thirties and 'forties; the Institute for the Scientific Treatment of Delinquency, which co-operates with the Courts, was founded in 1933.

2. Lancelot Hogben, *Science for the Citizen*, 1938, p. 1077.
3. The Royal Institute of Chemistry, *The Student and the Institute*, 1950, p. 3.
4. Francis Watson, *Dawson of Penn*, 1950, p. 171.
5. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1951, Vol. CXIV, Pt. I, p. 23.
6. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 176.
7. Quoted in *Social Casework in Great Britain*, ed. Cherry Morris, 1951, p. 51.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 199; cf. E. L. Younghusband, *Social Work in Britain, a supplementary report on the employment of social workers*, Carnegie Trust, 1950, p. 124.
9. R. Titmuss, *Problems of Social Policy*, 1950, p. 506.
10. Younghusband, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
11. L. Urwick and E. F. L. Brech, *The Human Factor in Management*, 1935-1943, Institute of Labour Management, 1944, p. 13.
12. Gilbert D. Shepherd, M.B.E., F.C.A., *The Future Role of the Accountant*, address to the sixth Australian Congress on Accounting, 1949.
13. G. R. Moxon, *The Growth of Personnel Management in Britain During the War, 1939-44*, Institute of Personnel Managers, 1945, p. 28.
14. W. H. Wickwar, *The Social Services*, 1936, p. 132.
15. Wallas, *op. cit.*, p. 141.
16. Eric L. Bird, M.C., A.R.I.B.A., 'The Architectural Profession', in the *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Institute of Chemistry*, Pt. I, 1949.
17. *Journal of the Engineers' Guild*, July 1948, pp. 8-10.
18. W. E. Wickenden, 'Professional Goals for Today', in the *Journal of the Engineers' Guild*, November 1947.
19. *The Times*, 23 February 1951.
20. J. Prestland, *Deedes Bey*, 1942, p. 20.
21. C. Graves and R. Hodge, *The Long Weekend*, 1940, p. 146.
22. R. Lewis and A. Maude, *The English Middle Classes*, 1949, Chap. IV.
23. Cf. Robert Tressall, *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists*, reprinted Penguin Books, 1940.
24. 'Solicitor', *English Justice*, 1932 (Penguin ed.), pp. 50, 163, 191, 217.
25. H. H. Henson, *The Church of England*, 1939, p. 153.
26. G. D. H. Cole and R. Postgate, *The Common People*, 1938, p. 339; Colin Clark, *The Conditions of Economic Progress*, 2nd ed. 1951, pp. 398-9. Classification changes make comparison difficult. In a preliminary examination of the results of the 1951 Census. *The Economist* (9 July 1952) showed that the numbers of the principal learned professions, as analyzed in this book, (but excluding certain callings such as medical auxiliaries, pharmacists, opticians, nurses, and business managers, as well as civil servants and officers of the forces) rose from about 475,000 in 1931 to about 700,000 in 1951. Among the significant increases were: doctors and radiographers, from 29,300 to 41,900; male teachers, from 79,500 to 121,000; architects from 9,200 to 15,900; accountants from 13,900 to 27,000; engineers and surveyors from 33,000 to 94,200; scientists from 28,300 to 113,000. The number of solicitors increased by only about 1,000. A decline in Church of England clergy was not quite balanced by an increase in priests of the R.C. faith and other religions. Female teachers, dentists, and artists hardly increased at all: but figures for the unorganized professions are of doubtful validity.

CHAPTER IV

What is a Profession?

'I hold every man a debtor to his profession, from the which as men do of course seek to receive countenance and profit, so ought they of duty to endeavour themselves, by way of amends, to be a help and an ornament thereunto.'

BACON, *Maxims of the Law*

'It is regrettable that the public has to be on its guard whenever an occupation sets out to establish its status as that of a profession. For one thing, customers tend to be transformed into clients, which means that pounds are automatically converted into guineas. More serious is the fact that the occupation almost invariably lays claims to powers of self-regulation which insensibly or deliberately entail monopoly privileges.'

GEORGE SCHWARTZ in *The Sunday Times*

PROFESSIONAL STATUS has thus come to be coveted by ever larger numbers of people, groups, or callings; 'professional' has become a descriptive term vaguely suggestive of such legitimate privilege, based on specialized knowledge and ethical behaviour, as can be made acceptable to a society committed to an egalitarian ideal. But just what is a profession to-day? We have seen how professions were evolved, how the newer were often modelled, with greater or less propriety, upon the older: how every *expertise* based on some systematic instruction hopes to bear comparison with law, medicine, and—presumably—the Church. The flight into professionalism by technicians, tradesmen, brokers, social workers, and administrators in the last few decades should suggest that no simple, or even comprehensive definition is likely to cover every case, or convey adequately the quality of professional service. Yet that quality is a very real thing, and we ought to make some attempt to understand what we mean by it. Whatever meaning it once possessed, has it any meaning *now*? This exercise, even if it can lead to no neat answer, should lead us to the main problems and tendencies in professional life to-day, as compared with those of other occupations.

1. THE BASIS OF A PROFESSION

In *The Professions*, published in 1933, Carr-Saunders and Wilson declined to attempt any definition, beyond the limiting of their survey—

to a group of callings which bear a greater or less resemblance to the acknowledged and ancient professions of law and medicine. This caused them to include public administration, but to omit officers of the armed forces or police; to exclude the clergy but to examine the claims of management. They observed that, under duress to provide a definition, they could not improve on that of the O.E.D.—‘a vocation in which a professed knowledge of some department of learning or science is used in its application to the affairs of others or in the practice of an art founded upon it’.¹

This definition will certainly cover many, if not all, cases; but it may cover too much. Perhaps the Court which recently agreed to give a photographer, called as an expert witness, the professional fee for attendance (seven guineas a day) instead of the common fee (one guinea) had it in mind. It would certainly confer professional status, for example, on osteopaths, advertising agents, and many kinds of technicians above the simple mechanic. Craftsmen of the higher sort (such as goldsmiths) would have to be included; but whether civil servants, hospital administrators, or higher management could be included would depend on whether it was agreed that they professed knowledge in a recognized department of learning or science.

It was with the express purpose of bringing the trained commercial executive into the professional class that the Carr-Saunders report on Education for Commerce² adopted the description: ‘any body of persons using a common technique who form an association the purpose of which is to test competence in the technique by means of examination.’ This definition places all the emphasis upon organization, though the history of professions is certainly more than a history of guilds. It enables us to call sales managers, export managers, and even commercial travellers (whose association is now instituting examinations)³ professional men, as well as librarians, statisticians, and occupational therapists; but it would, while bringing in most of the clergy, leave out artists, authors, journalists, and actors—for though some of these callings have set up associations, they are not for the purpose of holding examinations. It is true that many actors pass the exams of the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art, and that many, perhaps most, artists are now taking diplomas at art schools; but diplomas are for the purpose of teaching, not practising the profession, in which many who have sat no examination excel. It is doubtful whether managerial proficiency can be tested by examination.*

Moreover the whole definition is strongly attacked by the senior

* This is discussed in Chapter VII.

engineering institutions, who insist that (in engineering at least) a professional association must give training in a *fundamental* department of science; they base on this condition their rejection of the pretensions of radio, production, and even chartered structural engineers.⁴ Finally, the definition excludes Royal Navy and Army officers and even teachers; for, though teachers are examined, and upon their training and degrees their basic salaries are assessed under the Burnham scale, their associations do not examine them. The same is true of Merchant Navy officers and airline pilots.

Possibly the definition was intended to be only partial: that *if* any body of persons set themselves up with an association and examinations, then they must be accounted professional. This, again, will not satisfy the Institute of Chartered Accountants, or of Estate Agents, who will not admit smaller bodies with lower qualifications to parity of esteem.* The question of association is important. It could, for example, be argued that an independent body could be set up to decide whether any association qualified as a body holding examinations which are effective tests of proficiency. This to some degree exists: the Civil Service establishment authorities have to decide it, for the purpose of allocating salary grades, when recruiting experts. They do not accept the qualification awarded by the Institution of Radio Engineers, for example, but do accept that of the Institution of Structural Engineers. Again, the Companies Act of 1948 decides, in a rough and ready way, what accounting bodies effectively test proficiency: besides the C.A.'s, A.C.A.'s, and F.C.A.'s, it permits audit functions to members of the Incorporated Society and the Association of Certified and Corporate Accountants.

2. ATTRIBUTES OF THE PROFESSIONAL

A longer and more comprehensive formulation of the attributes which mark off the life of a corporate group of persons as 'professional in character' has been attempted by Mr W. E. Wickenden, formerly president of the Institution of Electrical Engineers.⁵

'We may place first a *Body of Knowledge* (science) or of *Art* (skill) held as a common possession and to be extended by united effort.

* Thus at the International Conference of Accountants held in Britain in 1930, the Institute of Cost and Works Accountants were not allowed to act as joint hosts with the Chartered Institute and the Incorporated Society; in 1952, however, they will be allowed so to act.

'Next is an *Educational Process* based on this body of knowledge and art, in ordering which the professional group has a recognized responsibility.

'The third is a *Standard of Professional Qualifications* for admission to the professional group, based on character, training and proved competence.

'Next follows a *Standard of Conduct* based on courtesy, honour and ethics, which guides the practitioner in his relations with clients, colleagues and the public.

'Fifth, we may place more or less formal *Recognition of Status* by one's colleagues or by the State as a basis of good standing.

'Finally there is usually the *Organization of the Professional Group*, devoted to its common advancement and its social duty rather than the maintenance of an economic monopoly.

'Professional status is therefore an implied contract: to serve society over and beyond all specific duty to client or employer in consideration of the privileges and protection society extends to the profession.'

The first attribute plunges us, however, once again into the question of the 'technician' demanding professional status. If, as the senior engineering institutions would have us do, we insist that the body of knowledge should be fundamental, we not only rate chemical engineers and time-and-motion-study engineers as no more than technicians, but we inevitably raise the question whether a pharmacist can be a professional man, seeing he has not specifically qualified as a chemist. The Royal Institute of Chemistry would certainly not deny status to the pharmacists⁸ merely on account of their having a rather narrower training and a more circumscribed routine in practice. The training of a master or navigator in the Merchant Navy, though stringent, does not require profound theoretical understanding; like that of nurses, it is vocational and practical, and is supported only by such of the elements as are necessary to understanding the rules of safety and efficiency. An actuary's training requires fundamental knowledge of mathematics but, on the other hand it represents an extremely narrow *expertise*, cloistered and theoretical. Yet if we say that the body of knowledge or of art need only be sufficient to the carrying out of the

duties of the profession, then we must accept the qualifications awarded by institutes of plastics or rubber technology as fully professional. They are certainly as adequate as those of actuaries or pharmacists; indeed, they demand considerable fundamental study in several sciences.

It is impossible to avoid this dilemma, which is by no means epistemological and hair-splitting, but, as will be seen in later chapters, pregnant with very practical problems. The lawyer or doctor who feels disinclined to accept the textiles technologist or the radio engineer as men of comparable standing, aims, outlook, broad sympathies, and ethical practice, must either exclude engineers, scientists, and technologists completely from the professional field, or make some difficult frontier delimitations. How difficult these are may be judged from the official definition of a professional electrical engineer as:

‘One who is competent through his education and training to assume personal responsibility for developments in electrical engineering; to apply the scientific outlook and method to the initiation, organization and supervision of technical work; to give authoritative technical advice; and to exchange ideas with his fellows for the general furtherance of science and its application.’*

Unfortunately, a like definition of *engineer*—mechanical, electrical, or civil—excluding all technicians, craftsmen, and other operatives with any training would be still longer and more abstract.* But if the position is yielded, as it is in the Carr-Saunders definition, then ultimately men and women of the smallest learning and slenderest academic resources must be conceded professional status—foremen and works supervisors, for example.†

) The second attribute of a profession, the educational process, is widely accepted. It is education which makes a profession possible; it is the cramming of a would-be house-agent with some law of contract, taxation, and property, some accountancy, some surveying and mensura-

* After lengthy negotiations, a formal definition of the terms ‘professional engineer’ and ‘engineering technician’ has been adopted by the Conference of Representatives from the Engineering Societies of Western Europe and the U.S.A.; these definitions run into many pages, and it will, so far as one can see, still be open, for example, for members of the Institutions of Chemical, Production, or Radio Engineers, as well as graduates or members of many Institutes of Technology, to grade themselves as fully professional engineers under this definition. In America and Canada, broadly, a man is an engineer if he has passed certain university courses adequate to permit state registration, and the subtle educational and social distinctions which exist between the many engineering societies of Britain do not there exist. Cf: *Education for Management*, Anglo-American Council on Productivity, November 1951, p.8.

† Cf: the attitude of the National Union of Professional Workers, below, p. 220.

tion, some sanitary engineering and town planning, which entitles him, after passing the examinations and gaining practical experience, to call himself a Chartered Auctioneer, Valuer, and Estate Agent; he can then do, with the initials F.I.A. behind his name, the business performed by those who simply call themselves house-agents—if, possibly, more honestly and reliably. But, as has already been pointed out, in some professions the educational process is not formally conducted (with authors and journalists, for example) and in others it is the state, not the professional association, which plans the process, conducts the examinations, and awards the certificate of competence; for if a chartered estate agent is to be regarded as professional, so is a schoolmaster, mining engineer, or master of a ship. Much the same can be said of the third attribute, the standard of qualifications, based on character, training, and proved competence: though it is experience, as well as persistence in training and the passing of stiff examinations, that proves character.⁸

3. THE MEANING OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Most emphasis in defining professionalism has been laid upon standards of conduct—professional ethics. It is perhaps in morality that we find the L.C.M. of professional life. Pride of workmanship is, however, only part of professional ethics. The epitaph on an eighteenth-century clockmaker does not wholly satisfy the condition: 'Here lies in a horizontal position the outside case of George Roughleigh, watchmaker, whose abilities in that line were an honour to his profession; Integrity was the mainspring and Prudence the Regulator of all the Actions of his Life.' Certainly, the professional man or woman, like the craftsman, tends to put the job first, and will not be satisfied with second best. In this matter he is generally separated from the majority of operatives, to whom the job is the mere condition of a wage. Nevertheless, it is surprising, as well as pathetic, how deeply down into merely repetitive work the spirit of English craftsmanship still searches for roots and can be seen existing, while there are certainly professional people without shame for a botched job, as long as their money is safe. It is, however, not enough to regard devotion to the job as the sum of professional ethics, for though devotion to the job goes beyond that competence which is tested by examinations and deepened by experience, many occupations not professional (farming, for example) can claim as much morality as this, though they commonly call it 'efficiency'.

Nor is a sort of general altruism, a kind of sublimation of the craftsman's pride in his product, a satisfactory description of professional ethics, even though bureaucracy relies heavily on something that looks like it:

'The intellectual life of the government official is indeed becoming part of a problem which every year touches us all more closely. In literature and science as well as in commerce and industry, the independent producer is dying out and the official is taking his place. We are nearly all of us officials now . . . whether we write on a newspaper, or teach in a university, or keep accounts in a bank . . . If we merely desire to do as little work and enjoy as much leisure as possible in our lives, we all find that it pays to adopt that steady unanxious "stroke" which neither advances nor retards promotion. The indirect stimulus, therefore, of interest and variety, of public spirit and the craftsman's delight in his skill, is becoming more important to us as a motive for the higher forms of mental effort, and threats and promises of decrease or increase of salary less important.'

But where lies the pure spring of this great tide of public spirit, this devotion of salaried experts to the job, this humane 'interest' which Professor Graham Wallas saw as vital if state social services were not to become 'selfish and pedantic bureaucracy'?

Professional ethics arise from the codes of the most ancient professions: the Hippocratic oath, the inviolability of the confessional, the devotion of lawyer to his client's interest. The relationship of client and practitioner is the basis of professional morality. It is between individuals, and it is fiduciary; the practitioner gives the best possible advice, advice which the buyer is not competent to criticize, and then acts under his client's instructions. The interests of third parties are excluded, at least as far as is possible. The medical profession makes a stand, even to breaking the law, against divulging a patient's affairs in a Court of Law; solicitor and counsel, once retained, are concerned to defend their client's interest, within the framework of law, irrespective of any over-riding considerations of administrative or public interest, however great. As Trollope unkindly put it in *Orley Farm*, 'No amount of eloquence will make an English lawyer think that loyalty to truth should come before loyalty to his client.' The priest should prefer, and some have preferred, martyrdom to varying under pressure from a mundane power the spiritual advice given to souls in their cure. It is essentially a high form of personal obligation.

Some of the newer professions inherit from the older precisely this type of obligation. Much of the legal code will be applicable to dealings

between clients and such' diverse professions as probation officers, land or estate agents, company secretaries, patent agents, accountants. The code of all kinds of social workers, on the other hand, must be modelled upon the medical, as must the code of virtually all of the medical auxiliaries. Social workers, indeed, should conform to a particularly altruistic code of behaviour :

'Moral judgments, particularly in the field of social work . . . only come from a living relationship, an I-Thou rather than I-It relationship with others. . . . It seems fairly likely that fairly often no *moral* judgment as such is required by the social worker in making the decision itself [i.e. the decision how to advise or direct patients, arrange services for them, or select them for special treatment]; rather that the moral obligation lies further back in such matters as refusing to make a decision on inadequate information, refusing to work or to allow others to work under conditions which may put a premium on the making of wrong decisions in matters which affect the lives of others. What is required of the social worker in the last resort is not a series of decisions made on a set of clear moral rules, but the attitude epitomized by St. Augustine in the saying "love and do what you like".'¹⁰

It is one of the defects of the psychiatric (and more especially psycho-analytic) branch of the medical profession that the moral sanctions exerted by the churches over their ministers seem to be rather haphazardly in force in dealings between analyst and analysand; the result is a fairly serious lack of public confidence in both their devotion and their ability; ordinary people, considering the powers conferred by the phenomenon of 'transference', would say that the psychiatrist needs to combine both medical and church professional morality in one person; but the implications of the doctrines upon which practice is based render this difficult to achieve.

From this kernel of professional conduct, an ethical relationship in all dealings has developed. Of these, perhaps the most obviously important is that of agent to principal. Thus the architect stands between the contractor and his client, and he must accept no consideration from the former to influence him in safeguarding the interests of the latter. It is the second article of the R.I.B.A. code: 'a member or student is remunerated solely by his professional fees payable by his client or by a salary payable by his employer. He is debarred from any other source of remuneration in connection with the works and duties entrusted to him'.¹¹ This carefulness must extend to the smallest of matters; ideally the professional man always keeps his professional honour highly polished :

'It occasionally happens that a builder or specialist or merchant yielding to the feelings of good fellowship, or permanent regard or gratitude for some friendly act, will, as an individual, send an architect the kind of gift that passes between convivial friends at Christmas; but all such ingenuousness has been rendered suspect by commercial enterprise, which is ready to falsify the purest motives of humanity at 6d. a time . . . There are practising architects who are contemptuous of those who refuse gifts, and laugh scornfully at the idea of a couple of boxes of cigars or a case of champagne weighing with them when, as arbiters, they have to determine the means due from and to the giver, and to interpret the contracts against his interests. The scornful tone of that remark is the reaction from the laugher's contempt for himself in accepting . . . The gifts are offered by those whose business it is to get full return for their investments, and they are accepted by those who desire possession and whose greed outweighs their self-respect.'¹²

Any consultant is under strict obligations in this manner—architect, consulting engineer, consulting chemist, broker, or land agent—and the codes of all their professional associations are drawn up in very similar terms. In business, it is different.

It is an obvious safeguard of proper conduct in all these respects that professional practitioners are not allowed to advertise their services; the ethical relationship between practitioner and client necessitates etiquette regulating relations between practitioners in the same profession. The practitioner with large reserves of capital must not be allowed to use this to influence the public's judgment of his qualifications, prowess, or suitability.

So important is the practitioner-client relationship to the historical and conventional conception of professional ethics, that it is sometimes suggested that only private practice confers professional status. At one time, of course, there was virtually nothing but private practice, whether of doctors, lawyers, surveyors, or architects, and even those in state service served by appointment to the King personally. But teachers have always been employed by corporate bodies, their profession consisting of the performance of duties to pupils and parents.* It is certainly very difficult to exclude the professional salariat from the professional classes—for one thing a man may, and often does, alternate between private practice and salaried employment. It would always have been absurd to exclude medical officers of health from the medical profession; and it is now absurd to exclude permanent legal advisers to government departments or local authorities or large corporations

* Which in theory, at least, cannot conflict. But parents' wishes have always been held subordinate to the teacher's conception of the child's good.

from the legal profession: Salaried architects form fifty-two per cent of their profession,¹³ and while no estimate of the proportion of practising to salaried accountants has been made, in the case of the Society of Incorporated Accountants and Auditors less than sixty per cent are in private practice. It is estimated that two-thirds of chartered surveyors are in private practice.

It is clear, nonetheless, that by far the greater part of any professional code can apply only to private practitioners. Although in the R.I.B.A. code of conduct, cited on page 60, it is laid down that employees are remunerated solely by the salary paid by their employer, by the terms of his engagement an employer would impose such a condition upon any employee, professional or not; contrary action would be as 'unprofessional' in a department store buyer or a clerk in charge of stationery supplies as in a salaried architect, engineer, or works chemist. None of the rules in the accountancy code has any positive bearing on salaried members.¹⁴ Good service to an employer is not exclusively part of the professional code; it is the condition of any employment at the ruling salary; and no employee, professional or not, is entitled to break the law on his employer's orders. Again, it is a cardinal rule in professional etiquette that one practitioner must not supplant or undercut another; a client may change his doctor, lawyer, or accountant as he pleases, but the practitioner will desire a valid reason before he takes up his position as adviser. But employers may discharge professional employees for any reason—and applicants for the vacant post will not enquire why, or what was the salary of the outgoing incumbent.

The difficulty arises in an acute form when we consider those professions whose members are virtually all employed. Probably less than five per cent of all engineers are consultants in practice (it is a higher proportion for the Institution of Civil Engineers alone) and barely 200 members of the Royal Institute of Chemistry are consultants. It might seem rather absurd to maintain a code that can affect only these; nonetheless in the case of the engineers and physicists it is rigorously done¹⁵ though only in very general terms by the Institute of Chemistry.¹⁶ But the *salaried* engineer or chemist can hardly be guilty of unprofessional conduct without being merely incompetent—conduct which means well-merited discharge for engineer and fitter alike. 'The predominating characteristic expected of the chemist is loyalty, implying an honest endeavour to give his best service to his employer, and to deal fairly with his colleagues.'¹⁷ But not of chemists alone. Finally there are those professions, notably officers of the forces, whose professional conduct is almost wholly a matter of prescribed duties:

just as it is one of the conditions of employment of the civil servant that he serves all governments alike, so the officer must act without thought of personal safety in the face of danger, and the merchant navy captain put the lives of passengers first.

Can we speak then of a standard of ethical conduct which distinguishes the professions above others? On the whole, it would seem that we can, even beyond a pride in doing the job well for its own sake. With professional status goes a high sense of duty towards the employer, just as there is towards the client. At least until recently, there has never been any suggestion that a profession could go 'on strike' for better conditions when its employer is mainly, or wholly, the state; under worsening conditions of employment duties are carried out with the same fidelity; this has been notably the case with the higher Civil Service in the past ten years. Officers in the services have for a hundred years and more acted as though their duty was to the Army and the nation, rather than to a niggardly and unfair employer; until Cardwell's reforms in 1870, for example, it was true to say that 'for two hundred years . . . the officers had, from sheer regimental pride, averted the extinction of their regiments by a Parliament animated by unquenchable hostility and unutterable meanness'.¹⁸ It was regimental army officers who sought to alleviate the hard lot of the private soldier, long before the War Office could think of him as anything except 'the scum of the earth'.

Nonetheless, the extent to which a professional ethic can be said to exist among employed persons is limited. It may be less among civil servants than among naval or army officers: for the civil servant is continuously acting under direct instructions, whereas the officer in the forces, though he receives general orders for action, has greater powers of initiative in carrying them out, and far closer contact with men. The distinction between those who are practising their profession, and professional people in state or private employment is very clear: one is bound by an often complex code, the other simply by a sense of high responsibility, engendered largely by the knowledge that he is a member of 'an honourable and skilled profession, bound by the code if at any time it does affect [his] conduct'.¹⁹ In some professions such as engineering, in which most members are employed by large organizations, the bye-laws on professional conduct are very general, and are detailed only with special reference to those called in as consultants.²⁰

Just as standards of professional conduct were evolved historically by the relations between practitioners and clients, so it is difficult not to feel that the standards of any modern profession are ultimately

maintained by the example set by private practice: hence the need to retain a proportion of fee-earning private practice in medicine, for example, and to preserve (for education) the stimulus of the public schools. Where high standards are maintained in professions in which private practice is entirely absent, these are probably due to the standards *already set* by the other professions; but it does not follow that they will survive indefinitely. The quality of professional life is generalized, but each profession benefits from its own internal stimulus. Almost the first thing a new professional institution does is to draw up a code of conduct, even when it finds it hard to produce more than general exhortations to high-mindedness and common honesty.*

On the other hand, it does sometimes happen that employment conflicts with professional 'feelings', if not with the professional code. Production engineers, for example, in their desire to exchange views on the best way to operate factories, find themselves up against the love of secrecy which still prevails among British boards of directors;²¹ mining engineers may know that there is a right and a wrong way to get coal or other minerals out of the ground, but find that purely profit-making considerations in the short run lead to their receiving very different instructions; and the probation officer sometimes finds there is a conflict between the Court, of which he is the servant, and what he considers professionally to be in the best interest of his 'client'.²² There could be no clearer indication that the basis of professional morality lies in the fiduciary capacity of the man practising his profession.

For all these reasons, it would appear that a moral code is the basis of professionalism, though it may not always prove easy to stretch even this to such professions as journalism or the arts.† There is, nevertheless, in the aspirations of journalists towards a strict guardianship of truth, against the pressures of newspaper proprietors, an indication that journalism (as distinct from propaganda or advertising), seeks (and often achieves) a responsible professional attitude, even comparable with that in medicine or law.

4. THE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

The professional organization, as distinct from the trade union, provides a framework and sanctions for this complex of obligation and

* See below, Chapter VI. It is noteworthy that in professions in which the proportion of private practice is small, even when the consultants are less well-off financially than senior employed members of the professions, they enjoy a special prestige, hard to define, but very noticeable.

† See below, Chapter X.

responsibility. In essence, it is disciplinary; in all its functions, especially the educational, it is concerned to keep its membership to the implied contract with society to provide the best possible advice and service, within existing knowledge. When the question of economic monopoly enters, it is subsidiary to this motive—monopoly is required in certain professions to make sure that the qualified practitioner can discharge his professional responsibility without fear; and where there is any degree of monopoly, the need for discipline is increased.

The public must be protected against the unqualified practitioner in medicine and law, because if in ignorance a layman employs an unqualified practitioner, he may lose health or fail to assert his rights; but it is also true that where the unqualified freely practise in competition with the trained, the quality of the latter service may suffer to the prejudice of the individual client and of the public in general. This is the link between professional duty to the individual and professional duty to the community. It is doubtful if much meaning can be read into the suggestion that any profession has (in Wickenden's phrase) a contract 'to serve society over and beyond all specific duty to client or employer in consideration of the privileges and protection society extends to the profession'. Either society *is* the employer—as with professional civil servants or army officers; or else society is served *only* through the punctilious discharge of duties owed to the individual client or patient. Indeed, the larger and more grandiloquent conception of service is dangerous. May the doctor conduct, unknown to the patient, an experiment—or at least an experiment involving risk—upon the patient for the good of society? May the psycho-analyst divulge professional confidences for the enlightenment of neurotic mankind? Ought the social worker to make any use of the intimate knowledge she gains of a fellow creature's circumstances to serve some higher purpose of law, justice, or psychology? Difficult cases abound—but the answer which springs from professional tradition is No. Society has derived benefit, and been best served, through devotion to the client's interest.

It has been said that professional bodies act as trade unions, and that they were the first to institute the idea of the 'closed shop', and that the main goal of their endeavours is not the advancement of learning or improvement of proficiency, but the social and economic advantages for their members. Of medicine and the law, Arnold Bennett remarked in 1915, 'I come of a family of lawyers and . . . I consider that their two great Trade Unions are among the most vicious opponents of social progress in Britain to-day'.²³ It is doubtful if he would have

endorsed such opinions to-day, when professional bodies so clearly stand between state omnipotence and the isolated individual. The membership of proper professional bodies is voluntary, except in the few cases where there is monopoly and registration and the professional association is the registering body—notably the Law Society and the Pharmaceutical Society. The National Union of Teachers, for example, has fought a protracted campaign in Durham to prevent a local authority from insisting on 'union' closed-shop membership.*

Only in certain well-defined professions has monopoly been given to the professional person with an approved training. Medicine, dentistry and some of the medical auxiliaries, pharmacy, law, architecture, navigation by sea and air, colliery management, are the main examples; though the degree of monopoly function conferred varies greatly. Moreover, in the case of merchant ships' officers and colliery managers, it was the state which stepped in and laid down the requirement that only certificated men should be in charge of ships or mines; the associations of ships' officers and mining engineers came into existence later, one to perform mainly trade union functions, the other largely as a learned body offering special qualifications (and only in the last few years). Since the B.M.A. in the nineteenth, and the legal organizations in the seventeenth, century achieved special privileges for professionals, other associations have sought to get similar privileges. In the main this has been done in a perfectly legitimate manner—by making the qualification bestowed by the association such a warrant of proficiency that the holder is sure of preference when applying for appointments, or of gaining the best and most wealthy clients if in practice. A royal charter confers a sort of state underwriting of this claim; the next stage can normally only be the protection of the professional appellation, and this can only be made legally enforceable if all the practitioners and their associations can make a case for it before the Privy Council. For the rest, the possession of qualifications alone entitles a man to prestige or preferential treatment. This can be given in many ways; for example, audit functions for public corporations are reserved by Act of Parliament to three English and two Scottish accountancy associations; again, under the War Damage (Valuation Appeals) Act, 1945, the Lord Chancellor must consult with the Royal Institution of

* The percentage of membership to total practitioners in some leading associations is as follows: R.I.B.A. 95 %, B.M.A. 80%, British Dental Association 50%, Institution of Electrical Engineers 90%, Institute of Physics 75%, Institute of Chemistry 60%, Institution of Mechanical Engineers 50%, Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors 75%. But the engineering figures are misleading because they relate only to practitioners who have passed the examinations.

Chartered Surveyors upon the appointment of persons to the valuation appeals tribunal.

How far should monopoly be carried? It is difficult to take exception to the general principle of employers, and more especially of the government, insisting on the qualifications awarded by well-established professional institutions as a condition for employment. The operative word here, however, is 'well-established'; if we are to include management and administration among the professions difficulties at once arise. The hospitals, under centralized control, are now able to insist that their 'administrators' shall be associates of the Institute of Hospital Administrators. Yet, as will appear later on,* it is far from established that professional administration exists in the sense that professional accountancy or engineering exist. Nor would be it right or proper to close such professions as social work, though (were it not for the shortage of trained people) the hospitals have the power effectively to close them. This is an instance of the power of socialized or nationalized organizations† to impose professional conditions which the professions themselves would hesitate to insist upon.

How far ought the unqualified practitioner to be specifically branded as unqualified by further Acts of Parliament? In general it may be said that, while most professional people have a yearning in that direction, it is no easy matter now to get registration Bills through Parliament, especially where there is more than one professional organization. In engineering, for example, the special prestige of the three chartered institutions militates against registration of engineers, because the 'big three' would decline to recognize the examinations of the other bodies as adequate, even though all will award associate-ships on national certificates followed by some practical experience.

The example of accountancy is relevant here. The Institute of Chartered Accountants enjoys a *cachet* which, however, the other bodies do not consider derives from any higher qualification conferred by its form of training or toughness of examination—contending that the examinations of all the accountancy bodies mentioned in the 1948 Companies Act are now much of a muchness. But the determination of the Institute to maintain its exclusiveness and identity, to preserve the full marketability of the initials A.C.A. or F.C.A. compared with other accountancy designations, and to conserve its senior traditions, has so far stood in the way of the proposed Bill for the registration of accountants.²⁴ Yet there is more than one argument for making accountancy a registered profession. Apart from the reputable pro-

* See Chapter VII.

† See Chapters VIII and XI.

fessional associations cited in the Companies Act, 1948, others tout for membership and confer diplomas without providing adequate training, or maintaining any standards of integrity. Indeed, anybody can put up a brass plate with the word 'Accountant' behind his name. But a profession thus loosely organized, and little disciplined, (yet of growing importance owing to the heavy incidence of taxation) does not enjoy an altogether savoury reputation. The best testimony of this comes from the conscientious income-tax inspector.²⁵ Large accountancy firms, engaged in the audit of public or substantial private companies, are beyond reproach; and so, by the nature of their work, are accountants employed on a salary by large undertakings. But much of the rest of the profession interprets its fiduciary responsibilities to clients as consisting in confidential advice on how to wangle income-tax concessions, and turning a blind eye to palpable understatements of income. Income-tax inspectors consider that the certificates of a high proportion of accountants on the returns of their clients are no guarantee that these in any way comply with the law, though they are sometimes worded in such a way as to protect the professional reputation of the practitioner.* Such an interpretation of this behaviour is not in the interest of the client,† quite apart from the fact that it is against the law. Registration of accountants might do a good deal to raise the standards of private practice.²⁶

Again, the existence of unqualified 'house agents' and associations of estate agents of no standing, in the opinion of many chartered estate agents, makes a mockery of the code of professional conduct which attempts to make of the estate agent an honest broker instead of a huckster in house property. The issue, in the cases both of accountants and of estate agents, is whether to tell the truth about a set of facts. It is, moreover, an inevitable deduction from our ideas of professional conduct that a profession must deal in some requirement to human good, and that in purveying it to clients it must act with integrity. It is for this reason impossible to accept the claims of advertising to

* Some accountants make a practice of forwarding to the Revenue some sets of accounts with the certificate 'I certify that these accounts are correct according to the records submitted to me' and others with an audit certificate in a proper form, e.g. 'I have obtained all the information and explanations which to the best of my knowledge were necessary for the purpose of audit; in my opinion proper books of account were kept, and the balance sheet gives a true and fair picture of the state of X's affairs as at . . .' There is a world of difference, and the Revenue knows how to take a hint. Many accountants, including F.C.A's, are less fastidious, however.

† False returns to the Revenue do not enable an accountant to guide his client into a better understanding of his business position, which is one of his professional functions.

professional status, convincing as these may be made to appear. Professional men and women—artists, journalists,* technicians, psychologists, accountants, statisticians—may work for an advertising agency, whose services are indeed a composite of their efforts; but the function of producing half-truths and bogus scientific terminology to sell products (however ‘ethical’ they may be) cannot be professional. Nor can the agreement among the firms engaged in the trade (within limits a useful and even honourable one) not to write ‘knocking copy’, that is, statements which shall vaunt one product by tending to throw its rivals into disrepute, and not to filch each other’s clients, be regarded as anything but a travesty of professional etiquette,²⁷ especially as advertising agents advertise their own services with the same skilled persuasiveness as they do their clients’ goods. Again, it was mainly because the quality of the service could not be fully established as reliable that recent efforts to form management consultants into a profession, separate in identity from consulting engineers and chemists, came to nothing.²⁸

5. THE THREAT TO INDEPENDENCE

Whatever the *degree* of monopoly exercised by the organization, the management of most professions is entrusted to the self-governing professional association; and where this is not so, there is often friction. This does not mean that the state is uninterested in the manner in which these professions are carried on; but in Britain it delegates or relinquishes a great deal of possible state functions to, for example, the Law Society, the General Medical Council, and the General Nursing Council, and to colleges and bodies associated with them; by contrast it lays down the code of navigation or colliery management, and may or may not take advice from professional bodies whose members are mining engineers or ships’ masters. In education, the state not only intervenes directly (though tactfully) but sends round inspectors to see that professional teachers are up to their job. In 1861 the College of Preceptors urged that a Scholastic Council should be formed analogous to the G.M.C.; and the N.U.T. has often, though without effect, demanded that teachers should enjoy more self-government in their profession, and more control over education itself.²⁹ The degree of state control of professions therefore varies, as does the degree of state employment of professional people, and we have here

* We include copywriters and other members of an agency’s so-called ‘creative’ department in this designation.

a very critical frontier-area between the professions and the officials, one which, as subsequent chapters will show, is now the scene of some dangerous incidents, if not pitched battles.

Because the foundation of professional life is moral behaviour, a measure of independence in professional organization, as well as in professional practice, seems an indispensable condition of professional life as we know it. Though some professions are state-organized, and some wholly state-employed, the general condition of professional association is that of freedom and self-government. And it is the free, rather than the controlled, professions which set the standard and justify professional prestige, just as it is the private practitioner, rather than the salaried man, who sets the individual moral standard—or, by letting it down, only proves its validity. The moment that the state organizes, trains, and employs all the members of a profession, we can no longer speak of it as a profession. We can only speak of a body of expert officials. Such officials might, or might not, have high standards of conduct—but these standards would depend on the state of society, not the professional spirit; and any freedom they enjoyed would be on sufferance from those who held power. In view of the increasing state control over professions through education, through 'socialization', through nationalization of industry, and through the steady growth of state employment of professional people, we are now brought face to face with the question whether the traditional professional attitudes as analysed in this chapter will be maintained in the course of a few generations.

Professional ideals, at present, permeate official behaviour at one end of the scale, and are penetrating business behaviour at the other. But in psychology and function, in attitude and ambition, the professional life is sharply distinguished from the official and the mercantile. We shall consider, in some following chapters, the extent and the significance of this permeation, most notably in the business field; but for purposes of definition we exclude the state-employed administrator, the pure, departmentally-trained official, on the one hand, and the entrepreneur working for profit, in his many guises, at the other.

Finally, it should now appear reasonable to suggest that there are professions, quasi-professions, and would-be professions, merging indistinguishably into one another, influencing one another, and sharing common problems. One such problem, almost by definition, is to maintain independence of state (or more particularly civil service) control. Most of the others will be found to have a close bearing upon the struggle by established professions to uphold their standards of

conduct and service, and, by those technologies and vocations which approximate to professions, to achieve such standards, and to win general recognition.

We thus conclude this chapter with no hard-and-fast definition; no single simple test of what a profession is; though in an adjoining table the extent to which the professions exhibit all or only some of the main characteristics of professional life is summarized—ranging from registration which involves the embodiment of standards of training, conduct, and standards of practice in some statutory form, to a complete independence which nonetheless involves an inner integrity on the part of the practitioner: the giving of a service which, because it cannot be precisely prescribed or examined in advance, requires a relationship of trust between practitioner and client or employer. If a study of the professional spirit cannot end with a neat verbal formula, it should nevertheless leave a clearer picture of the attitudes to work, to pay, to self-esteem, to colleagues, to clients and employers, to the general public, which distinguish the professional outlook, as it has been evolved by some centuries of contractual service.

To some people the emphasis placed on the moral aspect will appear sentimental if not exaggerated, and certainly more honoured in the breach than the observance; to some the professional man is no more than an expert, to be selected for his I.Q. and special abilities, trained to serve the community in a speciality, and to be paid for it simply as a state official. Others, less sanguine of the power of institutions and systems to engender devotion and selflessness in employees, will readily perceive the special quality of professional service and the institutions created to sustain it, and will be concerned to see its influence increase, rather than diminish, in the community. The question of adequate supplies of experts is, in fact, only a small part of our enquiry. The vital issue to-day is how far professional people are staying professional, in every sense of that term examined in this chapter. Upon this, every problem ultimately turns.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROFESSIONAL STATUS

Registration or State Certifica- tion	Practitioner-Client Relationship	Ethical Code	Ban on Adver- tising of Services	Independent but service of a fidu- ciary nature
Barristers	Barristers	Barristers	Barristers	
Solicitors	Solicitors	Solicitors	Solicitors	
Patent Agents	Patent Agents	Patent Agents	Patent Agents	
Doctors	Doctors	Doctors	Doctors	
Dentists	Dentists	Dentists	Dentists	
Opticians	Opticians	Opticians		
Pharmacists		Pharmacists		
Nurses	Nurses	Nurses		
Midwives	Midwives	Midwives		
Architects	Architects	Architects	Architects	
Merchant Navy		Merchant Navy		
Officers		Officers		
Airline Pilots		Airline Pilots		
Vet. Surgeons	Vet. Surgeons	Vet. Surgeons		Vet. Surgeons

Teachers	Teachers	
Coll. Managers	Coll. Managers	
Estate Agents	Estate Agents	(Estate Agents*)
Land Agents	Land Agents	
Valuers	Valuers	(Surveyors*)
Surveyors	Surveyors	
	Actuaries	
Consultg. Engineers	Consultg. Engineers	Consultg. Engineers
Stockbrokers	Stockbrokers	Stockbrokers
Accountants	Accountants	Accountants
Bank Managers	Bank Managers	
Clergy	Clergy	
Social Workers	Social Workers	
	Insurance Brokers	
	Secretaries	
		Journalists
		Authors
		Visual Artists
		Musicians
		Actors
		Social Scientists
		Natural Scientists
	Natural and Social Scientists	
	(i.e. Consulting Chem-	
	ists, Physicists, etc.)	

* A partial ban operates for Chartered Estate Agents and Surveyors, who are permitted a 'card advertisement' in the press.

NOTES

1. Alexander Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, 1933, p. 287.
2. Report of a Special Committee on Education for Commerce; H.M.S.O., 1949, p. 2.
3. *Future*, April-May, 1950, p. 33.
4. *Journal of the Engineers' Guild*, March 1950, pp. 13-19.
5. Quoted in *The General Manager*, British Institute of Management, February 1950.
6. *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Institute of Chemistry*, 1949, Pt. IV, p. 347.
7. Cf. Institution of Electrical Engineers, *The Personnel of the Electrical Industry*, a Memorandum prepared by the Education and Training Committee, February 1949.
8. Cf. Bruce Truscott, *Redbrick University* 1943, p. 102.
9. Graham Wallas, *Human Nature in Politics*, 1908 (Constable Miscellany ed.), p. 266.
10. *The Almoner*, Vol. IV, No. 8, November 1951, pp. 348-9.
11. R.I.B.A., *Code of Professional Conduct*, published by Authority of the Council, and revised 2 May 1950.
12. H. B. Creswell, *The Honeywood File*, 1943; cf. Rule 2 of the R.I.B.A. Code.
13. R.I.B.A., *Report of the Committee to Consider the Present and Future of Private Architectural Practice*, 1950, p. 32.
14. Cf. Society of Incorporated Accountants and Auditors, *A Booklet for the Guidance of Newly Elected Incorporated Accountants*, 1947, p. 24.
15. Cf. The Institution of Electrical Engineers, Royal Charter, Bye Law 12; and the Institute of Physics, Memorandum of Articles of Association, 1949, sect. 45.
16. R. B. Pilcher, *The Profession of Chemistry*, Royal Institute of Chemistry, 1944, p. 23.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
18. J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 1930, Vol. XIII, p. 525.
19. Society of Incorporated Accountants and Auditors, *op. cit.*
20. Institution of Electrical Engineers, Royal Charter, Bye Law 12; *The Institution, Its Objects and Organization*, 1950, p. 12.
21. Cf. *Journal of the Institution of Production Engineers*, March 1949, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3, p. 142.
22. Cherry Morris (ed.), *Social Casework in Great Britain*, 1951, p. 133.
23. Quoted by Graham Wallas, *Our Social Heritage*, 1921, p. 122.
24. Speech by the President of the Institute of Incorporated Accountants and Auditors at the Annual General Meeting, 23 May 1951.
25. Cf. *Future*, October-November, 1950, p. 72; *Taxes*, October 1951, Vol. XXXIV, No. 10, p. 517.
26. The special difficulties and implications of telling the truth about the facts in accounting practice are described in 'Accountancy in the Modern State' by H. Smith, in *The Political Quarterly*, April-June 1947.
27. Cf. International Chamber of Commerce, *Code of Standards of Advertising Practice*, Paris, 1950; note especially Rules I, 4, and III, 1.
28. *Scope*, July 1947, article 'Industrial Consultants', and correspondence in issues dated September and October 1947.
29. Graham Wallas, *Our Social Heritage*, 1921, pp. 140, 146.

CHAPTER V

The Economics of Professional Services

'It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the whole British people (in so far as it can be said to have considered these topics at all) has been looking round for some formula which will persuade the rest of the world to maintain it at the standard of life to which it has been accustomed—or at the higher standard to which we conceive that the tenderness of our social conscience entitles us.'

RICHARD LAW, *Return from Utopia*

'Labour has set out to convert into practical reality the Socialist ideal that the best should be available to all.'

Labour Believes in Britain

IF PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE are to seek the causes of their frustrations, or plan to redress what they may conceive to be injustices in the scales of their rewards, they will do well to consider the present position of Britain's overstrained economy and its effects on the demand for professional services. We have seen that while state action has changed the professions, it has generally increased their markets, besides creating some professions for its own purposes. The welfare state heavily subsidizes professional services, for the same reason that it subsidizes bread, or rents—to protect consumers from their steadily rising real cost. Their real cost has steadily risen: not only because world shortages of materials prolong a general inflation of costs, but because the welfare state aims at freeing the nation 'once for all of the scandal of physical want, for which there is no economic or moral justification', in the words of the Beveridge Report. Under electoral pressure, the word 'want' has been interpreted by politicians in an ever more generous sense. The definition of 'social justice' is always Oliver Twist's—'more'.

1. PLANS AND PLANNERS

We have seen how this policy has steadily added to the cadre of experts; in the past ten years the planners have accelerated the process. The spectre of scarcity haunts administrators (but no one else)

like a hangover, provoking frenzied indulgence in ever more hairs of the dog that bit them. If starvation threatens, not only must farmers be subsidized (lest voters should have to be confronted with the economic prices of the foods they eat); but, since the tax-payers' money must be well spent and produce results, more of it must be laid out to provide agricultural advisers, and college graduates capable of deciding whether Farmer Jones should be dispossessed as a 'C' Class peasant or honourably promoted to a County Committee as a business-like and scientific agriculturalist. Exports must be promoted and production increased, which demands scientists to invent things and engineers to devise more mechanical and efficient ways of producing them. Around the business men hover more and more accountants, alert to notice any rise in costs and recommend that it be passed on to the consumer quickly, before anything so inefficient as a loss should be incurred.

An increasing army of social scientists (as proudly conscious of the scientific nature of their methods as they are sensitive to any reminder of the nebulous nature of their data) busies itself with the plans and models of the New Jerusalem, fearful lest some uncomprehending vandal should precipitately lay a stone which might form the basis of an imperfectly balanced community. Even the natives of Melanesia are left temporarily in peace, so that anthropologists can be mustered for the really vital jobs, such as mapping the social behaviour patterns of Devonshire villages and discovering whether the public house or the Ebenezer Chapel is the focal centre of an east-end slum. If there are not enough coal-miners, more people must be segregated from the turmoil of production in order that they may research into the psychological processes which make young men unwilling to risk death underground, in an atmosphere compounded of dust and damp. More economists are needed, to explain what went wrong with last year's plan and to produce forecasts on which to base the next.

Architects and surveyors must plan (since few will be allowed to build) the future towns, dwellings, and institutions for those ideal communities which the anthropologists will soon devise. Pedagogues and dons must purvey to ever-increasing classes of the young the benefit of free education, without which they will never be more productive, or become good citizens with a proper belief in the power of the ballot box as an instrument for raising their standards of life. Doctors, dentists, nurses, opticians, pharmacists, therapists, and almoners combine to oil the wheels of medical progress. All this (and no doubt Heaven too) is properly controlled by an apparatus of legislation and

statutory instruments which needs an indefatigable army of lawyers to interpret and enable them to operate. Above, around, below, and in between, the administrator bustles with his brief-case and his file, conferring, planning, noting, and recommending, setting up committees to advise and calling in experts to tell him what all the other experts are up to.

The Common Man, having been told that he is now at last the arbiter of his own destiny, is to have at call the services of every sort of expert who will tell him how to shape it. One will decide for him whether he ought to be allowed to build a home, another where he may build it and in what form; a third will decide the amount of development charge which social justice estimates is adequate to prevent him from making a profit on the deal; a fourth and fifth will assess the rates and taxes which he must pay towards the provision of these services; and finally a sixth will represent him at his appeal against the decision of the local authority to pull down his house or flood his back garden with a reservoir.

2. THE COST

Who counts the cost?—not simply the money cost, which is no more than the grand total income of all the professional men and women who work, for fees or salary, in the interests of private clients or of public authorities; but the *real* cost to the community, which consists of the effects of diverting all these people from other occupations, together with the costs of their training, the social influences brought to bear by their activities, and so forth? What is the economic trend represented by the present development of professional services and whither is it likely to lead us?

Let us examine the following series of simple propositions, which we put forward as a possible explanation of some of the phenomena which have been worrying professional people in recent years:

- (1) That the real cost of providing professional services has been increasing;
- (2) that this trend has been accompanied by a fall in the purchasing power of private clients;
- (3) that the normal results of this, which would have been a decline in the consumption of these services, and therefore ultimately a decline in the volume of them available, have been mitigated by deliberate state action designed to subsidize both their provision and their consumption;

- (4) that this artificially 'stimulated increase in quantity has been in part achieved at the sacrifice of quality;
- (5) that the effects of this, on the professions themselves and on the whole economy, are likely to prove unfortunate;
- (6) and that in any case the process is part of a national abandonment to wishful thinking—an attempt to sustain an average standard of life which is too high for the economy to bear.

The increase in the cost of providing professional services has been due to a variety of causes. There has been, as we describe in Chapter XIII, a general increase in the overhead costs of practices, particularly in wages, equipment, and uncontrolled rents, and the rate of increase has tended to be faster than that of professional incomes. Techniques have become more complicated, and therefore professional training has become longer and more expensive. These trends are examined in Chapters II, III, XII.

All professions have not been equally affected. Advances in building techniques, and an increase in the number of materials for building, mean that architects, surveyors, and civil or structural engineers have more to learn. Lawyers proposing to specialize in certain branches of the law have a far more complicated body of legislation and case law to master. The development of new drugs and new forms of therapeutic treatment have added to the complications of medicine, and there is undoubtedly more to learn, despite the trend towards increased specialization and the tendency for general practitioners to send more and more of their cases to hospitals and consultants. Even the provision of education has become more complicated, owing both to the difficulties of large-scale administration and to increasing insistence on the mastery of 'scientific' or experimental teaching techniques.

The provision of a service can become more expensive in two ways. There is the increasing cost of providing an identical service; but there are also improvements in the service itself, making it more complicated and expensive, with the result that the older version is considered inadequate and the newer and more ambitious service takes its place. It was, on the whole, much cheaper to cut off a limb before a wound became gangrenous than it is now to save it by prolonged hospital treatment with penicillin. The still earlier system, which was to allow the patient to die, may have been even cheaper.

This brings us to the ability of the public to afford the services available. Nearly everyone could afford to die although not everyone wanted to. Now, nearly everyone would prefer to be preserved by the lavish expenditure of skill and penicillin, but not very many people

can afford to pay the full economic price¹ for the treatment. They would be still less able to afford it if the price charged were made to bear, as that of most commercial products would, its proportion of the research and development expenditure incurred in perfecting the treatment.

Redistributive taxation, together with the effects of inflation on fixed or salary incomes, has contracted the private demand for expensive professional services. To dispense with many of these services is perhaps one of the last economies to be made by upper middle-class families, brought up in the Victorian tradition that 'it always pays in the long run' to buy private education for one's children, to have their health and teeth properly looked after, and to have a good family solicitor to advise about almost anything it is proposed to do. Nevertheless, these 'last' economies are being made: even executors of middle-class estates are becoming more adventurous in the daunting matter of carrying through probate arrangements without the services of a solicitor—greatly aided by the fatherly helpfulness of the officials of the Probate Registries.

3. STATE INTERVENTION

It is not easy to answer the hypothetical question, what would have happened to the consumption of professional services if the state had not stepped in to subsidize them. The state subsidies have been responsible for a considerable part of the burden of redistributive taxation which has impoverished the middle-class clients of the professions. But there can be little doubt that the private purchasing power available to back an effective demand for professional services would in any event have been decreasing, or at least not increasing.

If this be granted, it is not difficult to imagine what would have happened to some professions if the state had not intervened.* In so far as the cost of providing an identical service increased, the effective demand would have tended to fall off; and in so far as the professions were not driven by this to take drastic action to reduce their costs (and it is important not to overlook the possibility that this might have happened) the ultimate result would have been a fall in the number of people entering the professions and providing services. The lack of effective demand would equally have prevented or retarded the introduction of better (or at least more complicated), and more expensive,

* The Churches provide an actual example, although the lessons are not widely applicable.

techniques. Even if, for example, the universities and voluntary hospitals had used some of their endowments to finance research resulting in new medical discoveries, the knowledge that very few people would be able to pay for the new treatments would almost certainly have prevented the private or commercial development of expensive new drugs and appliances.

Why was the state impelled to intervene? First, the development of the social services made it necessary to take some action. Then there were the needs of defence. Then, too, the increasing responsibilities of state and local authorities for physical planning and for the provision of services extended the process. Finally, the assumption of state responsibility for the stimulation of production and exports involved a direct interest in research and development. There are two forms of intervention by a public authority. In one case it does something (such as the provision of defence forces or the imposition of physical planning regulations) for a community which the individuals composing the community cannot, or will not, do for themselves. In the other case the authority provides, or subsidizes the provision or consumption of, group services which all or some of the individuals in the community *could not afford* to buy privately for themselves. This action may be taken either in the general interests of the economy, or because it is considered socially (or politically) undesirable that a particular service should not be available to all.

Intervention has taken many forms. Education and training of professional people are subsidized, in order that the economy and the state social services shall not run short of experts—and also in order that the ‘under-privileged’ shall be able to rise to professional status. The state makes block grants to the universities and awards scholarships and grants to students, while at the same time assisting local authorities to provide free primary and secondary education. The state promotes and subsidizes research. Thus the rising costs of training and of developing new techniques are masked, and the consumer shielded from them, by public subsidies. In 1951–52 the universities received grants of about £25 million for teaching and research; state scholarships and awards amounted to another £7½ million.¹ If local authority awards are included, the total subsidy per university student was nearly £450 for the year. This high figure indicates that, for the average graduate, the total cost of professional education and training is being reduced by something like £1,350. It does not require much imagination to see what would have happened to the supply of professional people, or to the demand for their services, if the full cost of

training had been borne by the students' parents and passed on to the consumer in the form of higher fees or salaries. There are in addition, of course, the much larger sums spent on secondary education, training of non-graduate teachers, and so on.

The element of subsidy is traceable almost everywhere. Public authorities pay professional people to teach, to look after the sick, to give legal advice to the poor, and to perform a host of other services. Most of these are more or less direct subsidies to the consumer, but some are aimed at sustaining the producer of the service, in order that the practice of the profession shall not die out for lack of private patronage. The arts* are aided in this way: the Arts Council subsidizes orchestras, 'cultural' plays (such as *A Streetcar Named Desire*) and shows of pictures by contemporary artists; the Festival of Britain was deliberately given a (most un-British) slant towards the patronage of British artists; and municipal corporations run orchestras and buy 'safe' pictures for their public art galleries.

A kind of concealed subsidy is involved in the compulsory subjection of the citizen to a professional service. For example, a man who gets permission to build a house must, even though he would normally rely wholly on a builder and would never dream of engaging the services of a private architect, submit his plans for the approval of an architect employed by the local authority. The plans will then, by a process more or less perfunctory according to the authority and the architect, be made to conform to some sort of architectural standard. Similarly, the parent who might never dream of sending his children to a dentist has their teeth compulsorily inspected at school (or would, if the School Dental Service had enough dentists).

The point at which the provision of these professional services outruns the ability of the economy to sustain them must be a matter of controversy; the provision of some social services may increase national efficiency, while it is possible even for the warmest-hearted to realize that others are so plainly beyond the productive capacity of the country that the attempt to supply them would be ruinous. But political pressure undoubtedly operates to push the supply of social services to the limit. What is adequate to one generation, or one government, is Poor Law miserliness to the next.

* See Chapter X.

4. 'SOCIAL JUSTICE'

The provision or subsidy of professional services to the public arises out of the pre-occupation of politicians with an objective called 'social justice'. The principles, and therefore the implication, of this are impossible to define, for they depend entirely on the personal views or emotions of individuals. There are no absolute standards of social justice. 'Equity', to one man, means absolute equality; to another, it may mean unmitigated inequality, based on degrees of success or failure in free open markets. Most people's ideas of social justice lie somewhere between the two extremes, but still differ widely. The temporary predominance of one set of ideas, or an agreement to compromise between several, has produced most of the valuable social reforms in our history. At one time, nearly everything now represented by the ideals of social justice was contained within the meaning of the fair word charity,* which later fell into disrepute through its identification with a particular form of almsgiving. The chief difference between the two concepts lies in the fact that charity always involved giving away one's own possessions, while the loudest exponents of social justice generally advocate the giving away of other people's.

Before the 1950 General Election, the Conservative party's official policy statement, *This is the Road*, announced: 'We are determined to give a solid base of social security below which none shall fall and above which each must be encouraged to rise to the utmost limit of his ability.'² *Labour Believes in Britain*, under a heading 'Social Services for the People's Needs', proclaimed: 'Labour has set out to convert into practical reality the socialist ideal that the best should be available to all'.³ It is this ideal which has, in effect, produced since the war the results with which we are here concerned.

It may be that the ideal, thus put into words, involves a contradiction in terms; this we must leave to abler philosophers. But it is certain that the implications of the doctrine soon confronted its Socialist exponents with a virtually insoluble problem. For the party leaders were compelled to admit (some of their followers have not yet admitted it)[†] that, while the potential demand invoked by their promises was enormous, the resources available were inadequate to meet them.⁴

* 'Christian love of fellow men' (*O.E.D.*).

[†] Cf. Mr Ralph Morley, M.P., in the House of Commons, April 17, 1951: 'I do not accept the hon Gentleman's hypothesis that there is only a limited amount available for education.' (*Hansard*, Col. 1686). A little earlier in the debate (Col. 1684), Mr Morley said 'It is the business of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to find the necessary money.'

They had taken over from their predecessors educational commitments which were shortly to be immensely increased by a jump in the birth-rate.⁵ It is true that they had hoped to be spared the burdens of re-armament. But it is at least an open question whether, if the Labour leaders had realized in 1948 that the National Health Service would in two years be costing the state £400 million a year without doing more than touch the fringes of what could be held to be desirable, they would have introduced the service in the form and on the scale which they adopted.

Their doctrine confronts them with such problems as this: if the life of a rich old lady of 93 *can* be saved by operation or by expensive drugs, then the lives of all *poor* old ladies suffering from the same complaint *must* be saved. If one man's T.B. can be cured by pneumothorax or a visit to Switzerland, then the next man's must be cured likewise. It follows that aureomycin must be made available to all—*whatever the cost*. Similarly, if a film star can divorce her husband, Mrs Jones in the Buildings must be given the chance to divorce hers.⁶ If the duke's son can go to a university, the ability of the dustman's son to accompany him must be limited only by his ability to pass the entrance examination. By the same token, all children in primary schools must be subjected to (and now it seems, rigorously coached for⁷) tests of intelligence and mechanical ability at the public expense, to make sure that all children with the necessary aptitudes get a chance to go to a grammar school.⁸

And who, asks the benevolent reader, is to say that all this should not be so? Not we, at any rate—or at least not here. We are concerned only with the results of this policy, with the conflict between what is right and what is physically possible.

Let us consider one aspect of the medical problem. In war-time, most people would probably agree that the state has a moral duty to provide the best possible medical service for the purpose of saving the lives of those who are wounded or fall sick in its service. The state has accepted that responsibility, and in the discharge of it has advanced immensely the progress of medical science; new drugs, blood plasma, operations, and therapies have immensely increased man's chances of survival. The result is that, if preserved from accident, neglect, or 'killer' diseases such as cancer, men and women are finding it increasingly difficult to die. Octogenarians survive annual pneumonia and major operations with a persistence which would have seemed miraculous fifteen years ago. Can the state withhold from the pauper the life which money can buy for the millionaire? Surely no Christian man

or woman could advocate it. So the ability of the elderly to survive is now limited largely by the number of hospital beds available⁸ (which is well below the potential demand) or by a deliberate moral decision made by a general practitioner.*

In the event, of course, all old people are not thus preserved. The state cannot refuse them the promise of preservation, but it cannot afford to provide the resources to meet all the needs of its citizens. For it has accepted the obligation, not only to save the lives of the elderly sick, but to cure the tubercular, care for the teeth of children and provide new ones for adults, arrange for the confinement of mothers, and distribute aspirins and cough mixtures (free, or at small cost) to those who are unwell. All these things, and many more, were promised in 1948, and the first imposition of charges to the patient was not made until 1951. What happened? Expenditure exceeded estimates by many millions of pounds, a rearmament programme supervened, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to call a halt. The service still left a great deal to be desired even in the field of ordinary diagnosis and treatment, while its long-term objectives in the field of preventive medicine had scarcely been begun. Even so, the cost to the taxpayers reached £400 million a year. At that point, the Socialist Chancellor invoked the simple Treasury device of imposing a 'ceiling' on expenditure, which meant that the health budget must remain at that figure. Since an ageing population tends to make progressively increasing demands on the service⁹; since capital expenditure already carried out involved higher annual maintenance charges; and since the cost of everything was steadily rising, it followed that either something would have to be sacrificed or the quality of the whole service would decline. To the accompaniment of a violent rift in the Labour Party,⁹ charges were imposed on spectacles and false teeth; but even this was insufficient to stave off a decline in standards elsewhere in the service.

Here is the dilemma. If you promise to make 'the best available to all', you cannot pick and choose among priorities. You cannot tot up the figures and say, 'We can afford the best possible treatment to eliminate the scourge of tuberculosis, and we can give a 100 per cent dental service to children and expectant mothers—because we think

* We cannot here discuss the very grave problems arising from the increasingly frequent predicaments of doctors faced with the questions of whether or not to preserve, by new techniques, old people whose survival would place a heavy burden on themselves and their relatives, although it raises immense moral issues and important problems of professional ethics. It would seem to be high time that someone—whether doctor, parson, or philosopher—had the courage to bring the question out into the open for discussion.

these priorities will pay the best dividends on the investment—but we shall have to cut down on hearing aids and massage.’ This is to admit that no attempt is to be made to make the best available to those who are neither tubercular nor pregnant, but who do happen to be deaf and suffering from fibrositis. Social justice would be outraged by such arbitrary decisions.* The result, of course, is that the best is made available to no one at all. But the cost is still £400 million, of which the administrative overheads take a sizeable slice.

A similar process has occurred in education, and will no doubt be found to have happened in the Legal Aid Scheme when that has got fully under way (although the element of means test is far stronger there). Means and needs, resources and priorities, ideals and harsh realities have all settled down into a state of precarious equilibrium in which no one is wholly satisfied and no one quite knows where the money is coming from to meet the next year’s bills. There have been no absolute priorities, either inside each individual social service or between the different services. The failure to tackle any single immediate problem successfully has increased the number and seriousness of long-term problems, and even intensified some of the immediate ones. Housing waiting lists have grown, as more rent-controlled property degenerated into slums: over-crowding and broken homes have increased the amount of crime among children, so that more resources have to be devoted to social work, psychiatry, and approved schools. Shortage of suitable homes for old people has added to the demand for hospital beds, so that more of these are denied to acute cases among younger people. The effort to educate more and more children with limited resources perpetuates—if it has not intensified—the swollen classes and bad physical conditions in primary schools; meanwhile, the supply of really gifted and inspired teachers needed to triumph over such difficulties has been greatly reduced by the inability of authority to raise salaries to competitive levels; at the top, the egalitarian influence of the National Union of Teachers has cast the Burnham Scale into a mould which has reduced the proportion of graduate teachers and seriously lowered the academic standard of those graduates who do enter the grammar schools to teach.¹⁰ As a result, industry and the professions are finding their recruits from the secondary schools deficient in basic education, and are having increasingly to remedy the defects at their own expense; and as the natural tendency is for the next generation of *teachers* to be similarly deficient, we may face an accelerating fall in standards.⁹

* Very vocally, too, when Mr Butler finally took some of them.

Yet still the fiction is preserved that an attempt is being made to make the best available to all. Not a soul dare advocate that a part of any service should be abandoned,* or relegated openly to the level of second best. For nearly ten years, speeches and articles have rung the changes on the theme that 'when it comes to such-and-such a service, the nation can afford only the best'. The brutal question, 'Can the economy afford this or that?' has invariably been countered with the question, 'Can we afford not to have it?' In reality, this argument could not now convince anyone but a man so transfused with the idea of social justice that he had never gone out to see what is actually happening. It cannot be sustained on economic grounds at all. Industry is not benefiting through the earlier return to work, restored to health, of workers who would, but for the National Health Service, have remained away longer. On the contrary, the last available report of the Ministry of Health, commenting on a sample survey of sickness, stated: 'The incapacity rate† rose sharply during the second half of 1948 upon the inception of the National Health Service and though it fell somewhat in the second half of 1949, it still remained much higher than in 1946 and 1947.'¹¹ Productivity and technological progress will not be advanced by the lowering of the standards of teaching science and mathematics in grammar schools, nor by continued failure to turn out secondary school leavers who can read, write, and do simple sums at the age of 15.¹²

The state continues to demand large numbers of professional people to dispense, and administer, these services. Yet the increased demand is not, with rare exceptions, reflected in an increase in the real incomes of the professional people concerned. Money increases have barely kept pace with the rising cost of living—in most cases not even that; so that, in addition to being relatively worse off as a result of redistributive taxation (largely devoted to financing the very services in which they are employed), most of them are actually receiving lower *gross real* incomes. The reason is, of course, that the state can always retard, relatively to those of privately employed people, the rise in incomes of its own employees. The result is a tendency towards a decline in quality. In addition, deliberate attempts at dilution of the professions are being made. An infusion of 'ancillary dental workers' is proposed

* When the *Economist*, in December, 1951, suggested raising the school entry age, there was an uproar.

† Defined as: 'Number of days away from work, or for persons not going to work, number of days confined to house on account of sickness, per 100 persons interviewed.' It is not, of course, possible to be sure from this that the rate of absence from work is as high as the average thus defined, but it is at the very least highly probable.

for the dental profession, 'assistant nurses' are entering hospitals, and half-baked architects become town planning officers, while the official organ of the Scottish Schoolmasters Association says, 'we can state categorically that we have seen young women drafted into the profession with no more qualification to teach than many a girl in Woolworth's stores.'¹³ Thus does the state seek to perpetrate its gigantic confidence trick upon the public, and to mask a reduction in quality with a judicious spreading of quantity.

5. ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Similar shifts and contradictions can be perceived in the state's other incursions into the professional field, designed to stimulate the supply of experts to an economy in which the need for increased production and exports becomes daily (subject, of course, to the overriding demands of social justice) more urgent. If there are not enough first-rate technologists, then let us have a lot more second-rate ones.¹⁴ Is not this in any case more socially just, since it diminishes the danger of creating an aristocracy of talent while at the same time it up-grades the status of numbers of the under-privileged? If the professional institutions of engineers insist on trying to sabotage progress by maintaining standards of qualification, the under-privileged might be found a back-door entrance through a Royal Institution of Technologists.* It is an attractive philosophy, epitomized in the headline with which the *Daily Herald* welcomed the arrival of the General Certificate of Education: 'Farewell Matric—Hail the Exam that No one Can Fail!'

Political considerations forbid most of the possible methods of stimulating higher productivity. No one can be encouraged by the hope of making (or at least keeping) an increased profit. Income differentials cannot be widened to benefit the skilful or industrious worker. Controls which shelter the inefficient producer cannot be removed, because the vested interests protecting them have become too strong, and because no one dares face the risk of even temporary local outbreaks of unemployment. In any case, why should industrial firms want to undertake the risks and trouble of fighting to secure their own raw materials, when the state will do it for them in accordance with the principles of social justice? Why should anyone desire to face the chill winds of competition, when all can make an adequate profit as things are and no one would be allowed to keep a higher one?

What is left? Nothing but to set up more committees to advise; to

* See Chapter XII.

spend £750,000 on sending productivity teams to the United States to report on the conditions of intolerable social injustice which enable the Americans to do what we cannot; and finally to make industry 'more efficient' by subsidizing research and training more experts to assist it. Again, the general result is to increase the demand for professional people, and to meet it by a combination of heavy expenditure and open or concealed decline in quality: meanwhile, the job still does not get properly done.

Mr Colin Clark, in *The Conditions of Economic Progress*,¹⁵ provided the first statistical analysis of the trend in economic development which directs labour from primary into secondary (manufacturing) industries, and thence into tertiary (distribution and services). With this there goes a steady increase in the proportion of workers described as 'administrative, professional, and technical'.¹⁶ As the economy of a country becomes more industrial, more mechanized, and more highly organized, real income per head of population tends to increase. Or, at least, Mr Clark demonstrated that this had been so in the past, and is still happening in 'backward' areas which are being 'developed'. But what is the marginal productivity of employment of experts? At what point does the addition of on-cost workers in an economy cease to pay dividends and result in *lower* production per head than would otherwise be achieved? If no one knows, is it not time that someone tried to find out—especially in a country which cannot even feed itself?

So far, the post-war experiment has not been markedly successful. The managerial revolution and the triumph of social justice in Britain have been financed by internal inflation and an immense external deficit. The efforts of one set of experts have signally failed to pay for the efforts of the rest. What happens now? Can a Conservative government, perhaps with less advanced ideas about social justice, create a new and more enduring equilibrium? Or is the conspiracy to live beyond our means too strong, too popular, and too deeply rooted to be broken by anything but economic disaster?

Obviously these reflections do not amount to advocacy of complete abandonment of the ideals of social justice and a return to *laissez-faire*. It is the doctrine of perfection which seems to us disastrous;¹⁷ for the unforeseen and appalling consequence of its pursuit has been a growing acquiescence in increasing imperfection.

More and more professional people are apparently content, for the promise of a pension, to work for ends, and in conditions, which result in second-rate work. This acquiescence is encouraged by the denial to brilliance and industry of their former rewards, and also by the

inflation or dilution of the professions with a higher proportion of second-rate brains and undeveloped characters. Finally, it is everywhere implied that it is immoral to want to pass on an increased inheritance to one's children, while at the same time no child is allowed to suffer for the idleness or incompetence of its parent.

In the struggle for a higher standard of life, however insecurely based, the professions have, as will be seen, tended to come off worse than any section of the community except retired pensioners. Profits and wages have soared, while fees and professional salaries have lagged.¹⁸ There are many more professional people than there would have been if the state had not intervened,¹⁹ but—naturally enough—all of them are doing worse than a smaller number would have done without the intervention. Meanwhile, subsidies to the consumers of professional services have resulted in a greatly increased consumption of material luxuries by people who could not previously have afforded them. The artisan who earns £10 to £15 a week has his children educated free by teachers who may be earning £7. He also pays no doctor's bills, can send his children to a university if they are clever enough, and on top of all that pays a rent which is subsidized either by the rate-payers or by a restricted private landlord. The net result is that he can afford a television set. It is perhaps too cynical to see the subsidization of television sets as the end-product of social justice, but there is an awkward problem for the social justiciars here if they could only be persuaded to recognize it. Certainly Mr Colin Clark never envisaged that the increased availability of luxury goods and services would result in an increased demand for state subsidies on essentials, so that a greater proportion of income could be spent on the luxuries. Yet is not this what has happened? Average expenditure on rent to-day is about one-twelfth of income, compared with about one-fifth before the war. The direct subsidy on bread has become an indirect subsidy on circuses.

Will the professions indefinitely acquiesce in a process which has begun to undermine their status, their living standards and the quality of their work? Perhaps they will. Yet they may still come to see truth in the words of Mr G. M. Young:

'The human animal, especially when young, is wonderfully prompt and skilful in adjusting itself to new circumstances. The future historian of social England will have abundant material out of which to illustrate that theme. . . .

'But what that historian will know is whether the adjustment was to a higher or a lower form of life. There, we who are living through the transition can only speculate.

'And it seems to me that unless stability is restored, and with it the,

assurance of advancement by personal endeavour, the movement must be downward; each generation growing up accustomed to something not quite so good as the last, and yet paying more for it. But if that is the direction in which we are moving, the end of the road can only be such a debasement of standards as will fatally impair our civilization, and with that our standing, and our influence, in the civilized world.'²⁰

Reactionary? It will be said so. Socially just? Probably not. Yet may it not be that when everything is equal nothing is best, so that it is available to none? Is it possible that, when there are no anomalies at all, and no injustice, there is also no progress and no perfection?

With these possibilities in mind, we turn to the immediate circumstances of professional life to-day, in private practice, in business, or in the service of the state.

NOTES

1. *Civil Estimates*, 1951-2, Class IV, pp. 62-6.
2. *This is the Road*, Conservative and Unionist Central Office, p. 14.
3. *Labour Believes in Britain*, Labour Party, p. 18.
4. E.g. Mr Gaitskell's Budget Speech, 10 April 1951, especially *Hansard*, cols. 847-53.
5. Between 1947 and the end of 1953, the Ministry of Education has estimated that extra school places must be found for 1,15,000 children.
6. Cf. *The First Report of the Law Society on the Operation and Finance of Part I of the Legal Aid and Advice Act, 1949*, H.M.S.O., 1951, p. 18. It is there stated that in the first six months of the scheme 13,000, or about eighty-one per cent. of the cases accepted for the grant of civil aid certificates related to matrimonial causes.
7. See *The Times Educational Supplement*, 25 January 1951 and 1 February 1952.
8. Cf. *Report of the Ministry of Health for the year ended 31 March 1950*, Pt. I.
9. See especially report of the Committee Stage of the National Health Service Bill, 1951, *Hansard*, 2 May 1951, especially cols. 1284-1372.
10. Cf. *First Report of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers*, H.M.S.O., May 1951.
11. *Report of the Ministry of Health for the year ended 31 March 1950*, pp. 125-6.
12. Cf. Ministry of Education, *Reading Ability: Some Suggestions for Helping the Backward*, H.M.S.O., 1951.
13. *The Scottish Schoolmaster*, April 1950.
14. Cf. *Fourth Annual Report of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy (1950-1951)*, H.M.S.O., July 1951, Cmd. 8299.
15. Colin Clark, *Conditions of Economic Progress*, 1940.
16. See also *Manpower*, PEP, November 1951, pp. 12-13 and 35-40.
17. For a full discussion of this question see *Return from Utopia*, 1950, by Richard Law, M.P., especially Chapters III and VII.
18. See annual White Papers on the National Income, H.M.S.O., and periodical surveys in the *Bulletin* of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics.
19. Cf. Cmd. 8299 (see note 14 above), par. 4: 'In fact there are now about 11,000 students in the applied science departments of universities as compared with somewhat less than half that number before the war.'
20. The *Sunday Times*, 10 December 1950; article entitled 'Civilization Withers at its Heart,' by G. M. Young.

CHAPTER VI

The State as Client

'If I find you, Gisbourne, sitting in your bungalow und hatching reborts to me about der blantations instead of riding der blantations, I will dransfer you to der middle of der Bikaneer desert to reforest him. I am sick of reborts und chewing paper when we should do our work.'

R. KIPLING, *In the Rukh*

'The establishment of a right relationship between Knowledge and Power is the central problem of modern democracy.'

SIR ALFRED ZIMMERN

UNTIL RECENTLY, though the state might regulate the conditions in which professional people trained, qualified, and worked, it employed very few. Departments would call in consultants to advise—lawyers to give legal opinion, engineers and architects to prepare plans and supervise works, various experts to draw up technical statements upon which policy might be framed—but the maintenance of established staffs of specialists is the result of growing state power.

Naval and army officers, of course, have been fully in state employ for at least three hundred years. The forerunners of the present cadre of experts in the Civil Service may be the Royal Corps of Naval Constructors, formed in the reign of Charles I; the post office engineers, who became important by the mid-nineteenth century and from whose work arose the Institution of Electrical Engineers; the Medical Officers of Health taken on by the Sanitary Commission, and so forth. Social service expenditure began to grow about 1908, and the Treasury had to enlarge its staff of actuaries. The 1914-18 war generated a still greater need for expert advice, and by 1919 there were enough professional men and women in Whitehall to justify the foundation of the Institution of Professional Civil Servants to watch their interests. Nonetheless, until the 'thirties, professional civil servants were a small advisory cadre scattered thinly through the departments. At a time when the state was spending £1,000 million a year, only 150 professional accountants were employed in Whitehall.

The war and the welfare state have changed all that. The state has now become a large employer of professional talent, and for some,

professions it is the greatest employer. It certainly employs the majority of scientists not engaged in university teaching. During the war there was created the Scientific Civil Service, on the recommendation of a special committee of enquiry; and in 1945 the terms and conditions of employment were formulated so that 'the conditions of service of scientists working for the Government shall be such as to attract into the Civil Service scientifically qualified men and women of high calibre.'¹

The state also employs 600 doctors and 1,000 architects, while every department has its complement of lawyers, accountants, engineers, surveyors, land and estate agents, and valuers. Nor does it stop there: from the ranks of journalism have been haled press officers and public relations officers; from the lower slopes of Parnassus have been drawn designers and illustrators of brochures and other media of government publicity; statisticians abound; there is work even for psychologists; outside the universities the majority of practising economists are working for the state—largely in contributing to that official Old Moore's Almanack, the *Economic Survey*. In all, there are not less than 12,000* professional people in the departments, quite apart from officers in the services, and the number grows. That form of professional practice in which 'the State is sole client' and the 'fees' are a salary scale and superannuation on a scale invented by the Treasury has become an important field for qualified men and women.²

1. THE SERVICES

What sort of client is the state? The professions which have had most experience of state employment are those of naval and army officers, who are wholly dependent on the state. The state can claim striking success in its treatment and control of these professions; for, whatever the conditions of service at any particular period, almost all military and naval enterprises undertaken for some generations have been successfully concluded. But that does not mean that, however service officers are treated (including now, of course, R.A.F. officers), they will continue to discharge their professional functions successfully. For example, the loss of almost the whole of the regular force which was sent to the Crimea in 1854, and the failure of the Navy to achieve any remarkable success in that war, were the direct consequences of the neglect of these professions for forty years—partly due to a Victorian

* The Institution of Professional Civil Servants represents 33,000 civil servants, but only a proportion of these are fully professional in 'grade'.

dream that they were becoming unnecessary to civilized society. At the outbreak of that war, to give but one instance of the position, 200 commanders and 1,450 lieutenants had received no promotion for twenty years.³ Those were days, however, in which the professional soldier and sailor could occasionally practise privately, which is now hardly ever the case; when, upon peace being declared in 1815, naval officers found themselves expected to live as gentlemen and support their families on £91 5s. a year, they sought out new clients in South America or Greece, and conducted for them some successful wars of liberation. (Indeed, in private practice they advanced the art of warfare, experimenting with steam warships, for example, before the British Admiralty did so.)

The only check on state exploitation of the profession of arms is the need to offer such careers as will attract recruits of the right quality. The state has always been able to trim its terms to the fact that soldiering and sailing are vocations as well as professions. In the past, governments have even been able to rely on the readiness of private individuals to supplement the nation's naval and military needs out of their private resources. In many regiments (as in the diplomatic service) private means were for long a necessity for an officer; only in certain regiments and corps did the pay meet the full cost of carrying out the prescribed professional services. Nor is this method of getting professional services on the cheap confined to crack regiments, or to days long past. In the inter-war years it was not always easy for a naval officer to live on his pay, and it was impossible for certain duties to be performed by senior officers without private means—notably those duties inseparable from flag rank, and the many quasi-diplomatic functions which devolve on naval commanders in foreign waters and even on commanders of small vessels. Indeed, all wardroom officers have been regularly involved in heavy items of expenditure when it becomes necessary to return courtesies received from officials at Commonwealth and foreign ports. Booms and slumps in the need for their services affect professional soldiers and sailors as seriously as they do brokers or estate agents. The naval officer, narrowly specialized in the complex function of operating a warship, is vulnerable; private practice now being very limited, the 'axed' R.N. officer in periods of retrenchment has only general administrative ability to profess (see p. 113).

The degree of specialized knowledge required of a naval officer and the responsibility for precious (highly expert) life and valuable public property confided to his care have continually increased with the application of science to sea warfare; emoluments have risen but slowly.

Scales of naval pay, before and after the second world war, show that there has been a steady reduction in officers' living standards. Not only has the differential between officers and ratings been reduced, but promotion has brought senior officers less and less pecuniary advantage. In fact, the steady loss of men with private means to the service is posing a problem. Inevitably the supply of such men diminishes as the work of redistributive taxation proceeds. The scales of pay and methods of naval education and recruitment* inevitably affect the type of man attracted to the service. A type of man very conscious of his pay and what the nation can expect in return for it may tend to predominate in a few years. Ironically enough, this is most likely to be the result of making Dartmouth training 'free', for in every vocation the need to make sacrifices in order to qualify acts as a salutary sieve of recruits. The difficulty of handling a situation in which men may not be able to afford to hoist their flag would no doubt be overcome by a left-wing administration through arrangements for the British Council, rather than the British Navy, to sustain the nation's prestige abroad.

2. THE ANATOMY OF FRUSTRATION

Royal Navy and Army officers have at least the satisfaction of full executive responsibility; they carry out their missions in their own professional way. So do some other professional civil servants—for example the managers of the Royal Ordnance Factories, and the scientists who run the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research. They may be enraged by lack of funds or impracticable directives sent down from their ministries, but in day-to-day work they are either responsible for their decisions, or they receive instructions from professional men whose training they share and respect. Very different is the predicament of the majority of the professional experts, ranging from doctors to accountants, and from scientists to engineers, that have been taken on since 1939 to help the Civil Service carry out its vastly widened responsibilities. Not only are they underpaid; they are nearly all working in an advisory capacity. They are employed to advise their 'clients' professionally; but their advice is either misused or ignored; and in purely professional matters in which action should be taken by qualified men, it is in fact taken by civil servants trained only in administration, who hold firmly to the view that experts shall be on tap, not on top. What is particularly infuriating is the inability

* See footnote on p. 218

of civil servants to see that professional men—happily relieved of that hateful thing, ultimate responsibility—have any grievance whatever.

Frustration has been brought into the Civil Service by professional people. It was virtually absent under the system in which a man washed his hands of a matter once he had made his noting on the file. Before the war, administration was concerned largely with the enforcement of the details of Acts of Parliament, or ministerial Orders arising out of Enabling Acts. Manufacturing, the supply of commercial services, or purchase of commodities in bulk were conducted only by a few odd departments, and even they, though run by professional men, were not noted for efficiency. (Naval officers prefer a fighting ship constructed by a private firm; and the inefficiency of the Post Office is now so universally resented that the Post Office can be defended only by treating public criticism of it as an insult to the staff.) To-day the duties of the Civil Service have grown out of all recognition.⁴ A mass of services formerly performed by outside specialists and contractors, professional and commercial, are being performed inside the departments. The Ministries of Works, Supply, and Food not only advise on matters of architecture, engineering, manufacture, and commercial buying and selling (through controls); they build houses and towns, drain the countryside, design and construct aircraft or engines, and in 1948 purchased goods worth £988 million from abroad. Before the war, the Ministry of Agriculture administered, without conspicuous efficiency, minor Acts directed to the better governance of a neglected major industry, collected statistics, and notified diseases; to-day it hands out huge slabs of technical and scientific advice to farmers, and to manufacturers of farming products and equipment; decides what shall be grown and where and when; dispossesses those it judges inefficient, and operates endless other services. Other ministries control whole industries in detail, or supervise their control, and the result has been the duplication of experts in the ministries. Thus the creation of the Coal Board has not only concentrated mining engineers in Hobart House, it has produced a demand for mining engineers at the Ministry of Fuel and Power. Those who approve or advise must know as much (or nearly as much) as those who seek advice and approval.

But the professional civil servants are not to any large extent directing the professional functions in the ministries. The administrative class of the Civil Service does not find itself on the bridges of warships, in the works engineers' offices of R.O.F's, or drawing up programmes of research at the D.S.I.R.; but it is, for example, put in charge of laying down and executing policy for livestock improvement, pest and infesta-

tion control, animal health and dairy farming. A Post Office official, of the executive grade of the service, is put in charge of land drainage; an Assistant Secretary is blithely moved to control land use after fifteen years of enforcing the regulations about offshore fishing. They have 'experts' to advise them—that is, if the experts can frame the advice in terms which a layman can grasp. Because advice tends to be bedewed with technical terms, it is sometimes best not to be confused by it. Rules about how to deal with rats, aphids, grain-weevils, or precautions to be observed in spraying crops with chemicals of the dinitro group, are framed first and shown to the experts afterwards. When a foreign scientist with executive authority in his own department visits Britain to co-ordinate infestation measures, he is amazed to find he must talk with a complete layman in Whitehall; a British expert is 'sent for' if any difficulties of communication arise.

Even in departments where it seems more appropriate for a 'pure' administrator to frame policy, the situation of advisers is far from happy. It puzzles the administrative or executive officer that engineers or architects acting in an advisory capacity consider they have a *right* to be consulted, and that, while they may accept the fact that their advice is not wholly followed in matters of policy, they consider it should be taken about the technical means of carrying out policy.⁵ Above all, the professional man resents finding himself in a position in which his advice is filtered through the hands of non-professional men before it reaches the administrative heights to which it is addressed and at which it must be considered. Yet this is the fate of most professional advisers in Whitehall. In the Ministry of Health, it is true, sheer facts have conspired to bring about a situation in which the Chief Medical Officer is recognized as being on a level with the Permanent Secretary, with direct access to the Minister; but in the Ministry of Labour, medical factory inspectors have no alternative but to tender advice to their ministers through a non-qualified chief inspector of factories, *via* a chain of administrative officers.

Scientists find the inability of administrative officers to see their point of view particularly trying. Dr Wark, of the New Zealand Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, puts the situation in a nutshell when he 'says frankly that frustrations arising from regulations that are useful in other types of work have ruined completely the morale of half the Government laboratories in the world'.⁶ One of the world's major botanical institutions, Kew, has even expressed unofficial and bitter suggestions that it should be transferred from the control of the Ministry of Agriculture to that of the

British Museum, simply to come under the direction of experts. A typical example of professional frustration is the case of the mycologist who asked for permission to attend an important conference in France, where he knew he could obtain knowledge of great value to his work in Britain. Not only was he refused permission to go officially, but he was also refused special leave when he offered to go at his own expense. Eventually he devoted part of his annual leave to the trip, whose value to the work at Kew was fully up to expectations. Such a situation is baffling, alike to the scientist, who cannot understand the state of mind of the petty officialdom which blocks his work, or conceive why he should have to accept non-professional ruling on such a request, and to the officer of the executive grade, who in similar circumstances would probably acquiesce with a shrug, remarking: 'Well, if they don't want the information, they can do without it. What do I care anyway? The work will suffer—not me.'

The gulf between the attitude of the civil servant and of his new technical colleague is widened by salary differences. As professional engineers or doctors advise and take no responsibility, the Civil Service sees no reason for them to be paid fancy salaries for softish jobs; because poor salaries are offered, the state mainly gets professional men of second- or third-rate abilities, whose work only confirms the administrative class officers in their assumption that professional training is utterly unfit to equip men to administer anything or carry any responsibility. This produces a ludicrous situation when government wants to take on men of the highest repute. When the Institution of Professional Civil Servants expressed the view that the salary of £1,700 offered for a senior advisory job to a distinguished professor of science was inadequate, and proposed something commensurate with his standing and achievements, the official concerned gasped, 'But do you realize that this would make his salary higher than *mine*?'

The professional grades of the Civil Service accordingly get salaries little above and often below those of the executive grade: of men, that is, whose qualifications, according to a Ministry of Labour booklet, are those 'of the higher school certificate, though it is not necessary that you should have passed this or any other examination.' There are men, on the other hand, with a B.Sc. and N.D.D. getting £5 and £6 a week inspecting milk; and it must be remembered that the *qualifications* of engineers, surveyors, doctors, land agents, and architects recruited to the Civil Service compare rather more closely with those of the administrative than of the executive grade. They mostly have degrees, and fellowships of the approved professional institutions,

and they are expected to have been trained in industry, commerce or private practice for several years before joining the service. Yet, whereas the average administrative officer can expect to reach £2,000 a year at the age of 45 or 50, the scientific officer seldom gets beyond £1,725, and does not reach this till he is 50 or 55; the engineer, surveyor, architect, or land agent finds that his maximum expectation is around £1,000, though he may reach it at 45 or 50. A senior accountant can expect no more than £950 after the age of 40, unless he gets promoted to chief accountant at about 55, when he can average £1,160. This can be expressed in another way: the aggregate salary of the administrative class officer from 30 to 60 (i.e. after he has been fully trained by the department) amounts to just over £50,000; that of the scientific officer for the same period (again after full professional qualification and subsequent training) is well under £40,000; that of the engineer, chief accountant, land or estate agent, architect, surveyor or valuer, under £30,000.⁷

Low salaries are not the only disability; slow promotion is the result of professional civil servants working in small sections, and having no access to promotion in other departments. Waiting for dead men's shoes is bad for men, and in small groups, working without responsibility, deprived of the chance to experiment, and even of hope of escape, intellectual rot soon sets in. The administrative officer draws his conclusions from the spectacle. Among the scientists, vacancies are 'trawled around' the departments; the Barlow Committee noted approvingly that 'a good deal has already been done in the direction of integration, and we gather that . . . a scientific civil service in the true sense is being gradually founded. We feel strongly that a similar development should be encouraged in the other professional and technical classes. Where the nature of the work permits it, we think it a good thing that someone should be generally accepted as the "unofficial" head of each class and should be consulted in an advisory capacity on interchanges of staff, reorganizations of technical or professional work, etc.'⁸

But until in fact professional civil servants can attain to administrative positions, to which their training entitles them and the nature of so much administrative work now calls them, frustration will be their lot. It is clear that this change will have to come about; the administrative grades will have to realize that professional training is as firm a foundation for executive responsibility as an honours degree and departmental instruction in the finer points of public administration; that on top of his qualifications, and his practice in commerce or else-

where, quite a short course of administrative training will give the professional man with organizing powers much that the longer training has given the civil servant. They will have to realize that their doubts about any particular professional expert arise in part at least from low salaries, poor career prospects, and discouragement.

It will, however, be necessary for the professional civil servant to become worthy of the best traditions of the administrative civil service; and in particular of the care with which decisions are reached on judicial grounds. Engineers and scientists, in particular, if their cultural background is impoverished, their education narrow and inferior, and their sympathies atrophied by their absorption in the reactions of material substances, sometimes exhibit Hitlerian traits when put in charge of high policy; and if the professional and scientific civil services are recruited from mainly second-rate minds, that is the type of person which will from time to time become eligible for administrative positions. Some administrative civil servants are nearly as bad, when put into unsuitable or unfamiliar environments, but on the whole their training and origins keep them from forgetting that they are, in fact, the servants of the public—the most fair-minded and tyranny-hating public in the world. They certainly need to exert an educative influence upon the mentality of the scientists and engineers in senior positions; they need to find some way of teaching the best in their craft to those who, perhaps sometimes wilfully, can only see a cumbersome amateurishness.

No doubt there will be some mental resistance. The administrative officer likes to think that his apprenticeship in Whitehall has given him a monopoly of *something*, and the idea that a man can master medicine or civil engineering *and* the art of getting things done in committees cannot but stir self-doubts long overlaid. The position is certainly delicate as between the executive grade and the professional accountants. The executive class was given the main body of government accounting to do thirty or forty years ago, when the art of accountancy itself was undeveloped, and government accounting meant little more than day-to-day book-keeping, and the correct recording of receipts and payments and their allocation to vote subheads. To-day accountancy techniques have been so refined (and so speeded up by machinery) as to make possible day-to-day control of the most intricate organizations and productive processes, and to provide not merely historical records but data for forward planning. But though the government's trading, manufacturing, and organizing functions are at least as complex as the largest business combines in the country, there are still hardly more than 400 qualified accountants in the entire

government machine, and the executive class is doing the accounting work on much the same basis as thirty years ago! Nor will any chartered or incorporated professional body agree that the training in accounting given in Whitehall could possibly fit a man for professional status. Even those professional men employed by government have very restricted powers. In the Post Office and the Admiralty the principal accountant reports to the Director of Contracts, in the Board of Trade to an Assistant Secretary; the Stationery Office and the Ministry of Health had in 1951 not one professional accountant between them. It is whispered that many departments are not at all anxious to have accountants prying into their methods of handling money, although several reports of the Committee of Public Accounts have attributed extravagance to lack of professional accounting methods and standards.⁹ It seems that in method and economy, a freer hand for a better type of professional civil servant might produce large dividends in Whitehall.

3. PROFESSIONALS AT COUNTY HALL

While the Civil Service is digesting the fact that departmental training is not the only possible training for the administrator, and that for some purposes it is the wrong training, the Local Government Service has long been administered by professional people. There is no 'heaven-born' administrative class to come between the borough treasurer, the county architect, the municipal engineer, and his work. In the best-run and happiest county councils, the Clerk of the Peace is *primus inter pares*; he appreciates the professional approach of his colleagues because he himself is a professional man—he is usually a solicitor, sometimes a barrister, occasionally a chartered secretary. Local government is peculiarly the meeting ground of the professions, as local government officers come from the law, medicine, civil engineering, education, surveying, valuation and estate agency, accountancy (and sometimes the Navy or Army when retired officers are brought in to help organize Civil Defence). Once it was the other way about—the councillors were largely professional men and the executives poorly paid clerks who put out any big works to local contractors, architects or other consultants, often friends of the councillors. Now the councillors are often earthy and ignorant, when they are not professional politicians, and they depend, to carry through their complex task, on the trained men under them.¹⁰ In the old days, it is true, the Clerk was sometimes an autocrat, laying down the law to councillors as well

as to surveyors, education officers, or Medical Officers of Health. This type is fading out, partly because neither councillors nor highway engineers (M.I.Mun.E.'s) are as impressed by the legal wing-collar, punctilio, and pin-stripe as they once were; partly because experts have come into their own in local government. The recent attempt by a Clerk of a County Council of the old school to make an incoming M.I.Mun.E. sign a contract which would submit his decisions on bituminous road surfaces to the authority of the Clerk was quickly squashed by the intervention of the Institution of Municipal Engineers.

Of course there is love of power in County Hall as in the Kremlin; and in County Hall, as in Whitehall, the man who holds the purse-strings acquires power. There are complaints by other departments that the Treasurer, who is usually an incorporated or certified accountant,* is tending to interfere in the purely professional decisions of his colleagues. This is a question of personalities. The ability of accountants to run things has become proverbial in local government as in business, and forewarned is forearmed; the Clerk keeps an eye on the Treasurer and has been known to remark that 'a lawyer is a match for an accountant any day'.

Unfortunately this pattern of control does not mean that 'having the local government authority as one's sole client' is professionally satisfying. Because the municipal engineer or treasurer does not have to deal with local administrators, it does not mean that he escapes them; far from it. The interference of Whitehall in local government has long been steadily increasing, while the welfare state has taken over, in one way or another, a large part of the responsibilities which used to be purely local. In this way gas, electricity, and some bus and tram services have been taken away; in many cases water undertakings; local rating valuation; and hospitals. In return for this robbery, the County Councils have been delegated powers which were previously wielded by the Rural and Urban District Councils, now miserably reduced to dealing with housing (where there is any housing), refuse disposal, street lighting, cemeteries, and public conveniences. Even those boroughs which are 'Excepted Districts' under the 1944 Education Act complain bitterly of the anomalies of their position. One such authority recently discharged a head cook from a school, only to have her reinstated on appeal by a County Council committee. Following fresh staff trouble in the kitchens they discharged her again, and once more the County reinstated her.

* Treasurers of the smaller bodies, as well as some of the larger, have their own professional organization, the Institute of Municipal Treasurers and Accountants.

The District Surveyor has been reduced practically to an advisory status; but the County Engineer or Surveyor is not much happier. Expenditure on highways and works has been ruthlessly cut, and because the councils contribute a proportion only of the cost, the rest being borne by the Ministry of Transport, the County Treasurer will not pay out anything in excess of his share—he will not ‘subsidize Whitehall’; especially as his own quarrels with Whitehall are multitudinous and bitter. With less work to do than ever the engineer spends his time telling the Ministry of Transport what little he has done at immense length, and preparing cases for additional improvements which take months and years to reach a decision. Insult is added to injury when brash young men from the regional office of the Ministry of Transport march in to tell him where to site his road-signs.

His desk is choked with paper. ‘Before the war’, a County Surveyor has been heard to remark, ‘no self-respecting engineer stayed in his office after midday; he was on the road seeing how his contractors were getting on with the job. Now he is making returns to the Ministry till three o’clock or later.’ He can find almost no work from which his trainees can make drawings to submit for their examination for membership of the Civil Engineers. He looks back to the days before the war, when his profession seemed on the upgrade, he had money to spend, discretion, the appreciation of the motoring public to spur him on. To the engineer it appears that ‘the status of Local Authorities has changed from that of an instrument of the citizens, interpreting their wishes, with power to initiate, to pioneer, to experiment, to that of an agent of central government with no power . . . except such as is necessary to carry out closely designed and detailed instructions on a standard pattern of action.’¹¹ He often declares he would not put a boy of his in the same profession.¹²

Many county and borough architects echo the engineer’s sentiments; they suffer from the same inability to spend money, the shortage of satisfying work, the same need to go up to Whitehall for everything*—only to find that they have there to explain their problems to

* A writer in the *Journal of the Institution of Municipal Engineers*, February 2, 1949, complained: ‘Some idea of the impossible conditions under which Local Authorities are operating at the moment can best be gained from an example:

‘Take the case of the development of a housing scheme:

‘Purchase of land is subject to the approval of:—

The District Valuer.

The Ministry of Health.

The Ministry of Town and Country Planning.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

‘Preparation of Layout must secure the approval of:—

The Ministry of Town and Country Planning.

a member of the administrative class, who may or may not summon his architect to advise him. Where the County Architect finds himself with a large school-building or other programme, he is luckier; indeed some local government architects are getting the most interesting work in the country. The exterior of the Royal Festival Hall may cause the profession to mutter fretfully 'Well, what do you expect of a salaried architect?' but against some of the more depressing architecture of the L.C.C. must be set the work of such enlightened councils as Hertford and Bucks. In County or County Borough Architect's offices containing perhaps 150 architects, surveyors, heating and sanitary engineers, and draughtsmen, personal satisfaction in professional work is often lacking. Most of the staff will be specialized on repairs or alterations, while the chief architect, burdened with administrative work, will try to sketch every new project (to bear his name), pass it down to his deputy 'to work out in detail', and so on down the line to the draughtsmen, and up again as queries and difficulties arise. Such work is impersonal and uninspiring, and the young architects, with no real work, initiative, or responsibility, soon lose their girlish or boyish laughter. By contrast, in a few councils, a humane and professional system of teamwork has been evolved, whereby small self-contained teams of architects, surveyors, quantity surveyors, and engineers handle a complete project from planning to supervision on site; in effect the office is organized as a series of so many private practices (but with common financial and secretarial services) and the result, besides comparing very favourably (even in cost) with that done by private architectural firms, combines good architecture with professional pride and satisfaction.

The Education Officer has in many areas steadily increased in importance, in proportion as local government has been shorn of its other responsibilities; it is not uncommon for the education department of a County Council to spend sixty per cent of the budget. Education,

The Ministry of Transport.

The Ministry of Health.

'Design of Houses:—

Subject to approval of Ministry of Health.

'Licences for materials:—

Subject to approval of Ministry of Health and Ministry of Works.

'Acceptance of Tender:—

Subject to approval of Ministry of Health.

'Loan Sanction:—

Subject to approval of the Ministry of Health.'

This hopeless tangle has now been somewhat simplified by the combination of the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Town and Country Planning functions, in relation to such a housing scheme, in the single Ministry of Housing and Local Government; but the difficulties remain formidable.

indeed, overshadows council business, and, because it is the main local function, attracts more attention from the electorate than is healthy. Complaints about the Health Service have to go to the Ministry; but complaints about education can be brought home to County Hall. The Health Service gets one or two days of Parliament's time a year: education is under fire all the time in the local press, and though this focus upon education rather than doctoring is unbalanced, at least it shows that the instinct for local government is still alive; that it can make itself felt, and does. Moreover, by a convention established since Whitehall and Local Authorities become closely associated with education following the 1902 Act, the Ministry of Education, while paying a high proportion of the educational budget, exercises restraint in its dealings with local education departments. The 1944 Act, as well as the building restrictions, have brought Whitehall more into the picture; and, at the same time, local education officers have begun to copy the centralizing tendencies of the Ministry. Pushed around by civil servants, the local education officer sometimes makes this interference an excuse for treating his headmasters in turn as if they were subordinate executives—and works off his frustrations by so doing. The best type of education officer, of the sort who has been a good headmaster working with his assistant masters in a team, will not set himself to undermine the self-respect and efficiency of his own profession; but the higher salaries given to education officers and their assistants attract a type of schoolmaster who is temperamentally prone to dictatorship. This has become so absolute in a few counties that headmasters are not even allowed to interview their new pupils before they take their places in school. Everything is done by the education department—except instruction from the dais. The stripping of local government of so many other functions has contributed to such an apotheosis of the education officer, who, with all the weaknesses of pedagogy in his make-up, at times finds himself more important than the surveyor or the medical officer of health, all-important to the architect, constantly in confabulation with the Treasurer, and occasionally enjoying more real authority than the Clerk himself. When he has important technical colleges under his charge, he may also find himself an authoritative figure in local industrial circles.

There is thus no shortage of work for local government officers. The system makes work. Even the Medical Officers of Health, shorn of their interest in hospitals, have all sorts of ancillary adjuncts of the health service to administer or fuss over; and there is always the dream of that wonderful health clinic, to cost £200,000, the result of a triumph-

ant co-operation of M.O.H., County Architect, and County Engineer. The Education Officer, bristling with his new-won authority, has his own dream—the County College, also costing £200,000, and an architectural as well as Further Educational gem, to keep him going. The planning officer, that lowest form of local government life, with his diploma from the Institute of Town and Country Planning, is kept busiest of all, planning the co-ordination of every other professional expert's plans. The paper chase between every department of County Hall or Town Hall and Whitehall keeps everyone toiling, and for heads of local departments there are constant conferences and interviews in London.

If, ultimately, the work achieved professionally should seem unsatisfying, and the rewards, as obtained by N.A.L.G.O. or the Engineers' Guild, inadequate to the rising cost of living, there is always the chance to transfer oneself to Whitehall permanently; for as its preoccupation with local government grows, the departments are taking on—to advise them—quite a number of treasurers and accountants, engineers, architects, medical officers of health, education officers, and planning officers with local government experience. Thus the browned-off municipal engineer or architect can perhaps ultimately discover whether it is more frustrating to sit in front of an under-secretary, and argue with him and get nowhere, or to sit behind him and try to insert arguments into his ear, and get nowhere.

Whichever way we look at it, bureaucracy is a voracious user and spoiler of professional talent. A C.B.E. is not an entirely satisfactory compensation for a lifetime's frustration of the creative instinct.

NOTES

1. T. A. Critchley, *The Civil Service Today*, 1951, p. 44.
2. A. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, 1933, p. 391.
3. H. D. Trail, *Social England*, 1895, Vol. VI, p. 13.
4. Cf. Bosworth Monck, *How the Civil Service Works*, 1952.
5. Cf. Sir F. Floud's lecture to the Institute of Public Administration, 2 January 1923, quoted by the Tomlin Committee, para. 75.
6. *Nature*, 18 February 1950, pp. 270-1.
7. Figures prepared by the Institution of Professional Civil Servants for the Sir Thomas Gardiner Committee on the Works Group and the Civil Service Class of Professional Accountants.
8. Cmd. 7635 (Barlow Committee), para. 36.
9. Cmd. 7969 of 1950 (Crick Committee), para. 160.
10. Cf. J. E. MacColl, 'Some Management Problems in Local Government', British Institute of Management, May 1951.
11. *Journal* of the Institution of Municipal Engineers, 2 August 1949, Vol. LXXVI, No. 2, and see Presidential Address, 1950, Vol. LXXVII, No. 1, 4 July 1950.
12. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER VII

Professional People in Business

'The deliberate aim of all those set in authority, however humble or exalted, should be that everyone under their charge may exercise to the full whatever gifts he may have, and may gain therefrom a measure of happiness. To this end a manager—foreman, works chemist, works manager, or board of directors, corporal or colonel, leading seaman or captain, prefect or headmaster—must not only arrange the details of the work to be accomplished, he must organize the conditions for good working, must maintain or must create an atmosphere genial and of mutual understanding, and he must infuse confidence in everyone above and below him. This he will achieve in proportion to his self-forgetfulness. His motive must be service; service to his men as well as to his paymaster, whether this be himself or others.'

E. I. LEWIS and GEORGE KING, *The Making of a Chemical*

WE HAVE SEEN the significance of the close relations of business and the professions—of the capitalist entrepreneur working in his sphere of risk-taking, profit and loss, and of the professional practitioner developing his art or science. The business man created a market first for professional services, and later for professional appointments; all the professions (not merely the technological) provided the business man with the conditions for business expansion. But in Chapter IV we have drawn a distinction between the business motive and the professional motive, between the nature of trade and the nature of professional service. It is no easy distinction to draw, and it becomes harder as business yearly becomes more professionalized.

It is a paradox that the professional man serving industry for a salary is often far less of a business man than the private practitioner. A practice is, in one sense, a business. The National Health Service Act has stripped much of the entrepreneurial quality from General Medical Practice, and so rid it of some unwanted commercialism,¹ besides depriving it of certain other incentives and safeguards. Many accountancy and civil engineering practices are in fact run as businesses, conforming to the professional code as regards advertising and ethics, but little distinguishable from other, depersonalized, commercial undertakings. Some professions suffer from a constitutional inability of their practitioners to deal adequately with the business side; the

need of architects in their clients' interest to correct this tendency has been suggested.² And a professional man with a keen business instinct is not prevented by the advertising ban from going out and getting custom. There are contented and prosperous partnerships in accountancy, architecture, and several other professions, in which the labour is shrewdly divided between the partner who plays golf, bridge and billiards, attends cocktail parties and dances, and the partner who just does the work. Professional advertising is a little art of its own—clothes, manner, politics, technical and popular journalism* may all play their part in it . . .

1. PROFIT AND TRADE IN PROFESSIONAL LIFE

But there are also professions which must frankly enter the field of trade. The Revenue places in a distinct category professions which are occupations carried on by virtue of the personal qualifications of the principals and in which the chief functions do not consist of giving advice in relation to commercial contracts. This operates by exempting legal, architectural, and medical people from business profits tax, but leaves estate agents, auctioneers and chemists as 'businesses' in the full taxable sense of that term. Much of the medical profession has emerged from shopkeeping, but some elements are still allied with shopkeeping. The right to 'sell or keep open shop for the retailing, dispensing or compounding Poisons', or to use the titles 'Chemist', 'Druggist', or 'Dispensing Chemist or Druggist' was reserved for registered practitioners under the 1852 Act,³ and the law of pharmacy is now such a complex and severe code, demanding so much academic study, that it is difficult to deny professional status to those who have trained in it, even if they divide† their earning hours between compounding drugs and selling shaving soap and toilet requisites, and pay profits tax if they can do well enough. Moreover, many qualified pharmacists never stand behind a counter, but work in hospitals, clinics, government departments, and industrial and university laboratories; and to deny their professional function because other pharmacists work in a shop would be illogical. Pharmacy is a 'shopkeeping profession', and as long as the retail chemist is a key part of the National Health Service, it is likely to remain one.

The spectacle-maker has also become more than a tradesman with the development of ophthalmology. From sight-testing to qualification

* Many books—some of them valuable books—appear only for this reason in present uneconomic conditions for authorship.

† About one-third of a chemist's turnover comes from dispensing.

and full statutory registration has been a gradual process, in which the opticians have organized and trained themselves in the face of obstruction from the doctors. The provisions of the Health Act have completed the state registration of opticians, which was partly achieved in the preceding Act of 1936. Nonetheless, opticians keep open shop, and will continue to do so until health clinics are instituted—a development as strongly opposed by the profession as by the pharmacists⁴. While spectacles were free, the profession enjoyed windfall profits; now that things are quieter, a certain amount of entrepreneurial effort to get customers—patients—has become noticeable. Opticians have a smaller retail sideline than pharmacists.

Similarly, the estate agent keeps open shop in a main thoroughfare, with advertisements of desirable residences in the window. His work also presents anomalies. Unqualified 'house agents', or those with qualifications from non-examining bodies, run 'hard' businesses (not to say, at times, straight rackets) and their profitable operations make a thorny path for the professional estate agent. The housing shortage has made estate agency rather easy meat, with little difficult negotiation in urban areas, and quick rake-offs. 'If *that's* professional service', mutters the stung manufacturer of (let us say) electronic switchgear, as he buys a house, 'for sheer straight dealing and strictly limited remuneration for services rendered, give me business!' The Chartered Auctioneers' and Estate Agents' Institute is indeed unhappy about the standing of the profession with the urban house-buying public, though its solution appears to be simply to close the profession so as to make sure that sheer commercial activities are debarred for all;⁵ but it must be remembered that house property selling is only a part of an estate agent's duties, much of which is management of property, urban and rural, in a fiduciary capacity.

But while it must be accepted that in varying degrees every professional practice is a business, it by no means follows that business can be a profession. Banking, for example, is generally thought of as a profession—and so perhaps it was when bankers were individuals or small firms of partners, comparable to legal firms. But is it possible to regard a vast joint-stock entity like one of the 'Big Five' as a professional entity? It is only by an old-fashioned courtesy that people speak affectionately of 'my bankers'. Banking is, of course, conducted even by huge chains of banks, as a service with a code of strictly regulated behaviour, one of which is that a customer's affairs are strictly secret, and there was an outcry when, under the Finance Act of 1950, it was made obligatory upon banks under certain very limited

circumstances to reveal details of their customers' affairs to the Revenue on request.* A very high degree of public confidence reposes in the banking code, quite apart from the security of the banking system; and it was the prospect of banks ceasing to be independent of government control which helped defeat the Australian Labour Party at the election of 1948. People are less anxious to see their bankers and lawyers nationalized than their doctors.† It is to the credit of the commercial banks that they have put themselves in a position comparable to that of a trusted profession.

But neither that, nor an army of examinations or institutes, makes either the bank-clerk or the bank-manager a professional practitioner; nor is everything a bank does professionally ethical. Leaving aside the treatment of their own staffs by the directors of banks who think of themselves as professional 'bankers', the banks advertise vigorously, engage, (and, of course, rightly) in speculative commercial undertakings for profit on a wide scale, and they steal business from the legal and accountancy professions by touting for accountancy, income-tax, executor, and trustee work—a practice they will have to abandon before any lawyer or accountant will think of a 'banker' as a professional comrade.

Insurance is in a somewhat similar position: how can a huge joint stock company be regarded as a professional entity? The most we can allow is that the individual actuary, and insurance expert proper, is a member of a qualified profession wholly employed in salaried positions, and to which therefore, no special professional attribute attaches. Stockbrokers, like auctioneers, approximate more closely to the professional pattern (though they too are often depersonalized almost to the extent of the 'bankers'); of late the Stock Exchange, smarting from deliberate attempts by Labour Ministers and propagandists to falsify its function, discredit its members, and smear its honour in the eyes of the public, has sought to cut out the few remaining practices—such as sharing commissions—which would not be acceptable to most professional institutions.⁶ It is arguable, however, that since commercial buying-and-selling of an entrepreneurial kind makes it impossible to regard the stockjobber as professional, the broker ought not to qualify either, even though he is remunerated solely by commissions for fiduciary services.

* It should be noted that, under S.103 of the Income Tax Act, 1918, solicitors and other 'agents' have long been obliged to divulge the profits or other income of their principals if required to do so; until 1951, they seldom were so required.

† See below, Chapter XI.

2. CIVILIZING BUSINESS LIFE

The professional code, on the other hand, has had a steadily increasing and beneficial influence on business life. It may be true that honesty is not only the best policy but also the indispensable condition for the maximum increase in net revenue; it may long have been true that, as Defoe put it, 'a true-bred merchant is the best gentleman in the nation'; but the carry-over of professional ideals into commerce has certainly assisted in making 'an upright conscience the clerk of the market'⁷ and consigning 'caveat emptor' to the wastepaper basket in many trades. It was in finance and in restricted forms of trade and manufacture that the professional attitude first began to mould the business outlook; the nineteenth-century Gradgrinds and even John Halifaxes did not think of themselves in any sense as providing the community with services comparable with those of doctor, lawyer, soldier, or clergyman. Their job was to sell what was wanted at the ruling market price and make as much out of this for themselves as they could; and in that way, with all business men competing with each other on price and quality, the community would be best served. The professional economists revealed this to the business man, and he believed it, though he did not pay a fee for the opinion.*

But, as businesses grew in size, professional people began to enter the service of trade and industry directly, bringing their attitudes and ideals with them. As the workshop became a works, engineers had to run it; as the mixtures put into the vat became more complicated, a chemist was needed to watch over them; as trading operations ramified, simple single-entry book-keeping produced mistakes which led to over-commitment and illiquidity, and a trained accountant was required to watch the books, quite apart from the annual audit. As the improvement of the product demanded systematic research, rather than the occasional consultation of a university professor, chemists, engineers, and technologists of all kinds had to be brought in and often given (or conceded) a lot of say on the commercial side. The state, in some cases, insisted on the employment of trained men, who with training acquired a professional outlook; and insensibly the presence of growing numbers of these people modified the 'business is business' outlook

* Except in so far as he bought books on the subject. The professional economists were paid mainly by universities to discover these wonderful truths, though Ricardo was a stockbroker and Mill, at one time, a civil servant. There is, however, some demand for consultancy services⁸ from economists; an early instance was the feeing of Nassau Senior by manufacturers to detect the scientific fallacies in the Ten Hours Bill.

of the plain business man in the business. In some industries the result is very marked, in others less so.

‘The shore labourer’s liability is limited: the seaman’s is unlimited. The seaman may be called upon to give the utmost that he is able, even to laying down his life. This is not an imposition on him, a piece of chicanery on the part of his employers: it is inherent in the profession he practises . . . moreover this professional attitude is not confined to the seaman himself; it is an infection which spreads right through the business of shipping, and crops up in the most unlikely places, even in board rooms . . . The seamen come to expect almost as high a standard of conduct from the owners as from each other. Every act of the owners will be assessed by the whole fleet, and rigorously judged. Nor will the verdict be hidden for expediency. If an owner’s virtue is found lacking . . . [the seamen] may be so ashamed as to want to hide their heads; but they will not pretend they have not noticed the fault.’⁸

Dealing in ships and sailors, or in mines and miners and mining engineers, or in steel and mechanical engineers, or in chemicals and industrial chemists, pharmacists and the medical profession, does seem, over a period, to have an effect on the business atmosphere; it may even be traced in the behaviour of patent medicine manufacturers. There are certain types of mass-produced manufacture, such as clothing, where it has scant effect. But size itself, in so far as it brings a business prominently in the public eye and under newspaper scrutiny, may have an effect on standards, and though a corporation may have ‘no soul to be damned and no body to be kicked’, it does often have a sort of rudimentary collective conscience, in the form of the interaction on policy of the attitudes of its executives and officers, many of whom have ingrained views on what is and is not done by the organizations which they serve. The professional man who works with a firm enjoying a worldwide reputation for research, liberality, and straight dealing can hold up his head among colleagues who teach in universities; the man who works in an obscure but reputable firm at least keeps his self-respect; the professional man who works with a firm or trade which has a name for the ‘cheap and nasty’ feels professionally *déclassé*. A thick skin, good money, and no real sense of professional standards may compensate him; but he will tend to avoid his colleagues. Professional solidarity and snobbery are powerful social forces. All this has its effect when a firm goes ‘ivory hunting’ for the young.

Industry and commerce are now employers of professional talent and tradition on a massive scale. Indeed there can be relatively few professions which do not now contribute a sizeable proportion of

their membership to business. The engineer 'has already driven a deep salient of professional interest and spirit into the industrial world. In the electrical, chemical, metallurgical, and auto-motive world he is already dominant in management. His methods, factual, objective, analytical, and experimental, are in his favour. His position is a natural bridge between the mechanical and the commercial skills. He starts from an impartial basis, with professional canons of integrity, trusteeship and ethical obligation that rise above the lowlands of partisan expediency.'⁹ But in addition to the dozen (or is it 57?) varieties of engineer, the chemists, physicists, pharmacists, metallurgists, and biologists, as well as the array of technologists, claiming to be thought of, and paid as, professional people, all operate upon the business world from 'impartial bases, with professional canons of integrity, trusteeship, and ethical obligation that rise, etc.' And there are the accountants, actuaries, statisticians and chartered secretaries, merchant navy officers and air pilots, all of whom, in varying assortments, make up, with the engineers, scientists, and technologists, the backbone of industry.

Yet that is by no means all. Welfare considerations bring in medicine and almost all the medical auxiliaries; while psychologists, both medical and academic, often administer trainee schemes and test recruits or study working conditions. Many large firms require their own resident architects, surveyors, estate agents, valuers, and patent agents. The lawyer, too, is playing a growing role in business, his function developing with that of the accountant, as the result of the flood of new administrative law affecting industry and commerce, and the labyrinthine complications of tax law. 'The accountant has become more and more dependent on the lawyer, even for his taxation law, while the lawyer has become pitifully dependent upon the accountant for his figures and conclusions to be drawn from them . . . No stranger at any board meeting nowadays ever wonders who are the two quiet figures who sit cheek by jowl at the corner of the table. Although neither of them may have the cadaverous, pinched look popularly associated with their professions, he knows at once that they are the company's solicitor and accountant "in attendance". He knows that they have come to stay.'¹⁰

Artists and designers find their place increasingly in trades as varied as printing, advertising, pottery, and textiles. The growth of 'public relations'—which in itself testifies to the new sensitivity of the commercial conscience—has produced thousands of jobs for journalists driven off their normal course by the shortage of newsprint. School-

masters only in rare instances practise their profession in business employ, but business has had an important influence on the teaching profession, by offering, in its need for scientists and mathematicians, attractive alternative appointments for pedagogues. And, quite apart from those who are employed for their specific professional skill and advice, many are employed simply in administrative or pure 'managerial' positions. This is true not only of engineers and accountants, but of former Merchant Navy officers, R.N., Army and R.A.F. officers, lawyers, (especially barristers) and not infrequently retired members of the Home Civil or Colonial Services.

Employment is at every level in business. The professional man or woman with the necessary flair can, in propitious circumstances, expect to rise into top management, as many do. In some of the research laboratories of industry, men and women every whit as brilliant as those in universities bring the zest of free enquiry into their working lives. On the other hand, business provides niches for the less gifted, and often circumscribes the talents of the gifted who can find no post in university teaching or independent research. Industry has, in some few cases, found a place for the most brilliant researchers, and has produced fair livings for more humdrum brains trained in chemistry or physics, far better livings than are offered for comparable talent by government; but the situation is capable of improvement. 'The old idea that a career in applied science in industry is inferior in status to other professions must be killed stone dead if we are to meet the challenge of the times', Lord McGowan recently declared;¹¹ but status goes with function, and the remedy lies with boards of directors.

At top levels, business life in many industries is dominated by the rivalry of two professions—the engineers and the accountants. Perhaps one ought to rephrase this as 'technicians and accountants', as the works chemist, as often as the production engineer, finds himself struggling for power against the accountant. In either case, the fact that the struggle has arisen is an indication of the importance of the professional element in business. In the nineteenth century the natural controller of the business was neither accountant nor engineer. He was either a strongminded entrepreneur who knew how to buy and sell advantageously (whether what he bought and sold was material or talent) or else the son or nephew of one—a dynast. The latter might have gone through the mill or through the university; it all depended. To-day a dynast has usually done both; but the joint-stock company is increasingly in professional hands, and the question—accountant or engineer?—is one of great importance. It may be thought of some

significance that neither profession has, for obvious reasons, highly developed its code of ethics.

Between the wars, as we have seen in Chapter III, the accountant strengthened his grip upon the direction of British industry, aided by the growing importance for large organizations—and then for small—of cost accounting and the budgetary techniques which were largely introduced by the Institute of Cost and Works Accountants,¹² though many members of the senior institutions learned and applied them. Until then 'there was little attempt to analyse expenses, either in classes of goods or by departments. Overhead expense ratios were fixed on an arbitrary and empirical basis. The profit factors were large and, provided that the aggregate results were satisfactory, no serious attempt at analysis was made.'¹³ But most accountants obtained directorships and managing directorships as the result of their introduction to the firm as auditors, and the magic of the hallmark 'A.C.A.' They have become known as 'business doctors', from their financial therapy in salvaging firms in difficulties (a title not yet won by management consultants) and their work in aggregate undoubtedly led to the close costing which was one vital ingredient in international competition from 1921 onwards. The Institute and the Society point in their literature to the important commercial posts available to the A.C.A. and the Incorporated Accountant.

The accountant's training, when allied to flair for organization, gives him an analytical insight into all the departments of a concern¹⁴ which in many types of business has enabled him to achieve control—either the general managership or managing directorship—not just a position on the board. The engineer, immersed in practical technical possibilities and routine, has often been, and still frequently is, the prisoner of his speciality or department, finding it hard to see the composite of the business in its true proportion, and still harder to grasp the network of agreements and commercial tactics which are often a part of big business. When it comes to a straight fight, even in an engineering business, it is often the accountant who comes out on top.¹⁵ Nonetheless, British industry has suffered in many of its branches—for example, textiles—from the lack of technically trained men at the controls. Engineers have felt fierce resentment at the march of the accountants to prestige and power. For the accountant cannot 'dream up' the technical possibilities which are the propulsive force of industry, if not of trade; sometimes even his own attitude to costs is faulty when it comes to market forecasting for new technical products. The accountant does not understand the 'rhythm' of technical development, the

inner growth of the inventive process. He has less faith in sheer technology, more in the power of figures, manoeuvres, amalgamations, controls. He is often conspicuously successful even in industries where technology is of supreme importance, provided that in essence the operations are continuous and repetitive, however complicated to engineer; but where the element of research, invention and technical complexity enters—for example in the making of machine tools rather than razor blades—he is usually not merely hopeless, but, if in control, a dead hand. In recent years, as productivity has become an industrial catchword, engineers have asserted themselves strongly against accountants, even to the extent of including a thimbleful of accountancy in their examination syllabuses.

3. IS MANAGEMENT A PROFESSION?

There are something like 400,000 people in management positions to-day, involving a recruitment of 12,000 a year,¹⁶ and only a proportion of these are men and women trained in the discipline of one or other of the professions which we have been discussing. The rest are ordinary executives, junior and senior managerial staff, and there is no stronger testimony to the influence of professional ideals in business than the efforts made by these people to professionalize themselves and their functions. This 'management movement' was described in Chapter III. Faced with the trained accountant, chartered secretary, or technologist, with his letters-designate, his professional journal lying on his desk, his annual conference, and his indefinable air of 'belonging' to a greater entity, the salesman has always felt vaguely inferior, even though his chance of rising to full command is fully as great, in many businesses, as that of professional people.¹⁷ Other self-made managers, doing specialized jobs, felt the same vague dissatisfaction, the same desire to appear expert, the same wish to 'get together'. Moreover, long before the productivity reports blazoned it, the inferiority of much of British management compared with American was fully understood in British firms; not the least valuable, if least publicized, effect of the productivity reports has been that they have given able but dissatisfied and subordinate men a lever against the smugness of ageing and non-technical boards or managements. For many years, systematic studies of the running of businesses and departments, and especially of the welfare and human relationships involved in factory and office work, have increased—often to the point of unreadable jargon—in a flow of textbooks and periodicals.

Out of this mixture of inferiority feelings and systematic methods, the 'management professions' have grown. Most of them are concerned, as their titles suggest, not with supreme command in industry, but with specialized functions. Thus sales managers, purchasing officers, works managers, office managers, export managers, transport managers are generally heads of departments except when the function is the firm's *raison d'être* (for example, a transport concern or an exporting agency). These specialities all dutifully organize themselves on what they conceive to be a proper professional pattern,* the formation of an institute, the setting of examinations to ensure a standard of qualification, the creation of training facilities by postal tuition or in technical colleges, the conferring of graduateships, associateships, memberships and fellowships, the calling of annual conferences, the publication of a 'code of professional conduct'¹⁸, earnest, highminded and vague, and the issue of a journal and booklets of 'case material', representing the furtherance of the technique and art of the profession. They all look forward to the time when employers will appoint men to sales, office, or personnel managerships only if they have the professional qualification. New specialities in professional management continue to develop; the Institute of Packaging, for example, recently declared that 'the achievement of professional status for technicians in the packaging industry implies the ultimate establishment of specialized courses of instruction in all matters connected with the subject and the fostering of facilities for those persons entering the profession who wish to acquire the necessary training.'¹⁹ Thus far have we advanced since the day that Uncle Ponderevo learnt from his nephew how to pack bottles of Tono-Bungay scientifically through the sides of the cases . . .

Many of the management bodies speak as if their members enjoyed professional status already, and point to the wording of the report on Education for Management²⁰ which brackets accountancy and engineering with 'those institutions offering a professional qualification in some aspect of management, e.g. Personnel Managers, Sales Managers . . .' Few would, however, contend that the right to put behind one's name such combinations of letters as M.O.M.A., M.S.M.A., M.I.W.M., or M.I.Ex.,† carries quite the same glow of inward worth as the right to

* 'We have followed', said an official of one of the managerial associations in an interview, 'the pattern laid down in *The Professions*, by Carr-Saunders and Wilson.'

† i.e. (in order) Member of the Office Management Association; Member of the Incorporated Sales Managers' Association, Member of the Institute of Works Managers, Member of the Institute of Export.

call oneself M.I.Mech.E., or C.A. The fact is, that though there *are* examinations, relatively few of the members of these bodies have taken them; and a large and motley, but efficient, crowd of men and women carry out jobs of sales, office, and other management without bothering their heads about examinations or associations at all.* There is much overlapping between the management associations, and between them and the accepted professional bodies—for example, office managers are less often M.O.M.A.'s than accountants or chartered secretaries. In small firms, the same man often performs several functions.

Socialist administrations have shown themselves fascinated by the possibilities both of formal training for management, and of the 'professionalization' of management. They have appointed many committees to study the matter, and have given the 'management movement' enthusiastic support. Socialists have particularly emphasized the role of the personnel manager. Mr Bevin, when Minister of Labour, 'claimed with all the authority of his office, that the key to Britain's industrial difficulties should be sought in a failure to put Personnel Managers on an equality with Works Managers'.²¹ The apparatus of the welfare state, and the growth of joint consultation in factories, have made the office of personnel manager important—but at the same time, personnel management must be a general policy matter, not a narrow speciality.²² It has certainly been the responsibility owed by managers to their workpeople, and the problem of substituting incentives other than the 'simple one of 'hire and fire' in industries operating under conditions of full employment, which have caused Socialists to feel they require, for the realization of their plans, a new science of management. During the war, both Sir Stafford Cripps and Ernest Bevin encouraged the appointment of personnel officers in government and government-controlled factories; after the war Cripps was largely responsible for getting the Treasury to underwrite the British Institute of Management, as a corporate body designed to encourage both efficiency and professionalism.

But making top management and industrial administration professional as opposed to creating specialists who can run a sales cam-

* The following figures for memberships of the management bodies were given by *Future*, Oct–Nov, 1951:

	Corporate Members	Potential Membership
Institute of Industrial Administration	2,500	20,000
„ „ Cost and Works Accountants	3,500	25,000
„ „ Works Managers	1,700	35,000
„ „ Personnel Managers	1,000	4,000
Office Managers' Association	1,000	5,000
Sales' Managers Association	4,500	12,000
Purchasing Officers' Association	2,700	5,000

paign or keep a staff of typists and comptometer girls working with tolerable efficiency, is an extremely different and difficult matter,²³ and the great proportion of British business men still do not believe in it.²⁴ 'The success of the Institute in establishing itself as a professional body', said the Committee which prepared its constitution in 1945,²⁵ 'will depend on its ability to determine criteria by which individual capacity in management can be assessed.' This the Institute has not been able to do. It has co-ordinated all the management bodies; it has produced a lot of 'management studies' in booklet form; it has, with the help of the Ministry of Education, introduced a common intermediate examination in management studies;²⁶ it has tried to persuade the universities to pay more attention to business training;²⁷ but it has not found any method of certifying that an individual, after receiving training in management, can in fact manage. It may be argued that a man can possess medical degrees without being able to heal, or be called to the Bar only to make a woeful exhibition of himself in Court, but even these two men know more than the mere theory of their art, which is all that a 'manager' who has got up the syllabus of the Institute of Industrial Administration²⁸ knows of his, and that at a great distance; besides, the doctor and lawyer must have their basic training and degrees to make even a modest success of their professions—but *most* managers make a success of theirs without the slightest acquaintance with the I.I.A.* and all its requirements for general management.

4. TRAINING FOR ENTERPRISE

'No system of tests or competitive examinations', said the Urwick Committee,²⁹ 'however careful and objective, is a fully satisfactory determinant of the power to discharge major responsibilities.' That must still be decided by performance—by a man's record—and consequently whether a man has an F.I.I.A. after his name or not, it is his record which *alone* determines his appointment to a general managership. There are those who believe that psychology has advanced far enough to permit this combination of flair for leadership, for the nosing out of profitable ventures, and for detailed organization, to be tested on lines analogous to those which are fairly successfully†

* The Institute of Industrial Administration, which did pioneer work in education for management between the wars, is now the professional body attached to the British Institute of Management, which is itself supported not by individuals but by firms' subscriptions.

† We say 'fairly successfully' because it cannot be proved that, in the circumstances of war-time, at least the same measure of success could not have been achieved by rougher and less costly methods.

used to select junior officers in war-time, or to select junior civil servants or diplomats. They postulate group discussions to elucidate how far the would-be G.M. can adjust himself to a group of men he has not previously met; 'mock directors' meetings' at which the candidate's ability to put over his ideas on a previously studied problem can be assessed; intelligence tests—presumably to make sure his I.Q. is at least twenty-five per cent above average; 'projection tests' in which his reactions to a blot of ink on white paper reveal his emotional stability, and so forth.³⁰ All this is in order 'to assay the qualities in man, much as gold and silver are assayed.'³¹ But even the experts are constrained to admit that 'no professional institute has yet found a way to test the depth and quality of character of those who are already possessed of the practical and technical knowledge which has enabled them to discharge, with apparent success, the responsibilities of general management.'³² For one thing, the scope of the work of a general manager is too wide; there are too many independent variables. Men who run admirably a factory of 250 employees fail in one that employs 1,000; a man who makes big money for shareholders in one trade fails completely in another; one sort of man gets brilliant results from a team of scientists, engineers, and technicians, but would be wasted and probably fail in a factory where five hundred semi-literate teen-age girls turn out chocolate fudge bars.

Furthermore, the profession of general management has never been delimited. Who is, and who is not, a manager, functional or general, is decided on the merits of each application by the institutes concerned. We do know when a man is a lawyer, doctor, or engineer—but whether a man is a professional manager or not apparently depends upon the size and nature of the firm he controls: and this is decided by the I.I.A. upon no principle clearly and unequivocally laid down. The reason is obvious—it would be derogatory to the dignity of managers of large firms to be classified as equal in status with the managers of workshops, even though some day the workshop managers may become as 'professional' as they are.

Moreover, it is noticeable that all discussions on the nature of management, on its professional 'ethics' and solidarity, and on its purpose, consistently play down its *business* side—its money-making function. Professional management, at least in its published statements, appears to think largely either in terms of departmental organization, or of the administration of a handful of firms so large that they are almost departments of state. But the basis of management is making a business pay for the shareholders—otherwise it ceases to be

a business. True, it must concern itself with the welfare of all who are employed,* but the basic function is to enable the employees to get a pay-packet—which can be done only by making profits. It is this which distinguishes the business man from the professional man, however blurred the distinction may at times become. It is often a wide difference. The professional man is conservative and cautious by nature; the business man ought to (but now so seldom does!) think in terms of bold innovation—he must rush in wherever money can be made. His job is (or used to be) to undercut his competitors when possible. That is not a professional attitude; it is a very real worry to academic economists³³ that ‘professionalization’ in management may indeed lead to greater loyalty between managers than between managers and public—that professionals will agree to look after each other, instead of taking the line that their job is to get the customer’s custom and the devil take the hindmost F.I.I.A.

It does not at all follow, however, that the hard work put into education for management is entirely wasted. In America there is both a great deal more training for management† and a great deal more cut-throat competition. But there is less interest in professional status—it is enough to be a business man. Conversely, those taking professionalized management courses in America are deeply imbued with the importance of ‘entrepreneurship’ and initiative in industry. Consequently, the results of British and American training are very different, grandiloquent as the syllabuses of our institutes may sound. But in any case, there are in Britain very few business teachers. Those who can, in business, do; those who can’t don’t care to confess to failure by teaching. Until business professors are paid as well as fairly senior executives, this will remain the case.

For trained business leadership, therefore, we must still turn to those professions which are already strong in trade and industry, as well as to the plain, self-made business man. It is arguable that administrative ability is as well-founded upon any one stiff professional discipline

* Cf. The Managing Director’s definition of the purpose of the Glacier Metal Co: ‘The continuity and expansion of a working community which aimed at the establishment of such internal conditions as would enable its members to serve society, serve their own dependents and to serve each other, and to do these things with a sense of creative satisfaction.’

Elliott Jacques, *The Changing Culture of a Factory*, p.124

† In 1943–4, 200,000 students were taking management courses in the U.S.A. ‘A corresponding effort in proportion to population would have required that over 70,000 students in this country were taking courses in management in that year. We should be surprised to learn that the actual number of students in Great Britain was even one twentieth of that figure.’

(Report of the Committee on Education for Management, 1944)

as upon any other. But it may be that some cross-fertilization of attributes is necessary as a foundation for leadership in the biggest businesses. We were, in the course of our enquiries, offered a formula which may merit some consideration. 'Take a boy of first class all-round ability and send him to a public school where he will learn early that leadership has penalties as well as privileges. At seventeen, pull him out again and send him into the shops, where he will learn how to live with all sorts and conditions—and learn that character and courage belong to no one class or type. Let him work his way up and take his ordinary and Higher National Certificates in chemical engineering as he does so—chemical engineering because that is the frontier of the two greatest departments of modern industrial production, and he must know both, *and* their interaction. Then give him two years at Cambridge, to remind him that production isn't everything—and to meet scholarship and learning, to realize the importance of fundamental study, and to make friends with people whom he is later to meet in higher places all over the world. After that he is to become a Chartered Accountant; and, of course, the finished product will have somehow done his military service, at which he will inevitably have distinguished himself. In his spare time, he will read widely, master several forms of athletics, but certainly small-boat sailing, mountaineering, tennis, as well as bridge and billiards, as these are often important in business. Such a man should have a first-class farmer for a father, because he must know in his blood that the land is the basis of everything, including industry; and he should have a talented and beautiful mother, to bequeath him charm and poise, as all his knowledge and experience will be powerless when he is up against politicians. In due course, with maturity and experience, he will be capable of making a success of top management in a big firm—though whether he would match up to the superhuman task of running a nationalized industry successfully is doubtful. For that, he would probably need in addition the powers of a Nelson to inspire loyalty, of a Napoleon to work with only four hours' sleep in the twenty-four, of a Lloyd George to blarney his workers and the public. And of course, the second sight of the Piddingtons: without that even his powers will not be equal to the detection of all the waste and inefficiency inherent in this type of organization.'

At present, this form of training for management is rare, and the basic material itself scarce, so business will have to get along with executives rather more limited in outlook and mental equipment. But it is evident that, however important the professional outlook may be

in the ever-greater complexities of industry, the business instinct will remain indispensable. It takes a business man, whatever his professional antecedents—engineer, accountant, chemist, or barrister—or unprofessional origins, be they shopkeeper, salesman, or mechanic, to create and build the business that will grow large enough to employ in some style and dignity any considerable numbers of professional people.

NOTES

1. Cf. T. F. Fox, 'Professional Freedom', in *The Lancet*, Vol. CCLXI, No. 6673, 21 July 1951.
2. Cf. M. J. F. Secrett, A.R.I.B.A., *So You Want To Be An Architect*, 1949, *Daily Mail Careers of Today Series*.
3. F. W. Adams, B.Sc., Ph.L., A.R.I.C., Barrister-at-Law, 'The Pharmaceutical Profession', in the *Journal of the Royal Institute of Chemistry*, 1949, Part IV, p. 348.
4. Cf. G. H. Giles, F.B.O.A., articles on the State Eye Service, in *The British Optician*, May 1948 and August 1949.
5. The Chartered Auctioneers and Estate Agents Institute, *A Short Account of Its Origin and Activities*, November 1950, p. 7.
6. It was not, however, popular. Cf. *The Economist*, 3 and 24 July 1948.
7. Cf. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, 1929, p. 245.
8. Richard Hughes, *In Hazard*, 1950.
9. W. E. Wickenden, 'Professional Goals for Today', *Journal of the Engineers' Guild*, November 1947.
10. 'Lawyers and Accountants in Business', *The Director*, July 1951.
11. *The Times*, 18 January 1951.
12. Roland Dunkerley, J.P., F.C.W.A., *A Historical Review of the Institute and the Profession*, The Institute of Cost and Works Accountants: a paper submitted at the 18th National Cost Conference, May 1946, pp. 4, 8.
13. *Ibid*, p. 5.
14. The engineer is recommended to read 'The Accountant's relations with Management', in *Studies in Accounting*, ed. W. T. Baxter, 1950, pp. 169–83.
15. A typical case which had prolonged secondary effects is described in *The Changing Culture of a Factory* by Elliott Jacques, M.D., Ph.D., 1951, Chapter II.
16. Report of a Committee on Education for Management ('Urwick Committee'), 1947, p. 6.
17. According to an article in *Future*, August–September 1951, a poll of managements on promotion policy showed that Sales Department was adduced as producing managers of general adaptability by 21 per cent. of those replying, compared with 33 per cent. for Production Departments, and 5 per cent. for Accounts Departments.
18. Cf. Office Management Association, *Code of Professional Conduct*: this calls broadly for efficient performance of duties to the employer, good relations with subordinates, and readiness to help professional colleagues. See also *I.I.A. News*, Special Supplement, April 1951, 'Report of the Professional Standards Committee'. It states: 'The following six main principles constitute the foundation of the code of ethics:
 - 'The attainment of competence as a manager to the degree requisite for the responsibility undertaken.
 - 'The maintenance of the honour, integrity, and dignity of the profession.
 - 'The acknowledgement of Management as a means to an end, namely service to all sections of the community as a social obligation.

'The recognition that loyalty to the profession is a primary duty not to be surrendered by expediency . . .

'The acceptance of a discipline of continuing personal study . . .

'The avoidance of the abuse of executive power for personal gain.'

19. *Sales Appeal*, January-February 1951, 2nd National Packaging Supplement, p. iv.

20. Report of a Committee on Education for Management ('Urwick Committee'), 1947.

21. Cf. L. Urwick, *The Human Factor in Management*, Institute of Labour Management, 1944, p. 40.

22. L. Urwick, *Personnel Management in relation to Factory Organisation*, Institute of Personnel Management, 1943; F. W. Lawe, *Staff Management*, Institute of Personnel Management, 1944, p. 21.

23. 'The job of top management is radically different from the work and responsibility of the operating executives. Yet top management personnel must be recruited from operating executives. The atmospheres in which the future top manager spends his formative years . . . are all different from the atmosphere, the work, and the angle of vision of the top management job.' Peter F. Drucker, *The New Society*, 1951, p. 194.

24. *Future*, 'Managers of Tomorrow', August-September 1951, p. 53. 'A strong bias was noticeable amongst written comments in favour of practical rather than bookish training, of learning by experience, of the "born" rather than the "made" manager. Champions of wider academic training for business . . . would be surprised by some of these comments.'

25. *A Central Institute of Management*: The Report of a Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Trade to formulate detailed proposals for setting up a central institute for all questions connected with management, H.M.S.O., 1946.

26. British Institute of Management, National Scheme for Certificates and Diplomas in Management Studies (Handbook of Courses and Examinations), April 1951.

27. Cf. L. Urwick, 'A British Graduate School of Business', *British Management Review*, July 1950, Vol. IX; and Lord Lindsay of Birker, 'The Universities and Management', British Institute of Management, February 1950.

28. 'The examinations are not intended to test the candidate in regard to his full competence to initiate high administrative policy, since actual performance alone can do this, but the systematic knowledge acquired by the successful candidate will assist him to approach questions of policy on sound practical lines.' I.I.A., *Examinations Handbook*, revised April 1950.

29. Urwick Committee, *op. cit.*

30. J. R. Pinsent, 'Testing Potential Managing Directors', *The Manager*, June 1950.

31. Sir Harold West, 'Professional Assessment of Personality', at the 54th Oxford Managerial Conference, November 1949, p. 11 and esp. p. 13.

32. West, *op. cit.* Cf. F. C. Hooper, *Management Survey*, 1948, p. 140.

33. Joan Robinson and S. P. Chambers on the Third Programme, 11 August 1951.

CHAPTER VIII

The Impact of Nationalization

'The Board should create its own supermen and not try to import them.'

Sir MILES THOMAS, chairman of B.O.A.C.

'Is our changed status as servants of the State, which is in fact what most of us now are, to affect our freedom to express professional opinion? . . . We claim to reserve our rights as professional men to express our own views . . .'

Professor J. A. S. RITSON

'I have resigned from the National Coal Board because I have no confidence in it or in the organization it has set up.'

Sir CHARLES REID

WE HAVE SEEN how Bigness in Business has brought the professional man and woman into commerce and industry in ever-growing numbers and variety; how it has created new, and sometimes bizarre, associations of professional administrators; how the widening gulf between ownership and control has 'professionalized' management. Nationalization carries these developments to their final flower. Most of the British nationalized industries are the largest production units under single control in the world; as organizations they can be compared only with armies, navies, and government departments. The divorce of ownership from control is complete. And though efforts are made to explain the difference between civil servants and employees of nationalized industries, they are ingenious rather than convincing—and as the years go by, they will probably become still less convincing. The impact of this upon the professional people employed by these industries is very considerable, though it has not yet been fully felt—and it is also having a considerable impact on professional people not so employed.

Something like twenty per cent of the nation's production is now controlled by nationalized concerns, and their influence reaches far beyond their immediate frontiers. The professions directly affected are those of colliery managers and engineers, gas and electric power engineers, railway engineers, and airline pilots. These now find that their employment is almost wholly confined to the state's business.

But large numbers of managerial grades, accountants, estate agents, technologists, chartered secretaries, surveyors, and so forth now find themselves state employees, and with alternative employment only to the extent that their training, and their experience in the industry now nationalized, fits them for work in private practice or in private industry (what Whitehall now calls 'the private sector'). In many cases, this is no alternative at all. Looking at the situation in another way, and very broadly, for those about to go into business either as technologists or as commercially trained professional men and women one job in five, or perhaps one job in six, is in a nationalized industry. This will have its effect in years ahead—an effect on the professions, and a selective effect on the people offering for, and getting, jobs from the state concerns.

1. PROFESSIONS AT THE MERCY OF MONOPOLY

These effects are likely to be profound; and it would be a mistake to imagine that nationalized industry is just a bigger kind of Big Business, even as far as day-to-day routine and technical matters are concerned. In the first place, what of the position of those professional people who now find their employment virtually monopolized by the State? The only alternative employment for colliery managers is overseas; before nationalization they had about 800 employers to play off against one another. Gas engineers could, if necessary, 'shop around' about 1,000 privately-owned and municipal undertakings, and in addition there was a certain amount of employment for qualified gas engineers in the Iron and Steel industry—which is now, of course, also largely (not wholly) state-controlled. For electricity power engineers, the position was much the same, though the range of employment outside the industry was considerably greater; they could always hope for a job, if need be, in the firms manufacturing generators or power plant. Both airline pilots and railway engineers have long been in a weak position. The private railway companies largely trained their own technicians, and it was a career very much like that in the Civil Service. Airline pilots have now but one employer, apart from the charter companies; but, as in the case of all these technical men, there is some chance of jobs abroad on the strength of their qualifications.

The weakness of extreme specialism shows up in nationalization. Though a power station superintendent may be an A.M.I.E.E., he has taken those papers and options which rigidly confine his usefulness to electric power—he is lost in radar or electric traction. Railway engineers are in much the same case. A gas engineer may be an A.M.I.C.E.

—but he is little fitted to change over to port construction after a row with his employers following twenty years' service with gasometers. Colliery managers would seem to be in the worst position of all; their whole lives are in coal; commonly they begin to think about coal by going down the mine at 15. However, the position is mitigated by other considerations. A good colliery manager, rigorously trained, compelled to cultivate self-reliance as a condition of his calling, often finds lucrative employment in other industries, whose managerial (and even some of whose technical) problems cannot nonplus him. British mining technology is the most advanced in the world, because the difficulties are so much greater than elsewhere. 'There is no comparison between an American mine working its first seam, say 6 ft. thick under shallow but firm cover, and a 600-yard deep colliery in Britain working its fourth or fifth seam of coal when the ground overhead has been disturbed by earlier workings.'¹

Thus the British colliery manager with advanced qualifications can hope to find alternative employment; in this respect he is in the position of many Merchant Navy officers. The vital quality they have is leadership. Other nationalized engineers may or may not have it. If they have, they can spread their wings. But it is in much smaller degree the condition of their callings, and a greater proportion of them are therefore tied to their speciality. But while experienced engineers who have training in the collieries and utility undertakings of the private enterprise era may be able to find alternate employment if necessary—if they feel that conditions, economic or moral, dictate a change to a man with any self-respect—it is far from certain that engineers *trained* in nationalized industries will have either the will or the training to do so. The owners of coal mines in former days often put their sons or nephews—after a public or secondary school education—through the pit (or through several, British and foreign); this degree of hereditary leadership is now disappearing, much to the industry's detriment in the view of mining engineers.

The first reaction to nationalization by most of these professions has been a hurried strengthening both of professional institutions and of professional trade unions. Before nationalization, the gas engineers were not strongly organized, and in many cases lacked professional qualifications; in particular, those working for municipal undertakings were generally worse paid and worse educated than those working for private gas companies. It was possible for hard-working men to rise to top management without any formal degree at all. The Institution of Gas Engineers was a somewhat weak body; it did good work

in advancing technology and in holding examinations with the aim of raising standards, but it was dependent upon the employers, as well as on its members, for financial support. This subsidy came from the Gas Council, an association of employers, and as long as there were many employers, the institution had little or nothing to fear from improper interference. It evidently did not feel the same sense of security when the state became the boss, even though the gas industry is relatively decentralized. Moderation of examinations has now been handed over to the Institution of Civil Engineers, which is, of course, solidly independent; the Institution of Gas Engineers is now mainly a learned body, comparable to the Institution of Locomotive Engineers (it also controls the education of the distribution side). Gas engineers, upon qualifying, can now be elected civil engineers, though in the latter stages of training they have specialized in gas technology; it is felt that not only has the status of the profession been thus safeguarded, but a wider field of alternative employment has been opened up.

Coal nationalization has also been accompanied by a strengthening of the independent professional organization of the mining engineers. While the minimum qualifications of the colliery manager remain the First-class State certificate of competence, this is now considered to be of far too low a standard;² the Institution itself has now set up an examining board, so that from 1952 onwards election to its associate membership will be confined to those who have attained a high degree of general proficiency in engineering and have some academic background. The National Coal Board, it is expected, will have to conform gradually to these higher standards, thus opening the way to staffing higher posts with much more independent and versatile types of man. It may be argued that professional and learned institutions offer but frail protection against state power wielded—as even in Britain it very often is—by power-loving, ruthless, and authoritarian individuals; but it is remarkable what strength a professional ‘front’ can develop simply as the result of professional standing. Those who were able to watch the demeanour of a certain politician addressing, not long ago, a gathering of mining engineers, many with international reputations and honours from a half-dozen universities and institutions, had heartening earnest of it. Such professional prestige, however, derives not merely from one profession, however learned or altruistic; it is a collective possession, as has been noted elsewhere in this book, and one which every profession should help to keep in good repair.

Professional institutions themselves do not take lightly the threat to their freedom, inherent in state ownership of industry.

'In the present District Organization under the National Coal Board,' Professor Ritson remarked in his presidential address to the Institution of Mining Engineers in 1948, 'it may well be that a senior official produces a paper at the local Institute's meeting. Is everybody junior in grade to himself to applaud all his statements like Hitler's satellites, or can everyone say without fear of unpleasant consequences what he thinks? If a young member who is a junior official under the National Coal Board writes a controversial paper, is he to be allowed to publish it, provided it is clearly stated that the paper represents the author's own views. . . ?'³

This is not merely a problem for A.M.I.Min.E's wanting to air their views on technical points which N.C.B. does not wish publicized.* All the institutions need training facilities within their respective industries, easy enough to secure when there were many employers. To-day a single employer can, if he wishes, lay down a standard regulation. Again, all these industries supported, before nationalization, a number of rival trade journals, which kept clear the channels of communications of trade and technical information—and which offered a permanent open forum for discussion and controversy. They were kept alive, of course, by the advertising of the various firms in them—or of those who supplied them with machines and services.⁴ Will such journals survive under present conditions? Either advertising pressure (far more effective in the case of trade papers than national dailies) or a refusal to permit access to the plants and works now under single ownership would seriously weaken them. Their place could, after a fashion, be taken by a 'house journal', or series of such tied sheets, published by a nationalized industry itself, and this would almost certainly prevent controversial matters from being aired. The example of *Coal*, which is produced by the N.C.B. for miners, is not encouraging.

2. CENTRALIZATION, TRADE UNIONISM, AND MORALE

Nationalization is giving additional impetus to the growth of trade union types of organization among professional people. This in itself is bound to increase centralization. In private industry professional employees for the most part negotiate their contracts separately with their employers; their salaries and perquisites, if any, and any special terms of employment are kept confidential. There is much variation,

* It was, for example, only because he could 'shop round' from one board of directors to another, that Colonel Blackett, in the teeth of professional derision among senior engineers and of the colliery companies' indifference, forced the industry to take up his conveyer.

and, of course, a man can apply in secrecy for a new post. But faced with a huge, nation-wide employer, it is almost impossible to maintain such a degree of individual bargaining, though it may be significant that after the experience of coal, electricity, gas, transport, and airlines, the state steel industry is trying to maintain a system under which professional men and women will negotiate separately with the boards of the former private companies. But in the other industries, the national headquarters feels that it must treat everyone alike, grade for grade, and qualification for qualification; and just as nobody can secretly apply for a better job, so all other special covenants, to suit individual cases, are put out of court. It therefore becomes necessary for technicians, technologists, and even senior management to become part of the collective bargaining machinery. What has happened in local government has thus, in the past five years, developed in industry on a large scale; and, because it affects twenty per cent of production, the remainder is not likely to be indefinitely unaffected.

Inevitably, complaints, grievances, anomalies, are argued up and down the line, but more and more individual cases are settled in London between the board—or whatever the central organ of the industry may be—and the bargaining association involved. A tremendous strain is thus put on headquarters, with attendant delays. And this necessity for centralized negotiation inevitably reinforces centralizing tendencies of other kinds. In coal, the British Association of Colliery Managers has been formed to bargain on behalf of the mining engineers, and also all the engineering and scientific specialists employed by the N.C.B. In power supply, the Electric Power Engineers' Association has been developing its organization since 1921, and may well become a model for others; essentially a trade union, with an outlook bounded by wages and conditions (though also interested in joint consultation) it is affiliated to the T.U.C.⁵ Some forty per cent of its members are members or associates of the Institution of Electrical Engineers: one of its objects is to ensure 'legal certification of qualified engineers', and to ensure that 'qualified engineers only are appointed to responsible positions'—but it is not thereby necessarily thinking in terms of anything more elaborate than the National Certificate in electrical engineering. The Gas Engineers have created a gild; the pilots created their trade union, 'BALPA', in 1937; it now has close on 2,000 members and associates.

It is idle to deny that these circumstances have brought about big changes in the atmosphere of the nationalized industries—with the possible exception of steel. As Professor Ritson foreshadowed:

'When there were approximately 800 privately owned Colliery Companies and a junior technical officer disagreed with the decision of his superior (and we must remember that youth has an embarrassing habit of sometimes being right) he could seek employment elsewhere. To-day there is only one employer, and an outspoken junior who feels himself frustrated may lose his keenness and fall into the pernicious habit of waiting for dead men's shoes, or he may seek employment abroad, or even become a "yes-man". . . . Promotion by seniority without consideration of merit never leads to efficiency . . . there is a risk of a young man with brains and initiative being forgotten when chances of promotion are available.'⁶

In general the tendency is to insist upon promotion by seniority simply as the result of centralized wage-bargaining; already in the nationalized industries feeling runs strongly that what should count is seniority—and that outsiders should not be brought in to take jobs from the men who have waited for them.⁷ Strict promotion by seniority, and the exclusion of outsiders, is the more necessary if the state industry sets its face against 'shopping around' between areas or regional units. In fact, this is happening. There have already been complaints that men who wished to transfer to new regions have been prevented; applications have not been forwarded with recommendations; senior officials have shown some tendency to put their heads together and keep 'trouble-makers' out. Trade unionists have been fond of declaring that the old private employers had 'black lists', but it is obviously easier for a few area managers to get together and 'fix' matters than it ever was for several hundred employers. It is not suggested that this has become a serious matter yet; but the danger is revealed by a widespread feeling of insecurity.

There is also a widespread feeling of slackness and weakened morale. Frustration and red tape are mainly responsible; these in turn are the results of centralization—and it is still centralization to reduce 1,000 units to 12. Slender as was the competition between the former main line railway companies, it was sufficient to keep the commercial departments on their toes; men went out and tried to get business. To-day, that energy has vanished. Nobody cares; the *feeling* that nobody cares eats steadily into the whole organization.* These are not conditions in which professional engineers can long isolate themselves with their technicalities—the joys of standardizing 400 loco classes into a dozen, or of finally deciding for or against Buckeye couplers. In running the railways there has been a steady loss of responsible men at the top,

* It is said to have demoralized, to a terrifying extent, the clerical departments of British Railways.

the best men who should be making nationalization work; much is at present simply held together by men hanging on but counting the days to retirement.

A similar degree of frustration pervades the mining engineer's professional life. Here the vital point is the authority of the colliery manager, which has been emphasized in all Coal Mining Acts. Everybody accepts the necessity that in mining, as in navigation, the captain must have authority. Sir Eric Young, for example, when production member of the Coal Board, told the Scottish Branch of the Association of Colliery Managers in September, 1949, that he was well aware of the 'underlying grievances' of the mining engineer 'that he had not the authority he ought to have to discharge his responsibilities', and endorsed the comment of an article in the *New Statesman and Nation* that the 'most obvious moral' of the relaxation of colliery discipline 'is that nothing must be done under public ownership either to undermine the authority of the mine manager or encourage him to believe that the best way of avoiding trouble is to relax his efforts and let matters take their course.'⁸ Yet when the enquiry into the Knockshinnoch Castle Colliery disaster of September 1950 was held, the Chief Inspector of Mines found that there was in fact an apparent conflict of authority, inasmuch as the planning engineers from the sub-area made recommendations which the colliery manager felt he had to accept because they were superior in status, and the lack of co-ordination between the planners and the manager and agent played a large part in the tragic sequence of events leading to the accident.⁹

If it is harder to put one's finger on the development in gas, electricity, or transport, the feeling is the same: the authority of the man on the spot is weakened, his job loses in status, dignity, and pleasure, the ability to 'get things done' declines. Many colliery managers and railway engineers felt that nationalization should clear the way to greater professional freedom. Money would not be so important; shareholders would not have to be considered; coal could be extracted precisely as the engineer would like; railway working and equipment could be standardized on the ideal specifications. They have found that there are worse frustrations than lack of money, or than having to do difficult things with limited resources and improvised plant. The colliery manager finds himself sharing in the £150,000,000 scheme for modernizing the industry—but his part consists mainly in showing specialists round his mine, or, more likely, conferring with them in his office on the surface. A not entirely untypical experience is that of a northern manager who reported¹⁰ that on Monday in one week

he was visited by two financial experts who spent the entire day with him discussing his wage problems, on Tuesday by the Area Welfare Officer who took up the day trying to learn what Pit Welfare was, on Wednesday by an expert on roof control, on Thursday by two senior Hobart House engineers who were making tours to study development progress, and who, by remaining firmly in his office like the others, angered him most of all, since they were mining engineers and ought to have known that a pit manager's place is underground; in any case they were doing work which he felt was in his professional competence. On Friday at last he got down into his pit and saw his men. Another manager, asked about a pile of machinery collecting rust, remarked 'That's a consignment of the latest American cutters. I don't know who supplied them, or what for, or how I'm expected to use them, as they are all too high to go into my pit. I don't even know who to send them back to, and frankly I — well don't care.' Not long ago, colliery managers were astounded to receive a circular warning them that their hours were 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. precisely, and that 'only under exceptional circumstances' might they work a shorter period. This is like sending a circular to captains ordering them to work their watches fully. Colliery managers are responsible, whatever the hours; this is the unwritten law of their profession and goes beyond anything written into an Act of Parliament or Mines Regulations. Hobart House meant no harm: it is just that rules must be centralized and minuted 'for the record'. It is hard for civil servants to deal with eccentricities. What was Hobart House to do with the colliery manager who informed his area that his men had decided to strike over grievances arising out of head office delays, but that he had *arranged* with them to put off the stoppage three weeks to make sure that the pit broke the N.C.B. record that month?

Mine managers feel that leadership is essentially at pit level, though the Board must inspire and give direction. Nobody gets killed in Hobart House; nobody even gets dirty there. The mine manager is like the commander in the field; staff officers may advise him, but his is the responsibility for decisions. N.C.B., however, is now having to disentangle a situation in which Hobart House imagined—and in some respects still imagines—that functional, high-powered specialists take precedence over the colliery manager. The whole tendency is to take power from the 'man on the spot' and to load him with paper-work and paper instructions. Thus a colliery which was run before the war by a manager with a secretary, a storekeeper, and a girl or two, now requires nineteen clerks, who keep the manager so busy that his

time underground is cut by a third (quite apart from the time consumed by visiting specialists). This tendency to increase paper-work and reduce responsibility is common to all nationalized industries. It is specially strong in transport, but railway bureaucracy has been growing like cancer since the amalgamations of 1921, so that the protests from British Railways are perhaps less noticeable than in industries such as road haulage, electricity or gas, which are feeling it for the first time. A gasworks manager, for example, protests against

‘the trend to reduce them all to the level of foremen, responsible that nothing shall go wrong but powerless to exercise initiative without endless reference to superior officers. This trend has continued during the last twelve months until one wonders if there is anything—anything at all—that the district engineer is supposed to do except to report, to estimate, and to complete forms. . . Divisional managers are often too busy to discuss affairs with their district officials, and are themselves unable to make decisions on comparatively minor matters put to them. Area headquarters officers, supposed to act through divisional managers, are finding difficulty in implementing schemes which they are largely responsible for planning. The chairman, in spite of working harder and longer than anybody else, cannot find time to talk things over with his divisional managers and headquarters staff, bombarded as he is with correspondence from above and below. . .’¹¹

Under certain circumstances, this degree of centralization is as fatal to the superman at the top as to the managers of the individual undertakings, whether collieries, railways, marshalling yards, gasworks—or power stations. Whatever the shortcomings of the unfortunate Colonel Lapper, chairman of the Yorkshire Electricity Board, it is possible to feel some sympathy with his reply to the Lord Chief Justice’s interrogation about overspending on building licences: ‘I am so far removed that I have to rely on other people carrying out their duties.’

‘*The Lord Chief Justice:* Is the provision of headquarters such a small matter that you just glanced through things? Every single document that has been shown to-day you have said you just glanced at.—I am sorry if I have given you that impression.’¹²

The growth of bureaucracy and administrative top-hamper is hard to stop. Sir Charles Reid might feel, in his own words, that ‘without the most radical alteration in the coal board downwards, both in regard to control and personnel, the nationalization of the mines will prove a disastrous failure . . . it cannot deal with the indiscipline so rampant in the mines . . . it cannot keep an effective check on pro-

duction costs . . . it cannot give confident and effective leadership to management or men ;'¹³ but in the end his only resource was to resign, and Mr Arthur Horner's comment was that the Coal Board was well rid of him.

3. THE CHANCE FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE TYPE

Thus, while as a statement of theory Sir Miles Thomas's dictum that 'there is no fundamental difference in the basic principles of management in a private enterprise and of management in a nationalized industry'¹⁴ may be unexceptionable, in practice administration is more on civil service lines. Indeed, the Coal Board is taking young university graduates with first and second class honours, arts being no barrier, to train as an administrative grade, able to draft formulae and work on policy. A body of opinion in the Board sees no reason why men of this type, suitably trained (possibly in a special N.C.B. staff college) should not even be area managers, if they show the intellectual grasp, in preference to the elevation of mining engineers. Before nationalization, the shortage of mining engineers was already causing the profession to deplore the fact that 'the higher direction of collieries is more and more being left to the non-technical side of the Industry, which is obviously undesirable.'¹⁵ It is evident that under nationalization the non-technical side is still gaining in power.

The growth of headquarters staffs means, therefore, opportunities for administrative people. The engineer, to exert his influence, must prove himself as an administrator—not just in a mine, but in the higher levels of power politics in London, a different atmosphere altogether. The way is open for others with administrative powers to climb to the top—but in coal, the best chances seem to be reserved for the marketing officers (who wield great powers, not as sellers of coal, but as allocators of a key raw material as between one industry and another, now matters of high diplomacy) and the accountants.

Nationalized industry offers magnificent scope for the accountancy profession. Indeed, it has been suggested that in some respects the modern accountant must become the conscience of modern big business in general, and of nationalized industry in particular.¹⁶ The definition of income becomes a matter of morals, when accounts reach a certain degree of complexity. And the gathering of data inevitably requires increases in the establishment of clerks, cost clerks, statisticians and qualified accountants at all levels, even though this drives technologists to the agonized cry that:

‘The plague of locusts which afflicted the ancient Egyptians has its modern counterpart in the swarm of accountants, etc., most of them new to the industry, who have descended upon us with briefcases bulging with forms, forms and yet more forms.’¹⁷

The accountancy institutions will undoubtedly find that their own ideas of adequate training and proper qualifications will increasingly have to be discussed with the establishment branches of the nationalized industries; indeed the retention of any tolerable degree of efficiency in nationalized industry may depend to no small degree on the ability of the professions of accountancy and statistics to develop the necessary control mechanisms.¹⁸

But if interesting new careers for salaried men are thus opened up, it may be that the advent of nationalization will still further reduce the custom going to private practitioners and consultants. Big concerns like to ‘pool’ specialist services, conveniently and economically operated by a cadre of salaried experts, deployed at divisional level. The small colliery, local gasworks, power company or steelworks consulted or retained, largely on a local basis, firms of accountants and auditors, solicitors, architects and surveyors, land and estate agents, medical practitioners, brokers of several kinds. Their custom was quite an important element in the prosperity of many small and solid provincial practices. Much of it will now disappear.* The Coal Board is now organizing large centralized services, for example, for the administration of its property (it is probably the largest property-owner in the country). Though to some extent it will encourage its housing, estate and valuation officers to be members of the professional institution concerned, they will be essentially officials of the Board. The tendency will reinforce the growth of the salaried professional expert at the expense of the individual practitioner.

Even the clergy will not escape a further twist to their misfortunes from nationalization. The vicar of Newstead recently pointed out¹⁹ that whereas the former colliery company had paid his stipend and made an annual grant for the maintenance of parish social work, repaired the church and vicarage, delivered a monthly allowance of coal and paid a man to attend the vicarage garden, the National Coal Board had disclaimed all these responsibilities. The poor vicar was, however, foolish enough to claim that ‘the Board were enjoying all the privileges provided by the parish church without paying a halfpenny’. The miners,

* ‘The total cost of the internal audit staff of the Board, together with the fees payable to professional firms of accountants, including the auditors appointed by the Minister, is less than the audit fees paid by the coal industry before nationalization.’—Annual Report of the National Coal Board, 1947.

perhaps. But the Board—what use has a Board for the Church, any more than for the professional tradition? Unlike private enterprise, it is (at least in the literal sense) past praying for.

NOTES

1. J. A. S. Ritson, D.S.O., O.B.E., M.C., T.D., B.Sc., Presidential Address to the Institution of Mining Engineers, 15 January 1948.
2. The Institution of Mining Engineers, A Memorandum submitted to the National Coal Board, May 1946.
3. Ritson, *loc. cit.*
4. A. E. Blake, 'The Trade Press', in *Persuasion*, Summer 1947.
5. Cf. Electric Power Engineers' Association, Organisation and Purposes.
6. Ritson, *loc. cit.*
7. 'Promotion Policy in the Nationalized Industries', by the Acton Society Trust, *Journal of the Institute of Personnel Management*, January–February 1951.
8. Minutes of the Proceedings of the National Association of Colliery Managers 1949, Vol. XLVI, pp. 197–8.
9. Accident at Knockshinnoch Castle Colliery, Ayrshire, 7 September 1950, Cmd. 8180, 1951, p. 29.
10. In a private communication to the authors. But cf. The Acton Society Trust, *The Coal Industry*, 1951, Pt. I, p. 11, and Pt. II, pp. 25–6.
11. *Gas World*, 3, 10, 17 February 1951.
12. *The Times*, 15 November 1951.
13. *Manchester Guardian*, 14 May 1948.
14. British Institute of Management, *Management in Private Enterprise and Nationalized Industry*, July 1949, Conference Series 2.
15. Sir Douglas Hay, Presidential Address to the Institution of Mining Engineers, 1945, *Transactions*, September 1945, Vol. CIV, Pt. 12.
16. Henry Smith, 'Accountancy in the Modern State', *The Political Quarterly*, June 1947.
17. *Gas World*, April 1951.
18. Cf. Sir Frederick J. Alban, 'Socialisation in Great Britain and its effect on the accountancy profession', in *Studies in Accountancy*, ed. W. T. Baxter, 1950, p. 444.
19. *The Church Times*, 6 June 1951.

CHAPTER IX

The Disappearing Clergy

'It is open to question which is the more alarming feature, the failure of the Church to attract or its failure to repel.'

Towards the Conversion of England

'Each rector or vicar is the accredited agent of the Church in every parish. We may not take to the man, but we can at least appreciate his office. If he is not a person of many parts, and even if he is not personally sympathetic to ourselves, we know that, so long as he performs his allotted task and uses the means that are put into his hand, he is the channel by which the authorized grace of the Church and its authoritative teaching are made available to us.'

THE BISHOP OF LONDON

MANY WILL DENY that the clergy are a profession at all. Carr-Saunders and Wilson did not include them in their survey, on the grounds that 'all those functions related to the ordinary business of life, education among them, which used to fall to the Church, have been taken over by other vocations', so that 'the functions remaining to the Church are spiritual, and we are only concerned with the professions in their relation to the ordinary business of life'.¹ This assertion of a divorce between the Church and the 'ordinary business of life', of which the one specific example given is not even wholly true, must have appeared strange to many parsons, whether they were wrestling with the social and physical problems of a slum parish or performing the innumerable administrative tasks, and sorting out the small personal tangles, which form the staple of the life of a village priest.

We cannot doubt that the clergy form a true profession, even if we agreed with a bishop's view that it is 'a small and rather enigmatic profession, not sufficiently wealthy to be politically important and too obscure and disorganized to be socially considerable'.² The clergy's relationship with the members of the public whom they serve is as direct and confidential as that of the doctor; their technique is not (for the most part) specialized, but nor is that of the general medical practitioner, and their work is based on profound study and a professional course of education and training. The clergy are in a very real sense 'general practitioners', and they are most intimately con-

cerned with the 'ordinary business of life'. Finally, their profession, for all that it is divided into several professional bodies each working on its own—and to some extent in competition—enjoys a degree of monopoly based on the reservation of certain functions to those who have been admitted to one or other of the bodies. Each of these Churches is self-administered.

The numbers of the clergy are declining, and it is widely believed that the churches are dying, because the people of Britain no longer have a use for them. The Roman Catholic Church, which is able to impose on its members a greater degree of discipline, in matters of observance as well as of faith, than is even sought by other Churches, may be holding its ground. Statistics can be (and frequently are) adduced to demonstrate the decline of the rest. It has been said that the nonconformist denominations are dying with the Liberal Party—retaining some semblance of a hold only on those 'Celtic fringes' where Liberalism survives as a fighting faith. The Methodists have now four times as many churches as ministers, and the Congregationalists and Baptists about twice as many; the number of ministers is still falling. The shortage of ordinands in the Established Church of England is acute, but the other Churches too are finding it hard to secure ministers of the desired quality.

The differences in circumstances, problems, and even the aims of the Churches make it almost impossible to study them together. This chapter will therefore concentrate on the Church of England; not because it is the established Church of a part of the realm, but because it is the largest, the most familiar to the greatest number of people, and because the efforts it is at present making to grapple with its problems are of special relevance to this study.

1. THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

Among the many misapprehensions about the Church and its doctrines is the common notion that 'the Church' is synonymous with the clergy. It is, on the contrary, composed of the clergy and the laity together. The Church as a whole is responsible for its administration, at every level from the Parochial Church Council in the village to the Church Assembly. The laity have no control over matters of doctrine, although they possess sanctions—which may be none the less effective for being unofficial—which can be applied if their susceptibilities are offended. The clergy minister to the spiritual needs of the laity, and conduct corporate acts of worship for their comfort; in addition, they

perform innumerable parochial duties designed to assist their parishioners in their daily lives. Although the Church Commissioners and the Diocesan Boards of Finance administer certain funds largely derived from old endowments, while certain benefices are themselves endowed, the clergy—and indeed the Church as a whole—are entirely dependent on the laity for financial support. The establishment does not entitle the clergy to any income from the state. In short, the present financial difficulties of the clergy are due to the refusal of the laity to pay more.

These difficulties are serious. The Church needs between £20 and £30 million a year to do the work it would like to do, and its total income is around £17½ million; even this figure exceeds the annual income in 1939. Most stipends are pathetically low, so that the average parish priest receives a smaller income than a well-paid artisan, with inescapable expenses which are higher. The number of clergy in active work has fallen from about 22,000 in 1914 and 17,000 in 1941 to fewer than 14,000 to-day.

It is commonly said that the demand for the services which the clergy performs has fallen off. How true is this? Is the decline permanent, and is it of lasting importance? To what extent has the Church itself been responsible for the falling off?

Statistics are not easy to secure, nor are they particularly revealing. It is true that the number of people on parish electoral rolls has fallen from nearly 3,400,000 in 1939 to under 3 million to-day, but this could be due to a variety of causes, and is certainly no reliable guide to the state of religious feeling. The number of communicants is believed to be well over 3 million, although no more than 2½ million take communion on any Easter Sunday. Reliable statistics of baptisms, Church weddings and funeral services are lacking, but there is no doubt that the numbers of these are far higher, in proportion to the population, than the figures of regular Church membership would suggest. The same is true of attendances at Sunday schools.

Reasons are suggested in the findings of social surveys. The great majority of the population, while they feel that religion has nothing particularly helpful to offer them in their daily lives, think it worth while to take out some sort of insurance against the unknown perils of eternity, and are also generally in favour of children being taught formally the difference between right and wrong.³ Messrs Seebohm Rowntree and Lavers, in their *English Life and Leisure*,⁴ go further. They claim to 'have found so widespread a dislike of the ministers of religion of the Anglican and Free Churches that it can only be described

as anticlericalism', and a number of reported conversations is quoted in support of this assertion. However, this dislike seems not so widespread that any priest or minister of our acquaintance has become aware of it himself; on the contrary, they report that they are almost invariably received—even by the more hardened unbelievers—with a tolerant and friendly affability. There is sometimes suspicion, but suspicion is not dislike. When John Wesley wrote in his *Journal*, 'I did to-day preach the everlasting Gospel to the wild men of the Rossendale Valley. Thanks be to God, I escaped with my life', he might justly claim to know what he was talking about.

However, Messrs Rowntree and Lavers proceed to sum up their findings:

'Since a considerable proportion of the clergy are respected neither for their learning nor for their personal qualities, and since much of the dogmatic belief is considered to be simply untrue, and since persons outside the Church consider that, in general, laymen within the Church do not live up to the ideals they profess, there is a deep and widespread conviction that the Churches are of little practical account in modern life.'

This, of course, is familiar run-of-the-mill stuff, which has tripped glibly off the tongues of clever schoolboys these last fifty years or more. It may possibly be truer now that Messrs Rowntree and Lavers have said it, although it can be argued that they strain the inductive method a little far. When, however, they go on to state that 'it is inconceivable to us that they [the Protestant Churches] will ever again be a dominant force in the religious life of the nation', because the educated proletariat has become emancipated from dogma in an enlightened scientific age, this particular piece of special pleading can be dismissed as little more than a belated outcrop of the intellectual *avant-gardisme* of the 1870's. The ultimate conclusion is reached that religion, if it is to survive at all, must be released not merely from dogma but from all formal organization, so that people may meet together as and when they please to discuss the 'true values of Christianity, shorn of embellishments and dogmatic assertions'. This ideal, as the *Church Times* tartly observed,⁵ bears a marked resemblance to the 'distinguishing tenets of a certain religious body, in which one of the authors has been interested for many years, but to which any direct reference is carefully avoided.'

2. DILEMMA OF THE CHURCH

These findings have been cited, not as an excuse to attack doubtless well-meaning social surveyors, but because they are typical in doing no more than labour the age-old dilemma of the Church. If most people are antipathetic to its dogma, does that mean that the Church should shed, or alter it? Should one abolish parsons, because all of them are not clever or lovable? Because many people cannot comprehend the liturgy at first hearing, and will not take the trouble to become familiar with it, should it be abolished, or rendered into conversational or cinematic English? Perhaps most important of all—if people are unwilling to accept discipline, or even moral standards formerly thought to be desirable, ought the Church to court sympathy by relaxing its demands to make things easier for ‘ordinary men and women’?

Few Churchmen will waste time contemplating the total abolition of dogma, or regard the current humanistic pre-occupation with ‘Christian ethics’ as more than the loose thinking of a sloppy age. *Religion* without dogma is nonsense. Works without faith may constitute a code of living, but not necessarily a more appealing one. It may well be a faith, rather than a code of living, that is being sought to-day. In any case, as Professor Joad himself has pointed out,⁶ the dogma of the Anglican Church (which no one who has ever read the Thirty-nine Articles could⁷ accuse of imposing an unduly narrow doctrine to strain belief) has in the last fifty years already been sufficiently modified to satisfy ‘the most confirmed mover with the times’, so that ‘a doubt might, indeed, be hazarded if too much has not been abandoned’.* Such dogma as remains is not susceptible of ‘scientific proof’; but what survives of a *faith* if nothing is to be believed that cannot pass the tests of logical positivism? Those who demand an ethical code whose basis, inspiration, and sanctions make no demand on faith are not seeking a religion at all. They are looking for a utilitarian code of conduct, whose universal practice would make life more comfortable for the majority.

Furthermore, the demand for conformity with the proved findings of science, always irrelevant, is now out of date. The theologian can justly point out that scientists have in our own lifetime changed their theory of the physical nature of the universe at least once, and are becoming more cautious in their attitude even towards eternity. He

* It can surely be no narrow spirit of conformity which embraces in the Church a Communist Dean and a Bishop who is virtually a Unitarian.

will disdain the easy victory over such scientists' essays in theology as those of Mr Fred Hoyle. The day when laymen looked to science to provide a substitute for 'superstition' and open the door to a new Heaven upon earth is long since past. As one writer has put it: 'The dark past of the priest, we were told, was over. The bright future lay with the schoolmaster, the politician and the scientist. That bright future we have experienced. I hope you liked it. If the atomic bomb goes off, it should be still brighter.'

Then there is the question of discipline and moral standards. If the vast majority of people will not undertake the obligations which the Church seeks to impose, and if certain of the frailer faithful do not live up to these standards within the Church, should the Church relax them? To this the Churchman may well reply with another question: would you seek to double the size of the Army by guaranteeing recruits against any liability to fight, to drill, or to perform fatigues? Most people would agree that the standards must be preserved, until more people discover the greater peace of mind which can be secured by conforming to them.

3. PRIEST AND CONGREGATION

If, then, we rule out these suggested methods of attracting increased support to their religion, what can the clergy do to increase their influence and rebuild the fabric of the Church? First of all, how important are the clergy themselves as a factor in determining the support which the Church attracts?

The problem may be thought to fall into two parts, for it is a question whether the influence of the Church is to be measured by attendances at religious services or by the influence of the clergy on the lives of the people—whether it be felt through the public pronouncements of prelates on great issues or through the number of people who have recourse to their parish priests when they are in trouble. Probably there is no real distinction here, for one may well follow from the other, but it is convenient to discuss the problem in these separate aspects.

How great is the decline in church-going? No one knows, in statistical terms, and attempts have been made to show that it is less than is commonly supposed.⁸ It may be that the proportion of nominal Anglicans who regularly attend service has never been very high since the Reformation, except during the nineteenth-century days when the landlords and some of the industrial magnates could impose attendance on their tenants, workers, and servants as a duty to be shirked at their

economic, as well as spiritual, peril. If this is so, it is hard to understand why so many post-Reformation churches are so much too large for the congregations they now contain on Sundays. It is true that benefactors were apt to build large, perhaps as much for the enlargement of their own renown in the eyes of posterity as to the glory of God. Shifts of population, both from countryside to town and within the boundaries of cities, have left churches in some places empty, while in others dedicated Nissen huts seek to focus the spiritual life of sprawling housing estates. Even so, the Nissen huts are not always full: for example, in a new estate near Luton three priests, working on missionary lines similar to those of the Bush Brotherhoods, report that 'two years' work has produced fifteen communicants, a handful of confirmation candidates, and 120 children on the books of the Sunday Schools, of whom we get some seventy-five on any Sunday.'⁹ (Strangely enough, over 200 families took in the parish magazine.)

It must be conceded that the discipline of church-going has declined, although large numbers of people are prepared to attend on great occasions or under the stress of national sorrow or crisis, and demand continues for special services for voluntary societies and other bodies. Yet some churches, apparently circumstanced no differently from many others, are always full. Why? Can it be doubted that, directly or indirectly, it is due to the ability and personality of the priest? Here and there a village of two hundred souls will provide seventy or eighty regular communicants, and will fight tenaciously and successfully to retain its existence as a parish by raising its own funds; and here it will be found that the rector is the central figure in the village, and there is a continual two-way traffic between the doors of parsonage and homes. One church in a city will be empty, while at another the congregation pouring out of Matins surges round a queue of people entering for the Sung Eucharist. Here, although there may be little communal parish life, is nearly always to be found a dynamic personality which attracts people from far away. It is not without significance in the argument about dogma and ritual that these churches are now nearly always those in which celebration is 'high'—or, in the technical slang of the clergy, 'spiky'. Next in popularity are the most ardent of the Evangelicals.

If a parson of genius will attract congregations, does the converse follow: that where the congregation is small, or the vitality of the parish low, the cause is nowadays to be found in a lack of quality in the priest? In many cases, this is only too obvious to the least prejudiced observer. Apart from those who have wholly mistaken their

vocation, there are too many square pegs in round holes: simple, pious men who are incapable of understanding their own accounts, let alone of giving practical advice to parishioners; scholars or townsmen who are alien to the countryside, and have neither comprehension of, nor sympathy with, the problems of the farm and the cottage; hearty young men who seek to build, on a foundation of soft collars, boys' clubs, and breezy irruptions into embarrassed four-ale bars, a tradition of good fellowship which is immediately suspect to its intended victims; there is no doubt a place for each of these in the Church, but too often they have not been put in it. Again, many older priests have not realized what has been happening in the world around them or, realizing only too well, have turned away from a thankless task. All these together make up the majority of the failures, at whose doors can be laid the local deficiencies of the Church; they may be, in all conscience, numerous enough. Elsewhere, good priests are being defeated simply by the physical impossibility of the tasks assigned to them.

4. CHURCH MICE

The second question is whether the Church can hope to attract enough ordinands of good quality to do its work, and how they are to be financed. It costs about £1,200 to train an ordinand, and even scholarships and grants-in-aid from the Church will not prevent the young man or his family from having to find a substantial part of this sum for himself. After ordination, he may well have to start work on a salary of less than £300 a year. What is more important is that the average stipend of incumbents is about £465. Many priests exist on far less. In his *Challenge to the Laity* in 1947, the Archbishop of Canterbury requested that efforts should be made to bring all stipends up to a minimum gross figure of £500 a year. Many dioceses achieved this, only to find that the rise in the cost of living had raised the real requirement to something like £500 a year *net*. In November, 1951, the Archbishop recognized this change in a statement to the Church Assembly,¹⁰ in which he estimated that 'the former minimum figure of £500 gross to every incumbent represents in fact not more than about £430 a year, plus an official house to live in, but less unavoidable "official expenses"'. This figure leaves the incumbent very low in the list of skilled wage earners'. It might be added that out of this stipend many country priests have to run a car, in order to do their job at all; that many Church Councils do not even pay the rates and dilapidations on the vast old rectories which some parsons and their wives still

have to live in (and to heat); that if the incumbent tries to let some of the house off to tenants he may find himself in a tangle of legal and administrative difficulties which can cause him grave embarrassment;¹¹ that a married priest is expected to dispense much informal hospitality, which is not allowable against income-tax, and also to spend charitably at his own fêtes and bazaars; and finally that, if his parishioners seek to augment his stipend with a bountiful Easter offertory, the whole of it becomes subject to income-tax.

Of course, men do not—and should not—go into the Ministry for gain, or for an easy competence. Poverty may even be good for enthusiastic young curates—although those who are most anxious to prescribe this medicine are seldom those who have sampled it themselves. But there comes a point at which not only the priest's family life, but his whole work, may become soured and hopeless through the constant struggle to make ends meet with a minimum of dignity. The stipends are not enough.

Nor should the cynical layman console his conscience with the belief that the Church has vast hidden stores of wealth which would solve the problem if they were properly applied. It has not. The finances of the Church have already been thoroughly and ably overhauled, and the process is still continuing. Neither is it true that a minority of clerics enjoy fat stipends which they will not share with their poorer brethren. In 1939, out of some 14,000 benefices only 264 were worth more than £1,000 a year; there are certainly fewer now, nor do many exceed this sum by much. Where a Bishop's income is officially stated to be £4,000 a year or over, this is invariably a gross figure from which very heavy expenses have to be deducted; where the diocese has assumed responsibility for the Bishop's palace and certain other expenses, the Diocesan's income is fixed at £2,000, which is not nowadays by any means excessive for a man of great responsibilities, who must travel much and offer hospitality to many. Some Deans, Archdeacons, and Canons scarcely seem to justify their competences (which vary widely, from about £600 to £2,000 a year); but many do admirable work, and the Church would certainly suffer if it could not provide reasonable conditions for its scholars and its ablest administrators. People may feel that there is no place for an Archdeacon Grantley in the twentieth-century Church; but is it good that all clergy should be reduced to the straits of Crawley and Quiverful?

The Church cannot justly be charged with failing to take action to deal with this problem, even if it has started a little late. Since the war, drastic reorganization has enabled resources to be better applied and

spread wider. The control of finance has been concentrated and improved, benefices have been merged, and parsonage houses and glebelands sold. Bitter opposition from clergy and laity has greeted many of these measures; some of the opposition has been quite unrealistic, some of it based on grounds which may well evoke sympathy. Yet still the need remains for more money—and more men.

5. QUALITY AND QUANTITY

The annual wastage in the Ministry through death and retirement is about 550 priests, and an annual recruitment of at least 600 deacons is needed.¹² The ordinations in 1950 totalled only 425, but the annual number is still rising after its war-time slump, and the situation is not without its hopeful features. The Bishop of Southwell has said: 'One desperate expedient the Bishops have most resolutely ruled out. We will not be parties to lowering the standards of qualification or training required. The Church does not want the leavings or failures of other professions—it needs the best; and the more it asks for the more it is likely to get.'¹³ These are brave words, which might perhaps be pondered by leaders of some other professions; and it was noticeable that the pronouncement evoked a volume of clerical and lay criticism based on precisely the arguments for 'dilution' which have become familiar in teaching and other professions: that the Bishop's attitude is simply one of snobbery and intellectual arrogance; that the need for quantity must be met, even at the cost of a 'temporary' sacrifice of quality; that it is, after all, just a job, which numberless 'ordinary men' (provided they are of 'the right type', with 'sound characters') can do, whatever their I.Q. and irrespective of whether they can pass into a university. But the Bishops were right, for the standard of ordinands has never been any too high,¹⁴ and it probably needs to be raised. Not only must the Church recruit and nurture a proportion of first-rate brains, which can hold their own in intellectual discussion and debate with the best minds among the laity; it must also, if people are to turn back towards their parish churches and their parish priests, staff the parishes with men of intelligence and character, well-informed, well-trained, and following an undoubted vocation.

The Church has, by laborious trial and error, greatly improved its procedure for selecting candidates, and, in addition to trying to raise standards of education and theological training, is now devoting much more careful thought and ingenuity to the *technical* training of ordinands for their practical work—from visiting, and coping with the com-

plications of the welfare state, to intoning the liturgy.¹⁵ It is also experimenting during the present emergency with several expedients, such as the ordination of older men who have retired from the forces, from teaching, from business and the professions. This, despite an unfortunate observation from the Bishop of Woolwich that 'one recognizes that they are not going to help the Church very much when they are ordained',¹⁶ which provoked a certain amount of recrimination, is said to be working pretty well. In the Central Advisory Council of Training for the Ministry (known inevitably as C.A.C.T.M.) the Church has an enterprising and experimenting body which is promoting recruitment, even collecting together for residential conferences and discussions large numbers of sixth-form boys from public and grammar schools, in order to sow the seeds early.

In parish work, too, the Church is beginning to show an eagerness to experiment which looks healthy. Apart from its missionary ventures at home, and various experimental methods of dealing with the problems of new housing estates and shifting populations, there are schemes such as that of six parish priests in the Berkshire Downs who have inaugurated an experiment in 'group practice' as original and ambitious as any yet undertaken by the medical profession.¹⁷ On a larger scale, there is the Bishop of London's proposed experiment with 'Guild Churches' in the City, to be staffed with men of high quality who will minister to the day-time population of City workers.

The Church may, in the eyes of its critics, be dead, but it is showing no disposition to recognize the fact and lie down. Indeed, there are signs that 'the old miasmal mist' is clearing, although the fact that the breezes have not begun to blow through countless parishes, in each of which the same old parson potters and drones his ineffectual way, will dispose many people to doubt it. Another sign of vitality is that the Church has shown a quiet and not unsuccessful persistence in retaining its own schools. It has not been so vocal about the financial difficulties as have the Roman Catholics, and it has been forced to surrender many to 'controlled status' under local authorities. But it has not, like the Free Churches, cheerfully abandoned all its schools in return for a promise of a formal, non-denominational 'act of worship' in the County schools. Excluded by law from the schools in which the majority of their parish children are educated, the clergy have awoken to a deeper sense of the importance of their own, and in the so-called 'Barchester scheme' they have evolved an ambitious diocesan system of insurance against future costs which is likely to preserve these schools.

6. CHURCH AND WELFARE

In the end all this may fail; the effort may prove too tardy to make any impression on the apathy of a people which, although far from being pagan, has forgotten its religion and is not sufficiently interested to find out what the Church 'is after'. If so, the number and influence of the clergy will continue to decline, and the quality of ordinands will probably fall with them. This would be disastrous, for the welfare state has created problems which only the Church can solve. If it is to solve them, it will need the respect and co-operation of other professions. Inevitably, most of the work will have to be done in the parishes. There is no place for the official of state or local authority as a focal centre of life in a village or suburban housing estate; the parson, the doctor, and the schoolteacher are the triumvirate which will make or mar the community, and they have almost forgotten how to work together. There are schoolteachers who openly exult in the reversal of fortunes which has made them not only better-paid than the clergy but often more influential. But there can be no conceivable sense in which this spirit of competition has any meaning. The callings are wholly complementary. There is a ministry of welfare—scientific welfare, at that—to be done by the clergy among the old; and at the same time the physical impossibility of recruiting enough qualified young women to undertake 'scientifically' all the social work among the poor, the shiftless, and unfortunate, means that the Church must constantly be training its priests to fill the gaps and straighten out the anomalies in the state social services. Nor should it always be willing to surrender its responsibilities to bureaucracy without a struggle, any more than it should meekly acquiesce in the claims of psychiatry to look after morals—still less its ominous eagerness to alter characters by surgical operations.¹⁸ Indeed, many believe the Church would gain in strength if it more often *attacked* than merely bewailed.

Salvation will not come by accepting the decline as inevitable and seeking to palliate it with such second-best expedients as the employment of part-time parish priests.¹⁹ Work half-done will not encourage a demand for more. On the other hand, the experiments now being conducted—to some extent on the French model of 'industrial priests'—in sending priests and ordinands to work in industry for short or long periods are likely to have far-reaching effects. The Archbishop of Canterbury has permitted two of his diocesan priests to take jobs

at the coal-face of a Kentish pit, where they are becoming unexpectedly familiar to some of their parishioners. More promising is the increasing readiness of ordinands to spend six months or a year in industry, at the bench, in foundries, steel works, or docks. Evidence is accumulating²⁰ that the effects are highly beneficial, and not only on the ordinands themselves; for the first time, industrial workers are beginning to get an idea of the sort of men who go into the Church and why they go there. Religion becomes more personal and real if it can be connected with a known and sympathetic personality.

We began this survey with no very clear idea of the sort of showing the clergy would make when their efforts to solve their own professional problems were compared with those of other professions—although our knowledge was sufficient to make us believe that they would not be found nearly so slow and sleepy as most laymen might imagine. In the event, we discovered a resilience, a flexibility, a desire to adapt and experiment, and a determination to safeguard and improve standards of quality which exceed by far those of the law, and possibly of medicine as well. It is too early to say whether the efforts will succeed, although the Church will need the friendly co-operation of the other professions if success is to be complete. Nevertheless, those who have doubts may care to ponder the words of Archbishop William Temple:

‘Remember, the supreme wonder of the history of the Christian Church is that always in moments when it has seemed most dead, out of its own body there has sprung up new life; so that in age after age it has renewed itself, and age after age by its renewal has carried the world forward into new stages of progress, as it will do for us in our day, if only we give ourselves in devotion to its Lord and take our place in its service.’

NOTES

1. A. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, 1933, p. 3.
2. H. H. Henson, *The Church of England*, 1939.
3. See esp. Mass-Observation's *Puzzled People*, 1947.
4. B. Seebohm Rowntree and G. R. Lavers, *English Life and Leisure*, 1951.
5. *Church Times*, 21 September 1951, ‘Second Thoughts on *English Life and Leisure*.’
6. C. E. M. Joad, ‘The Twilight of the Church’, in *The New Statesman and Nation*, 27 October 1951.
7. Peter Green, ‘Drift from Religion and the Church’, in *Church Times*, 17 November 1951.
8. *Ibid.*

9. *Church Times*, 18 May 1951, 'Bush Brotherhood Methods in Modern England.'
10. See *Church Times*, 15 November 1951.
11. Cf. Peter Winckworth, 'Lodger in the Parsonage', in *Church Times*, 1 June 1951.
12. Bishop of Southwell, 'Men for the Church', in *The Times*, 19 May 1951.
13. *Ibid.*
14. See Henson, *op. cit.*
15. For a popular exposition of the problems and systems of recruitment and training for the Church, see *Whom Shall I Send?* S.P.C.K., May 1950.
16. *Church Times*, 23 November 1951.
17. See *Church Times*, 11 January 1952.
18. Cf. the warning of an eminent neurologist: *World Review*, August 1950, 'Psychiatry in the Law Courts', by F. M. R. Walshe, M.D., F.R.S.
19. As suggested, for example, by the Rev. Mervyn Stockwood in an article, 'Disappearing Clergy', in *The Spectator*, 7 September 1951.
20. Cf. *Business*, October 1951, and *Church Times*, *passim*.

CHAPTER X

The Individualist In Trouble

'Abnormal professions attract two classes: those who are not good enough for ordinary bourgeois life, and those who are too good for it.'

G. B. SHAW, *Man and Superman*

'Good heavens! And the world still believes in education, in teaching people the 'grammar of art'. Education should be confined to clerks, and it drives even them to drink. Will the world learn that we never learn anything that we did not know before? The artist, poet, painter, musician and novelist go straight to the food they want, guided by an unerring and ineffable instinct; to teach them is to destroy the nerve of the artistic instinct. Art flees before the art school.'

GEORGE MOORE, *Confessions of a Young Man*

'The great bother about the whole profession is that we have become too darned respectable.'

DAME SYBIL THORNDYKE to Equity in 1950

ACTORS AND ACTRESSES, artists and musicians, writers and journalists fail to pass the conventional tests of professional status. They are not generally qualified by set courses of training, examined and diploma'd by institutions or certificated by the state; and, when they are, the possession of such a diploma is either wholly irrelevant or amounts to a stigma of actual incompetency. The ethics of their professional conduct are far closer to those of the craftsman than to those of the consultant—and their personal morals are popularly imagined to be the antithesis of those of the steady-going reliable solicitor or civil servant. Though some may have individual patrons, they mostly produce for the market, and often for speculative sale.

Because these professions are unorganized, it is harder to delimit them than even such professions as engineering. At the lower end they merge indistinguishably into the ranks of amateurs, hobby-riders, and part-time practitioners—some of whom, by a thousand-to-one chance, or by the recognition of real talent late in life, not only become fully professional but rise to the first rank. What can there be in common between Heifetz and the fourth fiddle in the seaside bandstand? Between the West-end star and the small 'turn' who sometimes gets into type at the very bottom of a provincial variety bill? Between

the village correspondent of a county paper and the editor of *The Times*? Between the bearded aspirant who hangs on the line on sunny Sundays by Hampstead pond, and the bearded *arriviste* who hangs in the Royal Academy?

To exclude the arts, letters, and drama from professional pursuits, and to classify them as trades, vocations, or vagabondage, may suit individual cases—but for these groups of practitioners as a whole it is simply to burke an awkward problem. Though at a hundred points they diverge in attitude and type from other professional people, in vital matters they are often strictly comparable with them. They mainly come from the upper quartile of the nation's intelligence; they represent collectively a costly investment in nurture, education, and training; their labour is, despite appearances, indispensable in civilized (and even uncivilized) society. Before the engineers, they were making life possible.

1. ARTIST AND PATRON

The relationship between artist and patron—whether that patron is an organization like a newspaper, a group like an audience, or an individual buying a picture off the peg or commissioning a portrait—is comparable with that in professions like medicine or law or architecture.* The artist provides a service which the buyer cannot himself fully evaluate. 'He, too, must give something that is deeply rooted in his nature, something that cannot be commanded or coerced, or even bribed. But with him it is not his human judgment, his probity, his sound knowledge of life or affairs. It is his creative genius . . . in both cases the professional must be trusted to give what he cannot be compelled or contractually bound to give.'¹

Alike in art, letters, and drama, anxiety is felt about maintaining the quality of the service, and about the future of the practitioners themselves. The great diversity of achievements and rewards, which has in the past distinguished all professions, is seen at its extreme in art and letters. Their exponents have always had to gamble; for one

* 'Although the physical production of newspapers is an industrial process, their editorial production can properly be regarded as a profession. But journalism differs from other professions in that the direct responsibility which the individual practitioner normally bears to his client is in journalism indirect and diffused. The direct relationship is between the newspaper and the reader, and the responsibility is shared among all those who serve and shape the newspaper's personality, whether they are individual proprietors, directors, managers or writing journalists. We should like to see all those who share this responsibility regard themselves as members of a single profession.'

(Royal Commission on the Press, 1947-9, p.169.)

in affluence, there have always been dozens in poverty. In medicine, science, law, and engineering it happens that a man of talent, duly diploma'd and admitted to practice, may fail through adverse circumstances, or even undeserved neglect, to make his name; but the situation in which a man labours in obscurity and poverty producing work later recognized as that of genius, and making fortunes for connoisseurs, is not paralleled in other professions. Posthumous fame, like Mendel's, may occasionally come to the scientist; and neglect and stupidity may rob an inventor of wealth in his lifetime—but inventors are not members of a separate profession, but represent a creative faculty found in most, if not all, professions. Inventors are, in fact, closest in kin to the artists. If an engineer or architect has his designs rejected, the country goes without his bridges or cathedrals; but writer and painter contrive to produce their masterpieces, even if these are fewer than they might be were they more liberally patronized. Later generations of publishers and collectors may be enriched by them.

Wastage of talent, of course, is inevitable, in an imperfect world, in all professions. Nor shall we ever be able to calculate (as we can with city sewage) the extent of the wastage. We cannot even compare the position in art and literature to-day with that in any earlier period. We do not know what might have been created in different circumstances. It is possible that never in British history has the artist, actor, or writer had such chances of producing his best and getting reasonably paid for it as in the nineteen-fifties—which may be only to say that the odds have always been against these professions. Nonetheless, there is a widespread conviction that the self-same changes which have transformed other professions—technical advances, big business organization, redistributive taxation, the Representation of the People Acts, the welfare state and growing state power—have injured the pursuit of art and letters, and that the deterioration in the last fifty years has been grave. At the same time, these professions themselves, though composed of personalities noted for their dislike of organization and their inability to enjoy committee-work, have done something to protect their own interests, and in this have received, especially in recent years, a good deal of state encouragement. 'Art?' said Whistler, 'Oh, art *happens*!' He may still be right; but that is not the view of the Ministry of Education, the Treasury, the Board of Trade, or the majority of artists, writers, or actors. The government departments in particular are determined that art—at least art of a kind—*shall* happen. In this, the bulk of professional opinion is with the departments and ready to co-operate.

The interest of the state in the health of the arts is material. Good design is important to the all-important export trade, to take the most cogent example; but entertainment tax and film revenues are also of interest to the Treasury. Even books and authors' royalties are an element in the balance of payments. Further, the Foreign Office feels that the artists must be kept loading the guns of propaganda, which now fire such extraordinarily miscellaneous ammunition. Nor is the official feeling entirely vulgar or cynical: professionalism has spread the feeling that a country without art is a country without vitality or mission, possibly without even 'a way of life'. However low the priority for art, it is, most certainly, an official 'interest'.

The state has always taken some interest in art and letters; the Civil List is of long standing. But the private patron has, in the past, always been the artist's and writer's main source of revenue. The story of the decline in patronage need not be retold in detail; it constitutes the most important development of recent years. But the state cannot countenance—cannot handle—unorganized genius. The state has at least for the past hundred years been all for art regulated and examined and issued with certificates of competency, on the analogy of the other professions; and it must be recognized that the arts in general have not been wholly averse from this idea. Public-spirited leaders in these professions have always felt that status could be raised, pay improved, and performance guaranteed, only if a leaf was taken out of the medical, legal, and technological codes.

Training in the arts has always been arduous and prolonged; and for over a hundred years training for art and the stage has been partly formalized and provided in institutions. The tuition of the 'master' with his 'school' has been steadily replaced by the academies. From the first, however, the art schools have been primarily concerned with design, with craftsmanship, and with teaching, rather than with the making of hotbeds to germinate the spores of talent—which usually have had to get themselves wafted to the *ateliers* of Paris. Training for the stage was originally given by the old stock companies, and as type-casting was unknown until the end of the nineteenth century, it constituted a thorough apprenticeship. Before he reached the age of 21, Irving had impersonated 428 stage characters.² The first manual 'to reduce to rules a science hitherto practised almost entirely from fancy' appeared in 1825.³ Nonetheless for many years thereafter it had regrettably to be confessed that 'the accomplishments of a Classical education are of less importance to Stage Candidates than to the Candidates in any other profession'.⁴ Gradually, however, the need

for systematic studies in literature and the drama, as well as in technique, began to impress leading actor-managers, and the turning-point had arrived when Irving could appeal to the Benson Company:

‘Why do you not band together, work, study, and become a company the like of which this age has never seen? We have technical skill on the stage, we have the tradition. The difficulty nowadays is to get a company that has the literary mind and the trained intellectuality which is associated with university students.’⁵

The Royal Academy of Dramatic Art was founded in 1904, and a diploma awarded by London University in 1923; in the past fifty years some 600 dramatic academies, and a like number of art schools, have been set up by private bodies and local government, and by the Ministry of Education.

It is no accident that training has gone hand in hand with improved status, though there are other reasons for the removal of the stigma attached to the stage in particular,* and the investing of art with glamour. The vast improvements in actors’ and actresses’ salaries was associated with the work of the Bancrofts⁶; and when Gladstone introduced himself to Irving in Bond Street, it was a sign that the Vincent Crummies era was at an end, that ‘the Profession had lost its capital letter, it was just a profession like any other, such as medicine or the law’.⁷ George Moore might fulminate against the respectability of artists and mummers, but art schools and dramatic academies meant that they offered reasonably respectable careers to the middle classes, especially teaching careers. Writers, like artists and actors, were always divided into those who, like Thackeray, made enough stir and money to get into society, and those who did not; but the status of the run-of-the-mill writer and journalist has also steadily improved since the time when George Augustus Sala could complain that:

‘The English journalist has no definitely ascertained social position. The Courts of Law do not even consider him to be a professional person—much less a “gentleman” fit to serve on a grand jury . . . The doors of the House of Commons are partially closed against the journalist . . . If he be not a barrister, the very most which the chief of the political party to which during half his lifetime he has done yeoman’s service can do for him, is to fling him, very much as though it were a pennyworth of cat’s meat, a vice-consulship at Caqueville-sur-Mer, or a consulship in the Cruel Islands.’⁸

* See Chapter III p. 49.

Even in the 'eighties, journalism was pre-eminently the profession which might take you anywhere—if you could get out of it soon enough. But the steady growth of 'popular' journalism, of mass literacy, of both general and technical magazines, provided from then on a new earning capacity for the penny-a-liner; and in turn the extension of university and professional training brought professional people from all walks of life into journalism. Journalism, too, offered a regular, steady-going career for middle-class aspirants, women as well as men.

2. OVERCROWDING AND UNEMPLOYMENT

These professions, like others, have thus enjoyed an expanding market for their services; and technological developments have widened their scope. Films, sound radio and television are the obvious cases, but every new synthetic industrial material provokes a demand for designers. The general advance in wealth and leisure has created a larger demand for the services of writers, artists, and entertainers. Nonetheless the supply of talent of a sort has usually kept well ahead of the demand for it; the 'interesting' professions have always suffered from overcrowding. Overcrowding in medicine, law, and engineering has largely been ended by the processes of inflation and the provision of social services examined in Chapter V; but the subsidies to the arts have been inadequate to produce like effects, while the secondary results have been wholly adverse. There now exist together serious under-employment, new uses for artistic and literary talent, and adverse conditions for the production of the best work.

The stage, no doubt, suffers principally from the basic weakness that, in C. B. Cochran's words, 'all those connected with the theatre from stage hands to producers are stage-struck; if they were not they would not choose the theatre as a means of livelihood'.⁹ To-day there is nothing to deter people from following the will o' the wisp of stage glamour. On the contrary, it is vastly publicized, at a time when the satisfactions of life in workaday forms are less and less compelling. The Royal Academy of Dramatic Art alone is turning out 200 students a year, compared with 120 before the war. Contributory causes to stage unemployment are the closing of war-damaged theatres and the *débâcle* of the British film industry. If all the students turned out by the drama academies tried to get on the stage the situation would indeed be appalling; but probably not more than half make any sort of *début*. The rest are interested in the training for educational purposes, or because, for women, it is useful for deportment and provides

an introduction to quite other careers. Nonetheless to-day there are probably six competently trained actors for each part, and actors who get thirty weeks' work in fifty-two regard themselves as very steadily employed. Many work much less; women, who constitute half the profession, certainly work very much less on average, as there are two male parts to every female one.

The position is made worse by the fact that in shows dominated by stars' the big names get so large a proportion of the gross takings (often calculated as a percentage of box office receipts) that the supporting cast is sadly underpaid, or drawn from the less competent and lower-paid sections of the profession. Like artists, actors and actresses often have to find outside work. Fewer people teach drama than art; but many turn to broadcasting and journalism; there is a constant hunt for film, cabaret, and television work; actresses even turn to modelling, and the wiser marry men in better-paid professions than their own. A surprising number of stage people take quite 'menial' jobs to make ends meet while waiting for an engagement.

If under-employment is less serious in journalism than on the stage, it is still bad enough, as the result of newsprint reductions and the death of many periodicals from high production costs. Outside the daily and Sunday newspapers, and a few score more important periodicals, staff journalism is not a highly paid profession, except for those who have made a name in some important speciality. Free-lance journalism is still less remunerative, except for those whose names command thirty to forty guineas for short signed articles in a steady stream; to get £1,000 a year at an average payment of three to four guineas per thousand, which is a much more usual rate, requires the writing of about 300,000 acceptable words a year.

In terms of authorship, to get £1,000 a year demands the writing of at least two and possibly four modestly successful books a year—that is books which sell from 3,000 to 4,000 copies. To write a good novel or a serious study will take most conscientious craftsmen two years, which means that, to produce £1,000 a year the book must sell at least 20,000 and perhaps as many as 40,000 copies—a best seller. A few such books appear in every publishing season—but very few.¹⁰ The chances of reaching well-paid authorship are probably less than those of reaching stage affluence; and even for those who can establish themselves there are, under high taxation, very dubious prospects compared with other professions. Despite many representations of its injustice the proceeds of a best seller or of the sale of film rights, which may happen once in a life-time, are sur-taxed as one year's income.

'For the first five or ten years,' an established author told *Horizon* in 1945, 'an aspirant with unusual or acceptable talent will earn, with relative ease, as much as . . . would be paid to him during his first years in diplomacy, at the Bar, or in any learned profession. . . . In twenty years, however, his memory and ear will be debauched by the habit of composition to order; he will have lost the power of disinterested reading; his income will not have increased, though his commitments may well have trebled. He will never have dared to take a sabbatical year of travel and rearmament, for fear of that Tartar horde, so vividly evoked by Max Beerbohm—"younger men with months of work before them". His habits of mind will be known to the last twitch, and editors will dread his fixed grin or unvarying scowl. Most galling of all, he will see his beastly dull contemporaries soar high above him; collocations of letters will hang to the tail of these comets; K.B.E., P.C., K.C.M.G., K.C., he will read. And as the junior ministers move from N.W.3. to S.W.1. they will quietly drop him, and forbid their children to play with his. Illness will beggar him, and perhaps in another twenty years they will get him put on the Civil List at forty pounds a year.'¹¹

And since this picture of the fate in store for a reasonable degree of success was painted, the cost of book production has soared, and the suggestion has been put forward that authors should make the first contribution to getting book prices down by accepting cuts in royalty rates.¹² Many authors apparently accepted this sacrifice, although (in the words of *The Economist*) 'the author has not caused the rise in price; nor can any reasonable sacrifice on his part do much to moderate it'.¹³ Nonetheless, the economics of publishing seem to be inexorable; to make ends meet publishers must lengthen the runs of books that sell, and back the minority of best-selling authors even more fully, leaving the average author to abandon his profession or turn from craftsmanship to cheap-jackery. In these circumstances, the possibility of alternative occupations for authors and for journalists has been much discussed. This is no new device; Southey hankered after a consulship at Lisbon on the grounds that 'T'is a good thousand a year'. Some authors can, no doubt, contrive to produce and publish books while living on the proceeds of schoolmastering, banking or public service; nor is it to their disadvantage as writers to have worked in other trades; but, except for the most popular, the position has now been reached in which, however hard they try, they can *never* reach the stage of supporting themselves by creative writing alone.

The position of the creative visual artist is even worse. In 1946, the Arts Enquiry concluded that of the 10,000 men and women who described themselves as professional artists in the 1931 census, 'not

more than 700 painters and 30 sculptors earn a living by their art'.¹⁴ In fact, the number of artists who live entirely by selling paintings (including commissioned portraits) or sculpture to patrons is certainly far smaller than this. Enquiry reveals, for example, that of the forty-two still living artists who were among the fifty artists selected by the British Council for an exhibition of the best painters for the period 1925-50, only thirteen were at the conclusion of this period living entirely by their own work, as against twenty-three who eked out their earnings by teaching or other work, and three or four who have private means. Yet these are, by definition, among the most successful and sought-after of modern artists. Both before the war and after it, it has been fully demonstrated that no artist who sets out to make a living by taking a studio and painting has much more expectation of survival than of winning a lottery; the economics of it are utterly against him. The professional painter can hope to hold a one-man show, exhibiting thirty-six to forty pictures, every two years. He will be fortunate if he can sell thirty of these at £50 apiece, which gives him an income of £1,500 in two years, of which the dealer takes £500. Frames, paint and canvases will cost him £120, leaving gross earnings of £880, or £440 a year. As his studio will cost him £100, and his other expenses will not be much less than £50, especially if he needs models, his income will be under £300 a year—or comparable with that of a curate. And this, of course, is for a fairly successful man. A handful do better. An artist as popular as Andrew Freeth earns £800 a year; a portrait painter like Simon Elwes was paying £10,000 in income tax before the war.¹⁵

Artists, like most actors and many writers, need, therefore, a subsidiary employment or an alternative way of making money. A high proportion of successful artists, in fact, teach. Some teaching ought not to go against the grain of professional men; leading artists, like leading surgeons and physicians, scientists, architects and actors, *ought* to teach. Most artists agree, however, that all but the most fortunate of them devote far too much time to teaching (at least three days a week), simply to make the basic £300 a year without which life is insupportable. Many artists awaiting public recognition must expect indeed to teach full-time, devoting only their leisure to creative work: it is a frustrating life which gradually destroys the powers of all but the toughest and most single-hearted. If they do not teach, or teach only a little, therefore, artists must seek for commercial commissions. These come from advertising agencies, book publishers, and from industry direct. 'Commercial art' is fairly remunerative work, especially

for an established artist who has made his name in creative work; and many artists contend that it does not force them to compromise with conscience. Others consider that the money spent by advertising firms on 'art' has had a thoroughly noxious effect both on the art of the country and on its artists. Even the work done for the great self-vaunted industrial patrons, such as Shell-Mex or London Transport, comes in for severe criticism; the artist doing frankly commercial work to any great extent may rapidly deteriorate, even if he tries to keep his 'commercial' bread-and-butter work and his 'real' work in separate compartments.

'As time goes on he discovers, if he is unfortunate enough to have any capacity for self-analysis, that his work has become derivative, and in looking for the reasons for this peculiar and apparently unnecessary ingrowth he may discover that that which is most genuinely himself and which should therefore form the basis of his own work has shrunk back into some remote corner of himself and is refusing obstinately to allow itself to become involved in this purely commercial transaction.'¹⁶

The modern world has, of course, called into being the artist who has no desire to go beyond commercial work or design; who does not aspire either to the honour or the penury of the fine arts. This same distinction exists, perhaps, between literature and journalism, between concert-platform and 'incidental' music, and between acting and certain kinds of film work. But just as, in all these professions, there are now two races with almost nothing in common, so there is a hybrid; the best writers willy-nilly do some journalism; the best artists sometimes willy-nilly take a commercial contract. The exact proportions vary, and so, with each individual, varies the risk to his or her standards of performance. Modern society, while paying lip-service to the importance of art and letters, has in fact failed to provide any better than earlier societies for the livings of those following the *best* in their art or craft; all it has done is to bring into existence a whole profession of commercial artists and designers, of commercial journalists, of film 'stars' and 'extras' who need to know little of stage craft.

The total achievement of the art academies over seventy years or so has been to produce commercial artists and commercial art aping the real thing; the popular newspapers and their symbiotic advertising have produced merely the commercial journalists and copywriters; as for film puppets, who learn merely to do what the producer says and depend on the camera-man to "build them up", they come from everywhere and anywhere—products of drama schools, beauty salons,

bathing beauty contests, dancing competitions. Some film producers now prefer, in the documentary tradition, to use not actors but untrained people for secondary roles: the real civil servants, doctors, fishermen, or policemen who would fail utterly in their own roles on the stage can often be made more convincing on the screen, in the hands of a skilled camera-man, than would any character-actors obtainable for the trifling fee involved.

3. COMMERCIAL PATRONAGE

The professions which serve the vast industry of mass persuasion, though generally better paid than are the men or women struggling to make a name in art or letters, are not well-paid by comparison with other callings: in government employ they rank as technicians rather than professional civil servants. Prizes exist in the commercial world to be snatched by the most gifted and most skilled in self-publicity among them. A few leading industrial designers, ranging from exponents of poster technique to those who style the décor of airliners, make £3,000 a year or more, once their names are known. Film stars, of course, can be luckier on still less talent. But the majority are as modestly paid as the lower executive grades of the Civil Service, or certificated teachers, or clerks. The conditions in which much commercial 'art work' is done are so bad that they have become a matter of health and welfare, to be taken up by the Sign and Display Trades Union.¹⁷ Commercial artists, film workers, and journalists, have, of course, done much good work of its kind: most British manufactures are better designed than they were twenty-five years ago. British films have deserved well. British newspapers, and especially magazines, are technically far superior to what they were in the 'twenties.

For all this, the impact of technology, commerce, and government upon these professions has not, in the view of many artists and writers, been good. It hardly seems healthy that when advertising agencies alone pay out some £2,500,000 a year to professional artists, those who practise art for art's sake cannot make a decent living by it.

'The case against commercial art is that artists of real gifts have been persuaded to lend themselves to this deception of the people [by mass persuasion methods], that the comparatively huge amount of money advertisers pay to artists has adversely affected the production of works of art in this country, and that the training of artists in future will be seriously affected.'¹⁸

The more the art school specializes in commercial art, because this

at least offers a living wage to its graduates, the smaller the part will be which the basic academic principles of judgment and aesthetics will play in their education; and since improvements in commercial art are wholly dependent on the tradition and accumulated capital of the fine arts, this will, in the end, amount to cutting off the branch on which modern industrial design, display and packaging are so complacently sitting.

In journalism, analogously, there is disquiet at the impact of the battle for mammoth circulations, and the creation of publishing empires, on standards of truthful reporting and fair presentation, on editorial freedom, on intellectual appeal to readers. The journalist, no less than the artist, can only make a fair living if he serves a mass production industry. It is a simple matter of a trip to Colindale newspaper library to prove that *average* journalistic standards to-day cannot compare with those of the nineteenth century. This, however, has little to do with journalists as such; it has most to do with the fact that in this day and age so many more newspapers are sold that everyone reads a newspaper, instead of only a small intellectual and cultured section of the community. Much of the modern art of journalism is entirely new, and would have seemed weird to men like Stead or Delane: the wrapping up of serious news, 'personalizing' and 'angling' it, and putting it out in such a form that the masses will swallow a grain of information in the coating of a 'story'. The vast circulations which reward newspapers who print a minimum of news and a maximum of sensational gossip prove the difficulty of this art, which was wryly commended by the Royal Commission on the Press, with the rider: 'Smart journalism carried to extremes may produce a result as far from truth as carelessness or inefficiency.'¹⁹

It is, no doubt, a necessary art, but it has not been good for journalism; it puts a premium upon the rise to control of men of the type of Harold Nicolson's Stanley Primmett:

'Mr Stanley Primmett, editor of the *Sunday Mail*, was a man of great experience and slight education. The former quality gave him a certain unstable assurance: the latter defect rendered him suspicious. Mr Primmett was invariably hostile to all forms of knowledge which he did not himself possess. The scope of Mr Primmett's hostility was therefore wide: the area of his assurance on the other hand was much restricted. . . . He knew—and was happy to share that knowledge with the readers of the *Sunday Mail*—which of our front bench figures preferred tea for breakfast, which of them had an antipathy for cats. Yet to the wider and more durable aspects of public life the temperament of Mr Primmett was not attuned.'²⁰

It is a mistake to over-emphasize the evil; responsible journalism survives, and makes a modest profit. In fact the circulation of the 'quality' papers tends to increase relatively more rapidly than those of the popular ones. Serious weekly journals of comment contrive to live, and the shadows of the once-powerful monthly periodical press—the successors of the *Edinburghs* and *Quarterlies*—recede slowly. 'We believe', concluded the Royal Commission, 'that among men of repute in the press, whether proprietors, editors or other journalists, there is a considerable measure of agreement on what constitutes sound professional practice'.²¹ The Royal Commission exonerated the press from taint of corruption from any source, including that of the advertising agencies, declared that the press as a whole gave representation to all opinions, and considered that the best of the papers achieved a high degree of accuracy.

4. INDIVIDUALISTS' TRADE UNIONS

Because these professions cannot admit that proficiency can be tested by examination, or even that academic training, however useful, is indispensable to the highest achievement, they have not been able to evolve protective and regulatory institutions comparable with those of professions such as medicine or the law or architecture; the consequence has been that employees have turned to frankly trade union forms of organization. In this they have followed teachers and merchant navy officers, though these are both subject to certification by the state; in fact, the best comparison and closest analogy is between the position of the arts and that of top management. In management, as in the arts, there must be training, and there can even be college training; but there can be no certificate of proficiency other than the individual practitioner's own record or show of work. Top management, in short, is an art more than a science; indeed the importance of 'scientific' knowledge of his job to a manager is about as great as the importance of a knowledge of newspaper production and printing processes to the journalist, of pigments and the properties of materials and surfaces to the artist, and of stage technique to the actor: they are indispensable preliminaries, but mastery of them does not make artists, actors, writers, editors—or men capable of running businesses. If top managers ever effectively combine, it may perhaps be surmised, therefore, that their form of organization will be a trade union, like their workers', rather than a professional association like their departmental managers or experts—the efforts of the British Institute of Management notwithstanding.

The degree of organization achieved by the practitioners of the arts varies greatly, and for significant reasons. The strongest trade unions are those of the actors and musicians—who are even able to enforce a closed shop—followed by that of the variety artists. It is easier to force one's demands upon managements employing a company, than on those filling a bill of variety; moreover, many variety 'turns' consist of an employer and several employees, a state of affairs which leads Equity even to deny that V.A.F. is either a trade union or a professional association, but in fact a sham behind which a butty system perpetuates manifold injustices. However that may be, both unions can enforce their demands upon theatre managements, and to a lesser extent on the B.B.C. as the Musicians' Society does. Strikes take place for higher wages, and even succeed, as a successful walk-out by the Carl Rosa Opera Company recently showed.

The National Union of Journalists is less successful in strike action, but it was instrumental in raising the pay of reporters and sub-editors from as low as 30s. a week before the first world war to a minimum of £8 a week by the 'twenties.²² Both the N.U.J. and Equity developed largely because newspaper technicians and stage technicians were already fully unionized and enjoying better wages and more consideration than the 'professions' themselves. Artists and writers had no such models to copy. Their protective organizations have remained weak, and scantily supported, though they have done much good work. The Society of Authors exercises a watching brief over contracts with publishers, editors, and the B.B.C.²³ The earliest artists' association (other than the exhibiting societies such as the Royal Academy) was the Imperial Arts League, founded in 1909, whose first achievement was to give artists the protection of the Copyright Act of 1911. 'The League provides its members with free legal advice and undertakes legal action on their behalf, helps them to recover debts, provides confidential information on clients, agents and dealers, and obtains the cheapest rates for insuring works of art'.²⁴ Other bodies of this kind are the Artists' International Association and the Central Institute of Art and Design. But the most successful of them is the Society of Industrial Artists—for the simple reason that it is easier to urge a code of fair practice upon large organizations such as advertising agencies and business concerns, than upon individual buyers of pictures and sculpture or even dealers in them.

The doors to these professions, as to the bodies which represent them, however, remain wide open. Closed shop is different from closed profession; the former implies simply that membership of the union

is a condition of work (though later it may lead to restrictions on the issue of 'cards'). Art, letters, journalism, entertainment are all open professions requiring no formal qualifications whatsoever. But in some of them feeling is growing that they *should* be somehow partially closed professions, in view of the under-employment and low rewards which distinguish them. In its salad days, the N.U.J. was jejune enough to suppose that writing articles for the press, quite apart from staff journalism, could be closed to the unprofessional. 'The National Union of Journalists has adopted as a plank the principle of journalism for journalists . . . doctors and lawyers have statutory protection, but the body politic of journalism is open to attack by any dabbler or amateur who thinks he can write. . . . Nearly all Labour M.P.'s are writing newspaper articles now. When we have a Labour Government are they going to continue?' ran one passionate protest.²⁵ They did, of course, continue, and the N.U.J. has had to face the fact that black-legging is the rule in their profession.*

To-day Equity is contemplating some form of restriction of entry to the stage. It is proposed that the standard contract with management shall stipulate that while an agreed proportion of students may be employed in touring and west-end companies at agreed minimum wages, nobody else shall be given parts unless he or she can prove a full apprenticeship to the stage of fifty-two weeks of professional appearances; and the necessary provisions for providing for such apprenticeships and proof of it are proposed. Only those who have 'made good' on the stage are to be, so to speak, licensed professionals.

This method of restricting entry reflects the distrust of drama examinations as such, which is summed up in the stage improvement of Shaw's epigram: 'Those who can, act; those who can't, produce; those who can't even produce, teach'. The restrictions proposed would leave a way open for a fair number to find their way onto the stage by paths other than those of the drama school—notably by appointments in repertory companies as 'assistant stage managers'; it would exclude only the stage-struck amateur who elbows his or her way in either because he has money or pull, or because she has sex-appeal.

But overcrowding begins at the dramatic academy stage; most actors now do their preliminary studies in these places. The efforts which Equity is to make to bring home to stage-struck youngsters 'the real and appalling situation in the profession'²⁶ are more likely to do good than restriction. By Equity's own definition, it is talent

* Attempts are now being made to exclude 'unprofessional' sports writers and other specialists.

and personality which count, not training; and acting talent and personality may reveal themselves long after the normal time of life for training has passed. First-class actors have always been recruited from every walk of life: if the performer can hold an audience, there is an end of the argument. It is more than doubtful if a profession which can be taken up successfully without a prescribed course of training has any right to prevent any citizen from practising it. Acting is one of the arts; the arts must be open to all, and no hard-and-fast line can be drawn between amateur and professional, or between part-time and whole-time practitioner.

In writing and journalism, so far from restriction of entry being permissible, it is opposed to the public interest. In a free country everybody must be in a position to get his views into print if he can—in his own words and in his own way. Journalism and authorship are inevitably and rightly practised in their spare time by people in other professions; only specialists can present their own point of view. The full-time journalist is a man primarily with the skill to write about anything, rather than one speciality, one interest, or one set of personal experiences. This is a situation which heavily retards the interests of the professional journalist or writer. He is always competing with the 'amateur' and, of course, with the past. He was better placed when few people in other professions either could or would compete with him, and when it was best for a woman writer to pretend to be a man. Writers must take what consolation they can from the fact that

'During the real age of reason, it was the Grub Street authors who were articulate, powerful and able to stamp themselves on posterity as people. It was to them that the fluttering cabinet ministers had to act as toad-eaters, and it was the literary standard of culture, dictated from below, which dominated a largely illiterate peerage. . . . The last fifty years of the century were directly the reverse of this. It was then the fourth earl of Orford [Horace Walpole] who terrified the leaders of Grub Street and who drove young poets to suicide . . .'²⁷

Now professionals must compete with an entire population able to write (but also prepared to read to some extent), and above all with unmarried women who build up literary fame and capital at their parents' expense while angling for husbands, and at their husbands' expense (culinary and financial) thereafter. It is very hard, but it is inevitable that it should be so.*

In these circumstances, there has been considerable pressure to speed

* Besides, women journalists write more, work more earnestly, and live on less per annum. Their numbers doubled between 1931 and 1951.

up more effective organization in these professions; and it is still believed that such organization could be professional rather than purely protective: that it could mitigate, somehow, the impact of commerce and state power on the arts. The Royal Commission on the Press recommended a more formal training for journalists, coupled with the establishment of a 'General Council of the Press' designed 'to foster those tendencies which make for integrity and for a sense of responsibility to the public'.²⁸ But though the National Union of Journalists showed its professional uneasiness by pressing for the Commission, it has not yet succeeded in inducing the proprietors of the newspapers to make much progress in setting up the Council; and newspaper opinion, as expressed in leading articles, has been lukewarm. Again, the government, through the Council of Industrial Design, has been seeking to encourage full professional status for 'commercial art', although the Society of Industrial Artists has so far been able to do little more than issue scales of fees for commissioned work to guide business men when commissioning, issue a directory of artists, and make surveys of salaries and employment.²⁹

5. TRUSTING TO LUCK

Most artists and writers and probably a majority of actors would prefer a position in which the national demand for good work was large enough to keep them going financially without the need to bother about concerted action. During the war, a 'boom' in art and 'new writing' supervened, partly as the result of nostalgia and a feeling for an imperilled culture, partly because the tension of living did open the public's heart to better work and improve its critical standards; but mainly because there was a lot of money about and less food, drink, shop goods, and standard entertainment to spend it on. Art mopped up quite a lot of inflationary purchasing power. There was also less competition among artists and writers, as so many were in the services and being killed or otherwise inhibited from production. The return of peace-time conditions, de-rationing, disinflation, and hire-purchase have knocked the bottom out of the art and book markets.

The attenuation of patronage has gone on, as people with discrimination are highly taxed, while people with money are not art buyers. This process started fifty or sixty years ago; it has been slow, because the population has been increasing, and because longevity, thanks to modern medicine, has postponed the final liquidation of private for-

tunes through death duties; but it is now coming to full fruition. Artists have long foreseen it: nor have they had much hope that when the millionaires went the way of the Renaissance princes, the masses would take their places as patrons, buying little individually but a great deal in the mass. 'The first generation of universal education has not given us a nation of art lovers. Nor will the second, nor the third,' said Rupert Brooke,³⁰ although, in a lecture to the Fabian Society in 1947, Mr J. B. Priestley was found to be still hopefully looking forward to 'a people freed from the old host of gnawing anxieties and desperate worries, and, sooner or later, we hope, free, too, from the pressure exerted upon them by big commercial enterprises to entangle them in trivialities . . . and people living in reasonably civilized conditions will have far more mental energy to spare. . . . Their minds will look for things on which to fasten and among the arts they will find some of the most exciting of these things.'³¹ But six years of Labour rule saw no attack on the big football pools, and indeed saw government enterprise in film-making; and though there has long been full employment, the news generally, domestic and foreign, shows no sign of smoothing the average citizen's anxious brow. He spends about £25 a year on alcohol and tobacco, compared with £1 on books and reading matter, at most a shilling or so on live theatre, and a few pence a head on the acquisition of works of art. Until worried people turn from dance halls to art to forget their worries, there will be no mass patronage.

Rupert Brooke and many Socialist writers and artists of his day saw in state patronage the real substitute for private patronage. They rebutted fears that committee art would be bad art, though it was precisely in the loss of liberty involved that Sir William Rothenstein placed his hopes of curbing the tendencies of the time: 'too much liberty leads to cubism'.³² Nevertheless, the Festival of Britain notwithstanding, most people would agree with Professor R. G. Hawtrey that 'No way has yet been discovered of ensuring enlightened standards of taste in governments and public officials'.³³ There is a danger, too, in handing over the bestowal of state patronage to committees of practising artists, which can easily be captured by reactionary illustrators or by advanced souls who cannot draw. To-day even

* It means not only that there is less private patronage for art and letters, but also, of course, that the chance of any artist being born to a private income, inheriting one, or being given one by an admirer, is declining. Yet quite a lot of good writing and painting has seen the light of day only because their authors were financially independent. 'It is terrifying' wrote Rupert Brooke at a time when income tax was 2s. in the £ and death duties minute, 'how many [artists] live on unearned, presumably inherited capital.'

Mr Priestley fears state control, and the consensus of writing opinion is certainly against state endowment of literature.³⁴ Nonetheless state patronage has become the mainstay of the fine arts. It has not yet taken the form, favoured by the S.I.A. and other bodies, of setting aside 2½ per cent of the cost of all public buildings for decoration by sculptors and mural painters. But the state provides scholarships and hands out commissions for the decoration of festivals and exhibitions. The Arts Council keeps the Old Vic going and tries to breathe life into provincial repertory. The British Council sends books abroad.

Government money will no doubt provide livelihoods for designers, journalists, and a few Shakespearean and 'experimental' companies. Taking into account the nationalized industries, the state is a big buyer of talent, and the committees and paper-work involved in buying it and disciplining it must indeed be formidable. Between the departmental files, and the commercial firms and ad-agencies who know just what they want, the artist must continue to struggle. For him, as for others, an era of relative freedom, of elbow-room for individuality, is ended—and after all, many artists never tired of denouncing it. The conditions of patronage and appreciation which will ensure the creation of masterpieces in literature or the arts have not been worked out. All that can be said is that if money is lavished, it is probable that a sufficient output of masterpieces will be engendered to cover most of the initial outlay in, say, two or three hundred years time. In financing scientific research it is widely accepted that for the one idea which succeeds and returns 15,000 per cent, an immense amount of money and bother must be expended on men and equipment that return nothing. Works of art mature more slowly, and modern administrators, the public, and even the other professions, will hardly agree to apply to the production of works of art the economic principles which succeed in technological research. For one thing, this is a technological age, and is not, therefore, one in which it is possible to look forward even two years with certainty. This is not the Renaissance or the Age of Reason. We can justify the planting of the quickest-growing conifers but not that of oak or elm. As for the old age and retirement of the artist *himself*, there is the state pension of 32s. 6d. a week; and this must serve in satisfaction of the larger claims put forward, for example, by Mr Gulley Jimson: 'What I need is special consideration on account of age and rheumatism and my services to the British nation in the future—about the year 2500. When they'll probably need a few good artists in their country or they won't be in history at all'.

The economist's verdict is final, if comfortless:

'The only satisfactory solution hitherto found of the problem of providing for original artistic and intellectual work is to allow the maximum of freedom to those who have the desire to undertake it, to let those who have the aptitude make a pecuniary success of it in a free market, to make some provision for a limited number of selected individuals in endowed or governmental institutions, and to trust to luck for others who have the power of accomplishing something to find some subsidiary means of support which will not crowd out their better work.'³⁵

Other professional people can always still their consciences with the comfortable reflection that writers and artists have always had a rough time of it, with a romantic tendency to starve in garrets, and that many of those who complain most bitterly of the injustice of their lot are not really very good at their jobs anyway.

NOTES

1. T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class, and other Essays*, 1950, p. 135.
2. Ernest Short, *Theatrical Cavalcade*, 1942, p. 116.
3. Cf. John Hall, *The Actor*, 1835, p. 1.
4. *The Secret History of the Greenroom*, 1817, p. 15.
5. Quoted by Short, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
6. Sir Squire and Lady Bancroft, *Bancrofts on and off the Stage*, 1888, Vol. II, p. 393.
7. L. Hudson, *The English Stage, 1850-1950*, 1951, p. 218.
8. G. A. Sala, *America Revisited*, 1880, p. 77.
9. C. B. Cochran, *A Showman Looks On*, 1948, p. 302.
10. Cf. *Books*, the organ of the National Book League, April and June 1950.
11. *Horizon*, September 1946, Vol. XIV.
12. Letters to *The Times*, 3, 6, 7, 11, 17, 18, 19, 21 April 1951.
13. *The Economist*, 9 June 1951.
14. Cf. Francis Watson, *Art Lies Bleeding*, 1940, for the pre-war position. The Arts Enquiry, *The Visual Arts*, Dartington Hall Trustees, published by PEP, gives the immediate post-war position, and a later summary will be found in *Future*, April-May 1949, 'Art and Economics'.
15. Cf. Charles Graves, 'Art on the Supertax', *Evening Standard*, 5 May 1948.
16. James Boswell, *The Artist's Dilemma*, 1947, p. 32.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
19. *Report of the Royal Commission on the Press, 1947-9*, Cmd. 7700, p. 129.
20. Harold Nicolson, *Public Faces*, 1932.
21. Royal Commission on the Press, p. 169.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
23. *The Society of Authors*, published by the Society, 1950.
24. The Arts Enquiry, *The Visual Arts*, p. 56.
25. Quoted by Graham Wallas, *Our Social Heritage*, 1920, p. 151.
26. *Daily Mail*, 28 May 1951.
27. T. H. White, *The Age of Scandal*, 1950, p. 21.
28. Royal Commission on the Press, p. 165, 1949.

29. Society of Industrial Artists, 'Conditions of contract for industrial design consultants', 1950; 'Conditions of contract for commercial design', and 'Code of professional conduct'.
30. Rupert Brooke, *Democracy and the Arts*, reprinted 1946.
31. J. B. Priestley, *The Arts Under Socialism*, a lecture to the Fabian Society, 1947.
32. Sir W. Rothenstein, *A Plea for the Wider Use of Artists and Craftsmen*, 1917.
33. R. G. Hawtrey, *Economic Destiny*, 1944, p. 207.
34. Cf. a *Horizon* symposium, July 1946.
35. Hawtrey, *loc. cit.*

CHAPTER XI

The 'Socialized' Professions

'General medical practice is a unique social phenomenon. The general practitioner enjoys more prestige and wields more power than any other citizen, unless it be the judge on his bench. In a world of ever-increasing management, the powers of even the senior managers are petty compared with the powers of the doctor to influence the physical, psychological and economic destiny of other people.'

The Collings Report

'The fine dream is fading away fast; and the least concern of a teacher in the present day is to inculcate grammar-rules. The modern schoolmaster is expected to know a little of every thing, because his pupil is required not to be entirely ignorant of any thing. He must be superficially, if I may so say, omniscient.'

The Essays of Elia

CARR-SAUNDERS and Wilson defined a 'socialized' profession as one in which 'the State employs technicians to give direct service to individual members of the public', and drew a distinction between the practitioner employed in this way and the professional civil servant, who is employed to assist and advise the government. This definition, however, could be stretched to include the staffs of employment exchanges (although these are not normally professional people); certainly it would include agricultural advisers, who do form almost a new profession, although we think these should more properly be considered as professional public servants.

At the time when Carr-Saunders and Wilson wrote, schoolteaching, medicine, and the law were virtually the only three professions in which 'socialization' had been introduced. Twenty years later they remain the three outstanding examples; and indeed the only professions which have been added to them are those which are cognate or ancillary to medicine. Thus it is the dentists, opticians, pharmacists, nurses, medical auxiliaries, and social workers who now, with the county schoolteachers, doctors and certain lawyers, constitute the 'socialized' professions. But important changes have taken place within them. Whereas not much more than half of all the G.P.s in the country had panel practices under the National Health Insurance

scheme in 1933, nearly ninety-nine per cent are now working within the National Health Service in respect of at least a part of their practices, while for most of them this work constitutes almost their entire livelihood. To the teachers in the employ of local education authorities has been added a considerable number, many of them graduates, who work in grammar schools formerly independent but now assimilated into the state system under the 1944 Act. The small company of lawyers accepting work under the Poor Persons Rules has been reinforced as a result of the new system set up by the Legal Aid and Advice Act, 1949.

1. THE ESSENCE OF 'SOCIALIZATION'

In seeking to discover what is the essence of the relationship between state, profession, and public involved in the modern welfare technique described as 'socialization' of the professions, it is necessary to consider whether the definition given by Carr-Saunders and Wilson would remain strictly accurate if it were used to describe the present organization of the National Health Service. Are doctors and surgeons working within the Service 'employed' by the state? Most doctors would probably be forced by logic to admit that they were, although they would no doubt stress the essential differences between their form of 'employment' and that of the professional civil servant. To Carr-Saunders and Wilson, the essential difference is that the doctors are 'employed' to perform a 'direct service to individuals rather than to the government. So, however, are medical officers in the forces, and yet there are surely fundamental differences between the status and contracts of these and their civilian colleagues. Dr T. F. Fox has insisted that 'doctors cannot be employed, in the ordinary sense, by the state or anybody else.'¹ If one thinks of the medical officer employed by a large industrial firm, of the ship's surgeon in the Merchant Navy, and other cases, it might seem that the emphasis in Dr Fox's dictum is placed on the proviso 'in the ordinary sense'. This takes us little further than the position established by Carr-Saunders and Wilson, in a passage quoted by Dr Fox in his lecture:

'The man who belongs to a profession which has won for itself prestige and a position of dignity, may pass from the service of one organization to that of another. Though he remains salaried all his life, he takes his stand upon his proved competence and experience; he serves one client after another much as does a freelance worker. He is attached primarily to his profession whence he goes out, as occasion may offer, to render his services in some co-operative organization, and whither he returns.'²

Which is to say no more than that he is a professional practitioner first, and an employee second and incidentally.

The doctor in the N.H.S. is paid by the state, and can be dismissed by the Minister of Health: these two facts create a strong *prima facie* impression that the state is his employer. The strength of the impression, and its implications, can be judged from the efforts of the British Medical Association to prevent these two features from being incorporated in the N.H.S. Opposition was offered both to the provision of a basic salary and to a system in which remuneration would be accepted as part of a contract made directly with the state; similarly, the B.M.A. tried hard to secure the safeguard of an appeal to the law courts from a decision of the Minister dismissing a doctor from the Service. In the end, the Minister undertook to set up an appeal tribunal with a legal representative as chairman, whose decision he would not reverse except in the doctor's favour. He thus retained the right of dismissal, but only on the recommendation of the tribunal. Further, it was agreed that the individual doctor's contract of service should be made with the Hospital Board or with an Executive Council, rather than with the Minister direct. It remains true that the taxpayer produces the money for the doctor's fees or salary, but the distinction between this and 'state employment' does seem to be more than a polite fiction. For one thing, the Minister can neither compel a general practitioner to accept a particular patient on to his list, nor—which is more important—compel a patient to go to a particular doctor. In the end, therefore, the patients have power to decide whether the doctor succeeds or fails. The Minister can dismiss him from the service for gross incompetence or misdemeanour, just as the General Medical Council can strike his name off the register if he is convicted of a crime or indulges in 'infamous' professional conduct. But what is more important to the ordinary G.P. is that (except in areas where there is a very serious shortage of doctors*) he must give reasonably good service to his patients if they are to continue to remain on his list and earn him his capitation fees.

This is not true even of the county-school teachers. If a parent is dissatisfied with the treatment his child receives from a particular teacher, he may find it impossible to transfer the child to the care of another teacher; his chief sanction is to report the teacher to the local education authority, which may, if it thinks fit, dismiss the teacher

* It is true that there are many such areas now: but this limitation on the patient's freedom to change his doctor is due to physical shortage of doctors, not to the system.

just as any other employer might. Strenuous opposition from the N.U.T. will, however, prove an obstacle even in serious cases.

It would appear, then, that the definition of a 'socialized' profession given by Carr-Saunders and Wilson, while it will cover county school-teaching, will not cover general medical practice within the National Health Service—although it would cover the physician working in a hospital. The G.P. is not remunerated by salary, but by fees based on the number of his patients, all of whom have a measure of freedom to choose him or leave him. His relationship with his patients, then, remains essentially professional and his main responsibility is to them and not to the state or anyone else. Despite all the argument and controversy about the Minister's powers and the dangers to professional freedom, so freely indulged in at the time when the scheme was about to come into operation, we do seem to have achieved a system under which the state is subsidizing the *patient's* use of medical services, which can be derived from a source which, within limits, the patient is free to choose. The state, in fact, pays the citizen's doctor's bills for him—and in order to save trouble to all comes to a business arrangement in advance with the doctor under which, on a sort of insurance basis, the fees are compounded for the year in an average lump sum.

The organization of the National Health Service, therefore, suggests a modification of Carr-Saunders and Wilson's definition of a 'socialized' profession; in making this, we shall take the opportunity of getting rid of the word 'technician', which in this context says either rather too much or far too little. We suggest the following definition: 'A profession, the provision by whose members of direct services to individual members of the public is organized and financed by the state'. The fact that the whole machinery might be run by members of the profession would not, of course, alter the fact that the provision of services was 'organized' by the state, if the machinery had been set up by Statute or Ministerial regulation. It is not, in addition, necessary that all (or even the majority) of the members of the profession should be practising either wholly or in part within the state-organized service.

2. THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

Since the National Health Service represents a new experiment in the 'socialization' of a profession, we propose to discuss it at some length. We do not, however, intend to describe the statutory machinery by which it works, for this can easily be studied in the Acts themselves and in other publications.³ Still less do we propose to conduct a post-

mortem on the controversy which raged before its inception, and which was briefly commented on in *The English Middle Classes*.⁴ This celebrated wrangle, with which the names of Mr Aneurin Bevan, Lords Moran and Webb-Johnson, and Drs Dain and Charles Hill are associated, involved an immense amount of negotiation, speeches, meetings, plebiscites and letters to *The Times*. As a background study, forming an introduction to study of the Service in its present form, the history of the controversy can profitably be read;⁵ but our purpose here is to examine the present working of the scheme, and particularly its effect on the medical profession itself.

What is the purpose of the National Health Service? First, of course, to bring medical, dental, and ophthalmic diagnosis and treatment (including care in hospital) within the reach and notice of those who might otherwise either be unable to afford it or tend to neglect health in favour of other things. Secondly, it was intended that the various services should be 'integrated' and 'co-ordinated'—those magic words—with a consequent gain in comprehensiveness and efficiency. Thirdly, it was hoped that a state service would be able to initiate an ambitious experiment in social medicine, and that through the setting up of health centres and other methods an advance would be made towards the ideal of preventive, rather than merely curative, medicine.

These aims could not be achieved within two or three years. It is nevertheless important to examine the progress made and the likelihood of the aims being achieved in the next five or ten years. It is, of course, well known that the original estimates of cost seriously underestimated both the potential demand and the inflationary rise in prices which followed the war. In the event, there has been an unceasing struggle to meet even the minimum requirements of the planned Service, and the building of health centres and expansion of work on preventive medicine have been indefinitely postponed. The table opposite shows the progressive inflation of costs.*

The reduction, in the estimates for 1951–52, in the costs of dental and eye services is of course due to the effects of the imposition of charges for dentures and spectacles under the National Health Service Act, 1951. It will be noticed that, compared with the immense increase in the cost of hospitals, drugs, and dental and ophthalmic treatment, the cost of the general medical services (i.e. treatment by G.P.s) has remained relatively stable. This springs from the system of paying doctors, which is now to be changed.

* The original estimate of *net* cost by the Coalition Government was £107.8 m. a year, while the estimate mentioned during debates on the 1946 Act was £152m.

	1948-49* Original Estimate £m.	1948-49* Revised Estimate £m.	1949-50 Revised Estimate £m.	1950-51 Revised Estimate £m.	1951-52 Revised Estimate £m.
Total Gross Cost	198.4	275.9	451.1	465.0	470.2
Total Net Cost	159.7	208.3	358.5	392.9	399.2
Hospital and Specialist Services	120.6	145.1	250.8	269.5	284.9
General Medical Services	31.5	33.8	47.1	48.3	48.4
General Dental Services	8.1	21.8	48.6	46.9	36.2
Pharmaceutical Services	12.7	17.7	35.3	32.0	43.6
Supplementary Ophthal- mic Services	2.3	15.0	25.1	28.2	14.6
Local Authority Services (Exchequer Cost only)	4.0	10.2	15.4	18.4	18.5

* For a period of nine months only.

A great deal of nonsense has been uttered on both sides, for political purposes, about the need for a National Health Service to enable the poor to secure medical treatment. It has been suggested on the one hand that before 1948 only the well-to-do could afford to go to a doctor at all, and on the other that anyone who really wanted medical care could get all he wanted for next to nothing through National Health Insurance or by joining a Friendly Society or some other contributory scheme. It is, of course, important not to underestimate the cover which was available before 1948. It has been estimated, for example, that 'by 1944, twenty-four million people were covered by health insurance in respect of practitioner and sanatorium treatment, drugs and appliances, and over ten million by hospital contributory schemes in respect of hospital treatment.'⁶ Of the twenty-four million people covered by medical treatment, the large majority were probably covered also in respect of dental treatment.

Nevertheless, it must be obvious that, if people had not wanted either far more medical care than was available, or much more than they thought it desirable or possible to pay for, the potential demand for services under the N.H.S. could not have been so seriously underestimated at its inception. It is no doubt true that the demand between 1948 and 1952 for treatment—and especially for certificates, drugs and appliances—considerably exceeded what might reasonably have been described as 'needs'. But there were clearly gaps in the services

provided, especially in respect of the families of those insured as employees under N.H.I., of middle-class people who were either self-employed or whose salaries exceeded £420 a year (above which level they were not compelled to insure), and in respect of dental and ophthalmic treatment and appliances. Many of these gaps could have been filled if people had taken the trouble to enter voluntary National Health Insurance, or had joined a contributory scheme: but there are, of course, strong arguments, if these schemes were going to be widely extended anyway, for setting up a single service to cover everyone. Nevertheless, it remains to some extent true that with health—as with any other commodity—people will take more free than they will ever buy, even if they can afford to pay.

There are more than 50,000 registered medical practitioners in Great Britain, including those not practising and those in the public service. The overwhelming majority of those who practise, whether G.P.s or specialists, work wholly or partly inside the National Health Service. About ninety-seven per cent of the population have their names on the list of the N.H.S. doctor. It is, however, impossible to estimate the extent to which the facilities of the Service are in fact used by middle-class patients who used to pay for private treatment. Certainly nearly all of them use them to some extent, and most of them use nothing else. On the other hand, many families use a N.H.S. doctor for minor ailments, but pay fees as private patients on other occasions, as the spirit moves them. Since it is still considered unethical for a doctor to treat another doctor's patient, this habit (generally practised without either doctor being aware of it) is not popular in the profession. It will not, however, be easy to get rid of it. Many middle-class families prefer to get their treatment outside the Service but use a N.H.S. doctor primarily in order to secure free drugs and dressings. It is probably the chemist's bills, rather than the doctor's fees, which drive upper middle-class families with children into the Service; for the incidence of purchase tax on proprietary medicines can run up chemist's bills of anything up to £25 a year for a family outside the N.H.S. This was the argument behind the Conservative Party's promise at the 1950 election (it was not repeated in 1951) to provide free drugs for private patients. There are many arguments against it.

Some doctors practise wholly inside the Service, while others take a proportion—which may be quite large or very small—of paying patients. No doctor may take fees for any treatment given to a patient on his N.H.S. list. Out of some 20,000 G.P.s in the country, about 600 are completely outside the Service, and there are indications that the

number is increasing.* But, even if there is a trickle of doctors returning to private practice, the proportion is, and is likely to remain, very small. With expenses high, and the need to keep fees as low as possible in order to retain patients, a doctor in private practice in a middle-class residential area will need to attend between 1,000 and 1,500 families in order to make a net income of £1,500 a year or so. This means that his total list of patients will be somewhere around the maximum figure permitted in the N.H.S., which was 4,000. He can, however, generally manage this number without acute overwork and still give good service and careful attention to each patient, as the paying patient tends to make fewer demands on his services than the patient who 'is entitled' to free care.

Whatever the deficiencies in our health services to-day, nothing is to be gained by fostering the idea that all was well before July 5, 1948, and that a marked deterioration has taken place since. In several respects the public is being worse served, and there are also dangerous potentialities latent in the N.H.S. which it would be folly to ignore. However, the medical profession will be doing itself, as well as the public, a poor service if it concentrates so fiercely on the moles in the eye of the Minister of Health (or of his predecessors) that it fails to descry the beams which have for so long disfigured its own. When *The Lancet* published Dr J. S. Collings's startling survey, *General Practice in England To-day*,⁷ *The Times* observed that 'it accords with what most serious students of the medical services have been saying about the state of general practice for thirty years.'⁸ For all the complaints that it exaggerated the predominance of 'bad practices' and underestimated the amount of devoted service being rendered by G.P.s, the 'Collings Report' remains an alarming exposure of a very bad state of affairs, and one which existed long before the National Health Service was set up. It is the more depressing to find that so many doctors have still not even heard of it.

Dr Collings, a Harvard Research Fellow who has also practised medicine in New Zealand, studied in detail the work of fifty-five carefully chosen general practices all over Britain, selected by local people to give a fair assortment of those judged by conventional standards to be good, bad, and indifferent. In each case he spent some time with the doctors concerned (104 of them in all, in the 55 practices), observing them in their surgeries and accompanying them on their rounds. He also followed up some of their cases into the out-patient wards of

* A doctor wholly in private practice is allowed by law to sell his practice, which a doctor taking even a few N.H.S. patients cannot do.

hospitals. The practices varied in type from industrial or 'urban-residential' to wholly rural, and in size from under 1,000 to the then permitted maximum of 4,000 patients per doctor.

The main conclusion from the case studies is frank: 'The overall state of general practice is bad and still deteriorating. The deterioration will continue until such time as the province and function of the general practitioner is clearly defined, objective standards of practice are established, and steps are taken to see that these standards are attained and maintained.'⁹ Dr Collings is in no doubt about the causes of the decline. The G.P. of to-day is living on the tradition of the nineteenth-century 'family doctor'; but, except in a minority of practices—most of them in the countryside—he has ceased either to be, or to follow the ideal of, a family doctor. Most of them have abandoned midwifery and ante-natal care to the district nurse and the local authority clinic; they are surrendering the care of children to the school doctors and to the specialist paediatricians, and will probably willingly surrender their 'old chronics' to the new speciality of geriatrics; they thankfully dispatch eye cases, without examination but with the regulation green form, to the Supplementary Eye Service; they have abandoned even such elementary 'laboratory work' as blood tests, together with minor surgery such as the removal of a finger-nail, sending all such cases to hospitals; and the conduct of their practices 'is inextricably interwoven with commercial and emotional considerations, which too often negate the code of medical ethics by which the public are supposedly safeguarded and from which the high reputation of medicine stems'. While it is obvious that there are many doctors to whom some of these strictures do not apply, there are few to whom none apply, and far too many to whom all apply. Nearly all doctors are content with—or have become resigned to—surgeries and consulting-rooms which are technically unsuited to the work, and in large industrial practices these are often squalid and insanitary; so many patients swell the surgery queues that almost all pretence of proper physical examination before 'diagnosis' has been abandoned (in some surgeries Dr Collings found no examination couch at all, while in others the couches were covered with books or bottles which had been there for months); finally, and worst of all, the practice of keeping proper medical case notes of patients is almost unknown.

Where, then, is the family doctor to-day? He has ceased almost entirely to treat families, and deals only with individuals. Partly as a result of this, he is unable to get at the causes, however superficial, of

psychological disorders; consequently he either treats the physical symptoms or abandons the case to the psychiatrist. With a few exceptions, the G.P. has become little more than a clearing station which sorts cases out in order to dispatch them to the hospital, the specialist consultant, the optician, or the pharmacist. This is nothing new. It has been going on for years, and it is not good. It is still true that

'There must be someone who can still take the broad view and the long view. Someone who can see the patient as a whole and over a period of years . . . who knows the commoner illnesses intimately and knows when the rarer ones may be possible, so that he can then call in one whose interest lies among those rarities. The family doctor, in fact. He cannot be by-passed. . . . His place is supremely important, for without him the others fail in their purpose. He has to keep a balance, to observe God's own common sense, and to know his patients as human beings, their lives, backgrounds, families, jobs, histories, virtues and vices. He is the great co-ordinator of the medical plan.'¹⁰

That the National Health Service has tended in some respects to exaggerate the defects—particularly by putting too high a financial premium on large lists of patients—cannot be doubted. But too many doctors are using the difficulties of the N.H.S. as an excuse for their own unwillingness to render the devoted service which a true profession demands of its practitioners. There are too many doctors who, without the excuse of an excessive list of patients, still rush through their cases with a minimum of time⁹ and trouble. There is not, despite all the superficial excuses which are adduced, the slightest real justification for being content to receive sick patients, year after year, in dirty and untidy consulting-rooms. No doubt most partnerships cannot raise the working capital needed to build new, and properly designed, surgeries—although many could have afforded it before the war. But even the scruffiest writer is occasionally goaded by a sense of personal shame or professional pride to tidy up his study and attack it with a bucket of distemper. If a doctor refuses persistently to treat his patients for any but functional illnesses, being unwilling even to consider the psycho-somatic or psychological aspects of the individual, there is something wrong with either his training or his temperament. Finally, a doctor who acquiesces in a general agreement to pass on all but the simplest routine cases to a hospital or a specialist is deliberately leaving unused, and therefore allowing to decay, most of the fruits of a long and intensive training; he is wasting time and public money.

These evils cannot be eradicated by the Ministry of Health, the B.M.A., and the Royal College alone, although they can publicize

them and offer incentives to reform. In fact, of course, the last thing they are likely to do is to wash their own dirty linen in public. Only the doctors themselves, determining individually and collectively, for the good of the public and the honour of their profession, to rebuild general practice on a sound foundation, can cure the rot which has attacked it. It is no good repeating, 'if only the government would build us Health Centres . . .', 'if only the capitation fees were different . . .', 'if only the hospitals would be more co-operative . . .', 'if only there were more doctors . . .' (especially as most of them will go to remarkable lengths to prevent a new practice being established in their own area), when the real trouble is that many doctors have lost the true conception of, and any real interest in, their job. Much of the blame must rest with the system of medical education and training, which must to some extent have ceased to inspire its students with the ideals—and to provide them with the equipment—needed to carry on a general practice of the best sort. A young medical student, frankly stating his preference for specialization in hospital—for 'the science of medicine'—remarks:

'It seems to me that two considerations weigh very heavily against the choice of General Practice as a career: too little time is available for each patient, and there is too little general responsibility. If it worries me at all, I shall probably be unable to undertake any original work, and I may indeed have little enough time even for diversions. Also, though I hesitate to mention it, I cannot expect regular hours of work. . . .'¹¹

He did not, in short, realize the deeper significance, or rewards, of general practice; indeed, these are often only realized in advance by the G.P.'s son or daughter who (often against his or her father's advice) determinedly follows in his footsteps. Many G.P.s with the welfare of their art at heart, feel that medical students need, while training, to spend some time with a G.P. who runs a practice well, to realize just what can be made of a practice; to a very limited extent some teaching hospitals co-operate in such schemes.

The Minister of Health could bring about improvements in the Service, if he could carry the doctors with him. He could reorganize its finance. At the time of writing, the dispute between doctors and Ministry over remuneration, which had been dragging on ever since the N.H.S. began, has culminated in the issue of the 'Danckwerts Award'. Many were hoping for a 'loaded' capitation fee, high for each of the first 1,000 or 2,000 patients on a doctor's list, and tapering sharply as the list nears the 4,000 mark. This would both curtail over-large lists

and remove the injustice done to the country G.P., whose patients cannot flood his surgery with vast queues, and who must do much more visiting; the Working Party preferred a different solution, and no doubt the Government will have to accept most of their major proposals. The Minister could encourage group practice, where this is suitable, and raise the standards of surgeries and the work done in them by making expense payments separate from the capitation fee in cases where a proper return could be shown.¹² He could provide incentives to retain, and deterrents to parting with, cases which a real G.P. ought to treat or diagnose himself; he could also make the hospitals less ready to accept them without question, although he will have to contend with the empire-building enthusiasm of the hospital doctors. He could restore to country G.P.s the partnership with the cottage hospitals, which the Regional Hospital Boards are doing their best to destroy, while providing proper safeguards against the excess of semi-amateur surgery in which a few enthusiastic G.P.s were perhaps too prone to indulge. He may already have struck a useful blow with a financial weapon at the insatiable demand for, and too ready prescription of, bottles of medicine which fill the psychological void left by the absence of proper diagnosis and therapy.

He could, even during the indefinite period in which resources will not permit him to build the health centres on which the whole success of the N.H.S. was to be founded, at least get some more experimental ones working, and encourage pioneering doctors to venture into co-operative enterprises of their own. Finally, he will have to check the growth of the bureaucratically administered health factories which the hospitals are fast becoming, and provide some inducement for young doctors to seek general practices, rather than registrarships as a prelude to the joys of specialism, if general practice is not to continue its decline.

We cannot discuss the problem of the hospitals in detail here. It has already attracted wide publicity.¹³ As costs have soared, so has the number of administrators*—sometimes being multiplied many times.¹⁴ Bureaucratic routine demands that purchases of goods shall not be made casually as and when small articles are needed, so that squads of purchase clerks are recruited to fill in indents and pass them through the proper channels, often with the result that a complete case of the articles is delivered from a central dépôt some weeks after the

* Yet simultaneously many G.P.'s complain that it now takes a fortnight to get from a hospital the case notes on a discharged patient—compared with two days before the war.

surgeon or sister has bought one with his or her own money. One Regional Board is reported to have employed forty architects on the preparation of plans for hospitals which there is now no money to build. Examples can be multiplied.¹⁵ Work that used to be done by volunteers is now done by whole-time salaried officials; no one doubts that some of it used to be badly done, but it is clearly folly to discourage *all* such efforts for the sake of sheer prejudice. Finally, there is urgent need for closer co-operation between Regional Hospital Boards, Executive Councils, and Local Health Authorities; this could do much to restore the status and tasks of general practice.

Specialists were readier than G.P.s to accept the N.H.S.—readier, even, to see the independence of cherished hospitals extinguished. They were promised much; and it was natural that the preponderance of medical students wishing training as specialists should increase to such a degree that it worried the Ministry of Health.¹⁶ In the early stages, all those who were accepted as registrars were promised steady employment and inevitable promotion to consultant posts; the salaries were attractive; and all the medical services once given free were now paid for—as Harley Street could not be expected to support ‘honoraries’ in the classless society. However, discontent has grown among hospital doctors. They have seen the state, through the Regional Hospital Boards, cutting down very heavily in hospital services as the cost soared, and although at first it was the patient’s food, and then beds, and finally expensive treatments which came in for a form of ‘Treasury-type’ control, at last appointments began to be suppressed.

Registrars found that their chances of getting consulting appointments were slimmer than was expected, while medical students who had looked forward to specialization (and indeed were increasingly specialized in training) found that there was as fierce competition for registrarships as under the old system—except, perhaps, for some ‘dead end’ hospitals. If anything, the imperative need for the very highest medical degrees, to gain even a fairly minor hospital appointment, was found to have increased; nor was the abolition of so-called ‘canvassing’ for appointments found to be in practice any fairer than the older system. Then came cuts in registrarships, which forced many young doctors unexpectedly into general practice (usually as assistants) and there were sharp complaints—as there still are—that they could not ‘get in’.

Whether hospital doctors will exhibit the same devotion as under the voluntary system has yet to be shown. The most ambitious doctors still work for their registrarships and consultant appointments. It has

been said that the surgeon has now lost one important sanction to care: in the past, if anyone died under his care, his private practice immediately suffered. (Since the Cassidy case,¹⁷ he cannot even be personally sued for negligence.) This was doubtless often hard on him; but it was a very solid inducement to craftsmanship of the highest order. Moreover, hospital surgeons and also physicians depended upon G.P.s to send them cases; it followed that they had not only to please the patient (who grumbled to his G.P. if Mr So-and-so did not have a word with him in the ward), but also the G.P. himself, who could insist on being kept fully posted as to *his* patient's condition. Not all of this tradition has gone—but some of it has; and men with private practices make most effort to conserve it. It is, after all, a fact that before the war, patients preferred voluntary hospitals to municipal or L.C.C. institutions—because the medical staff was better and more punctilious. To-day, the incentives and sanctions to good work approximate more to the municipal than the voluntary hospital, and it will be a tribute to the toughness of the best hospital traditions if this does not have the inevitable relaxing effect on doctors.

Does the National Health Service threaten the status and professional freedom of doctors? Of course it does: any element of state control is bound to do so. It has not yet, however, shown clear signs of the insidious dangers which were freely forecast, and for this both the doctors themselves and successive Ministers of Health can share credit. But what of the future? We have called attention in Chapter V to the tendency of the state to depreciate quality when its social services are overwhelmed by the sheer quantity of demand. The Conservative Party is pledged to reverse this trend, and its government will be watched carefully to see whether the pledge is honoured. But Conservative governments do not last for ever, and the public may grow more, rather than less, demanding in the quantitative sense. At present there are not enough doctors, and the medical schools cannot take anything like the number of students who seek admission. This is preventing any serious decline in quality, although there are already signs that the system is tending to attract more of the 'wrong type'—men who are after a hospital job with fixed hours, a quick rise to a good income, and a pension at the end of it all.

Only the doctors themselves can preserve the integrity of their own profession. We cannot forbear to repeat what we wrote more than three years ago in *The English Middle Classes*: 'What will happen when the state, by subsidizing and stimulating the output of medical students, sees a chance of "diluting" the medical profession sufficiently to remove

the scarcity of doctors?'¹⁸ They can best meet this threat, and ensure public support in any trial of strength which might ensue, by setting their own house in order now, and restoring the proper relationship between patient and devoted family physician. Above all, if they have at heart the true interests of their art rather than purely selfish motives of competition, they will fight to ensure that the private practitioner, outside the National Health Service, survives to keep in repair for them a last citadel of freedom to which all can, at need, turn for safety and self-respect.

3. DENTISTS

The full effects of socialized medicine on dentists will take some time to reveal themselves. Certainly the dentists have enhanced their status. The report of the Teviot Committee¹⁹ and the Dentists' Bill, 1952, would make the dentists a self-governing profession, with a General Dental Council, independence or university status for dental schools, and the right to set up an 'Ancillary Dental Service'.

But all the germs of state interference and official subsidization of recruitment, deliberate dilution and depression of standards, are present in this well-intentioned scheme. And is it not the dentists' fault? Why did the British Dental Association issue a leaflet²⁰ urging the rapid recruitment of unregistered 'oral hygienists', who would be allowed to teach dental hygiene, to scale teeth, treat gums and take X-ray photographs? Why did they encourage an innovation (nonetheless an innovation because it was authorized—though not introduced—by an Act of 1921) which would have been fought, in their own professions, by doctors, lawyers, and engineers? Was it a disinterested desire to improve service to the public? Or can it have been a lurking fear that, if this concession were not made, the state would train and infuse into the Service so many genuinely qualified dentists (or rather dentists qualified according to standards determined by the state itself) that their present scarcity value and windfall incomes would be proportionately reduced? Under the terms of the Bill, however, the dentists may ultimately have to face both the lesser evil and the greater.

Before the war, almost alone among the major professions, it was losing by wastage more members than were entering it as recruits. The Spens Committee,²¹ which investigated the pre-war earnings of dentists between the ages of 35 and 55, found that half of these were earning a net income (i.e. *personal* income, after deducting expenses of practice, but not tax) of less than £700 a year. The Committee

recommended that this net sum should be increased to £1,100, a figure subsequently raised to £1,600.

In debate on the National Health Service Act in 1946, Mr Aneurin Bevan—then Minister of Health—said:

'We have not enough dentists and it will therefore be necessary for us, in the meantime, to give priority treatment to certain classes—expectant and nursing mothers, children, schoolchildren in particular and later on, we hope, adolescents. Finally, we trust that we shall be able to build up a dental service for the whole population.'

However, these sensible proposals were not translated into practice when the N.H.S. came into operation on 5 July 1948. The responsibility for securing treatment to these 'priority classes' was placed on local health authorities, which normally employ dentists on salary; but the remainder of the adult population was confined to dentists working under arrangements made by the Executive Councils set up under the N.H.S., and these were paid on a piece-work basis, not by capitation fee. When the demand for dental treatment far exceeded expectations,* the school dental service proved quite unable to compete with the rewards which could be secured in ordinary N.H.S. practice.

The earnings of N.H.S. dentists soared. An income of £4,000 a year could be made without much difficulty, and there were rumours that some were earning more than £20,000; this is unlikely to have been so except in one or two isolated cases (and it was probably a *gross* income in any case), but there were certainly dentists who made more than £10,000 in the first year of the scheme. In most of these cases the maximum working week of 33 'chairside hours' recommended by the Spens Committee was considerably exceeded. The incentive of piece rates worked like a charm, but the quality of work tended to decline; conservative work was skimped, and too many dentists concentrated on what were graphically described as 'blood and vulcanite methods'.²² The bulk of the profession was let down and discredited by a minority of practitioners—some of whom had not flourished in private practice—deliberately setting out to exploit the demand by taking the most profitable work and sacrificing quality to maximum earnings. Before long, newly qualified assistants were being engaged at salaries equal to the maximum earnings recommended by the Spens Committee.

It was not allowed to continue. In February, 1949, all N.H.S. dentists' earnings over £4,000 a year were cut by fifty per cent; in June, 1949,

* In addition to the immense rush to obtain dentures, it is probable that large numbers of men and women, who had not before the war been accustomed to seek conservative dental treatment, had been persuaded of its advantages by their experience in the forces.

this cut in excess earnings was replaced by a general reduction of twenty to twenty-five per cent in the scale of fees for treatment. In May 1950, fees were further cut by ten per cent, and the regulations imposing the cut were debated in the House of Commons.²³ Each time, the British Dental Association countered with a proposal for a scheme based on a sliding scale of fees, but negotiations with the Ministry of Health broke down. At the time when the third cut was made, it was pointed out that in the year 1949-50 some 10,000 dentists were sharing gross N.H.S. payments of £48,648,000, while about 19,000 general medical practitioners were dividing £47,145,000. The average *gross* takings of dentists, including newly qualified assistants and elderly men working part-time, were about £4,850, compared with £2,000 for G.P.s. The original payments scheme had laid down, arbitrarily, an estimate of fifty-two per cent of gross takings for overhead expenses of practice, but this figure proved excessive, as the overheads were spread over a far larger number of patients than had originally been envisaged. The true net incomes being made therefore much exceeded the recommended 'Spens maxima'.

The unbalance which had developed in the Service was due to the abandonment by the Minister of the priorities which he himself had laid down. In any case, the piece-rate system of payment was bound, so long as the supply of dentists remained inadequate, to produce the sort of gold rush which in fact took place. The earnings of dentists became a stock joke. As one M.P. put it:

'The good professional dentist, who is the backbone of the profession and in the vast majority, has welcomed, of course, the financial improvement to his position which this scheme has brought about, but he loathes and detests the contempt in which the public hold this honoured profession. Dentists hate not being able to go to the golf club without someone saying "here is a man earning £100 a day"; and when he turns on the wireless he finds he is the butt of every cheap comedian. Something should be done to remove this impression.'²⁴

If any pretence were to be made of returning to the original priorities, a situation in which three-fifths of the money spent on dentistry went on false teeth while the School Dental Service slowly disintegrated could not be allowed to persist. An announcement in Mr Gaitskell's Budget speech of 1951 was followed immediately by the National Health Service Act 1950, which imposed charges of up to £4 5s. for the provision of dentures. This cut the demand for dentures, but not enough to divert dentists' time to the neglected priority classes. Early in 1952, the new Conservative Government therefore introduced the

National Health Service Act 1952, which imposed a charge of up to £1 on each dental job done for a patient who was not under 21 years of age or an expectant or nursing mother.

It is probable that two or three thousand more qualified dentists are required if a 'complete service' is to be provided for the whole population. Even if all the present charges are retained, it is almost certain that this number could be fully employed on terms similar to those envisaged in the Spens Report—that is to say, with about thirty-three hours spent at the chairside each week and net earnings averaging £1,500 to £2,000 a year. If the right proportion of dentists were employed in the School Dental Service, so that conservative work was properly done in youth, the number of dentists could probably be reduced inside a generation.

Meanwhile, the initial workings of the National Health Service have revealed a somewhat lower standard of ethics in the dental profession than might have been hoped for. It remains to be seen whether the enhanced professional status accorded by the Dentists' Bill, with the sanctions placed in the hands of the new General Dental Council, would bring about an improvement. If the less scrupulous dentists continue to put maximum earnings far above service to the public, so that the cost of the Service exceeds the value received for it, we do not see how anything can save the dentists from further official restriction of earnings and from deliberate, state-subsidized dilution of their profession. Indeed, Clause 19 (7) of the Dentists' Bill provided that, at the end of a compulsory period of experiment, the Privy Council could direct the General Dental Council to make regulations enabling a class of ancillary workers to be employed in hospitals and public dental clinics, on work *which is to include the extraction and filling of teeth*, under the supervision of registered dentists. Here is dilution with a vengeance—and it may be that it is literally a vengeance. Whether the threat alone will be sufficient to produce results remains to be seen. Meanwhile, it may be worthwhile to record that a substantial, though of course diminishing, proportion of practising dentists are in fact not 'qualified' at all, having entered practice before the 1921 Act made recognized qualifications compulsory.

4. OPTICIANS

The socialization of this profession presents such an extraordinary picture of what state power can do to a hard-working body of practitioners that it constitutes a case-history of particular interest to all

professional people. With one hand the state has built up professional standards and encouraged professional organization and independence; with the other it has laid its plans for the destruction of private practice, the decimation of the practitioners, and for total subjugation of the survivors to the level of professional public servants.

As we noted in our review of professional history, doctors have obstructed opticians* in the struggle towards professional status; as late as 1930 the B.M.A. maintained that the use of sight-testing opticians was 'wholly undesirable',²⁵ but without taking steps to provide any adequate alternative service of ophthalmic treatment. Largely because of medical opposition, the Optical Practitioners (Registration) Bill failed to pass in 1927, but in 1936 the National Insurance Act made it illegal for any practitioner not on the list kept by a newly-established Ophthalmic Benefit Approved Committee to examine the eyes of a panel patient. In this partial and *ad hoc* way, state registration of opticians became a fact.

During the war the profession set up its Joint Emergency Committee which later became its negotiating body with the Health Service; it was composed of representatives of a congeries of optical bodies, both protective and examining, which had come into existence in the course of the profession's struggles to raise its status. This committee invited Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders to report on the organization and future of the profession; his recommendations led to the merging of the Institute of Ophthalmic Opticians and the Joint Council of Ophthalmic Opticians in the Association of Optical Practitioners, comparable in function to the B.M.A. A Central Professional Committee deals with registration, except the registration of ophthalmic medical specialists, who found it beneath their dignity to be represented on a body which also represented opticians (whose standards of training and qualification they regard as so inferior to their own); they are separately represented. There are five examining bodies for ophthalmic opticians and one which confers only the status of dispenser.²⁶ Local Ophthalmic Services Committees, consisting of members of the various bodies, advise the National Health Service.

* Those loosely described as 'opticians' perform two functions (although some may perform only one of them): one, the examining of the patient's eyes, and the prescription of lenses to correct refractive errors; the other, the dispensing of such prescription by provision and fitting of lenses and spectacles. The prescribing optician should more properly be called an optometrist. He is *not* qualified to diagnose or prescribe for diseases of the eye, and it is his duty to send any patient with any eye abnormality to an ophthalmologist, who is a qualified medical specialist. The latter may be a surgeon treating eye diseases only; more often he combines this with prescriptions for errors of refraction, when he is known as an 'oculist'.

Thus, if not unified, the profession has been organized, and sight-testing has been put on the basis which public-spirited opticians have been seeking for so long. But all this is merely to be regarded, apparently, as a temporary measure, because, to quote the N.H.S. Handbook,

... the Government aim to bring sight-testing right into the hospital service as rapidly as possible, with special eye departments and clinics in the charge of medical specialists (ophthalmologists) and with opticians on the staff. Spectacles would then be obtained either directly from the clinics or, on the prescription provided, from opticians working in their own shops.²⁷

The Government, in effect, adopted the doctors' view of the 'ophthalmic opticians, who though qualified experts, are not doctors', and intends to replace them with something better—*i.e.* to put them under the medical ophthalmologists as subordinate clinic workers. It is under this threat to their present status that the profession has meanwhile done the overwhelming bulk of N.H.S. work (although under this 'supplementary ophthalmic service' a patient does require first a G.P. to sign a form before the optician can get to work).

The profession has done well out of the temporary scheme—but it has also worked the scheme. Before the war the annual demand for spectacles was between four and five million pairs; during the first twelve months of the scheme it was eight million pairs. Manufacturers pushed up output by twenty-five per cent, but by October 1948, the output of completed jobs was only half the intake, and by 1949 the whole process of obtaining spectacles took five months. The secretary of the A.O.P. estimated in 1949²⁸ that it would take two years to catch up completely with this tremendous increase in demand—but in fact the Government stepped in and in 1951 imposed charges for spectacles (not for testing) which was followed by a halving of demand. Since then, naturally enough, it has been creeping up, as the financial headaches occasioned by the charges gave way to the more functional ones derived from the need for new spectacles. The free scheme snuffed out private practice, but it is now said to be reviving. Some 19,000,000 people in England and Wales wear spectacles; most people over 45 need them for close work. The demand for spectacles, even when charged for,* in a rapidly ageing population, will hardly fall to the level which prevailed before the N.H.S. introduced people to the comfort produced by accurate compensation for errors in vision.

Considering these changes, the opticians feel that they have shown

* The poor can apply for aid to the National Assistance Board.

themselves fully capable of delivering the goods professionally. As the Secretary of the A.O.P. put it in October, 1951 :

‘There is no doubt that the supplementary service has proved itself and has shown the worth of the ophthalmic optician and his ability to work alongside the other professions. You will understand, therefore, why we think that Section 41 (4) of the Act, which gives the Minister power to close down the supplementary service when he has substituted a clinic scheme in its place, should be repealed.’²⁹

But they evidently view the future with foreboding, for a warning slip has been pasted into the last edition of *The Optical Profession: A Guide to Training and Examinations*,³⁰ which concludes with the words ‘Should the clinic scheme be introduced . . . it would affect materially the prospects of ophthalmic opticians, not all of whom could be absorbed in the hospitals, and the remainder would have to rely entirely on private practice.’

Even if the A.O.P.’s forecast of a reduction in the number of optometrists is correct, it does not mean that the clinic system would be more economical, and certainly not that it would be more efficient. This reduction would be achieved only partly through concentration and large-scale organization, and possibly queueing; it would partly result from employment of more medically qualified ophthalmologists, whose longer training and higher qualification are now reflected in a consultation fee exactly double that of the optometrists. Taking into account the overheads, and bearing in mind what has happened to hospital administration and costs, it is improbable that clinics would dispense better eyesight more economically in money or manpower than does the present scheme.

But the Ministry’s desire to put eye-testing into clinics is not primarily the result of a desire to save money. It springs from the unappeased medical distrust of the opticians; the conviction first that their training is not good enough for them to be trusted with a patient’s eyesight, and secondly that the dual role of dispensing and prescribing confers altogether too great a temptation to ‘over-prescribing’. Of the two, the second is the more fundamental: it touches ethics as well as competence. Opticians deny it, and maintain that those who bring it do not appreciate that the art of giving a patient the right spectacles depends entirely on the making of small changes in prescription (since slightly wrong spectacles can be compensated for by physical effort, giving rise to headaches or other symptoms)³¹; nevertheless, the medical argument that, if you remove the opportunity to make a profit out of

dispensing one's own prescription, an improvement in ethics will follow, is hard to rebut.

The doctors can afford to ignore the riposte that they themselves have been accustomed to dispense their own medicines, for this part of their practices has never been particularly profitable, and has now almost disappeared. But they will find it harder to answer why they have not been as eager to deprecate the functions of prescribing and dispensing being linked in dentistry, where it *is* immensely profitable. That the temptation exists is shown by the setting up of the Dental Estimates Board; but the doctors have not clamoured for the removal, into state-run workshops, of the profitable business of making dentures prescribed by the dentists who decide to extract the teeth which they replace. Obviously the dentist himself must fit and modify the denture; but it *could* be manufactured from casts as well by a state factory as by his own mechanic. 'Why pick on *us*?', is the opticians' not unnatural reaction.

The outcome of this struggle seems to us of great significance; it will show whether doctors, as well as opticians, can read the signs of professional history. Are the doctors bent upon using the machinery of the state to destroy a large area of private practice, while facing the decay of, and the threat to, their own; or are they ready to uphold the interests and status of another profession, by helping it to deserve them? The doctors entertain a deep suspicion of any body of practitioners which claims to be professional, while keeping 'open shop' as traders; but this prejudice could be broken down if optometrists could demonstrate that this system need not lead to over-prescribing or touting for business. Medical doubts about the standards of qualification can be met simply, over a period of time, by raising them. In this, the ophthalmologists are already helping.

Can opticians play their part in a professional alliance with the doctors? Thanks to the National Health Service, they are now well organized; and they may be in a position to fight doughtily for their independence by the time (if that time ever comes) that the Ministry of Health can afford to build clinics. Can they, in the interval, bring their system of regulation up to the level of their protective organization, and put their ethics beyond suspicion? They probably can, if they will; raising qualifications will be one means of bringing this about.

5. PHARMACISTS

The Health Service contains a somewhat similar threat to most pharmacists as to opticians; it could finally convert them from part-professionals, part-shopkeepers, to salaried officials employed in a health clinic. In so doing it would enhance their status in one respect, for retail pharmacists are at present less convincingly professional than are optometrists. They do little prescribing, and that for minor ailments, while much even of this has ceased with the N.H.S.; on the other hand their general trade in 'toilet requisites' is larger as a rule than the optician's in binoculars and 'photographic supplies'.

The profession is diverse. It includes very highly qualified specialists working in research laboratories, and salaried dispensers working either in hospitals or behind glass screens in shops; but it also includes salaried managers of branch shops and shop-proprietors carrying on a risk-bearing enterprise. The immediate result of the inauguration of the N.H.S. was a large increase in prescriptions dispensed, which meant that the pharmacist did more of the work for which he had been professionally trained and qualified. It brought dispensing up to an average of about one-third of a chemist's shop turnover, although in some cases the proportion may have been as high as ninety per cent or as low as ten per cent; the remainder of turnover was derived from the sale of patent medicines, dressings, cosmetics and even 'fancy goods' to the public.

This increase in dispensing was not pure gain, since it was attended by a decrease in sales of other medicines on which the retail profit margin was higher. Margins on N.H.S. prescriptions were provisionally settled at the inception of the Service, but a provisional reduction was imposed by the Ministry in 1949; this has never been accepted as permanent by the National Pharmaceutical Union, which claims that it has resulted in the smaller practitioners having to work longer hours in order to cover their overheads, so that they are in effect subsidizing the N.H.S. with additional work which was not originally contemplated. The system introduced in 1949 involved supply at cost, plus sixteen per cent, with an additional fee of around 1s. per prescription to compensate for the fact that many prescriptions are based on materials costing only a few pence. The margin on patent medicines may range from twenty-five to fifty per cent.

The 1949 cut brought home to the pharmacists the vulnerability of their new position, in which the state was their largest single customer.

In addition, they suffered considerable hardships from the bureaucratic delays in payments made for N.H.S. prescriptions. Even before the imposition of the 1s. prescription charge to the patient in February, 1952, whose effects on demand it is too early to assess, the retail pharmacists were not making fortunes. The average turnover of a shop, estimated at about £1,500 a year in 1938, had gone up to between £4,000 and £5,000 a year, but most of this increase was due to higher prices which were largely swallowed up by higher overheads. The average net income of a proprietor was almost certainly below £1,000 a year—probably about £800.

The Ministry of Health could, under the Act, concentrate dispensing in Health Centres, when they are built, and in clinics and hospitals. The motive here is not, as in the case of the opticians, a distrust of the qualifications of pharmacists, or a desire to separate the functions of prescribing and dispensing, since these are not here in the same hands; it is a desire to 'integrate', to improve efficiency and to lower costs by large-scale organization. It may be doubted whether economies could be realized in pharmacy any more than in optometry, since the new professional hospital administration does not suggest that state health centres could dispense on a margin of sixteen per cent and still cover overheads. Nevertheless, if health centres are ever built—and we have already suggested that it may be essential to the survival of general practice that they should be—it is possible that N.H.S. dispensing will be done in them. The retail pharmacies would then be left with a minute amount of dispensing for private patients—which in some areas may not be enough to justify the salary of a dispensing pharmacist at all—together with the sale of patent medicines and dressings, and their 'non-professional' lines of cosmetics, sun-glasses, and so forth. Their establishments would become, in fact, shops pure and simple, and the loss of dispensing would have to be made up by increasing turnover and handling new lines of merchandise in competition with other traders. Yet it should not be forgotten that most of us use the advice of our friendly 'chemist' to do a certain amount of simple and quite sensible self-doctoring: when only half-wit girls dispense lipstick and soap behind their counters, we shall presumably take every scratch, snuffle, and stomach-ache with portentous solemnity to the local health centre.

If the profession were completely 'socialized', pharmacists would be wholly professional in their work; they would also one and all be salaried. An increasing proportion are employed on salary now; few newly qualified pharmacists can afford to buy a retail business, despite

the efforts of the N.P.U. to assist them with loans. After paying interest on borrowed capital, returns are not high enough to be attractive. The Pharmaceutical Society has steadily improved standards of qualification in the profession; but, as training becomes longer and more complicated, and the number of new drugs to be studied increases, salaries increase in proportion. Minimum salaries are now about twice what they were before the war, which of course makes the employment of dispensers an increasingly heavy burden on a small retail business. The better qualified the pharmacist becomes, the less anxious he is to 'waste his time peddling toilet-soap in a shop'. Although the bulk of professional training is still done in technical colleges, there are now five universities awarding degrees in pharmacy, and the prize graduates do not go into the retail business at all. The best go into good jobs in laboratories, either industrial or medical, where their prospects are now almost as good as those for an industrial chemist, and the next flight enters the hospitals. But it remains to be seen whether the complete 'socialization' of the profession would result in the trend towards higher qualifications and rewards being subsequently reversed by state dilution. We are inclined to doubt whether the risk of complete 'socialization' is very great.

6. MEDICAL AUXILIARIES

The official definition of medical auxiliaries is that they 'are persons who assist medical practitioners (otherwise than as nurses) in the investigation and treatment of disease by virtue of some special skill acquired through a recognized course of training'.³¹ Translated into practical terms, the main branches of this group of highly specialized minor professions are: almoners, chiropodists, dietitians, occupational therapists, physiotherapists, radiographers, and speech therapists. The taking over by the state of the health and hospital services has resulted in the almost complete 'socialization' of these professions, but their reorganization is not yet complete.

In May, 1949, a series of eight committees was set up by the Minister of Health and the Secretary of State for Scotland to consider, and make recommendations on, 'the supply and demand, training and qualifications of certain medical auxiliaries employed in the National Health Service'. The committees dealt with those auxiliaries mentioned above, together with medical laboratory technicians. Their reports, known as the 'Zachary Cope Reports', were published in one cover in April 1951.³² The then Minister of Health stated on April 19

that the recommendations on registration would require legislation, and would form the basis for discussion with the professional organizations concerned, and that meanwhile, pending the establishment of official registration machinery, he proposed to apply the recommended qualifications to new applicants for posts in the National Health Services.³³ At the same time, most local authorities followed the Ministry's example in making their own appointments. At the time of writing, the discussions are not completed (by June, 1951, they had not been begun).³⁴ Meanwhile, the provisional adoption of the Cope Committee recommendations had already resulted in the refusal of the Minister to continue recognizing the qualification of the Joint Council of Chiropodists of Great Britain, on the ground that in addition to passing the appropriate examinations, N.H.S. chiropodists must also have been trained in 'suitable schools',³⁵ while certain types of physiotherapist were also being refused jobs for which they had previously been held to be qualified. Not unnaturally, the professions are in a state of ferment.

As the reports contain 122 recommendations, we cannot discuss their probable effects in detail. The reports make fascinating reading to anyone who is interested in what may be called the technique of professional 'socialization'. The recommendations are all designed to improve efficiency and raise standards of qualification, though whether this would be the actual effect remains to be seen. What is certain is that they will result in the subjection of these professions to the tightest form of state control. The stimulation and subsidization of recruitment, the prescription of schools and syllabuses, qualifications and registration, numerical control of entry, even the demarcation of functions between one of these professions and another are to be reserved to the state. It is difficult to see how the influence of such private practice as is left can ever prevail upon this virtual monopoly.

Until this bombshell burst, the impact of the National Health Service upon the medical auxiliaries had appeared to be mainly favourable—especially from the economic point of view. With increasing calls upon doctors and medical specialists, not only were more cases made available for treatment but in some instances a greater proportion of the medical treatment given to patients was passed over by the doctors to the auxiliaries. Almoners, freed from the necessity to devote their time to means tests and the assessment of contributions, were able to fulfil their true functions as qualified social workers. Less and less concerned with the effects of poverty, they could concentrate on the

job of compensating for individual incapacity (or simple shiftlessness). In fact, the almoners emerge almost unscathed from the Cope Committee's scrutiny, for the Institute of Almoners is given a distinct pat on the back; provided they do not mind coming almost entirely under state control, and presumably accepting the state's directives as to what ethics may properly be embraced by the profession, it seems that they should do well enough. In the event, the Institute of Almoners reacted against the recommendations.

7. NURSES

The profession of nursing has been almost wholly 'socialized' since the inception of the National Health Service delivered the hospital system of Britain into the hands of the Regional Hospital Boards. In addition, the profession itself has greatly changed, partly owing to changes in training and conditions of employment, partly as a result of the shortage of nurses caused by the general decline in the proportion of young women in the population. Even before the war, the number of suitable girls presenting themselves for entry into the profession was too small, but the numbers were rising at the outbreak of war. Unfortunately, however, a third of the candidates normally failed to pass the Preliminary State Examinations, and nearly a quarter of the remainder failed in the Final, so that the survival rate among candidates was little more than a half.³⁶ 'There was then still a substantial amount of private practice, including jobs in private nursing homes; this has now been reduced, although the hospitals still find they are apt to lose good nurses, whom they have trained, to the co-operatives which place nurses in private jobs.

The excess of demand over supply (reflected in the fact that more than 50,000 hospital beds have for some years been closed for lack of nurses) has brought about considerable changes in the organization of recruitment and training, and much thought has been given to these problems.³⁷ Not only does an ageing population, with more elaborate health services, make greater demands on nursing time; the need for increased numbers has also been intensified by the fact that working hours have had to be shortened in order to get recruits at all. The more irksome disciplinary regulations have been eased, and salaries increased.

The General Nursing Council now counts 45,000 state registered nurses and 13,000 students, and they are much more strongly organized than before the war. Before the Nursing Act, 1949, the G.N.C. had been

trying (with five inspectors) to supervise some 600 training establishments; now there are area training committees, on which nurses have themselves the majority of seats. Hospital finances for training purposes have been separated from working finance, and the nurses have the important sanction of being able to withdraw training facilities from a hospital which gives inadequate training. This means that the hospital loses the labour of the students. The sort of training given is changing, for nursing is becoming much more technical and less personal as new therapies are developed. There is less *nursing* (in the old sense) of patients who have to be pulled through crises by the efforts of the nurse; there is more supervision and carrying out of routine treatments—often a mechanical round of medications and injections. Where the personal factor is important (as, for example, in the case of old people), it is often difficult to get nurses at all. There is great competition among hospitals to provide attractive training facilities, in order to secure students who will at the same time provide labour for the hospital, but often the facilities provided are not good. Consequently, while the London teaching hospitals, and the best of those in the provinces, get the best of the recruits to the profession, some of the smaller ones get very poor material indeed.

Before the war, training commonly started at the age of 21. Now, some girls start their training before they are 18, and it is usual to become a S.R.N. at 21. Parents and girls do not take kindly to the gap of two or three years between leaving school at 15 and beginning training, and this prejudices recruiting. Nevertheless, a girl who has had several years in another job before entering a hospital will, in addition to being more mature, be less likely to mistake her vocation. Meanwhile, many good recruits are being lost. The Hertfordshire County Council solved the problem, and secured twenty-five additional nurses a year, by selecting a number of intelligent girls at secondary modern schools and paying them 10s. a week subsistence allowance to stay on at school until they were 18, when they easily passed the preliminary examination.

Wastage is high. Before the war, a girl who did not qualify until she was 24 generally stayed on at her hospital as a staff nurse. In addition, she had made sacrifices in order to qualify, and hesitated to waste them. As one senior sister said to us: 'I had to pay about a guinea a week, and pay for uniforms and books; when seven weeks' training cost £20, you wanted to get something out of it. And in those days it was hard to get on; you had to pass out of the preliminary school; pass the first year exam., qualify as a staff nurse and take your final—

and if at any stage you did not seem suitable you were not kept on. It was a continuous challenge; though it seems awful, it created character. Now, a girl gets about £200 to enable her to train, and if the slightest strain or trouble is put on her she is apt to weaken and flounce out. They are always talking of their grievances. . . .’ Most people will recognize here the typical symptoms of a state of full employment; some will discount the whole thesis as sheer prejudice. But the greatest body of opinion seems agreed that standards are falling. The teaching hospitals no longer have their own examinations, which were mostly far higher qualifications than the state ones, and this is resulting in the production of fewer first-rate nurses. Already it is becoming hard to find good Sister Tutors, and with the greatly accelerated promotion rates this difficulty will increase. At the same time, better methods of technical training are apt to be frustrated by the poor basic education of the majority of students. It is almost impossible to teach a girl anatomy and physiology if she reads with difficulty and has never been taught to reason. The result is that more time has to be devoted to repairing these deficiencies with pre-nursing courses.

The profession, in short, has been subjected to state-subsidized dilution and standards have suffered accordingly. Yet without this, possibly half the hospital beds in the country would have been closed; apart from the fact that this would obviously have been a social disaster, it would have been a political blow to the sponsors of the National Health Service. The root cause of the trouble is, quite simply, that (unless all other professions and jobs for girls are to be further raided for recruits) there are not enough young women of adequate intelligence and education in the country to staff both the schools and the hospitals, at the present level of services provided, without lowering standards. ‘Socialization’ makes it easier to dilute the professions, but it cannot find girls who are not there. It is therefore difficult to see how standards are to be prevented from falling further. With technical standards, professional ethics are likely to suffer as well, and indeed there are signs that this is happening already.³⁸

8. SCHOOLTEACHERS

Schoolteaching was the first of the professions to be ‘socialized’—if one accepts the proposition that the ‘teachers’ who staffed the system of schools which emerged from the Act of 1870 and its successors belonged to the same profession as the ‘masters and mistresses’ in the public and grammar schools. Carr-Saunders and Wilson did not

accept this; they regarded them as a new profession.³⁹ The Butler Act—at least in the areas of the best local education authorities—has at any rate brought the two professions nearer to coalition. Adoption of the Burnham scale of salaries as a basis for employment even in private schools is bringing them closer still.

The right of the County schoolteachers to be called a profession has been disputed. It is true that over 300,000 teachers, representing one and a half per cent of all employed persons in the country and including an immensely varied range of functions and qualifications, can hardly be said to constitute a homogeneous profession. But they are organized as one profession, which is more than can be said of the engineers; and their variety of training and function is at least no greater than that of the engineers. It can be held that professional status is degraded to vanishing point when practitioners are subjected to periodical visits from government inspectors to see whether they are doing their job properly. One educationist confided to us his private opinion that the profession will have taken a big step forward towards its proper status on the day when a headmaster throws one of H.M. Inspectors out of a schoolroom window! Leaving on one side the fact that most teachers find H.M.I.'s helpful, we felt bound to point out that the activities of H.M. Inspectors of Mines had rarely induced a professional inferiority complex in the colliery managers, and the experience of inspection would appear to be far less of an affront than, for example, the submission of a dentist's proposals for treatment to the Dental Estimates Board.

On the other hand, a full discussion of the present position and problems of so vast a profession would require a book to itself. Our object here can only be to relate the experience of the teachers to the main theme of this book—especially their relations with other professions. What we have to say will necessarily be synoptic and provocative, and is certain to be challenged as inaccurate and biased. But any generalizations about a profession with 300,000 members are bound to be challenged by at least 30,000 of them. Our own conclusions may well be unpopular with about 240,000.

The teaching profession affords a good example of the processes described in Chapter V; and in particular of the impact on a profession of the state's attempt to give a better service than the country can afford. The plight of the 'socialized' teaching profession was much in the minds of doctors negotiating with Mr Bevan, as it is often in the minds of other professional people. Its position is worsening, as the result both of the increase in the number of schoolchildren to be taught,

and of the rash promises made of better education for all. The upshot has been that standards have declined—more especially academic standards in teaching. The Emergency Training Scheme brought in many new teachers, many of them born teachers, and this saved the educational system from foundering; but in general what has happened in the past few years has been that the profession has been diluted.

No one would wish to overstress the importance of academic standards in infant schools (though the N.U.T. hold that even infant-school teachers, for preference, should have university degrees, as it is highly skilled educational work). Again, it would be foolish to exclude the hope that standards may revive somewhat when the new system of secondary schooling has been going longer. The general average, over the whole educational terrain from infants' to grammar school, may not have fallen very greatly; but it seems certain, nonetheless, that many young men and women are qualifying as teachers now who would not have been acceptable before the war; we note as an unquestionable symptom of dilution the fact that *unqualified* teachers are now being sought to assist in the control and instruction of over-large classes (a partial return to something like the pupil-teacher system, which has even collected a few nostalgic advocates on its own account);⁴⁰ finally, the decline in standards of grammar school teachers has become notorious—and little imagination is required to foresee the probable effects of this on the *next* generation of teachers.

By the Act of 1944, the state undertook to improve the educational system of the country in a number of ways—notably by providing free secondary schooling for all children up to the age of 15 (to be extended later to 16) and for many until the age of about 18. Incidentally, the capital cost of carrying out all the provisions of the Butler Act would have been about £2,000 million. While it would perhaps be going too far to say that the war-time planners of social reform had never got together to discuss the likelihood of the country's future national income being able to support the total expenditure contemplated, it is abundantly clear that both the future economic situation and the costs of individual services were completely miscalculated. On top of these economic miscalculations, the unplannable British people produced a quite unexpectedly large increase in the birth-rate between 1944 and 1948, with the result that monstrous cohorts of infants began to queue in the nurseries for entry at the age of five to schools hitherto unbuilt. County rates began to soar, and County Councils to cast apprehensive glances over their shoulders at the rate-payers.

Year by year, cuts and economies were imposed by successive Socialist Chancellors and Ministers of Education. Each one was greeted with cries of horror from educationists and teachers, as the Brave New World began to disintegrate and the hope of an era of inexhaustible educational budgets faded from preternaturally hopeful minds. Finally, the new Conservative Government of 1951 apparently hit on the highly original new technique of provoking the loudest cries of all by hinting at immense and radical cuts, and then spending slightly more on education than its predecessor, with the result that the agitation fell a little flat and reductions actually made in the inflated estimates went through without much difficulty.

The 'bulge' in the birth-rate in the middle 1940's meant that education authorities were faced with the need to find places for 1,150,000 additional schoolchildren between 1947 and the end of 1953. On the face of it, it might appear that the initial pressure would be felt entirely in the primary schools, and that there would have been no difficulties about finding secondary school places. But the Butler Act made secondary schooling available to all, and the school-leaving age was raised to 15 in 1947, so that the great majority of children (all except those who were staying on after the age of 14 anyway) had to be accommodated for an extra year, while a start had to be made on the reorganization of all-age schools. The pressure on staffs and accommodation was thus felt all through the system. Exceptional measures were taken to increase the supply of teachers, including an expansion of the university and training college systems and the establishment of the Emergency Colleges. All things considered, the system took the strain well, although the cost was terrific.

But it has left an enormously expanded teaching profession, which is nevertheless inadequate to cope with the job which the state has undertaken to do. There is a serious shortage of women teachers, even though some sixty per cent of all the girls who stay at school beyond the age of 15 become teachers. Before the war there was keen competition for the more limited number of places in training colleges. Now there are about 500 empty places. There seems to be no hope of getting the extra teachers at present salaries, unless even the absolute academic standards needed for entry to training colleges are lowered. At present the requirement is a pass in five subjects in the General Certificate of Education at the ordinary level, which effectively precludes any appreciable amount of recruitment from secondary modern schools. Even this sacrifice may soon have to be made; and indeed it cannot be said with confidence that it would result in many recruits

being accepted who are any more unsuitable than the worst of those who are coming into the profession now.

Local authority teachers are regarded as under-paid—and rightly, if what is meant is that a good teacher is worth more and that present salaries will secure good teachers only if their vocation is so strong that they will resist the lure of higher pay elsewhere. But the state has had to sacrifice quality to quantity, and it is not easy to maintain (since the 1951 Burnham Award) that all teachers to-day are under-paid in proportion to their qualifications and the jobs they do. Girls who take the two-year training college course are usually by no means the brightest of those who stay the extra years at school. Having secured a qualification at small expense, they find themselves at the age of 20 with a permanent and pensionable job, three months' holiday in the year, and a position which to many of them represents a clear advance in social status. Further, the job can be made either an excellent training for marriage or a means of satisfying the maternal feelings of those who are less fortunate. Such a girl starting with these prospects and £300 a year can scarcely be said to be under-paid. So heavy is the wastage through marriage that those who evade it have a fair chance of securing a primary school headship while still comparatively young. Similarly, the young men who start at £400 a year and may hope to be earning a total of about £700 a year at the age of 35 are not doing too badly, having regard to the security and pensions attached to their jobs, together with the length of their holidays and the fact that their two-year training was inexpensive and unexacting. However, the shortage of two-year trained men teachers has passed, and promotion (except to primary school headships) is not easy.

The graduate teacher is relatively badly paid, and here lies the danger to the future of the profession. More and more graduates are now going elsewhere for jobs, and the proportion of graduate teachers in grammar schools is falling. Furthermore, since the 1951 Burnham Award abolished the supplementary payment for 1st Class Honours, the proportion of fine scholars entering the profession has further declined. The shortage is worst in science and mathematics, where competition from industry and government is strongest. Some grammar schools have had to close down their science departments altogether, while others find that advertisements for teachers produce only two or three applications from poorly qualified people.

This is said without any intention of 'attacking the teachers', for we well know that few other professions can compare with the devotion of the teachers. Except for a vocal minority, they have been unbeliev-

ably patient in working conditions which have tried them to the limit, and they have unhesitatingly put the interests of the children first. It is not their fault that the state promised to do something which it could not possibly carry out—to give a *longer and better* education to a greatly increased number of children. But it is surely time that the state's failures were faced realistically.

The state will not get more women teachers without either lowering standards of qualification (in which case the schools will start to compete for recruits with nursing and several other callings, so that secondary effects will be felt elsewhere) or increasing salaries. Teachers' salaries already account for anything from a half to three-quarters of a local education authority's total expenditure, and circumstances are against a further increase in the basic scale. In the end, qualifications will probably be lowered, in accordance with the general trend which we sketched in Chapter V. The National Union of Teachers will fight this, because it will take the normal trade union view than 'dilution' represents a threat to its bargaining powers and salary scales. It will not, of course, say this, but will base its opposition on a plea for the maintenance of academic standards.

This plea would be more acceptable if the N.U.T. were not itself largely responsible for the decline in academic standards in grammar schools. Since the overwhelming majority of its members are teachers in primary and secondary modern schools, it has allowed itself to take the easy, egalitarian way of the majority and has steadfastly opposed any increase in salary differentials for graduates—and these alone can preserve the standards of the grammar schools, which are all-important as producers of future leaders in industry, administration, and the professions.

Though teachers may be paid relatively better than they were, they suffer from the fact that their profession is so large, so diverse, and more dependent on the state than ever before. Nevertheless, it *is* a profession, and capable of acting as such. The National Union of Teachers, although its trade union features have outgrown its professional aspects, reacted to the 'closed shop' dispute with the Durham County Council in 1951 in the highest professional tradition, and maintained its stand to the point of victory—despite the strong left-wing majority among its leaders. A profession which is capable of behaving like this on a point of abstract principle is surely capable of looking beyond the end of its collective nose where the ultimate standards of education are concerned, especially as these standards will ultimately dictate its own status in the community, and perhaps even decide whether that community survives at all.

9. LAWYERS

The profession of the law is not yet 'socialized' to any marked extent,* although the process has begun. The reasons for the demand for it are obvious. The cost of litigation, and even of defending oneself against criminal or civil proceedings, had become prohibitive to the majority of the people, and this state of affairs began to look somewhat inconsistent with the famous 'ideals of British Justice'. Since lawyers themselves, despite continual prodding and a few fair promises to mend their ways, consistently failed to reduce either costs or the terrifying delays in the processes of the law which so often inflate the costs, the state had to step in with subsidies to the consumer. This process culminated in the Legal Aid and Advice Act, 1949, which was to set up a comprehensive system of legal aid for those of moderate means, based on a means test and a graduated scale of contributions by the litigant. Before the scheme came into operation, however, all but a small part of the Act was made a dead letter by a sudden economy campaign on the part of the Labour Government. The putting into effect of the scheme was to be deferred indefinitely, with the exception of aid in proceedings started in the High Court or Court of Appeal, or remitted from the High Court to a County Court.

Nevertheless, the Law Society, which was charged with the administration of the scheme, threw itself with happy abandon into the task of setting up a large bureaucratic organization.⁴¹ Twelve administrative areas were instituted, each with an Area Committee, and panels of solicitors and barristers were enrolled. Each area had a permanent secretary, with staffs recruited in grades and with fixed salary scales. 'Establishments' for area staffs were formally approved by the Lord Chancellor. Then the staffs were trained, through special courses in London. Thirty-seven sets of office premises were next sought. One can scarcely avoid commenting on the fact that, when the first year's accounts of the scheme were published,⁴² fees to solicitors and counsel were found to have totalled £5,137 and disbursements in aid of legal costs £24,171—but the total cost of administration, etc., was £276,391! It is, of course, true that this included initial expenses, while the issue of legal aid certificates had scarcely got into its stride, but still . . . Some 13,000—or about eighty-one per cent—of the legal aid certificates issued in the first year were in respect of divorce cases. It is

* Ninety per cent of the members of the Law Society are in private practice; the percentage of barristers is not so high.

therefore not wholly unfair to conclude that this tremendous social service, planned to bring British justice within the reach of all, had ended up as little more than a method of speeding up the disintegration of family life.

Obviously there will be demands for the process of socialization to go further. Equally obviously, unless the lawyers are prepared rapidly to set their own house in order, the whole structure of the two professions will be in the greatest danger. So far, all has gone well. The professional associations have had control of the scheme, and there have been adequate safeguards for the maintenance of professional ethics.⁴³ But, sooner or later, the lawyers will have to face a much stronger demand for a complete free service of legal aid, which will make judge, prosecutor, and defending counsel equally the paid servants of the state. The present independence and impartiality of our judges should not be hailed with too much certainty as a guarantee that the legal profession will be able to remain independent in the circumstances we have forecast.

We cannot, obviously, embark on a discussion of legal reform. There is already an official committee sitting with weighty and protracted deliberation on the question, and various books have been written about it.⁴⁴ It seems likely that the economic facts of life will in any case bring about some changes in the professions in the near future. If house prices begin to fall, solicitors will find their most profitable source of income in danger, while both solicitors and barristers will quickly feel the pinch of deflation in income from those industrial and commercial companies which have spent freely on legal aid since the war. Many of the barristers who at the age of 40 are still hopefully existing on incomes of about £400 a year in the confident expectation that either 'things will get better' or they themselves will suddenly make a name and enjoy a flow of fat briefs will have to look elsewhere for a living. More barristers may—despite the difficulties—have to carry on sidelines outside the courts.

The number of small solicitors' firms will almost certainly decline sharply. This is to be deplored, since the tradition of the family solicitor is a good one. Unfortunately, so few of them engender much confidence, for few have moved with the times—or even with the multiplication and complication of legislation. It is no longer true, as it was in Trollope's day, that

'there is no form of belief stronger than that which the ordinary English gentleman has in the discretion and honesty of his own family lawyer. What his lawyer tells him to do, he does. What his lawyer tells him to

sign, he signs. He buys and sells in obedience to the same direction, and feels perfectly comfortable in the possession of a guide who is responsible and all but divine.'

We have been astonished, when interrogating our friends about their family solicitors, how often we got replies in such disrespectful words as these: 'Oh, he's just an old sheep. He's all right for making wills and that sort of thing, but if anything serious happened to us we'd have to find a smart Jew in the City.' *Verb. sap.*, and pregnant with doom for the profession. The lawyers could no doubt reform their education and training, reform the practice and processes of the law, even reform the law itself if they felt like it. But probably they will not feel like it. Yet is salvation really likely to come to the public from a state scheme of legal aid? How much better if it could come from what was once the greatest—even if never the most popular—of the ancient learned professions.

NOTES

1. Dr T. F. Fox's Croonian Lecture, reprinted in *The Lancet*, 28 July 1951.
2. A. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, 1933, p. 502.
3. E.g. a review of the N.H.S. published by *The Practitioner*, Autumn 1949. Also several White Papers, and *The Lancet* and *British Medical Journal*, *passim*.
4. Chapter IX.
5. *The Times* reported it fully during the spring and summer of 1948.
6. Iain Macleod, M.P., and J. Enoch Powell, M.P., *The Social Services: Needs and Means*, C.P.C., 1952.
7. *The Lancet*, 25 March 1940.
8. *The Times*, 24 March 1950.
9. *The Lancet*, *loc. cit.*
10. W. Edwards, M.D., *The Art is Long*, 1947, p. 11.
11. *University College Hospital Magazine*, Spring 1951.
12. Cf. letter to *The Times*, 3 June 1950, from R. A. Murray Scott.
13. See *The Lancet*, *British Medical Journal*, and *The Practitioner*, *passim*. Also reports of Select Committee on Estimates.
14. *Ibid.*
15. See Note 13.
16. Cf. *The Times*, 17 April 1950. In the end, the number of registrars was cut.
17. See *The Times*, 16 February, 1951, p. 2.
18. p. 164.
19. Cmd. 6727, February 1946.
20. *Fuller Dental Service for the People*, British Dental Association.
21. *Report of Committee on the Remuneration of Consultants and Specialists*, Cmd. 7420, H.M.S.O., 1948.
22. *One Nation*, by a group of Conservative M.P.s, C.P.C., 1950, p. 55.
23. *Hansard*, 15 May 1950, cols. 911-54.
24. Iain Macleod, M.P., in *Hansard*, *loc. cit.*, col. 947.
25. *British Medical Journal*, *Supplement*, 1930, vol. I, p. 140.
26. See F. W. Skinnard, *The Status and Training of the Sight-Testing Optician*, Association of Ophthalmic Practitioners, for a full description of the system.

27. *The National Health Service*, H.M.S.O., 1948.
28. G. H. Giles, in *The British Optician*, August 1949.
29. G. H. Giles, in address to Executive Councils Association (England), 12 October 1951.
30. Published by the Association of Optical Practitioners.
31. *Reports of the Committees on Medical Auxiliaries*, Cmd. 8188, H.M.S.O., 1951.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Hansard*, 19 April 1951.
34. *Hansard*, 21 June 1951, col. 691.
35. *Ibid.*, col. 692.
36. *Report of Nursing Reconstruction Committee*, Royal College of Nursing, 1943, Section III, p. 57.
37. *Ibid.* See also Working Party's *Report on the Recruitment and Training of Nurses*, H.M.S.O., 1948; and Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, *Observations on Working Party's Report*, 1948.
38. Cf. correspondence in the *Sunday Times*, 3 and 10 February 1951, including a letter from a S.R.N. who writes: 'I have recently heard nurses of senior rank laugh at such ethics as courtesy, loyalty, team spirit, honour, charity, and human understanding, and say that there are no such things and that they are just earning their living.' (10 February.)
39. P. 479.
40. E.g. *The Times Educational Supplement*, 1 February 1951, article entitled 'Secondary Modern Girls', from 'A Correspondent'.
41. See *First Report of the Law Society on the Operation and Finance of Part I of the Legal Aid and Advice Act, 1949*, H.M.S.O., 1951, pp. 4-16.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 47-8.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
44. The most recent, and one of the most comprehensive, is *The Reform of the Law*, by a group of Socialist lawyers and edited by Professor Glanville Williams, 1951.

Educating the Expert

'A lawyer without history or literature is a mechanic, a mere working man; if he possess some knowledge of these, he may venture to call himself an architect.'

SIR WALTER SCOTT, *Guy Mannering*

'Men are men before they are lawyers or physicians or manufacturers; and if you make them capable men and sensible men, they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers or physicians.'

J. S. MILL, in the inaugural lecture at St Andrews

'It is necessary to make the ordinary man a good professional. Besides his apprenticeship to culture, the university will teach him, by the most economical, direct and efficacious procedures intellect can devise, to be a good doctor, a good judge, a good teacher of mathematics or of history.'

ORTEGA Y GASSET, *Mission of the University*

IN EDUCATION, the many problems examined in the preceding chapters come to a head. Specialization has been intensified as knowledge expanded and techniques became more complex: but now the cry goes up that the specialist must have his outlook broadened and his basic studies widened. Even on the most utilitarian view, advanced modern technologies demand the understanding of several sciences and their applications; beyond that, on the crudest calculation of professional interest, every vocational discipline needs now to fit men and women for administrative work, which intrudes increasingly into professional routine and, as a separate function, carries the highest rewards. Administrative work to-day requires a grounding in the elements of several *professions*, as well as, in many cases, the mastery of a technology.

Beyond these already exacting requirements of present-day administration, looms urgently the unresolved question of the social impact of the expert's activities. To ignore this is to repudiate professional leadership—to rely for social understanding upon specialized psychologists and sociologists, who add to the babel of jargon. But the satisfaction of all these requirements means lengthening professional training at a time when teachers are themselves attracted from their

own work into the ranks of other professions. While the experts, to be equal to their work, need to know more, the state is in a hurry to get more and more experts. The state seeks simultaneously to encourage them to get a better training, and to reduce the period of training in order to get qualified men from anywhere, anyhow; at the same time it is trying to curb rising costs. So, with the cry for better and broader-minded experts, goes the steady attenuation of the educational basis upon which the whole structure is built, the hurried creation of new classes of semi-professionals, 'technical assistants', 'dental hygienists' and the rest, who inevitably aspire to rise in the professional world, yet whose training is more narrow, occupational and inadequate even than that which went before.

1. THE FAILURE OF TECHNICAL SPECIALIZATION

It is important, however, to put the problem of specialization into perspective. As a reading of history shows, specialization is a law of life for social as for biological evolution. The principle of increasing division of labour holds good for professional people, as well as for Adam Smith's pin-makers. Whatever may be the definition of the much-discussed 'Whole Man', it includes the cultivation of special abilities*—the Whole Man is a specialist, whatever else he is. (Another of the things he is, one suspects, is a nostalgic ideal.) Education has always made provision for this awkward fact of human nature. Moreover, educators have at most periods brought some form of occupational training† into the broadest curriculum for higher studies. Not to realize this is to misunderstand the function of schools, universities, and technical colleges, and to allow barriers of prejudice and ignorance to grow up between them. 'In the medieval universities the work of the Arts Faculty was only preliminary to the higher work of the professional schools of Theology, Law and Medicine', Sir Walter Moberly reminds us,¹ and quotes Professor Rashdall's statement that many medieval universities 'were almost entirely occupied with professional education', preparing students not for lifelong research, but for careers. The advantage of medieval man was that his professional training was short enough to leave him time for a fairly thorough understanding of the organization of his world, and of its relation to the next. In this he enjoyed a unity with his surroundings which has since been lost.

* Psychologists distinguish general intelligence (G) from special abilities (S) in the human individual's hereditary make-up.

† The most serious-minded now call it 'pre-vocational training', to avoid the charge of over-specialization.

It was lost as knowledge grew, running up sprawling suburbs beyond the theological wall and moat built round medieval natural science—it was lost as doubt and uncertainty became part of scientific method, as heresy and innovation became part of the adventure of professional practice, in law, medicine, architecture, and technology. For a long time the universities clung to the fading vision of unity, but it gradually became a mere encyclopaedism. In England, the provincial universities were founded as a reaction against this encyclopaedism, which was no longer a structure of knowledge, but an ever-growing pile of discrete bricks. It was inevitable; the sciences grew up separately and empirically, the paths between them only partially marked out, so that in general they were divided by ill-defined and unexplored frontier areas. The result was the Honours Degree in this or that science: specialization. 'Society, at the time most of us came into being, lacked technicians and schoolteachers as once it lacked clerics; and just as the older universities were founded to meet the earlier need, so the newer were brought into being to satisfy the latter.'² Engineering became respectable at Cambridge in 1878, at Oxford in 1907.

Now things have come full circle—though in a wide sweep. The sciences have been linked; Nature, seen through men's eyes, has become a unity once more, however great the gaps may be in our knowledge of the processes and purposes of life; to grasp this new vision of unity requires, however, a huge range of learning.* (See pp. 240–1). For professions based on technology this has produced great difficulties in the training curriculum. The old distinctions have been blurred, and new problems require extraordinary hybrids in technological *expertise*. Sir John Cockcroft's triumph in smashing the atom in 1932 was less one of pure physics than of electrical engineering.³ The need for technologists more broadly based has been vividly demonstrated.

One of the reasons why British industry has been slow to apply the outstanding results of fundamental science emanating from British universities has been the shortage of such technologists—and this shortage is a reflection not merely on inadequate university technical training for them, but also on the somewhat traditional views still held by the British engineering institutions. America took the lead long ago, as witness the findings of almost any of the sixty or seventy productivity reports issued in 1950–51. It is significant that in America,

* This has not halted the process of scientific specialization. No one is now a 'biologist' in the old sense; there are experts in different branches of biology. Nevertheless, the mating of the sciences has produced new hybrid specialities, such as bio-chemistry and metallurgy.

which relies more on state universities and technological institutes than on learned professional institutions, no attempt is made to divide engineering into watertight compartments, or to 'separate it from 'mere technology'; there is not the same touchiness about professional status on the part of the American engineer-technologist, whatever his defects. In Britain the Big Three—the Institutions of Civil, Mechanical, and Electrical Engineers—hold that 'chemical engineering' is neither fundamental chemistry nor fundamental engineering, and that a M.I. Chem.E. is not (if those be his only letters designate) professional in the sense that a M.I. Mech.E. is; yet the triumphs of American technology are largely ascribed to the rapid development of chemical engineering in that country, and to the large output of chemical engineers, whose potent art is the child of two scientific disciplines.⁴

In theory, the hybrid technologist has a wider understanding of the sciences and their inter-relationships than, for example, a mechanical engineer. In practice, in Britain, institutes of brewing, rubber technology, dairy technology, plastics, building, or textiles 'teach technique to technicians' rather than create the true technologist—'one who needs a basic training in general science',⁵ and for whose bare academic skeleton at least a three-year university degree course, followed by a year or more of post-graduate work, is considered a minimum. Training needs to be lengthened at both ends: the immature mind in the late 'teens requires to be taught principles, and the trained mind, after graduation, then needs to be made familiar with an ever-growing variety of interlocking techniques, whose mastery in turn forces continual reference back to fundamentals. To meet the shortage of the sort of technologist wanted, the individual student needs more education, and more intellects are needed which are capable of this better education. Whether the economy can afford or supply either is a matter already considered in Chapter V.

A comparable dilemma is found in the 'health professions', of which medicine remains the core, although it is now unable to function effectively without the assistance of auxiliaries and social workers. The practical necessity of specialization at the hospital level is challenged by the conception of 'psycho-somatic medicine', demanding the treatment of the Whole Man as a whole. The G.P. can no longer do this at the exalted scientific level required by developments in every science from neurology to psychopathology; the hospital specialist remains a specialist. But preventive medicine, and indeed health, now assessable in terms of its economic value, requires that the patient be treated continually—educated in health to begin with, watched at

his home and working environment, treated in hospital for every possible ailment. The result has been both to swell the medical curriculum with new lines of study, and to create new and unrelated types of training, even though the basis—health—is the same for all. Dentists and consulting opticians need to know more about the relation of teeth and eyes to the whole man than they ever did, and their training becomes more complex; the problem of teaching a nurse all she needs to know to follow medical instruction in modern medicine is becoming almost insuperable. 'Not only does the nurse require to know the answer to such questions as why one heart case must be nursed in the recumbent position, and another upright, and why an extension weight causes a pain when too heavy in one case, and when too light in another; but to-day she must also be a health teacher and educator. As the scope of medicine increases, so does the scope of nursing'.⁶ Nurses, like doctors, inevitably specialize to a growing degree. The other health professions have indeed begun by specializing: they make no attempt at any common preliminary education in social health, even though 'social medicine', as a new hybrid study, is now well recognized. 'It has been suggested . . . that there might be some common training in basic sciences for some medical auxiliaries . . . We are sympathetic with this view . . . We fear, however, that there are often practical difficulties', notes one investigation;⁷ yet, 'if this is not done, the ultimate result will be as many certificates as there are types of social workers in the welfare state', warns another.⁸

Any such improvements, even if designed merely to enable social workers 'to become acquainted with the work in related services' leading to 'better teamwork when the student becomes qualified',⁹ would involve lengthening and widening the course, and putting up costs of training. The result of the recommendations of the Goodenough Report on medical training has been to lengthen the time before a doctor can be registered, in the cause of giving him a broader picture of his work, in a training in which teachers 'tend to be concerned too much with the status of their particular specialities and thus to perpetuate in the minds of their students a distorted view of the relationship between the specialities and general medicine'.

As in health, so in commerce: a wide range of narrow specialities has been developed by professional bodies, technical colleges, and even universities to meet the demands of trade and industry, which in consequence were never so rich in experts as to-day, and never in such sore straits for men capable of top management. The need is for vision, and understanding of the total commercial picture, which now

merges into economics and government at one side, and into social health on the other. 'A •bewilderingly complicated provision of facilities for the study of commercial subjects'¹⁰ produces, in watertight compartments, actuaries, insurance brokers, banking graduates, chartered secretaries, statisticians, and five or six separate kinds of accountant, besides the specialized types of 'functional manager' whose efforts to achieve corporate status were described in Chapter VII. There are specialists without end, training courses and certificates in even richer profusion and complexity than those of the social workers and medical auxiliaries—but no provision for a broad understanding of commerce and industry as a whole. Nor is the mastery of a variety of techniques placed within the grasp of men with the ability to rise to positions of control and responsibility, to bring the experience of commerce to bear in central or local government or in the administration of other professional services.*

Finally a word must be said about the divorce of all these practical specialisms, whether in the technological group, in the health group or in the commercial and administrative group, from the arts and crafts. While it is conceded that the technologist is 'one who needs a training in basic sciences', and the need to inject humanities and sociology into this basic training is accepted by advanced educationists (though mainly in the hope that it will produce a solid return in terms of ability to run companies and offices at a later date with a minimum of strikes or bankruptcies), it is rarely conceded that the broadening process must reanimate the aesthetic feeling lost soon after the medieval unities were broken up and buried by technological specialization. It is so deeply buried that nobody knows how it can be revived, as the state of the arts, described in Chapter X, bears witness. But it has implications even for the practical man. Thus we find on the one hand the chartered structural engineer thinking of himself as the designer and constructor of buildings, and the architect as the fellow who puts the pretty-pretty on after the engineer has done the real job; and on the other the production engineer thinking of the industrial designer as the man who 'pretties up' the case or package, after he has done *his* job, to please the silly customer who wouldn't know naked engineering worth when he saw it.

For the architect this promises disaster—he may find himself hard pressed to master a dozen engineering techniques, and may end by

* The naively enthusiastic description of the wonders of punched-card accounting and record technique in the Law Society's Report on the first year of the working of the Legal Aid scheme is an amusing instance of the broadening of the professional mind by contact with the commonplaces of other specialities.

not mastering the engineer when that barbarian presumes to dictate the fundamentals of house (or flat) design because he knows the principles of bridge or factory design. It would be an ill day on which the architect was driven to become a sort of adviser to the engineer, or was compelled to join himself commercially to a building firm in order to get the facilities for research on structures which his office lacks and his training is not broad enough to give. He should *be* the structural engineer. On the other hand, either the industrial designer should *be* the production engineer or the production engineer should be as versed in aesthetic form as in plant layout and the handling of materials. If our culture had not lost its unity, the industrial designer would probably never have emerged, a parasite in the larval stage, from eggs laid by the art school in the body of the artist, searching for an engineer to serve as host. As it is, there is some danger that the force of specialization may turn the architect into just such a parasite on the engineer as is the industrial designer. There is a suggestive analogy with the management consultant, who exists because the engineer's and accountant's specialized training leaves them both inadequate as administrators.

2. TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS

The established institutions are in no hurry to abandon the present specialist-producing routine until something better is proposed. To the criticism that we have not enough broad-minded technologists, they retort that the British professional engineer at his best has no equal. Engineering science, they contend, draws from the best brains that the university engineering faculties can produce. At the same time the system of ordinary and Higher National Certificates in engineering (first instituted in Mechanical Engineering in 1923 and since extended to many of the sciences such as chemistry and physics), enables an ambitious and able intellect to acquire simultaneously a qualification at the bench and at technical school; this, through its insistence upon a grasp of fundamental science, produces a trained mind (if not a rounded personality) not inferior to that produced by the university. Nonetheless, they watch its result with austere eyes: 'if there is one criticism of this type of education', Dr Lea told the Institution of Mechanical Engineers in his presidential address in 1944, 'it is that it lacks the possibility of that complete investigation of fundamentals which can only be studied effectively under somewhat more leisured conditions. This results in the danger of the instruction becoming

empirical rather than being of that fundamental character which should be implied when we speak of "scientific education".

This is all very fine and large—but meanwhile where is the missing technologist? A long series of official committees and reports culminated in 1950 in the proposal to create a new Royal Institution of Technologists to provide technical colleges with the wherewithal and offer the students the 'substantial inducement' necessary to produce 'a man broader in outlook, yet realistic in approach and with real knowledge of industrial conditions gained through practical experience.'¹¹ The new body was, in fact, to give a new sort of degree for a technical college course, without requiring graduates to hold a responsible position before gaining the distinction of election to a learned body. This proposal appalled not only most of the engineering institutions, but the scientific professional bodies too. Ready to welcome the expenditure of money on teachers, equipment, scholarships, and premises for technical colleges, they dislike and distrust any suggestion that technical education should be rewarded with a degree rather than regarded as a practical and theoretical preliminary for election to one of the professional bodies, or for taking London University external degrees.

They see, in any such proposal, *dilution*: an attempt not to provide a new kind of professional education leading to a new kind of expert, equal in quality to existing engineers or industrial chemists, but to produce an inferior grade—simply to fill up the shortages which the professional bodies are behindhand in filling. They are behindhand just because, as they have warned government departments, they will not lower standards by stretching their facilities beyond the point at which training will be thorough. 'Only where a technology is based to a major extent on more than one science—as is now generally recognized to be true for chemical engineering and metallurgy, and may be so for textile technology—may it become desirable to institute a special undergraduate's course for that technology', is the most they concede.¹²

Behind their fear of dilution of education lies an older professional fear—the infringement of status and privileges. These latter have in the past been won by raising the standards of training. Now both are threatened. They fear that a new body, dignified as 'Royal', would in fact gather power and prestige, and in time its awards, though much inferior, would rank with theirs. For a Royal Institution of Technologists would in fact become at once a learned society and a professional body, composed of all the Bachelors of Brewing, Rubber, Timber, Clockmaking, Fine Instruments, and so forth, who held their 'degrees'

from it. It could hardly help becoming in time a state-aided and state-controlled super-professional body. That its awards were granted on mere examination results would be forgotten, and the time would come when political pressure would force a government of the day to compel the professional and scientific civil services and the nationalized industries to accept the graduates of the Royal Institution of Technologists on equal terms with members of the established professional institutions. Once the R.I.T. awards could get a man into a state job, like Gresham's Law for money, the bad examination and inferior training would drive out the good.

This is a very real fear. As specialities are narrowed and refined and examinations and higher degrees become more difficult under the pressure of the desire of professional bodies to keep standards up-to-date, the need to train the not-quite-so-good brains to do technicians' jobs grows. We need, in the view of an Anglo-American productivity team,¹³ to make more of our second-rate brains; to which the British universities and professional institutions retort that this is quite a different matter from giving them awards which will enable them to pass as intellectual equals of the man with an Honours Degree, or as comparable in toughness and pertinacity with the man who has won a London External B.Sc. through the Higher National Certificate.

The engineering and scientific institutions are not alone in opposing dilution. The Institute of Chartered Accountants has reacted as adversely to the suggestions of the Committee on Education for Commerce. This committee held that the training of accountants is narrow and occupational, because articles can begin at the age of 16, and that this produces men unfit for posts of responsibility. The I.C.A. also strongly objected to any standardization of commercial training, up to the age of 18, seeing in all the suggestions a desire to lower the Institute's standards and prestige to those of less particular bodies.¹⁴

It would be wrong to suggest that government consciously desires to lower professional standards except in one or two instances.* In

* One of these is the lowering of training standards for Naval officers, though this has largely been brought about by a Socialist government's obsession with equality. Under the older system boys were selected at 13½ for Dartmouth, on their showing, first, in a stiff interview, and secondly on written papers, so that out of 250 applications for boys (at full fee-paying rates) only 40 were accepted per term. To-day boys are selected at 16 almost wholly upon written papers: the applicants inevitably consisting mainly of those who, after four or five years at a secondary school, cannot get a better-paid job than that of a Naval officer. Not only is the result the selection of a rather less desirable type of boy, in terms of character and motive, but the intensity of indoctrination into Naval method and tradition has been reduced. The standards for officers entering by other ways have also been somewhat lowered (apart from lower-deck promotions), and in general, in the view of the older generation of Naval officers, a reduction in

the past it has, though in most cases at the behest of the professions themselves, done much to raise them. Sheer pressure may force it to recognize the need for and existence of, less skilled grades: even in medicine, the G.P. may become a less skilled grade of doctor, while the shortage of women of the required intelligence ready to train as nurses has forced the creation of the 'assistant nurse'. Talk of the need for a better all-round technologist conceals the fact that what is being produced, and is needed in still larger numbers, is engineering *technicians*. These brainworkers are not satisfied with inferior status. They deem the talk of fundamental studies to be simply class snobbery or gild exclusiveness, and think a practical skill as worthy of a degree, or membership of some qualifying body, as any amount of 'book learning'. All are experts; all experts should be equal. They believe implicitly in examinations; they do not like the stipulation to prove their worth in a 'responsible position'.

Many engineers, holding a Higher National Certificate, resent the fact that, just because they teach, or do a mere routine job, they have to be content with associate membership of the Civils, Mechanicals, or Electricals, and are refused election to full membership. Indeed, the tendency for these bodies to become more jealous of their full membership is a grievance, and so is their tendency to stiffen exams. Representatives of the building trade who serve on the Architects' Registration Council, which was created to uphold training standards when the title 'architect' was protected by Act of Parliament, in fact offer resistance to the R.I.B.A.'s continual pressure to raise standards in line with the march of construction technology; the Association of Building Trade Technicians have even considered establishing their own examination and qualification. Again, clerks in the Inland Revenue department, who are trained to do valuation work, ask why they should be refused membership of the Chartered Auctioneers' and Estate Agents' Institute, or the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors simply because they have not done five years' articles in a private office? What culture, what contacts with life and affairs, can such a training give, they ask, that the revenue clerks (who knock off punc-

quality seems inevitable. The younger generation shows an interest in status and in pay and pension which was less common before the war, and it marries very young, whereas Naval officers without private means previously were expected to regard themselves as married to the Service—at least until 30–35 years of age. It might be argued that these changes were necessitated by parents' inability to pay fees, and by the shortage of boys of the highest type offering for the service, on the analogy of other professions. Certainly there is something in this argument, even if the difficulties are of the welfare state's own making; but a primary motive, undoubtedly, was Socialist dislike of the old type of Naval officer.

tually at 5.30) don't get? The National Federation of Professional Workers, with a 400,000 'white collar' membership, is, like other trade unions, strongly in favour of the proposed Royal Institution of Technologists, on the ground that it will offer opportunities for the 'under-privileged', and not keep men and women out simply because they haven't the brains or application to pass a stiff examination in academic (and therefore rather unimportant) subjects, put there for reasons of class consciousness. Similarly, majority opinion in the National Union of Teachers believes that all schoolteaching is more or less the same job, and should be paid at a rate for the job: it would be nice if all teachers were university graduates, but meanwhile the certificated teacher from a training college is as good as the First in Greats.

This is indeed the nemesis of specialization and the nemesis of professionalism too. Because so many of the experts, be they engineers or chemists, chartered accountants or architects, are distinguished from their fellows only by a single, if highly developed, brain-function, they are not by their fellows considered worth the privileges and honours that were once conceded to educated men, all of whose faculties were developed and harmonized by their training. Because limited professional and semi-professional skills are awarded degrees and letters designate, everybody wants them, everybody judges merit by them; the examination is exalted above personality and trial of personal worth. A naturalized Briton of our acquaintance, interested in managerial studies, noticed this is as a sign of deterioration in national character. 'When I came to Britain before the war', he said, 'I was astonished that nobody asked me if I had a degree, or specialized qualifications, or showed any interest when I told them I had; when it came to a question of jobs in business or an institution, what mattered was the interview and, if that passed off well, my showing in a probationary period of employment. But to-day every English youth or girl seems to want a diploma or certificate to prove their worth, and to be an associate of something; it's the first thing that comes up on an application form or in an interview. Soon, perhaps, it will be like Germany: a man with a degree can *insist* on a larger dowry from the girl's parents when he decides to get married.'

3. UNIVERSITY OR INSTITUTE?

How far have the universities themselves contributed to this result? Oxford and Cambridge, and to a lesser extent 'Redbrick', have held

themselves aloof from the narrower forms of professional and occupational training. They have been forced to produce specialists, but they have endeavoured, however imperfectly, to teach a speciality in such a way that it constitutes a liberal education. Dr H. B. Charlton, in his *Portrait of a University*, has pointed out that the secret of the university teaching process is to pursue science in all subjects, academic or professional, using the word science in the fuller sense which includes art:

‘Science means, first, the study of the rational principles underlying each subject or art, and second, establishing relations between one subject and another, generalizing or distinguishing, which process is the beginning of philosophy . . . what art or passion is to the workman, science is to the knowledge which is required for the practice of the professions, which, however little we may like to think so, are as much crafts as the work of the artisan—the craft of the surgeon or doctor, of the lawyer, of the teacher or the architect. So far as these are mere crafts they may be practised with the dullness of routine or may be animated with art or passion. But these higher crafts, for which academic studies are preliminary, have in a higher degree than the lower ones the advantage that the practice of them depends on a previous cultivation of knowledge . . . and even if a professional man can carry no further the science he has learnt, can at most keep himself abreast of new knowledge and new methods, he has acquired at the University . . . the spirit of science which liberalizes knowledge by keeping it free of mere habit and utility.’

But to define the university's part in professional training in these words is to state the shortcomings of much, probably most, university teaching. It is just because this fundamental liberalizing influence is so often ineffective that, in America for example, efforts are being made to broaden specialist studies by ‘a twenty per cent admixture of the humanities’. And it is just because the young are so obstinately utilitarian and preoccupied with getting a job that any attempt to depart from what is strictly relevant to qualification is resented as a waste of time, and even of ‘their’ money.

In Britain more reliance has been placed on educating different types of specialists in the same institution, the theory being that ‘the bulk of general education should be done outside the laboratory and lecture room through student activities, so that student could educate student’.¹⁵ It is doubtful how effective such a process is in non-residential universities, and clearly it can be of little efficacy in technical colleges, unless these are improved out of recognition and attached to universities rather than to potteries, breweries, and watch and clock

factories. What happens, again, to such a principle of 'student educating student' in the proposed Universities of Technology which have been suggested to remedy the shortage of 'men who can bring to technical problems the large outlook of scientific method?' Dr Bronowski, who provides that definition of technologists, insists that:

'A university of technology need not neglect the humanities. Indeed the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has recently underlined their importance and that of economic and social studies. For if the technologist is to influence the direction of industry and of the state he must become more than a scientist: he must become a man of knowledge and sound judgment, who can see the technical problem in its whole setting.'¹⁶

It may be asked, what *is* a university of technology which teaches humanities as successfully as Dr Bronowski would require, but another university: one that simultaneously teaches engineering as well as Cambridge, medicine as well as King's, London, metallurgy as well as Birmingham, agricultural science as soundly as Reading, *and* the humanities, not as a meaningless extra taught by second-raters, but as Oxford teaches them? Nevertheless there is growing support in this country for the setting up of an institution which shall embody the best features of such foreign colleges as Massachusetts, Zürich, and Delft; some of it from university teachers, who see a chance of purging their own quadrangles of many of the scientists and engineers, whose increasing influence they deplore. Others take the view that it would divert from the universities a class of students with no aspirations to culture and with little to contribute to the community of scholars. This would enable them to push outside the universities responsibilities for solving the problem of the divorce between the 'technical training' which may not enter the precincts and the respectable technology which may.

4. WANTED—ADMINISTRATORS

More, however, will be required than giving all professions a foundation of liberal education. If the cult of Bigness, of increasingly large social services and of state planning continues unabated, more and more professions will be faced with the problem of shaping their education in such a way that they can produce their own corps of administrators. Should they fail to do so, they would run the danger of being administered by laymen—and, worse still, by those trained from youth to be administrators.

We have seen that industry is divided upon the question whether managers should be made a separate profession, the majority opinion being that specific training for management may be useful, but only for those who have already proved themselves in technical or commercial responsibility. But some foundation must be laid for such later administrative work—and this will swell the curriculum further. It means for the engineer or scientist a grounding in management accounting, for the accountant not only the economic background which the new course arranged by the Redbrick universities and the three major accountancy bodies is intended to supply, but an understanding of technological processes.

Nor is that the end of the inflation. 'Human relations' has now become a department of study, rather than an amalgam of culture, good manners, and intuition into people's feelings. In many American business schools 'the foundation sciences', psychology and sociology as well as economics, must be absorbed by the luckless novice. This is a thorny problem, seeing that many of the present university social science departments are inadequate and inefficient, teaching woolly subjects rather badly.¹⁷ But the would-be administrator cannot escape these 'sciences', if we are to resist the rapid development of yet another specialist profession: 'occupational psychologists, occupational sociologists, occupational anthropologists, call them what you will' was the alluring prospect held out for industry at the 1951 British Association meeting.¹⁸

If it be agreed that a sound professional training (following a liberal education) whether medical, legal, or technological, supplies the best foundation for the development of the personalities and powers of men and women with gifts of organization and leadership, it seems indisputable that training in the use of 'tools of management' should be given in post-graduate courses, and probably at staff courses still later in life. Only a proportion of those with professional training show these gifts in any case. For those who do, a well thought-out training is an aid to efficiency and breadth of vision. The 'higher degree' which is a valuable feature of medical specialization, might well be introduced for administrative training into such professions as medicine, engineering, and accountancy, and should be of comparable content. It should be taken only by those who have shown a bent for organization, and should therefore not be of the kind awarded, for example, by the Institute of Industrial Administration. The aim of such a degree would be to give the experience of several professions to the specialist.

In this respect, other professions have something to learn from the methods of the Forces. The Administrative Staff College works on similar lines but here the subjects studied and experiences pooled are those of industrial and commercial strategy. It has been suggested by Lord Hankey that science and technology ought to possess a comparable staff college, mainly to bring those concerned with research and those concerned with organization together for periods (three to six months, not a week or two as is the case with conferences) of fruitful common study, based largely on the intensive 'case history' method. The professions of medicine and law, accountancy and probably teaching should participate, with the technologists, in this or some such combined administrative study courses.* Writing on the value of such pooling of experience, Sir Hector Hetherington has pointed out: 'A time comes in eight or ten or fifteen years when, having learned and practised his calling, a man does well to cease a little from action and think about what he is doing and why and how he is doing it'.¹⁹ If this be true of soldiers, sailors, and civil servants, how true must it be of physicians, social workers, lawyers, or teachers involved in the operation of health, legal aid, and educational services (all of which have common frontiers).

The professions must face the challenge presented to them by the Protean growth of the administrative function. Previous chapters have shown that further socialization of professional services, and the creation of huge centralized productive units by nationalization, are bound to make this more difficult to control. It challenges the independence and self-government of almost every profession; it challenges the self-interest of every professional man and woman. 'Men who can

* Bureaucracy is now being subjected to the scrutiny of academic psychologists and psycho-analysts, but at the risk of being dubbed out of date in this department of study, we may perhaps quote the sociologist W. H. R. Rivers, who suggested in the early 'twenties that 'red tape' is a protective reaction shown by those who find themselves confronted with administrative problems for which their powers are not adequate. 'It flourishes luxuriantly in the War Office, where men who enter upon a career of arms because they have the qualification for fighting and adventure find their essential task is the management of a vast organization, in which the qualities especially needed are very different from those which led them to adopt the Army as a career.' (W.H.R. Rivers, *Psychology and Politics*, 1923, p.25.) It may be no accident that the Imperial Staff College was created in the same decade to meet this very problem—although in fact the professional soldier gets more training in routine administration (and a better one) than do most men in other professions. The same is true of Naval officers and Merchant Navy officers, who are to be found running businesses and organizations at every level in this country. (But it may be true that doctors, lawyers, and teachers to-day face, in the social services, the same problems of avoiding red tape as have been faced—if not overcome—in the services: the major problem is that of not putting administrative labours upon people who are unfit, either temperamentally or educationally, to master their intricacies.)

manage men will always manage men who can manage things'—and be paid twice as much. Because the administrative problem grew gradually in the universities, and because acute minds grasped its implications early, scholars have mastered the technique of running themselves efficiently, taking Treasury subsidies without endangering their independence, and keeping out the civil servant and the certificated manager alike. Professional institutions need to give comparable thought to the implications of the growth of modern administration for their own members. Nor will it be sufficient to 'expose' their students to a few hours of humanities and a subject called industrial administration or social administration, as the case may be. What they have to re-think, in order to solve the administration problem, is nothing less than the whole question of specialization, as set forth in this chapter—and this book.

5. NEEDED—TEACHERS

But all plans to improve professional education depend upon the improvement of the teaching profession itself. The difficulties in that profession have been described in Chapter XI: but it will remain almost impossible to make the university teaching of a professional subject into a liberal education if boys and girls are not given a far better primary and secondary education. In fact, so many science and mathematics teachers have left the schools that the Barlow Committee's projected increase in scientific manpower will probably not be reached, despite the overcrowding of universities.

'An inspector, writing with particular reference to science, points out that those schools lucky enough to retain an old staff have maintained a good standard of work. Owing, however, to the difficulty of obtaining suitable replacements he fears a slow but steady deterioration in the teaching of science. "More than a few schools," he says of this subject, "have had to curtail courses for lack of teachers to take them. Sixth form courses have been allowed to suffer least; nevertheless they have created still another difficulty—they have completely outgrown the old sixth form laboratory."'¹⁰

Out of 897 men taking the Oxford finals examinations in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and engineering between 1945 and 1949, only 49 became schoolmasters, and of these 8 had left teaching by 1950. The quality of those who did go on and teach is indicated by the fact that of the five mathematicians who went into schools from Oxford in 1949, one had a second, one a third, two had pass degrees

and one honours in the shortened school; of six new physics masters, four had thirds and two had fourths.

Technology shows signs of withering at the roots, all talk of improving it notwithstanding. The better salaries offered to science graduates in other professions is not the only cause of decay: another is the specialism of teaching itself. As Graham Wallas observed:

'... there are certain respects in which the teaching profession is peculiar. Mankind, like some birds, and some non-human mammalian species in which social inheritance is important, have a specific teaching instinct. This instinct can be observed in many "born" male teachers, and particularly in women who, at the age of early motherhood, are teaching very young children. But the teaching instinct was evolved under conditions where men and women taught during part only of their lives. The professional teacher now teaches every day; he forms, indeed, the habit of teaching... regular teaching produces a kind of disgust which is more profound than that produced by any other kind of work.'²¹

Not only does the teacher overwork his instincts by teaching all the time—his whole life is removed from freshening and maturing influences which are even more necessary to his health and power over his pupils' minds than to those of engineers or consultants in teaching hospitals. Teachers from training colleges, Dr M. L. Jacks reminds us,

'are a section of the community sharply segregated from the rest of the community, preparing themselves for their life's work in institutions where their fellow students are all preparing themselves for the same work, nourished on the trainee's diet of professional and methodological studies rather than in human nature's daily food... Such a system may have succeeded in "training" the teacher: it has entirely failed to educate the human being... our business to-day is with the education of the educator.'²²

Nor are the university-trained teachers in much better case; for in the civic universities they tend to meet and associate with relatively few students who are not also intending to qualify as schoolteachers. Thus in Dr Jacks's words 'the circle of Primary School—Secondary School—Training College—Primary School for one, or the circle of Prep School—Public School—University—Public (or Prep) School for another, circles which never intersect and which never touch any other social or professional circles' keep teaching a narrow profession, insulated from most of the others except for men and women of great personality and vision—and therefore, for men and women of ability, an unattractive profession when other openings offer.

The universities do not lose their teachers, in whatever faculty, even when salaries for lecturers, and especially women lecturers, are below those obtainable in industry. To offset the difference, there are the amenities and prestige of university life; there is the freedom of research, so infinitely superior in spirit, if inferior in material equipment, to the industrial research unit; there is the freedom to be astonishingly lazy once research has won a chair; and for chemists, physicists, mathematicians, and technologists university salaries can often be gratifyingly augmented by the remunerative consultancy work which flows in from industry. Indeed it has been necessary to put professorial competition with whole-time consultants on to an 'ethical' basis.²³

But the technical colleges are less fortunate; the shortage of able teachers for these vital institutions, which watch over the progress of and give some academic depth to the part-time students for Higher National Certificates in engineering, science and technology is already crippling.²⁴ These teachers' present situation, in which the local authorities who control them are unwilling to pay more than the Burnham scale of salaries,* while the engineering institutions for whose examinations they prepare students reveal their contempt for the mere teacher by refusing them more than an associate membership, is uncomfortable. The problem is rather to save the quantity and quality of the education now being given than to embark on grandiose and costly schemes. If the professional institutions and the universities dislike the R.I.T. idea, it is for them to give a helping hand to the technical college, to negotiate with government for more money for it, and to aid it to some academic independence and breadth.

None of this will solve the teaching crisis. Many professional trainings, of course, are undertaken less in the university or technical college than in practice. The young architectural student, articulated to a conscientious principal, is now often thought to get a sounder training than at one of the under-staffed, overcrowded schools. The Institute of Chartered Accountants, again, is determined to retain its system of training under articles, and considers that nothing, in the existing state of education, is to be gained by restricting to 18 the age at which boys can enter articles; on the contrary, the sooner they 'get down to it' in an office, the better.²⁵ It is a reflection which has some little bearing on the considerations raised in Chapter V that, as state education decays, not only do private schools take on a new lease of life, but the older methods of obtaining professional training revive

* And it is not unusual for a technical college instructor to be in college from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.

in favour, and parents even become willing to pay premiums to get it for their children.

The advantage of articling has always been that it does solve the problem of the specialist teacher, by spreading the teaching function, part-time, among the practitioners of the profession. If the principal enjoys spending some of his time in teaching, the system works well, though it is liable to abuses which the professional institutions properly seek to prevent—for example by limiting the number of articulated pupils a principal may have, insisting that proper instruction shall be given, and by controlling the premiums. Many do: to take a single example, the Institution of Civil Engineers has in recent years, by regulating conditions of articulated pupils in railways, county or borough engineers' and contractors' offices, reduced the cost of training and stopped the over-production of poorly instructed civil and municipal engineers who were ready to take inferior salaries. But in years ahead the leaders in every profession will have to take a much greater interest in education, and realize their own responsibilities for teaching, if professional training is to be maintained in face of the shortage of teachers. In medicine, it is considered an honour to teach; the best minds have always been ready to devote effort and time to demonstration and lecturing. In law, accountancy, land and estate agency, nursing, social work, and some other professions, practitioners are prepared to shoulder educational responsibilities. But in engineering and technology, wherein innumerable reports declare the worst manpower shortage exists, this is by no means the rule. The number of private practitioners, or consultants, is in any case small. Employers, though nowadays often willing to give part-time students time off to take technical school courses, see no reason why they should themselves run large teaching departments, though there are a number of outstanding exceptions. But even where education and training are given, the basic principle, that the top men in the profession should devote time to helping juniors, is largely ignored. The top men are too busy making money, and consider that the installation of technical instructors, often on little more than technical-school teachers' salaries, meets the bill. It does not. Nor is it enough for a few enlightened firms to endow university chairs of technology, present the universities with laboratories, or pay for bursaries and prizes. Though much has been done along these lines, much of it has been done with ulterior motives. The firms who leave education to the government and the teachers, grumbling at the first and despising the second, far outnumber those who play an enlightened part. But it is not simply money that is

needed: it is the genuine, time-and-money-sacrificing interest on the part of the best and most highly paid members of the engineering and scientific professions. They must teach; and at the same time, throughout the field of professional training, teachers must be given help and encouragement to vary their employment between practical work and teaching.

These things, in an age of specialization, will not be easy, but if they could be done they would contribute to the solving of many problems: the ending of the isolation, unhealthy specialization, and frustration of the teacher; the widening of the basis of professional education and the liberalizing of its content; improvement of the quality, rather than merely the quantity, of teachers; the awakening of a dormant professional conscience in many technologists who demand the prestige of professional status, but who no sooner qualify than they immerse themselves in research, management, or money-making; and the maintenance of the English system of 'dual entry' into the professions, through universities and through other channels under the supervision of professional institutions. It would make the setting up of a body like the Royal Institution of Technologists unnecessary, because the existing system would carry more prestige, produce more than the present output of 5,000 holders of Higher National Certificates a year, and improve both university degrees and professional status.

One thing at least can be said with certainty: the dangers into which professional education is drifting, dangers of over-specialization, and inadequacies in the supply of the right type of talent and character, are the responsibility of professional people themselves, as members of learned institutions and universities. They are not likely to solve them without some personal sacrifice. They will never solve them by sitting on government committees, for even to accept membership of one of these is implicitly to deny ultimate responsibility for action.

NOTES

1. Sir Walter Moberly, *The Crisis in the University*, 1949, p. 168.
2. Bruce Truscott, *Redbrick University in these Vital Days*, 1945, p. 52.
3. J. Bronowski, 'The Hard Nub of Our Troubles', *The Observer*, 2 December, 1951.
4. Anglo-American Council on Productivity, Productivity Report, *Universities and Industry*, November 1951, p. 8.
5. *Engineering*, 22 July 1949, p. 85.

6. *Report of Nursing Reconstruction Committee*, Royal College of Nursing, 1943, Section II, p. 11.
7. *Reports of the Committees on Medical Auxiliaries*, Cmd. 8188, H.M.S.O., 1951, par. 13.
8. Eileen L. Younghusband, *Social Work in Britain, a supplementary report on the education and training of social workers*, Carnegie Trust, 1951, p. 5.
9. *Report of Nursing Reconstruction Committee*, Royal College of Nursing, 1943, Section III, p. 57.
10. *Report of a Special Committee on Education for Commerce*, H.M.S.O., 1949, p. 19.
11. *Report of the National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce: The Future Development of Higher Technological Education*, 1950, p. 13.
12. Observations by the Council of the Royal Institute of Chemistry on the draft report on Future Development of Higher Technological Education, 1950.
13. Anglo-American Council on Productivity, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-3.
14. Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales, 'Education and Membership: a Report by the Council', 1951, esp. p. 27.
15. Sir Raymond Priestley, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Birmingham, to the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, June 1950, reported in *Engineering*, 30 June 1950.
16. *The Observer*, 22 April 1951.
17. Cf. Eileen Younghusband, *op. cit.*, pp. 155, 157.
18. Dr. A. Mace, as reported by the *Manchester Guardian*, at the British Association, 10 August 1951.
19. *The Times*, 27 December 1950.
20. Memorandum on the Shortage of Science Teachers, prepared by a Committee of the British Association Division for Social and International relations of Science, 17 May 1950.
21. Graham Wallas, *Our Social Heritage*, 1921, p. 147.
22. M. L. Jacks, *Total Education*, 1949, p. 147.
23. Joint Council of Professional Scientists: 'A Code of Practice in Respect of Consulting and Similar Work, accepted by Members of Wholtime Academic Staffs', November 1945.
24. Association of Technical Institutions and Association of Principals of Technical Institutions, 'Statement of Policy on the Future Development of Higher Technological Education', undated, pars. 39, 40.
25. Institute of Chartered Accountants, *op. cit.*, p. 3 ff.

CHAPTER XIII

Rewards and Costs

'There are kinds of labour of which the wages are fixed by custom, and not by competition. Such are the fees or charges of professional persons: of physicians, surgeons, barristers, and even attorneys . . . though competition operates upon those classes as much as upon any others, it is by dividing the business, not, in general, by diminishing the rate at which it is paid. The cause of this, perhaps, has been the prevalence of an opinion that such persons are more trustworthy if paid highly in proportion to the work they perform; insomuch that if a lawyer or a physician offered his services at less than the ordinary rate, instead of gaining more practice, he would probably lose that which he already had.'

JOHN STUART MILL

'The Economic Man sells his labour, at a rate for money. His working day is the number of hours he is willing to waste, in order to have the wherewithal to live and enjoy his leisure. The man with a profession also calls what he does "work": but his meaning is exactly opposite. It is the hours he is not working which he considers wasted. Pay? Of course he expects to be paid; a man cannot live on air. But whereas the economic man looks on work as the means to get money, the professional man looks on money as the means to do work.'

• RICHARD HUGHES, *In Hazard*

THE STATUS IN SOCIETY and the standards of living of professional people are—in their own view, at least—at stake, and no discussion of their remuneration or of the effects of redistributive taxation can omit awkward questions of relative rewards and relative values of services rendered. In an endeavour to view these questions objectively, we had better start by considering what factors are normally taken into account in assessing levels of remuneration—whether these be fixed by the state or by the free operation of the market.

Adam Smith, in a chapter on the remuneration of labour, catalogued the factors which are commonly taken into account as follows:

'First, the agreeableness or disagreeableness of the employments themselves; secondly, the easiness and cheapness, or the difficulty and expense of learning them; thirdly, the constancy or inconstancy of employment in them; fourthly, the small or great trust which must be reposed in those who exercise them; and fifthly, the probability or improbability of success in them.'¹

This statement still perfectly fits the professions. It is often said that parents and children are influenced in choosing employment by what is described as the 'social esteem' in which an occupation is generally held; but does the desire for 'social esteem', which leads to the acceptance of a lower income as a schoolteacher than could be earned as an engineering fitter, amount to more than a thoughtful weighing up of the relative 'agreeableness or disagreeableness' of the two kinds of employment?

In 1946 the official Social Survey investigated the relative importance which different groups in a sample of people attached to a number of factors in assessing the attractiveness of a job.² They were asked to say whether they considered these factors to be 'very important', 'fairly important', or 'not so important', and the following table shows the percentages in each group marking the factors as 'very important':

	Technical and professional workers	Men clerical workers	Women clerical workers	Schoolboys	Schoolgirls	Fathers	Mothers
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Interest of Work	96	89	94	96	97	97	97
Holidays	31	37	44	19	28	34	35
Pay	44	62	50	32	27	44	41
Prospects and Promo- tion	85	91	72	76	68	81	82
Security	50	67	57	63	65	64	71
Social Opportunities	32	28	39	31	51	39	47
Working Hours	37	44	54	26	42	31	35

Although these figures are suggestive, it is difficult to avoid the unworthy suspicion that many of those interrogated gave the answers which they thought they ought to give, rather than reveal the actual balance of motives which would influence them in accepting or rejecting a particular offer of employment. The motives measured in the survey include the first, third, and fifth on Adam Smith's list, but not the second and fourth. The second (the ease and expense of training) is of particular importance in assessing not only the attractiveness, but the remuneration of professional callings. Unfortunately, we lack full and reliable statistics of costs of training and education for the professions. Not only do the types of training vary so widely between

professions, so that it is invidious to compare them, but there are often alternative methods of qualifying inside a particular profession; again, one man may almost pay his way to the stage of qualification by earning as he learns, while another gets no income at all for several years. No simple comparative table of training costs would be of any value. Nevertheless, examination of a number of representative professions may broadly delineate the range of training costs and the extent to which costs are reflected in the remuneration to be ultimately expected.

At one end of the scale a nurse, although she may have had to stay on at school beyond the age of 15, or fill in time between school and the start of her training by taking a temporary job, can get her training in hospital at no cost to herself or her parents, even for pocket money. At the other end of the scale a doctor can hardly hope to scrape through his training for a total cost of less than £1,500, and this will involve a deal of pinching and scraping at university and while training in hospital. The training of the barrister does not in itself cost more than that of the doctor, but it may take him even longer to begin earning an income large enough to live on, while his living expenses during this period will probably be higher. But the total cost to parents will vary enormously between and within professions, according to the assistance provided by the state, local authorities, or voluntary bodies, in the form of grants and scholarships. While a barrister cannot earn anything from the law until he has been called to the Bar, and even then will probably pay out more than he earns for some years, the bank clerk is paid enough during his period of training to cover his upkeep. The doctor's training is likely to take at least six years from the moment that he leaves school; but the university student who takes First Class Honours may, if he is brilliant or lucky, find himself in a university teaching job as soon as he goes down—which may be only three years after leaving school.

1. COST OF UNIVERSITY

So many professions require a university education as a basis for training (or offer useful exemptions from training requirements to graduates) that the cost of a university education is an important factor in the total cost of training.

In the nineteen-thirties it was possible to live modestly but fairly comfortably at Oxford for about £200 a year, including residence, tuition, clothes, and books, but without taking account of the cost to

parents of maintaining the undergraduate during the vacations. The total cost to parents, if no grants or scholarships were secured, thus worked out at £700 to £750 for a three-year course. To-day, the comparable cost is not less than £300 a year, or a total cost for three years of about £1,100 to £1,200. At a provincial university, even if the student is living away from home, the annual figure may not be much more than £200, or a total all-in cost of around £750 to £800 for three years. It can, of course, be managed the hard way for less, while in Scotland it is still said to be possible for a student to survive on less than £150 a year. In England, a girl student living at home and attending a non-residential university can probably manage at an extra cost to her parents (over and above the cost of her maintenance at home) of about £150 a year.

Before the war, fewer than half of all university students were benefiting from scholarships or other grants. Now the figure is around three-quarters.

It is intended, under the new system, that about three-quarters of all students entering universities should receive financial assistance, subject to a test of their parents' means. The grants are adequate, if not generous, in the case of state and 'open' scholars and of students from most local education authorities. There are still some L.E.A.s which give much less help than the Ministry of Education considers desirable, and efforts are being made to bring them up to the recommended standard.

The state scholar has all his registration, tuition, and examination fees paid, and receives in addition a maintenance grant on the following scale: at Oxford and Cambridge, £265 (£235 at a non-residential college); at London, £241; at provincial universities and colleges, £215. The state also supplements university or college open scholarships to bring them up to the amount of the state scholarships. These figures, however, represent the full amount of grant awarded to children of the poorest parents, and a contribution towards maintenance is expected from other parents, according to a graduated scale of means. If the parents' income does not exceed £500 a year, the full grant is made, the parents' contribution increasing proportionately up to an income of £2,200 a year, at which level the state makes no grant at all towards maintenance. But it should be noted that the parents are allowed to deduct from their income before assessment, not only any mortgage interest and superannuation payments, but also a sum of £100 for each other dependent child, and up to £100 in addition for each child whose school fees they are paying, or up to £200 for another

child at a university. Thus the parents of a family of three children at fee-paying schools, if their annual income was £900, might still receive full maintenance grant when the eldest child entered a university.³

Although the grants are adequate for subsistence and cover all essentials and a bit over for the requisites of civilized life in a university they do not (and are, of course, not intended to) provide much pocket money. Nowadays a university student can supplement his grant quite considerably by taking jobs during vacations. Well over half do take jobs, and the National Union of Students runs an employment bureau to find them. Before the war, except for a little genteel tutoring, only indigent undergraduates did this, and indeed the state of the labour market made it difficult for them to find jobs; now, not only are seasonal jobs comparatively easy to get, but some jobs would probably not get done at all without the help of students. Christmas mail deliveries and sorting, shops, hotels, and railway stations employ hundreds, while hundreds more take temporary jobs on farms, or even pick up around £6 a week as building labourers. Most people might say that nothing could be better for them: their tutors, however, are naturally not so enthusiastic. Nor does academic disapproval spring merely from an old-world feeling that such goings-on are unseemly. The dons have always rightly considered that an honours degree course requires much reading—and thought—during vacations; they feel this to be even more important now that so large a proportion of students come from homes with a markedly sub-university standard of learning and culture. However, since the jobs are there for the asking, all but the wealthiest, idlest, or most devotedly studious would probably take them anyway, even if their financial need were less than it is. There is, after all, always plenty to do with extra money when one is young; indeed, many undergraduates manage to finance, with intermittent spells of manual labour, those instructive little summer trips to the Continent which used to be considered so educational.

The plain truth is that the student, if he is to be spared the temptation to take vacant jobs, must be given a total income of well over £400 a year, which is generally more than his parents can afford and certainly more than the state ought to afford. Meanwhile, the average undergraduate can pick up at least £50 a year in this way. No doubt his work suffers accordingly, and the ideal of the 'intellectual élite' is further debased; but the average Briton probably feels in his heart that what was wrong with the last generation of intellectuals was that they never had to work with their hands, and that the present system has its social advantages.

How does the system of grants and means tests affect the ability of professional families to educate and train their children for the professions? It does, not always send the cleverest boys and girls to the universities. For example, the doctor with three children and an income of £1,500 a year will probably have to find £100 a year to send his eldest daughter to Oxford, on top of any school fees he may be paying for the younger children—and in order to find this sum he will have to *earn*, before tax, a further £150 a year. If he decides that he cannot manage it (and such a decision, although entirely subjective, is largely conditioned by conventions which it is not easy for a professional man to ignore), his daughter's place at Oxford may be filled by the less gifted daughter of a clerk or artisan who will secure the full grant and find himself little out of pocket. On the other hand, the artisan's daughter may possibly benefit even more from a university education, in which event all may be for the best. On the whole, the system probably works as well as can be expected; since it is generally true that hard cases make bad law, the search for a formula which obviates all possible anomalies is vain.

The financial burdens of the middle classes are sufficiently heavy to deflect a number of boys and girls, whose fathers went to universities, into courses of professional training outside a university. Fewer budding solicitors now go to universities, graduate teachers form a smaller proportion of the total in schools, and more public-school boys are entering engineering straight from school, *via* apprenticeship, part-time study at a technical college, and the Higher National Certificate. This trend may have unfortunate effects, although there are now few who would claim that the 'cultural' influence of the average university is sufficiently beneficial for the lack of it to do serious harm to a whole profession. In the case of engineering, it may even be that a public-school boy who gets his experience on the shop floor at an earlier stage will ultimately make a better executive in a firm than the university graduate; but for most consultants, research workers, and other purely professional engineers and technologists the university training is essential.

2. TRAINING COSTS

We have already said that it is impossible to make due comparison of costs of professional training, because of the wide cost variations between different methods of training, and also because of the way in which the cost of maintenance of students varies, according to whether

they are living at home, in a residential college or in London lodgings. It is estimated, for example, that a five-year architectural course can cost anything from £965 to £2,110, including fees, maintenance, books, and so on. Fees may be as low as £25 or as high as £100 a year, while maintenance can cost anything from £150 to £350 a year. To set off against this, there may be a state grant (subject, of course, to a test of parents' means), but this will never exceed about £700 over the five-year period, and probably averages no more than £490: at several of the leading schools, the proportion of students with grants is known to be well under half.⁴ A school-trained architect, though he may earn a couple of hundred pounds during his training if he is good, will therefore cost his parents anything from £500 to £1,500 before he is registered. It is hardly to be wondered at that many parents prefer to put down about £75 as a premium for three years' apprenticeship. The apprentice will soon be earning enough to keep himself at home; he will take evening classes to enable him to pass his intermediate examination, after which he will probably earn £6-8 a week while he works for the R.I.B.A. exam. If his principal is good, his training will in some respects (structures, for example, and experience on the site) be better than the more academic one; but he will never, unless he is passionately eager to teach himself (and naturally gifted), achieve the ability and quality in design which comes from a solid grounding in the history and art of architecture. Further, if his principal is very successful, as well as being a good teacher, the premium he asks may not be £75 at all, but anything up to 500 guineas.

It is hard to see how any middle-class parent, unless he disgorges capital or is earning a huge salary in business, can afford to establish his son at the Bar. From the moment when he enters a university to the moment when he can be relied on to keep himself (whether wholly in practice or by supplementing his income in other ways), the young barrister can hardly cost his parents less than £2,000, even if a reasonable university grant is secured, and the cost is likely to be considerably more. The solicitor, however, who need not go to a university, can qualify over five years at a total cost of less than £1,000. The cost of training as a doctor, dentist, or veterinary surgeon is now well over £1,500, but a good proportion of students receive grants to set off against this figure. On the other hand, it is now possible to train as an incorporated or certified accountant for nothing: a firm may take a boy at 17½, straight from school, and begin by paying him £3 a week while teaching him. He can pass his intermediate examination in three years, by which time he will probably be getting as much as £5 a week,

rising to perhaps £7 or £8 by the time he takes his finals, when he will be established at £10-12 a week.

The training of an engineer now costs around £1,000 if a university degree course is taken (more at Oxford or Cambridge, but in all cases, of course, subject to grant assistance if the parents' means warrant it); it can be managed for much less without a degree course. The trainee in civil engineering no longer has to pay a premium to a consultant's firm if he starts in one, while a firm of contractors may well pay him £3 a week in the first year of his articles, rising each year by about £1 a week. The apprentice, working for the Higher National Certificate in mechanical or electrical engineering (most firms allow an apprentice a full day a week to attend classes) can probably complete his course for a total expenditure on tuition, books, etc., of under £50; but his maintenance expenses during apprenticeship may be not less than £500. The training of a scientist would normally cost about the same as that of a university-educated engineer. It is, however, also possible to qualify as a professional physicist or chemist through the Higher National Certificate scheme.

A commission in the armed forces can, of course, be obtained at no cost at all by those who are able to earn promotion from the lower deck or the ranks. Entry to the Royal Navy through Dartmouth is now entirely state-subsidized, and the total costs of training to the parents now amount to very little more than maintenance during holidays. In the Army, a national serviceman can secure a commission. The whole process need not cost anything, apart from an excess over the grant of the cost of uniform and kit which he elects to purchase. Except in the Brigade of Guards and certain 'expensive' regiments, it is no longer necessary for a subaltern officer to supplement his pay from private means if he lives carefully. The second mate's certificate in the Merchant Navy can be secured for nothing if a training period is served before the mast; an apprentice coming straight from school can also pay his way over the four-year period, although he may need a small advance for purchase of books and kit. A three years' course at a training establishment such as the *Conway* will cost about £700, although about £300 of this can be earned; this training provides a more solid basis of theoretical knowledge and skill than the others.

Bank and insurance employees entering their firms straight from school can earn enough to keep themselves while they are studying for their professional exams, although a few pounds extra may be needed for books, fees and so forth. The training of an actuary, although longer, need not involve a cost to parents of more than one or two

hundred pounds over the whole period. Journalists, if they can secure an opening with a newspaper at all, can secure a pittance from the moment they leave school, and their training will involve no cost except to the news editor's temper.* Most medical auxiliaries need a three-year period (at least) of training after leaving school, and the cost may run up to a total of nearly £1,000 including maintenance and without grants. Chiropodists can qualify for much less, but an almoner's training will cost between £200 and £300 even after a social science certificate has been secured at a university (a two-year course). Against this, the non-graduate schoolteacher gets off very lightly, for the training college student can secure a certificate at a total cost to parents of around £200 or less. The graduate teacher's course of training will cost at least £300, even if average grants are obtained.

Now that the costs of professional training have been briefly summarized, it is not hard to see why there is keen competition for entry into the Administrative Class of the Civil Service, which is by competitive examination direct from universities (or *via* the Executive Class, which can be entered straight from school). An even more cogent reason will emerge when we examine savings and pensions.

3. SALARIES AND INCOMES

In considering the remuneration of the professions, we need not devote much space to Adam Smith's third factor, 'the constancy or inconstancy of employment in them'. Before the war there was often quite serious difficulty in securing jobs in many professions, although it is no doubt true that this was felt more in persistent and widespread *under*-employment than in a high percentage of actual unemployment. In fact, the 1931 census showed a total of about two per cent acknowledged unemployment in the professions. To-day, 'inconstancy of employment' is not a serious menace, except among actors and barristers. Nor is it easy to measure the effect on remuneration of the 'agreeableness or disagreeableness' of various callings. This is no doubt the chief factor (the effects being reflected in recruitment difficulties) which has raised the pay of nurses relatively to that of schoolteachers, while a reasonably leisured life, coupled with the chance of an *entrée* into politics, provides some compensation to the barrister for his other troubles.

Adam Smith's suggestion that 'in a profession where twenty fail for one that succeeds, that one ought to gain all that should have been

* This will probably already be seriously depreciated, in any case.

gained by the unsuccessful twenty' was illustrated from the Bar, and he attributed the fact that in his day the successful never did in fact earn as much as this to the counterbalancing advantages of honours and appointments for the leaders of the profession. Since then, however, the top earnings at the Bar have come nearer to his ideal, but at the same time the opportunities for the unsuccessful to turn their talents and training to account in other callings (especially industry and trade association diplomacy) have immensely increased. But what would have shaken Adam Smith to the depths of his Scottish soul is the fact that a leading barrister who earns a gross income perhaps twenty times as great as that of the average in another profession has it reduced by taxation to a net figure about eight times as great as that of his less eminent neighbour; nor will any further effort or measure of success increase the difference. This phenomenon is also particularly well known to successful writers and playwrights, for the tax system is so arranged as to give them little hope of spreading the earnings from a best-seller or box office hit, or from the rare sale of film rights, over a period of leaner years.

But before we begin to discuss the effects of taxation, and the problems of the cost of living, it is necessary to see what incomes can be earned by the members of the various professions whose training costs we have been examining.

4. PROFESSIONAL EARNINGS

The doctor, who has to undergo about the longest and most expensive course of training, duly starts his career with the highest initial income. Whether the general practitioner takes a salaried job or joins another doctor as assistant or junior partner, he should be able to start at £750 a year or more. If he sets up a new practice on his own—which is not easy to do, except in what is officially classed as an 'under-doctored area'—he can secure a basic state salary of £300 a year if he can prove the need for it while establishing his practice. The average net income in general practice now is around £1,600,⁵ and a good man can reach £2,000 a year by the time he is 40. These are net figures, after deduction of the expenses of the practice, but before the deduction of tax. In densely populated cities a N.H.S. practice can bring a man in £3,000 a year or more, if he gets the immense queues of patients moving through his surgery fast enough. In the other hand, a widely scattered country practice, where a much higher proportion of patients have to be visited, may net under £1,000, which accounts for the pro-

professional demands for a 'loaded' or 'tapering' capitation fee for N.H.S. patients.*

The surgeons and other specialists, of course, do better, though their course of training is longer than that of the G.P., since increasingly, as competition grows for the top jobs, they must have one or two higher qualifications such as M.R.C.S. or M.R.C.P. They start as registrars at £1,000 a year, and can certainly earn £2,000 by the age of 40. The incomes of £10-£15,000 a year earned by eminent consultants before the war have now almost disappeared; but a successful surgeon can earn £5,000, and it may be remembered that a further £5,000 a year would now net him only another £1,000 after tax. Thus, although the top men cannot do so well as before the war, the average income, and above all the incomes earned in the first few years of practice, are considerably higher.

The qualified dentist may start with a slightly lower income than the new doctor, but he is likely to surpass the doctor's earnings before very long. Few young dentists can afford to put up a plate of their own to start with, because of the high cost of modern equipment; they mostly start either as assistants or in salaried jobs, and secure partnerships later on. A dentist (at least until the 1952 N.H.S. charges were imposed) could start at about £1,200, and pass the £2,000 mark before he was 35. A good N.H.S. practice has been made to yield over £4,000 a year, but it means a great deal of hard work—and probably fallen arches as well.⁶

The veterinary surgeon, despite his long and expensive training, does not do so well. He probably starts work at between £500 and £600 a year, and may reach £1,200 by the time he is 35, but there are now few 'vets' who earn more than £2,000 a year at any time. The medical auxiliaries, of course, earn salaries which do not appear at all commensurate with their training costs. Therapists, for instance, may start at salaries little more than £350 a year, and may not be earning much above £500 at the age of 35. Again, the pharmacist, whose training may cost £700-£800, probably starts at a salary of not more than £450, and will be earning little more than £600 as a manager at the age of 35; a proprietor, on a turnover of £4-£5,000, probably makes no more than £800 net. The salaried optician, whose training is shorter, starts a little higher, and may well exceed £750 a year at 35.

* All the figures here given for earnings of G.P.s reflect the position *before* the issue of the 'Danckwerts Award'. At the time of going to press the Minister of Health had not announced his decision. We have therefore thought it best not to attempt an estimate of the effects of the acceptance of the Award. It would, of course, markedly improve most G.P.s' incomes.

The building problems of the post-war years have created many difficulties for architects. At the beginning of the century, the salaried architect was not only a rarity but regarded as a failure in his profession; to-day, about half of all registered architects are salaried, and nearly four-fifths of these are in the public services.⁷ There, salaries are about three to four times as high as before the war in the junior grades (about £475-£750 now), but senior salaried architects seldom receive more than £2,000, which is less than twice the pre-war rate.

The position of the private practitioner in architecture is not easy. Broadly speaking, his income is derived from a commission of six per cent on the value of all building work he handles, but the rise in building costs has not helped him much. For one thing, of course, his salary and wage bill has risen at least in proportion, while the cost of stationery and so forth has soared; also, there is the tight restriction on the amount of private building. There are few big jobs (and what there are are nearly all industrial), and small jobs simply do not pay. A large part of the time spent on planning and inspecting has to be put in irrespective of the size of the job, and the time that has to be given to negotiating with ministries or local authorities and to chasing materials is out of all proportion to the return. Again, the houses for which licences are issued by local authorities tend to go to people who do not employ private architects. In any case, even commissions that are secured may vanish when the client discovers his liability to development charge. The architect's staples now are extensions to factories and farm buildings, and two types of jobs in which he is often competing for business with the surveyors—war damage work and advising purchasers of pre-war houses. Most architects would like to have a consulting appointment (to a planning authority, an industrial firm, or a church diocese, for example) to give a solid backbone to their practices, but there are not so many of these. Architects whose bows possess the second string of a surveyor's qualifications or a M. I. Struct. E. are often able to scrape together a bit more work than their colleagues. Total incomes in private practice are hard to assess. There are probably not many incomes over £2,000 a year, and very few outside the select body of very large firms and fashionable consultants. The chances of setting up in private practice and making a success of it are smaller than ever.

Quantity surveyors, too, have been rescued by war damage work since the war from what might have been a difficult time. In fact, the volume of war damage business almost swamped the profession; few will admit that it has been very profitable, but the volume has been

such that it must have brought in a good steady income. Now that this source of commissions is drying up, it looks as though the glorious complications of the Town and Country Planning Act may adequately fill its place as a provider of work for surveyors. There are no high peaks of earnings among any of the different kinds of surveyors, but there is a comfortable general level of prosperity—or would be if the cost of living did not continually outstrip increased incomes. Only on the agricultural side are there misgivings, for death duties are steadily eating away large estates, and there are far fewer good jobs for land agents; on such big estates as remain, an agent may not receive more than £1,200 a year, but he probably gets a house, garden produce, and perhaps a car, while most can hope for a modest pension. The surveyor in state employment may start at a salary no higher than £475, and he is unlikely ever to rise above £1,500 at the outside; but it must be remembered that his superannuation rights make this salary worth about the same as an income of over £2,500 to the private practitioner who is trying to save for his old age. Not many private practitioners earn this income for any length of time before retirement.

The young accountant, as we have seen, can earn while he is being trained and is studying for his examinations; having passed his finals he can get from £10 to £12 a week, or even, if he is lucky, £15. There is little scope for an accountant in the public service, but plenty in industry, which provides most of the salaried jobs for those who are not employed by large firms of auditors. At present, there is scope for the type of private practice which consists largely of showing clients how to avoid paying the full amount of their income-tax. This custom is particularly plentiful in farming districts, but the prosperity it brings is not thought to be either very soundly based or likely to last indefinitely. Apart from partners in the very big firms, there are a few accountants who earn quite large incomes (over £5,000 a year), but these are mostly the result of directors' fees, earned by their talents for organizing the finances of industrial firms, rather than of private practice. Apart from these cases, £2,000 a year is a pretty good income for an accountant.

It is difficult to say what are the prospects in the engineering professions, since the economic future of the country as a whole affects them closely. Thus, the capital investment cuts which have been recurrent features of our crisis-laden post-war history have played havoc with the business and prospects of civil engineering consultants. A newly qualified A.M.I.C.E. can hope to start with a salary of around £600 a year (probably rather more than a mechanical engineer would

get). Unless they are above average, both would be lucky to top £1,000 a year by the time they are 35. But good prospects in industry for engineers will continue, and a fair proportion of them will reach salaries of £2,000 a year; the men at the top will of course do better, but very few will reach £5,000. Production engineers (not necessarily A.M.I. Prod. E.s) get the largest salaries in their profession, except for the most highly paid geniuses of research and invention. Salaries for mining and gas engineers, and for a proportion of electrical engineers, are being stabilized very comparably with the scale of the professional Civil Service (with superannuation rights) by the nationalized industries. The salaries of graduate scientists have been improving for some years, salaries ranging from £1,000 to £1,500 at the age of 35 being more common. But very few earn more than £2,000 to £2,500, and these generally possess the exceptional personal qualities which enable them to become directors of research or take semi-administrative posts in industry.

A Merchant Navy officer can sit for his Master's certificate about five years after first getting his Second Mate's ticket (he can get the First Mate's certificate after eighteen months). Nowadays he is paid much better than a Naval officer. At 25 he may get a Chief Officer's job in a tanker at £750 a year, with his keep worth at least a further £300 (untaxed). The Master of a 10,000-ton cargo ship is normally about 40 years old, and probably receives £1,250 a year plus keep. These salaries may prevent the very high wastage rates common between the wars, when the average period served afloat was not more than seven years; officers, especially after marriage, tended to look out for shore jobs, although they often came back for short spells. Naturally, this did have the merit of ensuring that there was a large trained reserve which could be mobilized in a national emergency. A civil airline pilot, with five years' experience, is paid something over £1,500 a year; but the employment field is very limited, and a man must virtually be trained in the R.A.F., since the state airlines do not give flying training and it might cost anything up to £3,000 to train for an Air Ministry licence on one's own account.

There is now a fairly wide field of employment for solicitors, but the profession is no highroad to wealth. In the Civil Service, the starting salary for solicitors and barristers is £500 a year at the age of 26, rising to £800 (£700 for women) after a period of probation. At the age of 35 a man should be earning £1,200, and probably over £1,500 by the time he is 40. A very few can get as high as £3,500. In the local government service the scope is rather wider, although the

starting and intermediate salaries are not always so good. There is, however, a reasonable hope of becoming Clerk to a Council, at a salary which may be under £1,000 or over £4,000, according to the size of the authority. In private practice, there are reasonable prospects of securing a good salaried job with a big firm. In a smaller firm, a young man may hope to start at a salary of £500, but he can start younger than the age of 26 at which this can be earned in the Civil Service; he will not necessarily, however, have reached £1,000 a year by the time he is 35, and only in the biggest firms has he a pension to look forward to.

The prospects for the partner in the small family solicitor's business, or for the man who succeeds in getting taken into a large partnership, are not nearly as good as they were before the war. It seems that the statutory rates for lawyers' fees have risen by only fifty per cent since 1881, while expenses have more than quadrupled. Criminal work has never been profitable, and litigation is not now very remunerative. The suppression of private fortunes by death duties has cut the once profitable income from settlement and testamentary work. A few firms can do well out of company business, and individuals find profitable jobs inside industrial firms. But the private solicitor increasingly relies on conveyancing, in which the inflated cost of houses has produced a corresponding rise in legal incomes, and on miscellaneous business. In the provinces, a local solicitor can often supplement his income as clerk to the magistrates or in other part-time jobs, but to set off against this he is expected to do a great deal of honorary work for churches, charities and so forth. Not many solicitors can look forward with confidence to taking £2,000 a year out of their practices, and incomes of £5,000 or more are very few.

Gone, indeed, are 'the carefree days when country attorneys, tossing aside all "weightier matters of the law" would foregather in provincial societies or in private dinner parties and make merry over the foibles of their clients . . . Gone are the days of market ordinaries when, for two solid hours, one could feed and fraternize with the farmers. Gone are the days when solicitors, like Armigel Wade of Hitchin, could post up champagne in the book of petty expenses.'⁸

Prospects in the 'commercial professions' vary widely. The bank clerk in a joint-stock bank starts work straight from school, but is expected for some time to exist on about £5 a week. He may not be earning more than £600 a year by the time he is 35, and he may get less than £1,000 as a manager. A few, in head offices, will be better paid, and can look forward to a chance of finishing with salaries of

£2-£3,000 a year. Employees of merchant banking firms are better paid, but jobs are not easy to secure without influence. Insurance employees do a little better than bank clerks; actuaries may start at nearly twice the salary and should be earning £800 a year by the age of 35. Only a very few really large incomes are made by stockbrokers or jobbers, and the annual return is precarious—especially for jobbers. The two per cent transfer duty imposed in the 1948 Budget seriously reduced the volume of business, and it is now by no means unusual to find brokers refusing to allow their sons to enter even a family business. It is not easy to estimate the average annual income of employees, since dealers and clerks are commonly employed on terms which provide for bonuses based on the firm's profits, and these may vary very widely from year to year; but a diligent and fortunate young man can hope to earn £700-£1,000 by the time he is 35, and may finish at about £1,500-£2,000.

An assistant schoolmaster in a maintained primary school starts, after qualification, at a salary of £375, a woman teacher beginning at £338. If they are university graduates who have done the full four-year course, the starting salaries are £471 and £416 for men and women respectively. The maximum basic salaries for assistant teachers are, for men and women respectively, £630 and £504 for non-graduates, and £726 and £582 for graduates. In addition there is a number of special allowances, based on the size and type of school and the responsibility of the post held; since the last Burnham Committee award⁹ each local authority can set up a 'pool' from which to pay special allowances, and these may result in different rates of total salary between different areas. The headmaster or headmistress receives the basic salary plus allowances based on the number of pupils in school. For a school of only 100 'units' the allowance is £80 a year, and for one of 300 only £145, although there would be other allowances to be taken into account. Among assistant teachers, some resentment has been aroused by the variations between salaries caused by the differing practices of local authorities in administering the new 'pool' payments, while there is a strongly egalitarian section of the profession which objects to payments of 'special responsibility' allowances to some teachers (normally assistant head-teachers or heads of departments, although custom is stretched pretty far in some cases) while others remain on the basic salary.

Nevertheless, there is reason for thinking that egalitarian tendencies in the teaching profession have already been pushed too far. It is, as we have suggested in Chapter XI; not quite so easy to sustain the

argument that the non-graduate teacher in a maintained primary or secondary modern school is badly paid as is commonly supposed; but the graduate teacher in a grammar school, and particularly the headmaster or headmistress, fares badly by comparison with those in the public schools. There is not perhaps a very wide difference between starting salaries, although the conditions of life and work are generally more pleasant in the public school. But the public-school master generally has a very real hope of succeeding to the attractive post of housemaster; further, the headmaster of a public school will probably get £1,500 a year 'all found' (which may be equivalent to an income of about £2,700), while no headmaster of a maintained grammar school gets more than £1,500 in all.

By comparison, university lecturers now do quite well. As we have seen, the training period need not be long, since a brilliant undergraduate may become a don almost immediately after taking a first-class degree in his final schools. In some, but not all, departments, a period of post-graduate work is necessary. Strangely enough, the recent improvement in university salaries was an indirect result of the establishment of the National Health Service. It all began with the publication of the Spens Report¹⁰ on the salaries of specialists and consultants, which laid down salaries in the teaching hospitals and medical schools which were extremely high compared with those of non-clinical staffs in these schools and of ordinary university teachers. The anomalies arising were too great to be ignored, and in March, 1949, the University Grants Committee announced new salary scales or (as in the case of Cambridge) raised salaries all round.* An assistant lecturer (who may not be more than 22 or 23) can hope to start at a salary of £450 a year (sometimes only £400), with membership of a good superannuation scheme whose benefits are interchangeable if he moves to another university, and probably with a family allowance as well. A lecturer will get anything from £550 to about £1,200 according to the importance of the post and his own age and qualifications; a 'reader' will get more, and a professor will probably receive about £1,500 to £2,500. There are also, of course, chances of supplementing these incomes from additional administrative jobs in the university or college, from writing, and from work during vacations. The graduate who does not want to teach can sometimes find a full-time research job in a university; for instance, a social scientist can get employment as a research assistant at a starting salary of around £400 a year. The

* The Spens Report also had repercussions (not yet finished) in the Scientific—and even Administrative—Civil Service.

prospects of promotion are modest, but the experience gained is extremely useful, and may open the way to a fairly wide range of jobs outside the universities.

5. ARE THEY ENOUGH?

No doubt there will be many individual members of these professions who will complain bitterly that their own incomes do not fall within the ranges mentioned in the foregoing section, or who will disagree with these estimates of prospects. But to delimit a range of incomes, or assess an average income, in professions whose members work in a wide diversity of ways for widely differing rewards, is difficult. If we are pressed, we must take refuge in the statistician's last resort, which is to plead that the figures given are intended to do little more than indicate the approximate relation between earnings in the different professions.

The survey illustrates the tendency for the incomes of people in different professions to draw much more closely together towards a common average than before the war. This is partly a result of Britain's political obsession about material equality, and partly because the welfare state seems unprepared to do without the services of any of the professions, and is therefore compelled at a time of full employment to offer rewards which will attract enough recruits to *all* of them. Since the state, directly or indirectly, now employs a substantial proportion of the members of many professions, it can exert some influence both on the general level of remuneration and on the rate of entry to the professions. In particular, by financing the universities and their students, it can now directly raise or lower training costs.

The general picture shows that most young entrants to the professions are likely to start earning somewhere between £300 and £700 a year, and that the starting salary does (with a few quite marked exceptions) bear a reasonable relation to the length and cost of initial training. Again, not only is the premium system of articles comparatively rare, but entrants to most professions are now able to earn enough to keep themselves during at least a part of their period of training. A fairly bright young professional man may hope to earn anything from £600 to £1,500 by the time he is 35. This may seem a disparity wide enough to falsify our premise that professional incomes have drawn more closely together, but it is really a difference of timing, for ultimately most of the successful will draw together again around the £2,000-a-year level. Finally, it appears that in most professions

very few people will earn more than £2,000 a year for very long, while the proportion earning more than £4,000 will be minute. Outstanding merit is far less handsomely rewarded than it used to be, but the poor-to-average practitioner does considerably better—at least in terms of money.

Are these rewards adequate? In so far as rewards determine the flow of entrants into a particular profession, they appear to be adequate for most. In professions where a severe shortage of recruits is felt—such as women teachers, nurses, almoners, electrical and mechanical engineers, physicists, entomologists, certain types of technologists, and so forth, it is scarcely possible to relate rewards to recruitment, particularly at a time when the differentials between professions have been so notably decreased: teachers are perhaps the only obvious case, but in this profession the trouble is deep-seated,* and for the type of teacher now apparently considered acceptable, the financial reward may well now be adequate. The position is discussed in Chapter XI. •

Much more important is the question whether rewards are adequate to attract recruits of *high quality*, and to prevent the *standards* of work done by practitioners from declining. The evidence is conflicting, but observers who are qualified to give an answer mostly agree that they are *not*. Whatever the rewards, however, clever men and women will enter the profession which best suits their talents, unless the alternatives of emigration, business, or farming appeal to them. It may be that the rewards now offered are insufficient to draw forth the best work, but much good work will continue to be done, as it always has been, simply for the love of it, just as the shouldering of many onerous responsibilities is now undertaken from sheer duty. But in general it is not easy to be sure to what extent lower standards of work are due to lower quality among the rank and file of practitioners, and how much to the excessive total amount of work done by a profession as a whole. Overwork makes bad work.

In some professions, the discovery that rewards are falling behind living expenses may lead to an exodus. 'I believe', wrote a bank clerk to the *Spectator* recently, 'that the bank clerk's load is a little too heavy for his own good and for the good of his customers. Banking is an important industry—a profession to be proud of. Good men are leaving it, some for jobs that are less essential but pay a living wage.'¹¹ This may also be true of teachers, some social workers, and some Army and Naval officers. The temptation to leave professional creative work

*It is primarily an absolute shortage of young women in the population.

one loves and does well, for a routine administrative post at even a few pounds a year more, will, in these circumstances, always be unhealthily strong.

6. EXPENSES

No one can give an objective answer to the question, whether £2,000 a year is an adequate income to enable a senior professional man to do his job properly. In many cases it is, but the incidental expenses of keeping up a practice—and even of keeping up appearances—vary widely between professions. One cannot even be sure of the true *net* incomes of professional people. Everyone knows that a single man has his income of £400 a year reduced by tax to £360 a year, that a married man with two children has his £1,000 reduced to £888, and that when his children are grown up he will keep only £1,438 out of his £2,000 a year; and this probably represents the prospects of the average professional man, on the ghastly assumption that taxation remains at its present level. It is certain that very few salary-earners paying P.A.Y.E. manage to ‘get away with anything’ where the Inland Revenue is concerned, but there are still one or two little dodges known to professional partnerships and to those professions, such as opticians and pharmacists, who keep open shop; the salary-earner is also at a disadvantage in the matter of expense accounts. It is doubtful whether the weekly share-out of pound notes, which used to take place in the less scrupulous medical partnerships, has survived the accounting system of the National Health Service. The amount of evasion among professional people is certainly less than among farmers and small commercial businesses.

It is not our purpose to relate these incomes to the middle-class cost of living, a subject with which we dealt in *The English Middle Classes*.¹² Since that book appeared in 1949, the position has somewhat worsened. We are concerned here with the expenses peculiar to professional people, over and above those common to other middle-class families such as those of business men and civil servants. These are not, in general, as many or as heavy as they are sometimes represented. The general medical practitioner, of course, has to keep a car, and work it hard; he has to over-work his wife, and she will probably either collapse or leave him if he does not or cannot employ at least some domestic service. Against this, he charges the expenses of his car against the practice, and can take account of the services both of his wife and of the servant in his tax return; further, he can be sure of getting a new car, which is much cheaper than a second-hand one. The clergyman’s

wife, on the other hand, will probably do more than the doctor's wife without any domestic help at all. 'It takes a heroine to marry a parson', said Prebendary Linsey to the British Council of Churches.¹⁸ Wear and tear to wives is not susceptible of valuation in assessing costs.

In Chapter VI we referred to the subtleties of professional advertising—the ways in which the appearance and social activities of professional people may be exploited to attract business. It is clear that this process involves the investment of money. The housing shortage has provided excuses for not living at what used to be known as 'a good address' (even if such a thing exists nowadays), but it is not possible to do one's professional entertaining in a subsidized council cottage. The doctor can often combine home and surgery under one roof,* and derive income-tax reliefs from so doing, but many London professional men who have to present a smooth façade to the world are paying rents of £400 and £500 a year for their homes. Entertaining will certainly involve engaging domestic help. Then there is probably membership of a London club (at least twenty guineas a year), and of a golf club (five or ten guineas). The 'successful' practitioner may need one or two new suits a year, at thirty guineas apiece, and his total bill for clothes, shoes and cleaning is unlikely to be less than £120 a year; he may easily spend £150 a year, at present prices, on sherry and spirits for consumption at home. Unless much more of these expenses can be charged against the practice than is usually permitted, an income of £2,000 a year is not enough for a family man with children to be educated.

It can, of course, be argued that most of these expenses are unnecessary luxuries, amenities from which enjoyment is derived, and that 'distributive justice' demands that they be abolished. But there are other expenses which are less easy to criticize. Membership of a professional institution may cost five to ten guineas a year (some fees are three times as high as before the war), while in some professions essential books, newspapers and learned journals can easily add up to £25 in a year. There are international conferences, to which it is not always possible to arrange to be sent as a delegate with expenses paid; even a regional conference in Britain may set a visitor back anything from ten to twenty-five pounds. Fees to institutions can be charged

* One of the problems of the N.H.S. is that of the doctor's house. In the first place, a new doctor succeeding to an old practice may have to buy (sometimes at a high price) the retiring doctor's house, since there may be no other place for a surgery. On the other hand, the retiring man, or a doctor's widow, may refuse to sell the house, owing to the shortage of alternative accommodation, leaving a practice with no surgery.

against income-tax,* but the Revenue Authorities are sticky about books and journals.

What worries professional people most is that their living expenses have for some time been increasing faster than their net incomes. Probably no reader of this book will fail to recognize this, from personal experience, as an almost invariable middle-class characteristic, scarcely worth comment. It is, however, a particularly serious matter for the professions; for, as we have suggested in Chapter V, it is difficult to see how, in the present organization of society, professional real incomes as a whole can rise much more. Nor is it only living expenses which are rising. If the running expenses of practices continue to increase at the present rate, net *incomes* are likely to be reduced. The following table compares the costs of some of the ordinary items of professional and office equipment and services, now and before the war :¹⁴

	1939	1952
Rent of three-roomed office in Central London	£200	£3-400 p. a.
Wages of private secretary	£4-£5	£7-£8 p. w.
Wages of copy-typist	£3-£4	£5-£6 p. w.
Wages of office junior	£1	£3-£4 p. w.
Cost of standard typewriter	£33	£50
Cost of typing paper (ream)	5s.	18s.
Cost of notepaper, with embossed head (ream)	12s.	£6 12s.
Cost of tracing paper (25 yards)	7s. 6d.	17s. 3d.

The incomes of partners in private practice reflect, in most professions, the heavy burden of overheads which their practices are carrying.

The scales are loaded against the private practitioner in four ways. First, unlike the salaried man, he has to carry his own overheads; secondly, he has to find his own working capital; thirdly, he normally gets no pension, and so has to try to save for his old age out of annual income; and fourthly, death duties play havoc with the finances of partnerships in a way they cannot do with those of companies.

It is now almost impossible to accumulate reserves of working capital in most professions, and even harder to find the money either to build up a practice or to meet contingencies as they arise. Parents, hard pressed to pay the costs of professional training, rarely have money to put into a practice for the beginner. The state is now forced to assist some newly qualified doctors to meet initial expenses, in

* Except in the case of professional men in the Civil Service, who are taxed under Schedule E. This is a cause of considerable discontent.

order to enable them to start practices in 'under-doctored areas'. The initial expenses of starting up a new practice between those professions in which private practice exists do not vary as much as might be expected. Some professional people (dentists are the obvious example) have much more expensive equipment to get together than others; it remains to be seen whether hire-purchase facilities are going to be reduced, or rendered more costly. But, in general, the costs of setting up a new practice are largely those of equipping an office and paying its rent, together with clerical wages, until enough work is coming in to pay for them. It is also desirable not to starve during this period. The need for working capital in a going concern varies: the doctor will need very little, while a firm of City solicitors may need many thousands. Before the war, a big firm of stockbrokers would carry a good client on margin for a considerable sum out of its own resources, while the two-man partnership had to be less accommodating: even so, the firm could nearly always find the money 'somewhere in the City'. To-day, the amount of speculative business is much smaller, but the money is also far harder to find. The quiet words of Mr Butler to the banks have been translated into a tightening up of overdraft and loan facilities whose ultimate effects on professional practice cannot yet be foreseen.

The small trading business has always the last resort, when the effects of taxation batter the partners beyond endurance, of turning itself into a limited company, when it is possible to blunt the impact on the individual. Certainly this will have a profound effect on the vulnerability of the partnership to the withdrawal of funds caused by payment of duties levied on the death of a colleague. In the case of a company, death duties can often be carried by bringing in outsiders to spread the control. It may be a sad shift for 'the family' in a family business to be driven to, but it pays. The professional partnership cannot benefit in anything like the same way; besides, its assets will always be valued more harshly for the purposes of duty than those of a company.

7. OLD AGE AND RETIREMENT

It is, however, the difficulty of saving out of income to provide for retirement and for children that hits the private practitioner most severely. To secure a gross investment income of £800 a year, a man must save about £16,000 net, equivalent to gross earnings of £1,000 a year for at least twenty-five years, a rate of saving which is to-day virtually impossible. Even to live on capital for ten years after retire-

ment, at the rate of £800 a year, requires the setting aside of gross earnings of £1,000 a year for twelve years or £500 a year for twenty-five. Annuities are not universally popular, as tax reliefs on premiums are not generous. Further, an annuity income does not provide the reserve for crises and contingencies—or the capital to buy a house—which comes with invested capital savings. Some professional men, of course, now invest in annuities *faute de mieux*, but even so the annual sum to be put aside is pretty heavy.

Professional people in private practice therefore work not only far longer than they want to (if this were all, they could expect scant sympathy), but far longer than is good either for their practices or for their clients. Doctors who have entered the N.H.S. have the cushion of their compensation payments for loss of rights to sell their practices; nevertheless, while consultants and hospital doctors now mostly go on working until they are 65 (instead of 60), the elderly G.P. hangs on as long as possible, not only to go on earning, but to secure a N.H.S. pension. Some accountants and architects, when they near retiring age, now take in partners on the understanding that they themselves shall continue to receive a substantial proportion of the profits of the partnership after they have ceased active work. This is both unfair to the new partner and detrimental to the chances of getting the best men into private practice. Principals in solicitors' and surveyors' partnerships are said to go on working till they drop. Most big firms now run pension schemes for their salaried staffs through insurance companies (as a means of competing for staff with the public service), but the present seniors are too late to benefit from such schemes themselves. The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors considered recommending a group superannuation scheme to members, but finally decided against it. The Royal Institute of Chemistry runs a benevolent fund, and seeks to help retired members who have fallen on evil times; the widows of members who die young, leaving children to be educated, are also helped.

Meanwhile, the professional civil servant, the local government officer, members of the socialized professions, university teachers and a few others have their pensions and superannuation schemes. The retiring civil servant gets (at 60) a pension equal to one-eightieth of the average annual salary earned in his last three years for every year of service, plus a lump sum gratuity of three years' pension. Thus, if he retires having earned £1,600 for three years, his pension will be about £800 a year (taxed as *earned* income) and his gratuity £2,400. The attractions, to-day, are obvious. Indeed, the wonder is that so

many people still enter private practice, and in some professions (surveying, for instance) the proportion in the public service seems actually to be decreasing. It may be held to be a sad sign that so many young people are content to accept the limitations, the frustration, and the lack of adventure in the Civil Service, instead of taking a risk and hoping for the best. Young people always tend rather to the short view; but they have listened to their professional parents indulging for years in the process known vulgarly as 'belly-aching' (and for which there is no equally satisfactory synonym), and it would not be surprising if some of them had come to the conclusion that the days of private practice are numbered in an age of spreading state control, social security for all at a dead level of contributions and benefits, and death to individualists.

Grave as are the financial deterrents to private practice, it is still too soon to say that they will destroy it entirely. But they have destroyed a lot of it, and before the destruction or 'socialization' of still more professional service is accepted with equanimity on any other grounds, it is worth while recalling the fantastic cost to the nation of retirement pensions and superannuation contributions in official schemes. Many of these are still in their infancy: the ultimate burden on an ageing nation promises to be terrific. It may one day prove too great to be sustained—and that day may not be so very far away. If it comes, perhaps there may be seen to have been some merit in the old, brutal system by which the good man went to the top of his profession and was allowed to make (and keep) enough money to retire on, while the failures had to be supported by their children, who thereby gained a strong incentive to do better than their father. The system certainly offended not only against actuarial principles but against the ideal of fair shares for all. At times it is difficult to avoid a strong suspicion that it produced better work.

NOTES

1. Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, Book I, Chapter 10.
2. Kathleen Box, *Recruitment to the Civil Service*, Social Survey.
3. See *Economist*, 22 December 1951, pp. 14–15, for a full description of the scales and their effects.
4. These estimates were kindly communicated to us by Mr M. J. F. Secrett, A.R.I.B.A., who has been conducting an enquiry for the R.I.B.A.
5. This is the estimate of the British Medical Association.

6. These earnings are, of course, well above the recommended figures in the Spens Committee's Report, and have probably not survived the 1952 N.H.S. charges.

7. R.I.B.A., *Report of the Committee to Consider the Present and Future of Private Architectural Practice*, 1950.

8. R. L. Hine, *Confessions of an Uncommon Attorney*, 1945, p. 5.

9. April 1951.

10. Report of Committee on Consultants' and Specialists' Remuneration, Cmd. 7420, H.M.S.O., 1948.

11. *Spectator*, 27 July 1951.

12. Chapter XII.

13. *The Times*, 2 February 1950.

14. These are average estimates for Central London.

CHAPTER XIV

Prospect

"My father is all-wise", ventured Chang Tao dutifully, but observing the nature of the other's expression he hastened to add considerably, "but my father's father is even wiser."

"Inevitably" assented the one referred to; "not merely because he is the more mature by a generation, but also in that he is thereby nearer to the inspired ancients in whom the Cardinal Principles reside."

"Yet assuredly, there must be occasional exceptions to this rule of progressive deterioration?" suggested Chang Tao, feeling that the process was not without a definite application to himself.

"Not in our pure and orthodox line," replied the other person firmly. "To suggest otherwise is to admit the possibility of a son being the superior of his own father, and to what a discordant state of things would that contention lead! However immaturely you may think at present, you will see the position at its true angle when you have sons of your own."

ERNEST BRAMAH, *Kai Lung's Golden Hours*

'These struldbrugs and I would mutually communicate our observations and memorials, through the course of time; remark the several gradations by which corruption steals into the world and oppose it in every step, by giving perpetual warning and instruction to mankind: which, added to the strong influence of our own example, would probably prevent that continual degeneracy of human nature so justly complained of in all ages.'

JONATHAN SWIFT, *Gulliver's Voyage to Luggnagg*

THE GROWING COMPLEXITIES of a society run by experts have created steady employment for professional people—both for the professions established before the industrial revolution, and for new ones created since. According to the census of 1851, 2.5 per cent of the population was engaged in professional pursuits. The usual proportion of professional workers to the total population of an industrialized western country is nine or ten per cent. If every vocation that would claim itself as professional (including business management) were included, this proportion would be far higher for most, and certainly higher for Britain. This consideration must be set against the fact that grammar schools recruit their pupils from the top fifteen per cent of the nation's intelligence range; that in the last war ninety-nine per cent of the officer population were in the top thirty per cent of the population in terms

of intelligence, and the average officer within the top five to ten per cent; that for technical arms candidates for commissions had to be in the top two per cent; and that really brilliant individuals constitute a bare one-half of one per cent of the nation.¹

But it should be clear from the foregoing chapters that the manifestations which have in late years accompanied this growth of professional opportunity—the spread of professionalism inside and outside industry, the ‘socialization’ of professions, and above all the unchecked development of specialization—are full of dangers to the professional tradition. This tradition has influenced, for good, national life in the past, and we unconsciously expect it to continue to mould, and to civilize, the specialists of the future. It remains to consider what remedies have suggested themselves in the course of the foregoing analysis, and what others can be proposed.

1. FULL EMPLOYMENT FOR TECHNOLOGISTS

We can hardly expect any lessening in the forces which drive us to ever-greater complexity of living, unless a well-merited and sufficiently destructive atomic war should, as H. G. Wells thought perhaps it ought to, level down technical civilization to a point at which it was compatible with mankind’s very limited moral stature and ability to control his own productions. Given peace, we must expect industrialized masses to continue to demand as their right that ever-higher standard of life and welfare, that ‘progress’ to which for a hundred years the achievements of applied science have accustomed them. Though this, being outwardly a material thing, is mainly a fairly straightforward task for the technologist and administrator, its difficulty is likely to increase, at least in Britain. We are faced with the crisis of adverse terms of trade at a time when world population is pressing remorselessly on the means of subsistence. At the peak of the world price inflation it was said: ‘The present price relationship between British exports and primary products is such that in return for one Jaguar XK120 motor car we receive four and a half bales of fine merino wool; that is to say, in return for 3,896 lbs. of magnificent car we get 1,125 lbs. (one-third of its weight) of wool’.² Adverse as is the exchange rate for raw materials, for food it is worse and worsening. This situation may temporarily be eased; fundamentally, as world population moves towards the 4,000,000,000 mark, the weakness of any people which buys food by selling manufactures will remain. The change since the ’thirties is so great that we have not yet begun to comprehend it.

The change necessarily means, however, that the importance of the technologist, whether engineer, scientist, or scientist-engineer, will remain; the apparently immediate and most pressing problems will be the provision of food and clothing and the wherewithal of civilized life. But the 'laying on' of the services required by the experts will continue to generate a comparable demand for organizers of all kinds based on a diversity of professional disciplines ranging from technology itself to accountancy or law; and it is natural to suppose that a large proportion of professional brains will be absorbed in this battle with nature, both at home and in dependent territories in which we need to raise the yield of cash crops and raw materials for export to Britain. No doubt the teamwork of specialists has many technical triumphs yet to produce, wherewith to stave off the final judgment that Malthus was right—when all disease has been eliminated from plants and cattle, all weeds eradicated from cultivated land, there will still be the possibility of using the nutriment in seaweed and even in vast tonnages of microscopic marine life.³ But to mount such technical triumphs, big installations and organizations, as well as huge investments by commerce or government, are necessary. The march of Bigness, whether in the form of nationalized industries or in others, will continue. Whether administrative efficiency will keep pace with technological possibility is another matter altogether: the prognosis is bad.

Broadly, we find ourselves committed to this type of society, increasingly complex, increasingly efficient, working to ever smaller tolerances; the immediate masses of Britain's towns and cities always pressing for higher standards, for leisure, for pleasure, for more and more welfare; the greater masses, in the world beyond, demanding a bigger share in the good things that the Western world has got—and multiplying at the rate of twenty million mouths a year. Despite the work of professional engineers, scientists and administrators, the call is for hard work to keep level: 'the riddle is that industrial civilization, having created for its unknown ends a race of mechanical drudges, requires, nevertheless, a contribution of human toil more intense, more exacting, more irksome than ever. As toil it is more productive—there is more to consume. Life has expanded. It is safer. It is inconceivably richer. Was that the goal? What else is gained?'⁴

2. THE TRADITION OF PRIVATE PRACTICE

This emphasis on technical people has, as we have seen, been fully reflected in the demand for additional training facilities for them. It

has, however, another effect. This part of the professional spectrum is the part which is least concerned with the traditional qualities of professional life, and has contributed least to the general professional influence upon national life. Wherefore the temptation to think of 'the experts' rather than 'the professional classes', is strong: it agrees with the order of priorities. We have suggested that any claim which engineers, scientists, and technologists may have to be regarded as professional from the ethical point of view, derives very largely in fact from their being 'the same sort of people' as doctors, lawyers, teachers, and parsons—brought up to approximately the same general ideals, and subjected to the same educative and social influences. The nature of their work tends to make all but the most brilliant and reflective among them preoccupied with things and theories rather than people and atmospheres, and materialistic in outlook; their occasional talk of the social responsibilities of the engineer to society is nebulous.⁵ As the proportion of technologists to others increases at universities and in industrial organizations, their influence will increase.

Meanwhile, the professional ethic of the other professions is tending to become less important, as private practice becomes an ever smaller part of every profession. We have seen how professional practice has diminished in such professions as accountancy and architecture, as the result of the march of Big Business and the requirements of technology; we have also seen how relationships have begun to change in medicine and law as the result of the total or partial 'socialization' of these professions. But we have also argued that the basis of professional life is the contract between practitioner and client (or patient, or patron), an essentially ethical relationship; and that this fiduciary and confidential relationship lies not merely at the heart of the great professions of medicine (and its derivatives, the medical auxiliaries, social workers, opticians etc.) and of the law (and its specialized offshoots, estate agents, land agents, patent agents, chartered secretaries, etc.), but also, by the power of example and co-practice in the same environment, at the heart of *all* professionals. The body of private practitioners and consultants (whether medical, commercial, legal, scientific, or technological) sets the tone for professional life; and its profound reality as a living moral code has an invisible but potent effect upon the bearing and conduct of professional people in salaried employ. To the extent that they feel that they belong to their profession, rather than merely do skilled work for pay, they belong to a profession created and upheld⁶ by the tradition of private practice. In professions in which there is little or no private practice, they borrow

the ideas and attitudes (if sometimes ludicrously, nonetheless significantly) from those in which there is more. The special respect enjoyed by the private practitioner is sometimes recognized by the institution itself, in awarding its fellowships *only* to private practitioners of many years' standing and respectability.

We have also taken the view that the devotion which characterizes the civil servant, and which might be held up as the ethic appropriate to an age of 'socialized' professions and nationalized industries, is in the last resort also very largely derived from the conduct of the free professions. However important may be the sense of craftsmanship which peculiarly informs the civil servant's own job, 'his real compensation is not money, certainly not leisure, but the reward which springs from the consciousness of a worthwhile job, and the continual absorbing interest of it all. Perhaps, too, he secretly likes his authority and meed of power.'⁶ The danger may be that the interest will tend to attach more and more to the power rather than to unalloyed devotion to the public service.

The traditions of the Civil Service were largely made during the nineteenth century, when almost all professional men, whether doctors, lawyers, accountants, architects, or surveyors, were in private practice, and indeed when a far higher proportion of civil and mechanical engineers were consultants, modelling their codes and their propriety upon the other professions, in the hope of making their exponents *gentlemen* and acceptable as gentlemen. Civil Service traditions were also made when business was fairly rigidly demarcated from professional life, and *laissez-faire* was a philosophy also of personal worth and character-formation. The other formative influence upon the Civil Service was the tradition of the fighting services: they learned from the devotion and rigid obedience to rules developed by Samuel Pepys, when Secretary to the Admiralty,⁷ and from the devotion of regimental officers to the service, to regimental tradition, and to the welfare of their men. These were the examples held up before a professional Civil Service (in India, too), and it was from them that the distinguishing characteristics of the administrative civil servant developed. That class is the core and heart of the service, and has, no doubt, great power over the other motley ranks of the new bureaucracy; but it, too, is under some considerable pressure.⁸

It seems reasonable to think that service and selflessness are founded ultimately more on direct personal relations, ties of honesty, trust, honour, and loyalty, between a professional man and his client, as they have been practised over generations, than upon any natural or

instinctive urge in men to serve 'the community' under irksome restraints, with a load of responsibility and for limited rewards which constantly tend to diminish for the amount of *expertise* supplied. It seems reasonable, too, to think that this tradition needs to be nourished by the continued practice of the professional relationship, in its simplest and most satisfying (and most onerous) form: the form in which one man bears the full responsibility for the advice he gives, and which he has been trained, and has trained himself, to give. Nothing can provide a substitute for it. The technique itself may be, as Sir William Patterson remarked in Trollope's *Orley Farm*: 'just a trick of the trade that you learn, as a girl learns the notes of her piano. You forget all about it the next hour. But when a man has been hanged whom you have striven to save, you do remember that.'

How long can traditions be expected to survive? How long will the doctor continue to behave *as if* he was in a professional relationship with the patient, if he is made to feel that he is employed by, and strictly answerable only to, a local or national authority? Will he refuse to do, certify, or dispense things which his professional knowledge informs him are not necessary, and perhaps not advisable, *as if* he were completely free, when he knows he can be 'got at' by patients with grievances? How long will the mine manager use his own judgment, and ruthlessly set aside suggestions from functional experts, however well connected with the power nexus in Hobart House, *as if* he were answerable to law and his own engineering conscience alone? Tradition is tenacious, especially in Britain; but when we have a steady process of 'socialization', of removal of immediate responsibility in nearly all professions at work, only those will rely on it who believe in the innate goodness of human nature, in the deep appeal to natural instincts of a socialist order of society, and in the power of statutory rules and regulations to make people behave in a way which a religious ethic demanded, but which is now denigrated in proportion as the newer paper system is set up.

The signs of the times all point the other way: they point to the mounting power of the expert untroubled by conscience, interested only in getting things done; and, for the social repercussions of action, referring to other and separately trained experts. The expert is often more helplessly in the hands of other experts than is the layman. The main bulwark against the washing away of this professional tradition is, of course, the long memories and authority of the professional institutions themselves, and, to a considerable degree, the universities. (Resentment was expressed by various trade unionists to the writers

that the exclusiveness of the professions was maintained because the institutions and the universities were 'hand in glove'.)

'Professional associations', concluded Carr-Saunders and Wilson in *The Professions*, 'are stabilizing elements in society. They engender modes of life, habits of thought, and standards of judgment which render them centres of resistance to crude forces which threaten steady and peaceful evolution.'⁹ This is undoubtedly true, and was shown, as we have seen, in the handling of the Legal Aid Scheme by the Law Society. But more and more of the senior offices in all professional associations are staffed by those who have never carried on any private practice; the time will come when the officers of such associations have mainly been moulded in outlook by a lifetime of service principally in or for a government department. Training in many professions will tend, if these processes continue, to be taken more at universities or technical colleges (as in America) and less under articles; for any further decline of private practice would make this inevitable. It will certainly weaken the power of the older generation of practitioners to impress its moral standards on the next. The importance of the traditional professional association itself may, at the same time, tend to diminish in the eyes of the younger generation in comparison with that of the bargaining association; or professional functions will come to be thought less important than bargaining functions where these are combined in one organization. The link between standards of performance (as an attitude as well as a matter for examinations) status, and financial *prospects*, may be missed: money *now* is what will matter (provided there is a pension), and trade unionism will seem the proper approach. These mental tendencies will be reinforced in proportion as the professions themselves are diluted by entrants of a narrower outlook, smaller intellectual attainment and perhaps impoverished training; and also as occupations achieve professional status which in fact exhibit little opportunity for the deployment of professional virtues.

3. THE PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE PRACTICE

These dangers may be shrugged aside; professional people are very busy. Nonetheless, if they feel their independence is at stake, they should measure the forces against them, and the length of the fight before them, if a fight is to be put up at all. As has appeared in earlier chapters, many professional institutions have reacted swiftly to some threats as they arise; we find the main scientific and engineering institu-

tions opposing what they conceive to be a debased form of technological education, and the Institute of Chartered Accountants setting its face as bitterly against any diminution of the special excellences of its own professional doctrine. The weaknesses of disunity and extreme specialization are being realized in professions like engineering, where the 'big three' seek, however unsuccessfully, to put an umbrella over the whole gamut of specialist institutions, hurling only the unworthy into the outer darkness as technicians' institutes. They are becoming alive to, though they have as yet no prophylactic against, the danger of according professional status to technical skill. The profession of accountancy is similarly challenged to present a more united front, although, until the Institute of Chartered Accountants can find means to modify its *non possumus* without endangering its training standards, it is unlikely to meet that challenge; and it will have only itself to blame, if there emerge coal accountants, transport accountants, and even hospital accountants, each separate and distinct, with institute and training complete and specialized, and reducing the scope of the established institutions. Unlike the engineers or accountants, the chartered surveyors have seen the virtues of organization and devolution designed to retain within a single institution men who complete their training as highly diverse specialists.

By upholding educational standards, the institutions will no doubt achieve the *sine qua non* of upholding status. They may thereby lay themselves open to the charge of failure to provide the experts in the numbers which the nation demands. It is probably a charge that they will do well to ignore, or refute by pointing to the quality of candidates, and by making the counter-charge that the government, and the welfare state too, is a prodigious waster of professional talent, both in the departments and in nationalized industry. But institutional stiffneckedness alone will not preserve the professional tradition.

The essential need seems to us to be the preservation of personal responsibility to the client in the professions which set the tone for the others—primarily law and medicine. This must somehow be done within the framework of partly 'socialized' administration and finance. We have quoted Dr Fox's conclusion that 'doctors cannot be employed, in the ordinary sense, by the state or anybody else. It is essential, for the good of the public, that they remain the servants of their patients, and personally responsible for their work'.¹⁰ The problem is to translate this conclusion into practice. •

Freedom depends largely on control of the purse. The fee-taking professional practitioner is free; he is accountable only to himself in

financial matters. On the other hand, no individual or department in the British bureaucracy—which includes, for reasons set out in a previous chapter, the local authorities—is free of the Treasury's control; and, as far as Ministries of Works or Pensions are concerned, Treasury dominance is probably a good thing. But the universities, as we have noted, have largely kept clear of it; and so should all the professions. As we have seen, the Law Society is careful to pay for the Legal Aid Scheme on a system of block grants—the lawyers involved are paid by their own professional association; it is urgent that in medicine some similar system should be introduced. Doctors should handle the employment of doctors; and, broadly, the health professions as a whole should determine the conditions of employment for all those working co-operatively in them. There is everything to be said for systems of block grants to hospitals and other health organizations, under which there will not only be an incentive to economize, but money will be spent as senior staff on the spot feel it should best be spent—not by a bureaucratic regional board sending round circulars, at the behest of the Treasury itself, hag-ridden by thoughts of the Committee of Public Accounts. The Treasury meanwhile shows no sign whatever that it thinks it could trust the medical profession and its auxiliaries to handle such large sums of public money honestly.

In aiming at professional freedom, the professions must learn the importance of securing financial freedom. Once they have wrested freedom from the Treasury it may again be possible to appeal to the public for additional money for special needs. At present, with the state service paid from taxes and the doctor almost a civil servant, this alms-giving has ceased, to the detriment both of recipient and giver. Medicine cannot, perhaps, expect to gain the freedom that the law hopes to hold; but an independent medical profession is second in importance only, as we have seen, to an independent judiciary. While the state may have to limit the amount it can pay out for health, bureaucrats cannot be allowed to control the uses to which modern medical science is put. Inevitably, it has more to say in the uses to which money for education is put, though, as we have seen, it is already gaining too much. One of the arguments for retaining the Arts Council, with all its imperfections, is that, if the arts are to be in part paid by the state, artists should take a large share in the direction of disbursements.

The strength of medicine, like law, will reside in the degree to which the practitioner-client relationship can be maintained. It is therefore vital that the schism between the general practitioner and the hospital

doctor should be healed, and certainly that any imputation of inferior professional status to the former should be avoided. In the public's affection and respect for the family doctor lies, in the long run, the real safeguard of the professional freedom of the hospital doctor. If the G.P. loses caste, the public will gradually tend to think of medical men as simply purveyors of wrapped-up scientific cures, payable, therefore, at clerks' wages. No doubt this conception will alternate with that of the medical 'boffin', the all-wise inventor of the cures. But in either case the profession will have lost its main strength—the confidence of ordinary folk in the doctor's surgery. Schemes to bring the G.P. back into hospitals, to improve refresher courses for general practitioners, and to give medical students a fuller and better understanding of the uses and importance of general practice, in the course of their medical training, are much to be welcomed. Fundamentally, it is up to the hospital doctor to make these things possible by understanding what raising the standard and the standing of general practice means to *him* and to *his* profession.

For the same reason, all doctors within the National Health Service should welcome the survival of private practice outside it, as the most thoughtful already do.¹¹ Practice outside the scheme sets a standard of independence and competence which is of value to the whole profession; furthermore, it keeps alive the possible alternative. The state would feel far stronger if private practice were stamped out entirely, and doctors dismissed from the service were as completely finished as doctors struck off the Register. Then doctors can be forced to accept any conditions in general practice, and all sorts of disciplinary 'postings' may become possible. On the contrary, doctors ought to regard the survival of private practice as an insurance, not as competition; the public should know that private practice exists, enjoys great respect, and may have particular advantages.

It may be fanciful to liken the position of private practice outside the N.H.S. to the position of private schools *vis-à-vis* state education. But they both perform much the same function. They keep an alternative alive, admittedly for those who are prepared to pay for it; that people are prepared to pay for something a little better and more individual than the state standard is a tribute to both professions, and an ever-present warning to the state. But it is idle to deny that this is very distasteful to Socialists, and can be maintained only so long as the middle classes have some financial reserves.*

We regard it as important that the unifying influences of the pro-

* Or the well-off artisan develops a taste for good education or better medicine.

fessions as a whole should be strengthened. The attitude of some professions to others leaves much to be desired. In the case of medicine, it is evident that relations between doctors and their auxiliaries have been marked by jealousy on the one side and rivalry on the other. The doctor's ultimate responsibility is clear enough: and it would ill become laymen to seek to delimit the responsibilities of each of the medical professions. The fact remains that dentists and opticians are professional men now, and that they have unhappy memories of medical interferences with their natural evolution; the fact remains that hospitals do need the services of radio-therapists, social workers, and so forth. These are all professions in which the patient-practitioner relationship is of great importance. For the professional tradition as a whole, and for the best development of the National Health Service in particular, it is vital that there should be harmony between them, and that the medical profession, as the strongest, should help them in every possible way. They must not be allowed to develop the notion that a doctor is simply a 'medical expert', whose pretensions and better salary are unjustified even by his longer training; on the contrary, a better type of doctor, awake to the implications of his profession's position in a state service, should seek to strengthen the professional consciousness of all those in the health professions. Their influence can be very great, for health touches other professional existences at many points—particularly, of course, law, teaching, and the ministry. The bearing of the 'state doctor' can now be potent for evil, indeed—or for good. If he takes up a civil servant's attitude, even before he is a civil servant, it will be widely imitated.

How far private practice can be maintained in professions other than law and medicine is doubtful. The cult of Bigness, nationalization, and the state employment of so many scientific specialists in teams are all against it. But undoubtedly all professional bodies should become aware of the importance of preserving private practice, and promoting the interests of consultants, whenever they can. There seems no reason, for example, why professional men and women in positions of responsibility in large organizations should not consistently press the possibility of going 'outside' the organizations for professional services wherever possible, rather than trying to create specialized departments. Here is a direct example of a way in which professional civil servants, or accountants and engineers in large firms, could show that they belong to their professions, and seek (within reason) its welfare first and foremost; unhappily the pleasures of empire-building are likely to outweigh such considerations with many salaried men, whose professions are

the ornament behind their names rather than the ideal before their eyes. All measures designed to improve the survival-power of partnerships and practices, through taxation policy, should be pressed forward.

To enable professional traditions to survive, there is also every reason to watch, and where possible, check, the growth of centralized organizations. To some extent, the nationalizers have learned a lesson from the Coal Board, and every successive nationalized industry has shown a greater degree of decentralized control. Nonetheless, centrifugal tendencies are powerful; there is something in the spirit of the age which encourages a desire to 'control' that unfortunate person who used to be known—in days when telegraphic services were less perfect and ambassadors, colonial district officers, and ships' captains carried more responsibility—as 'the man on the spot'. This does not mean that mines must be despotically run by men of mediocre attainment, able to refuse all aid, and living with the security of a beneficed clergyman. But it does mean that once a mine manager has been taught *how to use* experts, and how to participate in specialist teamwork, he should remain, as a man with special qualities of character, the captain of his ship. The advantages of centralization are all on paper: and they are always advocated by the most interested parties, the people at the top.

4. THE CHALLENGE OF ADMINISTRATION

It is clear that one of the immediate challenges which face the professions is that of administration; and closely bound up with administration is leadership. This book is not intended to be a study of management problems, but we cannot conceal our conviction that there is almost no case for the creation of a profession of management—at least one trained separately from the other professions. On the contrary, the importance of conserving professional independence on the one hand and on the other of drawing into administration, whether departmental, industrial or other, the best leaders that any professional discipline may happen to have trained, seems to prove that each profession must train its own leaders and managers; that when they reach the managerial stage, they may then be free to move between one type of organization and another. Managerial ability is extraordinarily flexible. We have seen how diversely accountants are employed; Sir Miles Thomas recently told the British Institute of Management that 'character, sincerity and common sense are frequently worth more than specialized training when it comes to assessing the higher executive jobs that men are fitted to undertake . . . During the war I had motor

salesmen running precision engineering factories and motor body builders running aircraft repair shops, all with conspicuous success.¹²

It is quite mistaken to suppose that either administrators must be specially trained, from school leaving age, to run the hospitals, the nationalized industries and everything else, or that a really unwieldy organization, once set up, demands a civil servant to manage it. Professional bodies such as the Institute of Industrial Administration would passionately protest that they train only those who have preliminary qualifications and experience, and that these can be in wide fields; but the trouble is that higher administrative studies are not yet good enough, or in content wide enough, to constitute sound staff training for all professions. There is little confidence in them, and such as they are they tend at present to produce select circles of rather superior persons who are anxious to hang on to their jobs. If the professions are to maintain their independence, run their own socialized organizations, and be properly represented in the higher staff councils, they have to face this difficult problem of training administrators. It is no longer a matter which worries only the establishment branches of the Civil Service, or some 2,000 largish firms, the *élite* of British businesses, genuinely bothered by the training of their bureaucracy, the improvement of their labour relations, and the provision of succession in command. It is rapidly becoming everyone's problem; and, just because the present courses are vague and woolly, the concepts unscientific and repulsive to the specialized mind, it cannot be balked. If it is, administration will become the happy hunting ground of the second-rate mind, which, after taking a pass degree, can readily get through an examination in 'management studies'.

Administration at present is regarded as a narrow speciality. To train people to run hospitals, there is one institution (the Institute of Hospital Administrators) which teaches the organization of hospitals, the law affecting medicine, and some simple accountancy; to teach industrial management, there is the I.I.A., teaching the organization of industry, the law affecting employment in factories, and some simple accountancy; to teach commercial administration, there is the Institute of Chartered Secretaries, which teaches the organization of commerce, banking and public companies, the law affecting shareholders' money, and some simple accounting. These bodies will indignantly protest that to put the matter like that is to burlesque their impressive syllabuses: but all of them admit that nothing in their syllabuses makes, and nothing in their examinations tests, the qualities and character of the sort of man who runs a company, a trade associa-

tion, a hospital, or a factory with brilliance. Nor dare they deny that such a man, called to the wheel, would almost certainly run each and any of these with brilliance. In fact, they teach little more than clerklly routines, and give a man the (valuable) power to find out the details of his organization; possibly impart to him an inkling of the wider implications of his work, provided he does something more than cram for the exam when he reads his textbooks on economics.

On top of this, more than one nationalized industry professes the profoundest contempt for Chartered Secretaries or Fellows of the Institute of Industrial Administration; while to suggest that they might find in a Fellow of the Institute of Hospital Administration a man so trained, so imaginative and gifted with the power to inspire loyalty, that they could give him a high administrative post, would move them to laughter. We did not dare, we confess, to suggest it. But many of them propose to train university men in their *own* routines as administrators. It is hard to resist the gloomy prognostication that half this training and examining is useless, one quarter foredoomed to encourage endless red-tapery and white-collar intrigue, and barely one quarter of the slightest productive value. We are getting administration of a sort—but we are not getting leadership. The worst bureaucracy is administration—the Crimean war was administered, for the matter of that. But how can these bodies prove that they are doing the job that is needed to-day—to sift out the leaders we need? They cannot.

There will be no easy solution to the problem of administration; possibly there *is* no solution to it—though to believe this is to confess the shocking heresy that there are limits to men's powers, even when they have passed a professional exam. But something might be gained by a re-consideration of just what administration is, and the extent to which people can be trained for it. It will, however, be useless to appoint yet another committee with all the well-known people with vested interests in administration sitting on it. For our part, we feel that it is a strong recommendation to smallness and decentralization; in such circumstances, amateurs can do the organizing and managing.

5. WORKING TOGETHER

Co-operation between the professions as a whole can probably not be expected upon any but clear-cut issues of shared interest, such as taxation; but it is much to be hoped that it will extend. The failure, for example, of lawyers and estate agents to co-operate in guiding developments in the law of property has allowed it to get into the hands

of planning officers. It is to be hoped that co-operation, even at institutional level, will embrace, in time, exploration of means of conserving the professional tradition. But still more could be done by a growth of general awareness of each other's problems by professional people, and by direct co-operation 'on the ground'. In villages—in small communities of any kind—the doctor and teacher have always held jointly the key to preventive medicine; but the teacher has been so busy enjoying the rise in his fortunes relative to those of the parson that the main contact between them has been when the teacher caught 'flu or the doctor's children caught the cane. The parson's ministry has been split up among officers of the welfare state. Small communities are decaying in Britain, however, and it is difficult to bring people in different professions together on district level, save rarely in local government.

But some means of encouraging the sort of informal contacts which enable men of varied experiences to pool their ideas and examine together the objective of their several, specialized efforts, might well be considered. Of all the enormous effort and nervous energy put into organizing and keeping in repair our complex social machine, especially into making it more complex, what part is spent in considering just what this Leviathan is intended to achieve, and is really achieving—not in the cloudy generalizations of weekly political journalism, but in terms of the English family, Smith or Brown, to whose physical, mental, spiritual, and political welfare, doctor, teacher, minister, lawyer (not to add accountant, estate agent, town planner, district nurse, and the personnel manager of the nearby factory) are severally contributing? What part is spent in re-thinking the machine itself, particularly with a view to simplifying it, so that the family Brown can understand it, or even help to run it?

The conclusion of a historical review of the professions is that professional people have inherited the leadership in Britain to-day. That leadership will be in good hands if they can remain professional in the best sense, as we have tried, in the course of this book, to elucidate it. They need, however, to work much harder to strengthen an influence that is already waning; they need to protect themselves and defend their ideals; they need to face the fact that they are an aristocracy, of a sort, and to understand and uphold the personal attainments, as well as the exercise of power, which is implied in that word. They certainly need the humility which self-knowledge demands, and should discard the dangerous false modesty of pretending to be 'ordinary people—only an expert in this or that'. On the contrary, it is important

that their differences from other people should be emphasized; the atomic physicist is not an expert in the sense that a coal-face worker is an expert; nor are a doctor's or lawyer's *expertise*, life, influence, and dignity comparable with those of a radio engineer or packaging specialist. If so many activities must be 'professionalized'—and there is no escape from that conclusion—let professional people emphasize the hierarchy of professions, of education, of esteem. Let them not shirk the truth expressed by Matthew Arnold: 'the highly instructed few, and not the scantily instructed many, will ever be the organ to the human race of knowledge and truth. Knowledge and truth, in the full sense of the words, are not attainable by the great mass of the human race at all'.

NOTES

1. Eric James, *Education and Leadership*, 1951, pp. 20, 43, 48.
2. Lawrence W. Robson, Presidential Address to the Institute of Cost and Works Accountants, 22nd National Cost Conference, 1 June 1951.
3. *4,000 Million Mouths*, ed. F. le Gros Clark and N. W. Pirie, 1951.
4. Garrett Garrett, *Ouroboros*, 1925.
5. Cf. W. Boyle, 'The Professional Engineer in Modern Society', *Journal of the Engineers' Guild*, July 1951, p. 99.
6. T. A. Critchley, *The Civil Service Today*, 1951, p. 73.
7. Arthur Bryant, *Samuel Pepys, Saviour of the Navy*, 1938, pp. 203-15.
8. Cf. R. Lewis and A. Maude, *The English Middle Classes*, 1949, p. 118.
9. A. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, 1933, p. 498.
10. *The Lancet*, 28 July 1951.
11. *The Lancet*, 8 December 1951, 'Fragmentation or Integration'.
12. Sir Miles Thomas, *Management in Private Enterprise and Nationalized Industry*, British Institute of Management, 1949, p. 20.

APPENDIX

PROFESSIONAL LETTERS DESIGNATE

For the sake of convenience and ready-reference, the principal letters designate which are now in use are here listed in alphabetical order of initials. Learned bodies are included, where these have a professional rather than purely academic relevance, but not university degrees. The inclusion of any organization in this list is not in any way intended to suggest that other bodies accept its initials or examinations as equivalent to their own. Usage, not prestige, has been consulted in compiling this list. Medical degrees, except membership of colleges, are omitted.

- A.A.C.C.A. Associate of the Association of Certified & Corporate Accountants.
- A.A.L.P.A. Associate of the Incorporated Society of Auctioneers & Landed Property Agents.
- A.B.A.A. Associate of the British Association of Accountants & Auditors.
- A.C.A. Associate of the Institute of Chartered Accountants.
- A.C.I.A. Associate of the Corporation of Insurance Agents.
- A.C.I.B. Associate of the Corporation of Insurance Brokers.
- A.C.I.S. Associate of the Chartered Institute of Secretaries.
- A.C.W.A. Associate of the Institute of Cost & Works Accountants.
- A.F.A.S. Associate of the Faculty of Architects & Surveyors.
- A.F.R.Ae.S. Associate Fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society.
- A.H.A. Associate of the Institute of Hospital Administrators.
- A.I.A. Associate of the Institute of Actuaries.
- A.I.A.A. Architect member of the Incorporated Association of Architects & Surveyors.
- A.I.A.C. Associate of the Institute of Company Accountants.
- A.I.A.S. Surveyor member of the Incorporated Assoc. of Architects & Surveyors.
- A.I.B.P. Associate of the Institute of British Photographers.
- A.I.C.E. Associate of the Institution of Civil Engineers.
- A.I.C.S. Associate of the Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers.
- A.I.E.E. Associate of the Institution of Electrical Engineers.
- A.I.I.A. Associate of the Institute of Industrial Administration.
- A.I.Loco.E. Associate of the Institution of Locomotive Engineers.
- A.I.Mar.E. Associate of the Institution of Marine Engineers.
- A.I.M.T.A. Associate of the Institute of Municipal Treasurers & Accountants.
- A.Inst.P. Associate of the Institute of Physics.
- A.I.Q.S. Associate of the Institute of Quantity Surveyors.
- A.I.S.A. Associate of the Incorporated Secretaries Association.
- A.L.A. Associate of the Library Association.
- A.L.A.A. Associate of the London Association of Certified Accountants.
- A.M.I.A. Associate Member of the Institute of Almoners.
- A.M.I.A.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Automobile Engineers.
- A.M.I.Chem.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Chemical Engineers.
- A.M.I.E.D. Associate of the Institution of Engineering Draughtsmen & Designers.
- A.M.I.E.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Electrical Engineers.
- A.M.I.E.T. Associate Member of the Institution of Engineering Technology.
- A.M.I.GasE. Associate Member of the Institution of Gas Engineers.
- A.M.I.Mech.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers.
- A.M.I.Min.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Mining Engineers.
- A.M.I.N.A. Associate Member of the Institution of Naval Architects.
- A.M.I.Prod.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Production Engineers.
- A.M.I.Struct.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Structural Engineers.
- A.M.Inst.T.E. Associate Member of the Institution of Transport Engineers.
- A.M.T.P.I. Associate Member of the Town Planning Institute.
- A.R.A. Associate of the Royal Academy.
- A.R.A.M. Associate of the Royal Academy of Music.
- A.R.B.A. Associate of the Royal Society of British Sculptors.
- A.R.C.M. Associate of the Royal College of Music.
- A.R.E. Associate of the Royal Society of Painter Etchers.

- A.R.I.B.A. Associate of the Royal Institute of British Architects.
 A.R.I.C. Associate of the Royal Institute of Chemistry.
 A.R.I.C.S. Associate of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.
 A.R.M.S. Associate of the Royal Society of Miniature Painters.
 A.R.V.A. Associate of the Incorporated Association of Rating & Valuation Officers.
 A.S.A.A. Associate of the Society of Incorporated Accountants & Auditors.
 A.T.I. Associate of the Textile Institute.
 C.A. Chartered Accountant (in Scotland).
 F.A.C.C.A. Fellow of the Association of Certified & Corporate Accountants.
 F.A.I. Fellow of the Auctioneers' Institute.
 F.A.L.P.A. Fellow of the Incorporated Society of Auctioneers & Landed Property Agents.
 F.B.A. Fellow of the British Academy.
 F.B.A.A. Fellow of the British Association of Accountants & Auditors.
 F.Brit.I.R.E. Fellow of the British Institution of Radio Engineers.
 F.B.O.A. Fellow of the British Optical Association.
 F.B.Ps.S. Fellow of the British Psychological Society.
 F.C.I.A. Fellow of the Corporation of Insurance Agents.
 F.C.I.B. Fellow of the Corporation of Insurance Brokers.
 F.C.I.I. Fellow of the Chartered Insurance Institute.
 F.C.I.P.A. Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Patent Agents.
 F.C.I.S. Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Secretaries.
 F.C.W.A. Fellow of the Institute of Cost & Works Accountants.
 F.F.A. Fellow of the Faculty of Actuaries in Scotland.
 F.F.A.S. Fellow of the Faculty of Architects & Surveyors.
 F.G.S. Fellow of the Geological Society.
 F.H.A. Fellow of the Institute of Hospital Administrators.
 F.I.A. Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries.
 F.I.Arb. Fellow of the Institute of Arbitrators.
 F.I.A.C. Fellow of the Institute of Company Accountants.
 F.I.B. Fellow of the Institute of Bankers.
 F.I.B.P. Fellow of the Institute of British Photographers.
 F.I.C.S. Fellow of the Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers.
 F.I.C.W. Fellow of the Institute of Clerks of Works.
 F.I.D. Fellow of the Institute of Directors.
 F.I.E.D. Fellow of the Institution of Engineering Draughtsmen & Designers.
 F.Inst.F. Fellow of the Institute of Fuel.
 F.Inst.H.E. Fellow of the Institution of Highway Engineers.
 F.I.I.A. Fellow of the Institute of Industrial Administration.
 F.I.L.A. Fellow of the Institute of Landscape Artists.
 F.I.M.T.A. Fellow of the Institute of Municipal Treasurers & Accountants.
 F.I.O. Fellow of the Institute of Ophthalmic Opticians.
 F.Inst.P. Fellow of the Institute of Physics.
 F.Inst.Pet. Fellow of the Institute of Petroleum.
 F.I.Q.S. Fellow of the Institute of Quantity Surveyors.
 F.I.R.E. Fellow of the Institution of Radio Engineers.
 F.I.R.I. Fellow of the Institute of the Rubber Industry.
 F.I.S.A. Fellow of the Incorporated Secretaries Association.
 F.I.S.E. Fellow of the Institution of Sanitary Engineers.
 F.Inst.W. Fellow of the Institute of Welding.
 F.J.I. Fellow of the Institute of Journalists.
 F.L.A.S. Fellow of the Land Agents Society.
 F.P.S. Fellow of the Pharmaceutical Society.
 F.R.Ae.S. Fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society.
 F.R.B.S. Fellow of the Royal Society of British Sculptors.
 F.R.C.P. Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians.
 F.R.C.P.E. Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh.
 F.R.C.S. Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons.
 F.R.C.V.S. Fellow of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.
 F.R.E.S. Fellow of the Royal Entomological Society.

F.R.G.S. Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society.
 F.R.I.B.A. Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects.
 F.R.I.C. Fellow of the Royal Institute of Chemistry.
 F.R.I.C.S. Fellow of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.
 F.R.P.S. Fellow of the Royal Photographic Society. •
 F.R.S. Fellow of the Royal Society.
 F.R.V.A. Fellow of the Incorporated Association of Rating & Valuation Officers.
 F.S.A.A. Fellow of the Society of Incorporated Accountants & Auditors.
 F.S.G.T. Fellow of the Society of Glass Technology.
 F.S.I.A. Fellow of the Society of Industrial Artists.
 F.S.M.A. Fellow of the Incorporated Sales Managers Association.
 F.S.S. Fellow of the Royal Statistical Society.
 F.T.I. Fellow of the Textile Institute.
 L.R.C.P. Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians.
 L.R.C.S. Licentiate of the Royal College of Surgeons.
 M.I.A.E. Member of the Institution of Automobile Engineers.
 M.I.Biol. Member of the Institute of Biology.
 M.I.B.F. Member of the Institute of British Foundrymen.
 M.I.C.E. Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers.
 M.I.Chem.E. Member of the Institution of Chemical Engineers.
 M.I.C.W. Member of the Institute of Clerks of Works.
 M.I.Ex. Member of the Institute of Export.
 M.I.E.D. Member of the Institution of Engineering Draughtsmen & Designers.
 M.I.E.E. Member of the Institution of Electrical Engineers.
 M.I.E.T. Member of the Institution of Engineering Technology.
 M.I.GasE. Member of the Institution of Gas Engineers.
 M.Inst.H.E. Member of the Institution of Highway Engineers.
 M.I.Loco.E. Member of the Institution of Locomotive Engineers.
 M.I.M. Member of the Institute of Metals.
 M.I.Mech.E. Member of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers.
 M.I.Min.E. Member of the Institution of Mining Engineers.
 M.I.Mun.E. Member of the Institution of Municipal & County Engineers.
 M.I.Mar.M. Member of the Institution of Marine Engineers.
 M.I.M.M. Member of the Institution of Mining & Metallurgy.
 M.I.N.A. Member of the Institution of Naval Architects.
 M.Inst.Pet. Member of the Institute of Petroleum.
 M.Inst.P. Member of the Institute of Physics.
 M.I.Prod.E. Member of the Institution of Production Engineers.
 M.I.R.E. Member of the Institution of Radio Engineers.
 M.I.S.E. Member of the Institution of Sanitary Engineers.
 M.I.Struct.E. Member of the Institution of Structural Engineers.
 M.Inst.W. Member of the Institute of Welding.
 M.Inst.W.E. Member of the Institution of Water Engineers.
 M.I.W.M. Member of the Institute of Works Managers.
 M.J.I. Member of the Institute of Journalists.
 M.O.M.A. Member of the Office Managers Association.
 M.P.S. Member of the Pharmaceutical Society.
 M.R.Ae.S. Member of the Royal Aeronautical Society.
 M.R.C.P. Member of the Royal College of Physicians.
 M.R.C.S. Member of the Royal College of Surgeons.
 M.R.C.V.S. Member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.
 M.R.I.S. Member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.
 M.S.M.A. Member of the Sales Managers Association.
 M.S.R. Member of the Society of Radiographers.
 M.T.P.I. Member of the Town Planning Institute.
 Q.A.L.A.S. Qualified Associate of the Land Agents Society.
 R.B.A. Member of the Royal Society of British Artists. •
 R.I. Member of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours.
 R.P. Member of the Royal Society of Portrait Painters.
 S.C.M. State certified midwife. •
 S.R.N. State registered nurse.

INDEX

- Accountants, 30, 43, 44, 55, 66, 73, 114, 259; in business, 43, 113, 114-15, 134, 266, 269, 273; in Civil Service, 5, 76, 91, 99, 101; education of, 218, 223, 224, 227, 237; and engineers, 114; ethics, 68; registration, 68; remuneration, 98, 245, 256
- Accountants, Association of Certified and Corporate, 55; Institute of Chartered, 30, 55, 66, 67, 218, 227, 266; Institute of Cost and Works, 55 *n.*, 114; and Auditors, Incorporated Society of, 30, 43, 55, 62
- Actors, actresses, 16, 19, 49, 54, 73, 151, 155, 156, 165, 167; training, 154-5; unemployment, 157, 165
- Actuaries, 56, 73, 238; *see also* Insurance
- Administration, 95, 210, 215; in armed services, 224; in Civil Service, 95, 96, 98, 99, 271; in hospitals, 67, 183, 271; in industry, 45, 271; in local government, 100-1; in National Coal Board, 134, 135; as profession (management), 8, 67, 115-18, 163, 223, 270-2
- Administrators, 5, 51, 77, 93, 113; need for within professions, 7, 99, 216, 222-5, 270
- Advertising, 44, 50, 54, 61, 68, 72, 107, 161, 253; Institute of Incorporated Practitioners in, 50
- Aeronautical Society, Royal, 38
- Age groups, relative, in Great Britain, 4
- Agriculture, Ministry of, 95
- Airline pilots, 55, 72, 125, 129; remuneration, 246
- Almoners, 42, 197; *see also* Social workers, Medical auxiliaries; Institute of, 198
- Anthropologists, 76
- Apothecaries, 20, 22, 24; *see also* Doctors
- Apprenticeship, 24, 28, 165, 236, 237
- Architects, 11, 16, 20, 23, 29, 62, 72, 107, 215, 216, 237, 244; ethics, 60-1; in business, 112, 216; in Civil Service, 92; in local government, 103; registration, 47, 57, 66; remuneration, 98, 237, 244; Royal Institute of British, 29, 219
- Architects' Registration Council, 219
- Armed services, 23, 31, 55, 62-3, 91, 92-4, 113, 218 *n.*, 224, 238, 263
- Articles, 18, 227, 228
- Artists, 11, 17, 47, 49, 73, 112, 152, 159; art schools, 32, 49; in business, 112; commercial, 160, 161; patronage, 32, 152-4, 167; remuneration, 159, 169; training, 54, 154, 155
- Arts Council, 81, 169, 267
- Assistant Masters, Association of, 46
- Attorneys, 18; *see also* Solicitors
- Auctioneers, 50, 109, 219; *see also* Estate Agents
- Auctioneers' and Estate Agents' Institute, Chartered, 50, 55, 108, 219
- Authors, 15, 17, 18, 47, 73, 112, 116, 121, 151, 153, 155, 158, 166; patronage, 18, 154, 167; prospects, 117, 167; remuneration, 157-8; Society of, 164
- Bankers, 11, 25, 50, 73, 108, 233, 238, 247; independence of, 109
- Barbers, 15, 22
- Barber-Surgeons, Company of, 17
- Barlow Committee, 48
- Barristers, 7, 11, 18, 48, 50, 65, 72, 85, 92, 100, 113, 206-8, 242, 264; remuneration, 237, 246; training, 224, 233, 237
- Bevan, Aneurin, 10, 176
- Bevin, Ernest, 117
- Biologists, 37; *see also* Scientists
- Birth-rate, relation to occupational groups, 2, 4; to education, 83, 203

- Book-keeping**, 21, 30, 44; *see also*
 Accountants
British Broadcasting Corporation, 64
British Council, 169
British Medical Association, 25, 48, 66,
 174, 182
Brokers, 50, 68
Buckingham County Council, 103
Bureaucracy, 51, 59, 79, 105, 133, 182,
 224 *n.*, 267, 271
Burt, Sir Cyril, 4
Business, 112; distinction from pro-
 fessional motive, 106, 121; employ-
 ment of professionals, 62, 63, 64,
 106-22; influence of professions on,
 110-12, 115; training, 118, 271; *see*
 also Administration, Management
Canvassing, 184
Carry-Saunders, Sir Alexander, 8, 53,
 54, 137, 172, 173, 175, 190, 265
Centralization, 76, 80, 102-3, 128, 129,
 131, 133, 270; *see also* Nationalized
 industries
Charity, 22, 82; institutions, 19, 41
Chemical Engineers, *see* Engineers;
 Institute of, 38
Chemical Industry, Society of, 36,
 213
Chemistry, Royal Institute of, 36, 56,
 62
Chemists, 22, 36, 56, 62; *see also*
 Scientists
Children's Act, 1948, 43
Chiropodists, 41, 197; training, 239;
 see also Medical auxiliaries
Chiropody, Joint Council of, 41, 197;
 Society of, 41
Church, the, 14, 32, 137, 138; funds,
 139, 145; *see also* Clergy
Civil Engineers, *see* Engineers; Institu-
 tion of, 28, 213, 228
Civil servants, Service, 5, 17, 55, 59, 91,
 95, 97, 98, 263; examinations for,
 31; in industry, 113, 135
Clark, Colin, 88, 89
Class, professional consciousness of,
 48, 57, 261
Clergy, 16, 25, 50, 65, 73; displacement
 of, 4, 41; in education, 17, 32;
 moral standards of, 141, 142; parish
 life, 143, 148; as profession, 137-8;
 Quakers on, 139, 140; recruitment,
 146, 149; self-sacrifice, 144; in social
 service, 17; stipends, 135, 144
Closed shop, 12, 15, 17, 47, 65, 66, 165
Codes, professional, 1, 11, 13, 15, 16,
 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 68, 110, 111, 114,
 123 *n.*, 132, 141, 185, 188, 262 *seq.*
Collective bargaining, 47, 48, 51, 129,
 163-4, 265
Collectivism, 4
Colliery managers, *see* Managers;
 British Association of, 129
Collings, Dr J. S., 179
Collingwood, R. G., 6
Combination Acts, and craftsmanship,
 29
Commercial education, 218; *see also*
 Education
Commercial travellers, 54
Companies Act, 1856, 30; 1867, 43;
 1948, 55, 68
**Cost and Works Accountants, Insti-
 tute of**, 55 *n.*, 114
Cost of living, 5, 252
Costs of professional services, 77-9, 80-1
Coulton, G. G., 15
Court of Chancery, 15, 18
Cripps, Sir Stafford, 117
Dain, Dr, 176
Dental Association, British, 186, 188
Dentists, 12, 26, 40, 41, 76, 81, 86; in
 Health Service, 186-9; remunera-
 tion, 187, 243
'Dilution', 86-7, 146, 189, 202, 211,
 217, 219
Discipline, *see* Codes
Doctors, 4, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 22, 24,
 39, 40, 48, 59, 62, 65, 69, 72, 84, 92,
 96, 112, 175-86, 191, 213, 233, 236,
 252, 256, 262, 266, 269, 273, 274; *see*
 also Medical Profession
Dramatic Art, Royal Academy of, 54,
 155, 156

- Economists, 50, 76, 110
- Education, Board of, 32; Ministry of, 118; State, 32
- Education and training, 17, 19, 20, 27, 30, 31, 54, 57, 79, 117, 118, 127, 163, 200, 210-29, 236, 266; for actors, 155; for artists, 154; broadening of, 210, 221; for the Church, 146; by clerics, 17, 32; for commerce, 218; cost of, 80-1, 233-9; lowered quality, 5, 85, 226; for management, 120; of scientists, 213 *seq.*; for the services, 218 *n.*; of teachers, 225; university, 220
- Egalitarianism, 34, 53, 85, 205, 220, 248, 250
- Electrical Engineers, *see* Engineers; Institution of, 28, 47, 91, 129, 213
- Élite, specialist, 57, 77, 235
- Emigration, 125, 251
- Engineers, 21, 23, 24, 44, 47, 48, 73, 87, 238, 261; and accountants, 113-114, 136; in business, 110; Chemical, 121, 213; Civil, 28, 39, 57, 62, 67, 127, 228, 233, 245, 250; in Civil Service, 92, 95, 96; definition of, 55, 57, education of, 87, 212-13, 215, 219, 220, 227, 238; Electric Power, 129; Electrical, 57, 213; ethics of, 61, 262; Gas, 125; in local government, 102; Mechanical, 28, 117, 213; Mining, 66, 127; *see* Manager, Colliery; Municipal, 101; under nationalization, 125, 127, 129; Post Office, 91; Production, 38, 64, 246; Radio, 38, 55; Railway, 133; remuneration, 28, 246; specialization of, 28, 37, 38, 47; Structural, 38, 55, 215, 216
- Engineers' Guild, 48, 105
- Entomologists, 37; *see also* Scientists
- Equity, 47, 82, 164, 165
- Estate agents, 29, 50, 55, 57, 60, 61, 68, 73, 92, 108, 135, 219, 245
- Ethics, 58, 59, 60, 61, 97, 108, 189, 192, 200, 207, 263
- Etiquette, 61, *see* Codes
- Examinations, 2, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 54, 58, 117, 118, 127, 163, 204, 220
- Fees, *see* remuneration under individual professions
- Film stars, 83, 161
- Fox, Dr T. F., 175, 266
- Frustration, professional, 94, 96, 97, 102, 105, 130, 159, 229
- Gas Council, 127
- Gas Engineers, *see* Engineers; Institution of, 126, 127
- General Medical Council, 25, 69
- General Nursing Council, 69, 198
- General practitioners, 40, 106, 172-3, 174, 179-81, 182, 186, 193, 213, 254, 268; *see also* Doctors, Private practice
- Geologists, 36; *see also* Scientists
- Goldsmiths, 54
- Guilds, 16, 29, 48, 54, 219
- Heredity in professions, 1
- Hertfordshire County Council, 103
- Hospital administrators, 41, 54, 67, 267, 272; *see also* Administration; Institute of, 67, 271, 272
- Hospitals, 39, 40, 41, 183, 198; *see also* National Health Service
- Housing, 85
- Headmasters, 104, 201; *see also* Teachers
- Hill, Dr Charles, 176
- Ideals, professional 13, 70
- Incentives, non-financial, 59, 63, 87, 88, 97, 102, 103, 111, 131, 213, 215, 251
- Industrial Administration, Institute of, 119, 223, 253, 271, 272
- Industrial Artists, Society of, 47, 164, 167
- Industrial Design, Council of, 167
- Industry, market for professional services, 36, 37, 43, 110
- Inns of Court, 17
- Insurance, 30, 73, 109, 238
- Intelligence, national reserves, 4, 7, 260; tests, 61, 119, 259

- Journalists, 18, 23, 64, 73, 112, 151, 152 *n.*, 155-6, 162-3, 165, 166, 239; National Union of, 47, 164, 165, 167; remuneration, 157
- Journals, professional, 24, 46, 253; technical, 38, 128
- Kew Gardens, 96
- Knockshinnoch Castle Colliery disaster, 131
- Labour, Ministry of, 97
- Lancet, The*, 24, 179
- Land Agents, 23, 73; *see also* Estate agents
- Law Society, 20, 31, 66, 69, 85, 206, 265, 267
- Lawyers, 5, 11, 16, 18, 25, 30, 31, 48, 50, 59, 62, 65, 66, 72, 77, 267; in business, 112; as civil servants, 92; education of, 18, 78, 233, 237, 238; Legal Aid Scheme, 173, 206; in local government, 100, 101; remuneration, 237, 246, 247, 256
- Legal Aid Scheme, 12, 85, 206, 265, 267
- Librarians, 54
- Local Government Officers, 100-5
- Management, British Institute of, 45, 117, 118 *n.*, 164, 270
- Management consultants, 69, 216
- 'Management movement', 43-5, 50, 117
- 'Managerial revolution', 2, 7, 45, 51
- Managers, Colliery, 10, 66, 73, 125, 126, 127, 131-2, 264, 270; education of, 117, 120, 223; Export, 54, 116; General, 119, 133, 270, 272; Industrial and Commercial, 7, 44, 66, 88, 115, 117, 119, 120, 133, 163, 210, 215, 224, 225, 228; Office, 116; Personnel, 45, 116, 117, 273; Purchasing, 116; Sales, 44, 54, 115; Transport, 116; *see also* Administration
- Masons, 25
- Mass production, and technology, 38
- Mass Mechanical Engineers, *see* Engineers; Institution of, 28, 38, 39, 213
- Medical Association, British, 25, 48, 66, 174, 182
- Medical auxiliaries, 41, 86-7; in National Health Service, 196-7; training, 239
- Medical Council, General, 25, 69
- Medical profession, 15, 17, 20, 22, 39, 185, 213, 261, 267; education for, 20-21, 78, 213 *seq.*; and hospitals, 41, 183, 184, 198; independence of, 12, 185, 267; and medical auxiliaries, 25, 27, 188, 190, 196; registration and monopoly, 25, 66, 197; remuneration, 26, 27, 40; specialization in, 24, 26, 40, 41, 42, 108, 190, 197; training costs, 223-38; *see also* Doctors, General practitioners, National Health Service
- Mercantile marine, 10, 13, 15, 31, 47, 49, 55, 56, 58, 66, 72, 111, 113, 126, 173, 238, 246
- Middle classes, market for professional services, 16-17, 24, 79
- Midwives, 27, 72; *see also* Nurses
- Millard Tucker Committee, 12
- Mine managers, *see* Managers, Colliery
- Mines, Royal College of, 28
- Mining Engineers, Institution of, 129
- Monopoly, 65, 66; by State, 125; *see also* Closed shop
- Morality, general, 115, 141, 142; professional, 30, 59, 60, 64, 65, 110, 115
- Municipal Engineers, *see* Engineers; Institution of, 101
- Musicians, 49, 73, 151, 164
- National Coal Board, 6, 95, 127, 128, 134, 135, 265, 270
- National Health Service, 7, 40, 83, 84, 86, 173, 175 *seq.*, 184, 187, 190, 194, 197, 198, 243, 267, 269; cost of, 177
- Nationalized industries, 5, 124, 125, 270; centralizing tendencies of, 131, 132; influence of, 9, 89, 124; opportunities in, 125; threat to bargaining power, 129, 130; *see also* Administration, Bureaucracy

- Naval Architects, Institution of, 28
 Naval Officers, *see* Armed services
 Nightingale, Florence, 26, 27
 Nurses, 7, 26, 56, 72, 274; 'dilution', 7, 200; ethics of, 59, 200; in National Health Service, 198-200; recruitment, 198; training, 39, 199, 214, 233, 239
 Nurses, assistant, 7, 87
 Nursing Council, General, 69, 198
- Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, Royal College of, 40
 Occupational therapists, 196
 Oculists, 26, 41, 190 *n.*
 Ophthalmologists, 21, 190, 191
 Optical Practitioners, Association of, 190
 Opticians, 12, 26, 72, 108, 190, 243; in National Health Service, 189-93
 Organizers, 261; *see also* Administration
 Orthopaedists, 26
 Osteopaths, 54
- Packaging, Institute of, 116
 Partnerships, 12, 107, 155
 Patent Agents, 72
 Patrons, 18, 155
 Pensions, 255-7
 Pharmaceutical Society, the, 26, 66
 Pharmaceutical Union, National, 194, 196
 Pharmacists, 23, 26, 56, 72; in National Health Service, 194-6; status, 56, 107; training, 56, 243
 Physicians, *see* Doctors, General Practitioners; Royal College of, 20, 27
 Physicists, 37, 72; *see also* Scientists
 Physics, Institute of, 37
 Physiotherapists, 41, 197
 Pilots, *see* Airline pilots
 Police, 12
 Press, the, 163; *see also* Journalists
 Private practice, professional, 8, 61, 62, 79, 93, 95, 103, 106, 108, 109, 147, 175, 179, 193, 197, 207, 213, 253, 254, 261; in the arts, 156 *seq.*; and big business, 124 *seq.*; cost of setting up, 237, 243, 244, 246; expenses of, 252 *seq.*; importance in training, 227; influence on ethics of, 59-63, 262-5; and nationalization, 9, 135; outside the National Health Service, 186; preservation of, 265 *seq.*; proportions engaged in, 62, 66 *n.*, 262; retirement from, 255 *seq.*; and the state, 91
 Privilege, 50, 53, 66, 217
 Professional associations, purpose of, 8, 9, 17, *seq.*, 45, 46 *seq.*, 55, 64 *seq.*, 115, 127, 163 *seq.*, 186, 190, 197, 265
 Professional Civil Servants, Institution of, 91, 97
 Professional standards, 6, 70; decline in, 5, 6, 78, 79, 85, 88-9, 98, 105, 130, 144, 160, 179, 187, 199, 202, 205, 217, 225; raising of, 127, 186; *see also* Codes, Ethics, Morality
 Professional 'trade unionism', 12, 33, 35, 46-8, 128-9, 164-7, 265
 Professional Workers, National Federation of, 220
 'Professionalism', 8, 9, 14, 39, 50, 53, 220, 260
 Professions, creation of new, 7-9, 30, 38-9, 45, 274; definition attempted, 53-71; 'dilution', 86-7, 146, 186, 189, 202, 211, 217, 219; history of, 14-33, and industry, 36, 37; proportion of population in, 51, 88, 259; recruitment to, 5; remuneration, 86, 89, 98, 231-57, 242-57
 Psychiatrists, 26, 40, 60
 Psycho-analysis, psychology, 34, 42, 60, 65
 Public relations, 112
 Purchasing Officers Association, 44
- Qualifications, *see* Examinations
 Quantity surveyors, 244; *see also* Surveyors
- Radio Engineers, Institution of, 38, 55
 Radiologists, 41
 Reformation, the, effect on professions, 17, 19

- Registration, 65, 66; *see also* Closed shop
- Reid, Sir Charles, 124
- Religion, 141, 148
- Ritson, J. A. S., 128, 129
- Royal Air Force, *see* Armed services
- Royal Society, 20
- Salaries, *see* Remuneration under individual professions
- Sales Managers' Association, 44
- Schoolmasters, mistresses, *see* Teachers
- Scotland, educational system, 21
- Secretaries, chartered, 30, 73, 117, 272; Institute of, 271
- Scientists, in Civil Service, 92, 94, 96; education of, 211; growth in importance, 3, 35-6, 51, 212, 260; in industry, 113, 121; shortage of, 3, 4, 80; training costs, 238
- 'Social justice', 75, 77, 82-7
- Social scientists, 14, 73, 76
- Social services, 3, 39, 40, 41, 43, 75, 80, 91
- Social workers, 35, 40, 41, 42, 45, 51, 53, 60, 73, 112, 148, 196
- Society, increasing complexity, 2-4, 6, 259
- Socialism, and professions, 4-5, 34, 82-3, 89, 117, 268
- 'Socialization', 172-208; defined, 175
- Solicitors, 18, 31, 48, 59, 72, 79, 112, 206, 207-8, 224, 237, 265; effect of nationalization on, 135; remuneration, 237, 246-7; *see* Law Society, Lawyers, Private practice
- Solicitors Act, 1860, 32
- Specialization, 2, 14, 24, 34, 35, 125, 220, 259; in administration, 271; in education, 211; in management, 116; in medicine, 24, 182; in nursing, 214; in science and technology, 35, 211; in social work, 42, 214
- Standard of life', and demand for professional services, 2-3, 51, 78, 89, 156, 260, 261; and economic situation, 260-1
- State, as patron of the arts, 168, 169
- State employment and professions, 6, 8, 9, 10, 36, 37, 51, 61, 63, 67, 69, 70, 75, 79, 86, 87, 91-105, 125, 264
- Status, professional, 8, 11, 39, 46, 48-49, 53, 57, 63, 87, 89, 185, 204, 213, 217, 231; characteristics, of 72-3
- Stockbrokers, 11, 30, 43, 73, 109
- Strike weapon, 63
- Structural Engineers, *see* Engineers; Institution of, 38, 55, 215
- Students, 80, 233-7; National Union of, 235
- Surgeons, *see* Doctors, Medical profession; Royal College of, 20, 26
- Surveyors, 12, 16, 17, 21, 23, 61, 73, 102, 219; in local government, 102; remuneration, 245; Royal Institution of Chartered, 29, 62, 67, 219; unity of, 266
- Taxation, 2, 4, 12, 49, 79, 86, 107, 157, 231, 252
- Teachers, and the Church, 148; education of, 225, 239; ethics of, 61; independence of, 61, 69, 104, 210; National Union of, 32, 47, 66, 69, 85, 202, 203, 205, 220; and other professions, 148, 273, 226; remuneration, 85, 205 *seq.*, 248; shortage of, 7, 203, 225-9; standards of, 85, 202, 204; university, 221, 225, 227
- Technical Colleges, 104, 222, 227; teachers in, 227
- Technology, results of advances in, 23-4, 34, 156, 210, 260, 261
- Technologists, 38, 55, 56, 57, 213, 216-218, 260; Royal Institution of, proposed, 87, 217, 229
- Trade unions, 64, 65, 129, 265
- Training, 154, 155, 210, 211, 223-8; *see also* Education
- Trevelyan, Sir Charles, 31
- Universities, 17, 21, 211, 220-2, 249; cost of, 233-6; *see also* Education
- Urwick Committee, 118
- Valuers, 73

