

PRÉCIS

Central Superior Services Examination (CSS) 1976

Passage.

The present-day industrial establishment is a great distance removed from that of the last century or even of twenty-five years ago. This improvement has been the result of a variety of forces—government standards and factory inspection; general technological and architectural advance by substituting machine power for heavy or repetitive manual labour, the need to compete for a labour force; and union intervention to improve working conditions in addition to wages and hours. However, except where the improvement contributed to increased productivity, the effort to make work more pleasant has had to support a large burden of proof. It was permissible to seek the elimination of hazardous, unsanitary, unhealthful, or otherwise objectionable conditions of work. The speedup might be resisted to a point. But the test was not what was agreeable but what was unhealthful or, at a minimum, excessively fatiguing. The trend toward increased leisure is not reprehensible, but we resist vigorously the notion that a man should work less hard on the job. Here older attitudes are involved. We are gravely suspicious of any tendency to expand less than the maximum effort, for this has long been a prime economic virtue. In strict logic there is as much to be said for making work pleasant agreeable as for shortening hours. On the whole it is probably as important for a wage-earner to have pleasant working conditions as a pleasant home. 231

To a degree, he can escape the latter but not the former— though no doubt the line between an agreeable tempo and what is flagrant feather-bedding is difficult to draw. Moreover it is a commonplace of the industrial scene that the dreariest and most burdensome tasks, requiring as they do a minimum of thought and skill frequently have the largest number of takers. The solution to this problem lies, as we shall see presently, in driving up the supply of crude manpower at the bottom of the ladder. Nonetheless the basic point remains, the case for more leisure is not stronger on purely prima facie grounds than the case for making labour-time itself more agreeable. The test, it is worth repeating, is not the effect on productivity. It is not seriously argued that the shorter work week increases productivity that men produce more in fewer hours than they would in more. Rather it is whether fewer hours are always to be preferred to more but pleasant ones.

$$\frac{368}{3} = 122.6$$

1976

Final Draft

Productivity of Industrial workers.

(Title with marker)

Current industrial practices are better than past, due to government regulations. Technological advancements and role of unions have increased labourers productivity. But to make pleasant working environment, it was advisable to remove conditions making workers fatigued. Primary economic virtue is that workers put their maximum efforts. For that matter, wage earners should have pleasant working conditions just like a home. But it is difficult to analyze what makes a person lazy or committed labourer. The repetitive work requires least skills, it is better to give that tasks to unskilled workers. The major concern is to make labourers time productive. Repetative task should not affect their productivity. Whether working hours affect the productivity should not be a concern, rather those hours must be pleasant to workers.

(125)

PRÉCIS

Central Superior Services Examination (CSS) 1978

Passage.

"I was a firm believer in democracy, whereas he (D. H. Lawrence) had developed the Whole philosophy of Fascism before the politicians had thought of it. "I don't believe," he wrote, "in democratic control. I think the working man is fit to elect governors or overseers for his immediate circumstances, but for no more. You must utterly revise the electorate: The workingman shall elect superiors for the things that concern him immediately, no more. From the other classes, as they rise, shall be elected the higher governors. The thing must culminate in one real head, as every organic thing must—no foolish republics with no foolish presidents, but an elected king, something like Julius Caesar." He, of a course, in his imagination, supposed that when a dictatorship was established he would be the Julius Caesar. This was the part of the dream-like quality of all his thinking. He never let himself bump into reality. He would go into long tirades about how one must proclaim "the truth" to the multitude, and he seemed to have no doubt that multitude would listen. Would he put his political philosophy into a book? No in our corrupt society the written word is always a lie. Would he go in Hyde Park and proclaim "the Truth" from a soap box? No: That would be far too dangerous (odd streaks of prudence emerged in him from time to time). Well, I said, what would you do? At this point he would change the subject. Gradually I discovered that he had no real wish to make the world better, but only to indulge in eloquent Soliloquy about how bad it was. If anybody heard the soliloquies so much the better, but they were designed at most to produce a little faithful band of disciples who could sit in the deserts of New Mexico and feel holy. All this was conveyed to me in the language of a Fascist dictator as what I must preach, the "must" having thirteen underlining." (Lord Russell)

1978

Final Draft

(Title with marker)

Dr D.H Lawrence conceived the concept of Fascism before any politician did. He believed that man is capable to elect rulers to look after his circumstances, nothing more. But ultimate authority of decision making should lie to king. This was an utopian thought of his imagination, far from reality. He believed that king must proclaim the truth and people must accept that truth. Dr Lawrence did not propound any method to proclaim the truth. His arguments are based on self loving rhetorics, so powerful that it created group of faithful disciples, who were willing to die for him. These thoughts conveyed to Mr Lord Russel from Dr Lawrence to be preached

Passage words = 338

Precis words = 112