

Title: PRODUCTIVITY AND ENVIRONMENT.

The industrial establishment has greatly improved from last century or that of twenty five years ago. This has been possible by replacing manual with industrial heavy technology ~~and~~ for heavy tasks. Labour unions have also played an important role, as they demanded better working hours, better wages and better environment. Making the environment better directly improves the work productivity. The trend towards increase leisure is not reprehensible. But the old attitude that maximum effort is economic virtue is still prevalent. The problem in industry^{is} that, ~~the~~ the drearest and burdensome tasks are done by people who have minimum skills and are available in large number. The solution this is to increase the number of labour at lower end. However in order to increase productivity, ~~the~~ shorter work hours should be implemented, as man produce more in short hours rather in long pleasant hours. (128 words)

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 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.

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 pure 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 40

(430 words)