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Two Turning Point meetings were held during 1980 to discuss the redistribution of work. About 40 people came to a preparatory meeting in May, and about 300 to the main meeting in November.

Following these meetings, this paper provides a short reference guide to the issues, to opportunities for constructive action, and to people, organisations and publications concerned with new contexts for work. We obviously have not tried to be comprehensive; we realise that the projects we have mentioned are only the tip of the iceberg. Our aim has been to enable readers to plug into the rapidly growing network of ideas and activity about a better future for work, so that they can take things on from there themselves.

We hope we have covered most of the significant points that came up at the two meetings, and that where we attribute views, or give information about projects and activities, our statements are accurate. But we have not tried to produce a record of proceedings, and we do not necessarily expect that everyone present at the meetings will agree with everything we say.
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INTRODUCTION

Many people sense that Britain and the other industrial countries have reached a turning point. The path of economic, social and political development which these countries have been following since the industrial revolution has made us in many ways wealthier, healthier and more secure than our ancestors in pre-industrial times. But the limit to that line of advance has now been reached.

Business-as-usual no longer rings true for anyone who is concerned with energy and resources. Or with pollution. Or with technology and the way we use it and what it does to us. Or with the arms race and the threat of nuclear war. Or with the prospects for future economic well-being. Or with the social stresses that lead to crime, mental illness, suicide, alcoholism and drugs. Or with the future of health, education, housing and welfare. Or with relations between the rich countries of the North and the poor countries of the South. Or with the roles in society of men and women, young people and old people.

Britain, having been the first country to enter the industrial age, began to reach the limits of industrial progress first, some time in the 1960s. But now people everywhere in Europe and North America are asking: "What comes after business civilisation?", "What comes after the welfare state?", and "What kind of post-industrial society do we want?". In all these countries, as in Britain, people are beginning to prepare for a change of direction to a new development path.

What comes after full employment? That question underlies all serious discussion about the future of work. Sensing this, many people
now switch off when politicians, business people, trade union leaders and economists trot out the stale old arguments about how full employment is to be restored. This unemployment crisis is not just a short-term hiccup. Stop-gap measures to tide people over for a few months, or even a year or two, are not enough. New ways are needed for organising and distributing work.

Action is needed now. A society which continues to propagate the job ethic, but fails to provide jobs for some millions of its citizens, is inflicting great damage on them and on itself. We cannot leave on one side the problems caused by the shortage of jobs today, because we have a vision of a tomorrow in which different ways of working will be accepted as the norm.

In other words, the right approach to the future of work is both practical and visionary—tackling unemployment today in ways which will be stepping stones to new forms of work in the future. That mixture of the practical and the visionary was evident in the experience and insight which many people brought to the Turning Point meetings last year.

**PROSPECTS FOR CHANGE**

The three main speakers at the meeting on 22nd November sketched some of the changes now in prospect(2).

**Charles Handy(3)**

The present system of job opportunity and employment no longer functions effectively as a provider of livelihood and income. The old '3 x 48' norm (whereby people worked for 48 hours a week, for 48 weeks each year, and for 48 years of their lives) is no longer acceptable or possible.
We need to distinguish between three kinds of work.

First there is "organised work" - jobs in industry, commerce and services essential for society to function.

Second, there is "gift work" - work we do for love, for ourselves or for others, such as arts and crafts, gardening, growing our own vegetables, do-it-yourself (DIY), or supplementing the social services - like Meals on Wheels. None of this gift work is priced in our present society, nor is it reckoned with in economists' thinking. Yet it represents 50% of the country's total economy. Though not recognised, it adds to life's value, and without its contribution society as a whole would suffer.

Third, there is "pocket money work". This comprises work done for others and charged for, like selling apples or flowers by the roadside, or doing the odd maintenance job. Organised work is so highly priced today that a great many essential jobs would get left undone were it not for the pocket money economy filling the gap.

Organised work is the only kind of work normally discussed by government, trade unions, management and industry. But a totally organised society could not and does not function - a healthy mixture of all three types of work is needed and is desirable.

Opportunities to do all three types of work should be shared much more widely. To this end:

(a) Employers and employed should move to a 3 x 30 norm, i.e. work should be for 30 hours a week, for 30 weeks in the year, for 30 years of one's life.
(b) Full-time employment should be replaced whenever possible by contract work. This would result in a more adult relationship between management and workers; it would allow for more scope and personal freedom; and it would offer more freedom of choice.

(c) Organised work should also allow more opportunities for job-sharing.

(d) With earlier retirement, people would have scope for a second career. They should be trained and encouraged to leave employment early and branch out anew.

(e) There should be more and better provisions for sabbaticals.

All these proposals would lead to greater efficiency in organised work, as well as giving greater freedom to people to choose their patterns of working.

Individuals should be given incentives to become more creative and enterprising. Every house could turn itself into its own small manufacturing unit, and in this way high technology could contribute to DIY. We need to become a personal service society; those working in the community should receive better recognition and support.

Gift and pocket money work need to be recognised as valid and respectable. We can no longer perpetuate a system where only a job gives a person status. Unions might revive the concept of the guilds, with licensing functions for their members. We should use the right rhetoric, namely: don't call pocket money workers "unemployed", or those in the gift economy "drudges" or "volunteers", but make it clear that both these kinds of work are real and valuable.
This is not a middle-class dream. In fact, the lower and upper classes are much better at undertaking gift and pocket money work, but they lack the organising skills of the middle class.

Sheila Rothwell

We need to think specifically about the future of women's work and men's work, if we are to think clearly about the scope for redistributing work. Indeed, women's traditional work roles may come closer than men's to the norm for everyone in the future.

In the world of paid work outside the home, shorter working hours and part-time employment offer a more rational pattern for men as well as women. As job opportunities shrink, job-sharing among men, as well as among women, is a sensible and humane response.

In family terms it also makes more sense for both partners to be able to choose a balance of paid work outside the home and unpaid work inside the home. This can mean genuine liberation for both sexes. To assume that men will do one kind of work (i.e. the paid work) full time, and women the other kind (i.e. the unpaid work), involves accepting the old demarcation lines between traditional patriarchal roles.

As part-time rather than full-time jobs liberate men to fulfil their roles as house-husbands and fathers, a more genuinely symmetrical family pattern may emerge. There will be more scope for men to be responsible parents. The sharing of household chores will diminish the drudgery experienced by full-time housewives and by many women who, in addition to paid work in the outside world, also have to carry the main
responsibility for the unpaid work at home.

Changes in the system of taxes, social security and pensions will be needed, to recognise the rights of men and women to share the paid and unpaid work between them as they choose.

The old pattern of employment from 9 to 5, 5 days a week, from 16 to 65 is no longer with us. But this pattern has never been true for the female half of the population. The traditionally female pattern of work - in which full-time employment is mixed with part-time employment and with breaks for child-rearing, and for training and retraining - could become the norm for all. Unemployment would not then be the traumatic experience which it now is.

In short, the more flexible pattern of work to which many women have been accustomed could be a model for most people's work in the future.

James Robertson

People have increasingly lost control over their work.

The enclosures of the 17th and 18th centuries deprived many people of access to land, and made them more dependent on paid work(6). This was welcomed by employers who wanted cheap labour, and by those who wanted to impress on the "lower orders" their "duty to work for their betters".

The coming of the factory system brought a further loss of independence at work. Weavers, for example, had worked in their own homes(7). They were often very poor and grievously exploited by the manufacturers for whom they worked. But at least the family were together - husband, wife, young children, older children, adolescents and old people all taking their
part in the work. They could talk and sing at work and take their meals when they chose. As the factory system came in, in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, these freedoms were lost.

Nearly 200 years later, when the industrial age had reached its peak, it no longer occurred to most people that men, as well as women, might have a right and a responsibility to work directly for our families and our communities. The dominant ethic persuaded us that the important things happened outside the home and the community, and that the important work was done there too.

Many economic and administrative pressures, as well as social pressures, pushed people into employment and kept them there: tax, social security and pension arrangements all had this effect; declining numbers of small firms reduced the opportunities for self-employment; inflated property prices made it difficult for small farmers to buy land; managements and trade unions both discouraged part-time workers.

No one in their senses wants to go back to pre-industrial conditions of work or denies the achievements of trade unions and governments in improving conditions of employment over the past, say, 150 years. But further progress must now be sought in a new direction. We must find ways to liberate people from dependence on full-time employment, and to enable them to choose and control the work they do.

OUTLINE OF A STRATEGY

Formal employment will increasingly be seen as only one of several types of important and valuable work. Charles Handy stressed the importance of work in the gift(9) and pocket money economies, and Sheila Rothwell the
importance of work in the home. Other thinkers have pointed out the growing importance of the informal economy, the self-service economy, the DIY economy, the marginal economy, the neighbourhood economy, the community economy, the barter economy, and the household economy(10).

So where shall we find the main growth areas for work from now on?

A helpful suggestion about the emerging structure of economic activity was recently put forward by a joint European/North American task force of business thinkers(11). This can be summarised as follows.

New production technologies, including information technologies and the microprocessor, are likely to lead to more highly automated, more capital-intensive mass production processes. They could also lead to more decentralised living and working. They will probably do both. As a result, a four-sectoral economic structure may emerge in the industrialised countries in the 1980s on the following lines:

**Sector A**: a capital-intensive, highly automated and highly productive sector, including big manufacturing industries and big commercial services like airlines, international banking, and telecommunications;

**Sector B**: a labour-intensive, large-scale, service sector, including services like education and health;

**Sector C**: a revived small-scale, entrepreneurial, local sector, consisting of a very wide range of industrial, commercial and non-profit enterprises (the latter including community enterprises, common ownerships, work experience projects, voluntary groups, amenity groups and other socio-economic activities), and supported
by new locally based institutions such as local enterprise trusts;

**Sector D**: a revived household and neighbourhood sector, in which work is generally informal and unpaid or marginally paid, often takes the form of DIY or self-help, and is often difficult to distinguish from leisure.

So, are there good prospects of employment growth in Sector A? On the contrary, the introduction of new technology, growing competition from the Third World and from other industrialised countries, and a continuing fall in demand for the products of many industries (combined with today's low productivity levels in countries like Britain and the USA), mean that employment in this sector will almost certainly continue to contract (12).

What about Sector B, the services sector? Some academic researchers expect further growth of employment here (13). They forecast many more jobs for teachers, for health and welfare workers like psychiatrists and counsellors, for civil servants and other regulatory workers, for workers in the leisure industry and leisure services, for information workers like computer specialists, broadcasters and journalists, and for scientific researchers and other knowledge workers like themselves. But limits to the growth of public spending and the trend toward self-service and self-help make this much more questionable today than it seemed a few years ago. While there will no doubt be some new jobs in particular specialisms in Sector B (as indeed there will be in Sector A), it is realistic to assume no aggregate growth, and probably some contraction, of employment in this sector.

So it is to Sector C, the small-scale local
sector, and Sector D, the informal household and neighbourhood sector, that we must mainly look for new work opportunities. The movement of work to these two sectors will be reinforced by the need to conserve energy and material resources. More people will work on repairing, maintaining and servicing longer lasting products and on recycling the components and materials they contain. The foreseeable shift away from energy- and capital-intensive agri-business will similarly mean more work opportunities in small-scale food growing.

Against that background, five main growth areas for work emerge.

First, the revival of local economies. Local communities and towns in many parts of the industrialised world are threatened by the decline of industries (like steel or ship-building or textiles or nickel-mining or railways or motor-manufacturing), on which they have become all too dependent for employment. As central governments and national and multi-national employers prove less and less willing and able to bail them out, people living in these places are now recognising the growing importance of the small enterprise sector[14]. They are realising that the revival of the local economy and local employment is something that will have to be initiated locally. They are starting to explore the scope for providing more local work by meeting more local needs locally, for example by growing more of their food[15] and by replacing imports of fuel and power with energy conservation and locally developed energy sources. In Canada[16] and the United States[17] as well as in Britain, local developments of this kind, including local enterprise trusts[18], local energy groups[19], community
enterprises (20), common ownerships and co-operatives (21), and other local initiatives (22) have begun to spring up. Local centres of knowledge and skill (like colleges) and local associations (like trades councils and chambers of commerce) are beginning to get into the act. In Britain the Manpower Services Commission (23) has been providing funding and support.

Second, the revival of the household. Miniaturised technology in many fields (including micro-processors, micro-computers and video terminals) is making it possible to do at home work now done in factories and offices (24). People who handle information, like computer programmers and insurance salespeople, are moving in this direction already. Increasing numbers of people are spending more time on DIY and other informal kinds of work for themselves, their families, and their friends and neighbours - including food growing, car maintenance, plumbing, electrical work, carpentry and various aspects of home maintenance. Arrangements for exchanging skills and services with neighbours outside the formal labour market are spreading (25).

Third, a fairer sharing of work between men and women. Women now have a somewhat fairer deal than they used to, so far as paid work is concerned. But progress has been lop-sided. As Sheila Rothwell suggests, men need to be encouraged to undertake their fair share of the unpaid work of running the household and raising the family (26). Many men are, in fact, becoming aware of missing out on the convivial, familial, neighbourly aspects of life - that the world of the office or factory is not the real world after all. As this perception spreads, looking after the home and family will become a third growth area of work for men.
Fourth, the expansion of part-time employment. Part-time jobs enable people - men and women alike - both to earn an income and to spend time on voluntary work, family-raising and DIY work in and around their homes. Longer holidays, shorter working hours, and earlier retirement, together with part-time jobs, will be some of the elements in a variable pattern of living and working - "flexilife" - from which people will choose what suits them best at different periods of their lives. The spread of part-time jobs will help to share out the available jobs (27). It will also help to reduce the stigma of not having a full-time job. Thus it will play a key role in reducing the suffering caused by high unemployment, and in easing the transition to new patterns of work.

Special arrangements will be needed to organise work for those people - particularly young people but also, for example, disabled people - for whom it will be difficult to get employment or organise work for themselves. This will be the fifth growth area for work - the further development of community enterprise projects, youth opportunity projects, work experience projects, local amenity projects, training projects and various kinds of voluntary service projects, on lines begun in recent years by the Manpower Services Commission, local authorities, charitable organisations, voluntary services and other non-profit concerns. These will become a permanent feature, and it will be accepted that young people should be given opportunities for community service. Clearly this fifth growth area shades directly into the first - the voluntary and community elements in the revival of local economies (28).

Taken together, the five growth areas suggest a broadly based strategy for the redistribution of work. The practical question is how to take
that strategy forward. Before coming to that, we need to look briefly at people's attitudes to work.

ATTITUDES TO WORK

Different people have always had different attitudes to work (29).

Some have seen work as an unavoidable curse, a punishment by God for Adam's original sin. Workaholics have seen it as an opiate; as Voltaire said in Candide, "Let us work, then. It is the only way to make life bearable." Other people have seen it as a blessing, providing an opportunity for self-fulfilment; or as activity that gives meaning to life; or, like the Benedictine monks, as the practical way of offering one's life in worship and prayer to God. The Haitian proverb holds that "if work were a good thing, the rich would have found a way to keep it to themselves". The ancient Greeks and Romans saw work as something for slaves, that free-born citizens should avoid at all costs. Quite a few people today probably agree with Snoopy that "work is the crab grass in the lawn of life", to be cut to the minimum, or preferably rooted out altogether. Many people have always seen work as primarily instrumental - an activity of no meaning or value for its own sake, but only in so far as it brings them a livelihood and an income.

These differences reflect different temperaments, different opportunities, different experiences, different positions in society, and different cultural backgrounds. They will continue to exist, even when the dominant concept of work changes from employment to self-organised activity or to a mixture of the two. There will certainly be people who eagerly embrace the opportunity for leisure, as it becomes apparent
that full-time employment is not available for all and that lack of a job is no cause for worry or shame. On the other hand, being heirs to the Protestant work ethic, most people in countries like Britain will probably continue to regard work as centrally important in their lives, even when work no longer means having a full-time job.

For practical purposes it may not make much difference one way or the other. When people are growing vegetables in the garden, or decorating the house, or minding the children, or taking old people on an outing, or studying the history of the industrial age, or doing a multitude of other useful and interesting things, some may think of themselves as working and others as being at leisure. Either way, most people will want to do these things well. Learning to do them, and helping other people to do them, will be important — whether we call it education for work or education for leisure.

However, as employment loses its dominant place in our thinking about work, the nature of good and worthwhile work will be increasingly discussed. Is it work that provides necessary goods and services — thus meeting the genuine needs of ourselves and other people, as opposed to artificially created wants? Is it work that enables us and others to develop our abilities and aptitudes and experience—thus contributing to human growth? Is it work done in service to and in co-operation with other people — thus liberating us from ego-centricity, and contributing to our development as social beings? Is it work that enhances, rather than diminishes, the richness and variety of the living world of which we ourselves are part?

The concept of work as activity that meets needs
is fruitful. It calls attention to the range of human needs identified by modern psychologists like Maslow - including physiological needs, safety needs, needs for belongingness and love, needs for esteem, and the need for self-actualisation. It suggests that activities which help to meet those needs can be regarded as valuable work. It reminds us that what is traditionally thought of as women's work has been directly concerned with meeting people's needs, whereas much men's work has been more instrumental or abstract in its character and purpose. It suggests that people may increasingly demand the satisfaction of meeting some of their own basic needs - and other people's - more directly.

If work is regarded as activity that meets needs, who will define the needs that are to be met? Who will decide what work is to be done? In the last few years the "basic needs" approach to development in Third World countries has prompted the question, who is to define what needs are basic - economists and sociologists and other professional experts from the rich countries, or Third World people themselves? It is now widely accepted that needs should be self-defined. Similarly, good work may increasingly be seen as work that accords with the worker's own perceptions of need and value, rather than with needs and values externally imposed - for example, by employers, by advertisers, or by remote and impersonal market forces. (Millions of people are employed today producing products - including military equipment, luxury items and ephemeral junk - which would probably not be produced at all if their purchasers were given the choice of working or not working to produce them for themselves).

Hitherto, these questions of attitude and value
have been largely ignored in the public
discussion of unemployment. But they will
powerfully influence the redistribution of work
in the years ahead.

WHAT PEOPLE CAN DO

Initiatives can be taken in many areas.

(1) People's Own Work

Most important by far will be the initiatives
that people take to improve the quality of their
own working lives.

The term "quality of working life" (QWL) is too
narrowly used at present. It refers only to the
quality of employment. Progressive employers
supported by experts in QWL may have helped some
employees in recent years to spend their working
time more usefully and rewardingly(34); and such
employers, prodded by the organised labour
movement, will no doubt continue to play their
part in improving conditions of employment. But
more people will want to take more responsibility
for the quality of their own working lives,
either personally as individuals, or as members
of supportive groups of colleagues and friends.

As people talk to each other about the future
of employment and work, a "consciousness raising"
process will gather momentum. People who have
hitherto assumed they were powerless to define
and decide the purposes of their work, will help
one another to discover that they have that
power. They will seek information, advice and
counselling about possible openings for self-
organised work, and about conditions of employ-
ment (e.g. part-time jobs or early retirement)
which leave them with more time and energy for
their own projects. They will be helped by the
example of other individuals and groups who
have already made the change from unsatisfactory employment (or unemployment) to valuable and rewarding work (35). The key to change will be people's determination to help each other to create better work for themselves. Support networks will provide information and advice (36).

However, personal self-help will only be one side of the growing movement for better quality of work. The organised and collective side will also become stronger. In the last few years interest has revived in co-operatives and common ownerships, as forms of organisation which give people more control over their own work. A similar aim underlies the Lucas Aerospace Shopstewards Combine Committee's campaign for the right to work on socially useful products (37).

(2) Products and Services

The five growth areas for work (see pp 11-13) will mean a growing demand for products and services suited to them. The DIY market will continue to grow, and will expand into a much larger market for all kinds of up-to-date, small-scale technologies designed for people working in local or neighbourhood enterprises or in their own homes. Business marketing strategists in all sectors of industry will soon give top priority to these opportunities. Some have already been active for several years (38).

(3) Employers

Some employers may be able to keep up the supply of jobs. They may be able to create new jobs in the conventional way by successful business diversification and growth. They may be able to preserve existing jobs - for example, by preferring labour-intensive to capital-intensive
or energy-intensive methods of production. The feasibility of these courses will depend partly on straightforward business decisions, and partly on government incentives.

Many employing organisations will, however, be faced with reducing their workforce. How can they manage this contraction, and what else can they do, to minimise the damage caused by the increasing shortage of jobs? There are at least three positive responses they can make.

(a) They can modify their conditions of employment in order to encourage employees to work part-time, to retire early, to take sabbaticals, and in other ways to reduce the amount of time they work in employment. There is comparatively little information available yet about employers who have adopted this approach successfully on a substantial scale. It will be one of the most important challenges in the whole field of personnel management and employee relations.

(b) At the same time, employers can positively help employees (who wish to do so) to prepare for and find other work, full-time or part-time, formal or informal, paid or unpaid. Help can take many forms, for example: reorientation and training courses; counselling; specialist advice on such matters as marketing; technical assistance with accounting; or the provision of investment capital on favourable terms. Some employers already help their employees to prepare for retirement.

(c) Employers can provide resources to create new opportunities for work. For example, nine large firms have set up the London Enterprise Agency, the purpose of which is to foster small business development in
the London area. The British Steel Corporation (42) has provided facilities for new small enterprises in places where steel plants have closed.

(4) Trade Unions

The prospect of a new work order presents the trade unions with difficult problems. Their concern has traditionally been with the interests of the employed; and their goals have been to preserve employment, and to improve the pay and conditions attaching to employment. They have not campaigned for part-time employment for people who wanted it. Nor have they concerned themselves directly with the interests of people not in employment. It has never been their aim to enable people to undertake useful and rewarding work outside regular employment. Indeed, they have understandably seen that kind of work as open to exploitation by unscrupulous employers and as a threat to the interests of their members.

Many trade unionists are now aware that things must change. For example, Clive Jenkins and Barrie Sherman (12) of ASTMS argue that unemployed people must be helped to make good use of their enforced leisure. Recognition by the trade union movement that it has a responsibility to the unemployed, as well as to people in employment, seems bound to grow. The practical question is, what can trade unions do? Pressing the claim of unemployed people to adequate financial provision from the state will be one thing, but it will not be enough.

The trade union movement could help in at least two positive ways. First, it could facilitate the inevitable contraction of formal employment on terms which are favourable to affected employees. This will involve the negotiation
of terms for part-time work, early retirement, sabbaticals, etc., as well as terms for redundancy. It will also involve more active representation of the interests of part-time workers than has been customary, and more active support for people who would like a part-time job(43). Second, in a further extension of their present role, trade unions could represent the interests of people working outside formal employment. For example, they might provide technical and legal advice to protect them against exploitation. As Charles Handy has suggested, they might regulate the qualifications of independent workers (as the old guilds used to do), and so provide the public with an assurance of the standard of work on offer. They could press for changes in government regulations (for example, on taxation, social security and planning - see below) which currently discourage people from working on their own account. They could press for land and resources to be made more readily available for people who want to do such things as build their own homes, grow their own food, or start their own enterprises.

(5) Money

The prospect is that, whether by necessity or choice, many people in countries like Britain will have more time to do things for themselves and one another. They will therefore need lower money incomes to buy goods and services; and lower levels of public expenditure will be needed for welfare and other public services. On the other hand, increased investment will be needed in small-scale equipments and knowhow which enlarge the productive capacity of people in their homes and neighbourhoods - the new growth areas for work. And people who do not earn money from employment, will need some income from elsewhere.
The challenge is to bring about the change to this new direction for economic and social progress, not in such a way that those who are better off benefit at the expense of those who are worse off. On the contrary, the less well off must gain access to resources which will enable them to create for themselves more real wealth and wellbeing than could ever be redistributed to them by taxation, social security and public services. And new ways of caring for people who need help and support, more humane than treating them as an ever more burdensome cost on the economy, must be developed on a basis of mutual reliance and community self-help.

The paradox is that new ways of investing and spending money will enable people to reduce their dependence on money incomes and on services paid for by public expenditure. The most important initiatives will come from people who decide to change their own patterns of earning and spending. But government and other organisations responsible for handling our money and taking financial decisions on our behalf, can also help by changing the ways they raise and spend it.

Changes in Tax and Social Security could stimulate self-employment, part-time work, voluntary work, early retirement, more frequent sabbaticals, and the more equal sharing of unpaid work (as well as paid work) by men and women. Recipients of unemployment benefit could be encouraged to do useful work on their own account or with other members of their local community, and not to compete for scarce jobs. Useful moonlighting could be made legitimate(44). Unemployment benefit might be consolidated with other social security payments and tax reliefs to create a "personal allowance", "guaranteed minimum income" or "social dividend", to which
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all citizens of working age would be entitled. It might be decided that central government should make over an increasing proportion of social security expenditure to local agencies charged with stimulating community self-help activities.

The corporate sector (i.e. business and industry) gets tax allowances and subsidies for investing in new plant and equipment. Households are given no such incentives. Correcting this bias could help to revive the household as a centre of production and work.

Public Expenditure should be switched to programmes which provide people with resources, knowhow and support for productive and socially useful activities, and away from programmes which provide them directly with finished goods and services. A systematic analysis of public expenditure programmes is needed with this in view.

Financial Institutions (like banks, building societies, hire purchase companies, insurance companies and the stock exchange) have thrived in an age when people have become increasingly dependent on money. For their own growth these institutions have depended on the growth of people's money incomes. It is just as difficult for them to face the prospect of money playing a less dominant role in people's lives, as it is for trade unions to face the prospect of a less dominant role for employment.

Nonetheless, financial institutions could give positive help. For example, people will need advice about how to finance the transition to new ways of working. They will also be interested in investment opportunities in the new growth areas for work, such as solar energy, other small-scale technologies, and small scale farming.
(6) Public Policy, Planning, and Access to Resources

Public policy in many fields, including planning regulations, has assumed that employers would provide the vast majority of the population with the land, buildings, equipment and other resources required for their work, and that people's work would normally be located in a different place from where they lived.

These assumptions must now be questioned. Public policy will have to be reviewed - in such spheres as industry, employment, environment, planning(46), housing(47), land(48), agriculture, development, education and health - to identify measures that will enable people to have readier access on their own account to land, buildings, equipment and other resources needed for their work. These measures will include changes in planning regulations that now prevent or discourage people from working in their own homes and neighbourhoods.

(7) Leisure

Until recently, it has been generally assumed that people and public authorities would have more money to spend on leisure, and that the leisure industries and the provision of public leisure facilities would continue to grow. It now seems more likely that leisure time will grow faster than money to spend on leisure, and that people will be looking for ways to reduce the cost of leisure activities.

They will also be looking for ways of making their leisure positively productive, for example through DIY and voluntary work.

So there will be an increasing demand for information and advice about how to make good
use of leisure; and schools, voluntary organisations, and public authorities will want to be able to meet it(49).

(8) Education, Training and Counselling

The education system in Britain today does not equip most people well for employment or unemployment, for self-organised work, for leisure, or generally for self-development. Great changes are necessary throughout the system(50).

It is now widely recognised that education could provide a better preparation for employment. Schools could do more in this respect. Apprenticeship schemes could be extended and improved. Work experience projects for young people could be developed further(51).

But improvements in education and training for jobs in the manufacturing and service sectors, though important and necessary, will not be enough. Employment in those sectors is in decline. The most important new growth areas in education and training will be those which match the new growth areas in work and leisure: education and training for self-organised work; for self-employment; for co-operative self-reliance; for part-time employment; for unemployment; for productive leisure; for voluntary work; for work in community enterprises; for work in the home and neighbourhood; for early retirement and the transition to new patterns of working in middle age. Education for capability, not for certificates and diplomas, will be the name of the game.

The demand for this type of education and training has been mainly met hitherto by "alternative" centres outside the main education and training systems. But mainstream
teachers and trainers are now beginning to respond (52).

New forms of counselling, as well as new forms of education and training, will help many people to make the transition to new patterns of work, leisure and living. This transition can often mean personal crisis and growth, as well as the need for new capacities and skills (53). The mixture of training, counselling and management consultancy called "organisation development" has aimed to help people to become more effective employees. As its practitioners turn their attention to the broader aim of helping people to develop as people, they will become more directly involved in the transformation of work (54).

(9) Consultancy and Research

The horizons of established consultancy and research have been limited by the assumption that employment would continue to be the dominant, or indeed the only significant, form of work.

The new growth points in consultancy and research about work will stem from the contrary assumption.

There will be much to do under all the eight sub-headings above, especially by way of action learning and action research.

(10) Public Discussion and Debate

For a little while longer, the "opinion-freezers" will probably continue to preach full employment, and each will claim that she knows best how to bring it back. But that is no substitute for practical discussion and debate about the future of work.
Many of us are ahead of the politicians and media pundits in our thinking. The time has come for us to open up a more constructive and imaginative public debate ourselves, in every legitimate way we can think of. This will be an important piece of the action.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has been particularly about the redistribution of work in Britain. But the same issues are arising in all the industrialised countries.

So far as the international distribution of work is concerned, especially between the richer and poorer countries, there are two opposing views. Conventional economic thinking supports a continued division of labour - between Third World countries concentrating on primary commodities and routine manufactured goods, and "more advanced" countries concentrating on sophisticated products, services and knowhow. The contrary view, which we share, is that the redistribution of work outlined here for the industrial countries will be part of a world-wide shift towards greater self-sufficiency at national, as well as local and household, level. But that argument must be pursued elsewhere.

So what happens now?

Suggesting that other people should do something - and criticising them for their failures - seldom gets anything done. If we want to do something about unemployment, we need to find something we can do about it ourselves. In particular, don't let us think that government or industry or trade unions can do very much. They can facilitate the changes needed - as we have suggested - or obstruct them, but they cannot provide their direction or motive.
Almost all the people who came to the Turning Point meetings last year, and most of those who will read this paper, are already creating new contexts for work or are looking for ways to become involved. We hope this paper may help them, for example by putting them in touch with others with shared concerns.

So far as Turning Point is concerned, we shall hope to provide opportunities for discussing the redistribution of work, as an integral part of the change to a new development path. The Turning Point newsletter will continue to contain information about relevant projects. We shall also help whenever we can in response to enquiries.
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