

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Strangleman, Tim (2015) Rethinking Industrial Citizenship: The Role and Meaning of Work in an Age of Austerity. *British Journal of Sociology*, 66 (4). pp. 673-690. ISSN 0007-1315.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12135>

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/50794/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

Rethinking Industrial Citizenship: The Role and Meaning of Work in an Age of Austerity¹

Word count 8,292 (checked 18/5/2015)

Abstract

T. H. Marshall in his famous tract *Citizenship and Social Class* wrote briefly about what he called 'industrial citizenship', a type of belonging rooted in the workplace. Here Marshall's ideas are developed alongside a consideration of Durkheim's *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals* together with research material from the Guinness Company. It shows the way the Company actively sought to create 'Guinness citizenship' within its London Brewery. The article draws out the ways in which the significance and potential of work based citizenship for ameliorating the ills of industrial society are clearly articulated in mid-twentieth century Britain and echo earlier neglected Durkheimian sociological ideas on work. These ideas have real potential to inform contemporary academic and policy debates about the nature of capitalism and the form and content of work now and in the future.

Key Words: industrial citizenship; T H Marshall; workplace culture; Guinness; austerity

Introduction

In the early post-war period two compelling parallel visions of citizenship and work were being enunciated by very different actors. The first was by sociologist T. H. Marshall (1992 [1950]) in his classic *Citizenship and Social Class* where he considered ideas of citizenship, class and work in the context of the welfare state. The second was unfolding in the Guinness Brewery in West London where senior management examined afresh the postwar labour question in their own workplace. In both instances there was a direct linkage between the nature and type of work performed and the creation of citizenship through a broader

understanding of the potential employment had to underpin, shape and facilitate civic engagement. Marshall briefly alluded to 'industrial citizenship', while Edward Guinness wrote of creating 'Guinness Citizens'. Both visions of work citizenship echo directly Durkheim's (1992 [1957]) rather neglected *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals* where he sketches out a profoundly important way of thinking about the role and meaning of modern work groups. This article examines in detail these visions of work based citizenry and in doing so argues that in combination they flesh out in a complementary way this broader relationship between economic and social life. These historical debates have important resonance for contemporary discussions of work where economic life is viewed as fragmented and sterile. The aim here is to refresh sociological discussions of work which rarely feature the work of either Marshall's or Durkheim's ideas on work citizenship. Such a consideration allows for a set of broader critical questions to be posed about the form and content of work as well as the role of employers and employees.

The article opens with a reappraisal of the notion of industrial citizenship and the way this idea has been developed in later years by other writers and is prefigured in Durkheim's texts. After a discussion of methodology and sources it then looks in detail at the Guinness Brewery and its discussion on the nature and role of work during the 1940s and 1950s. I want to argue that the Guinness material must be read as texts which offer a 'privileged occasion' by which we can see ideas about social life emerging. The article stresses the importance of this historical material in contextualising key contemporary debates on the changing nature of work emphasising that even in an age of austerity both academics and managers could imagine and plan to profoundly improve working life.

Rethinking industrial citizenship

T. H. Marshall's *Citizenship and Social Class* was first published in 1950 and remains an influential text in social policy and sociology (Marshall 1992 [1950]; Bulmer and Rees 1996; Bagguley 2013; Roche 1987; Standing 2009; Streeck 1997; Zetlin and Whitehouse 2003). His essay charts the development of thinking about citizenship and in particular the extension of recognition to working-class people during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The essay is largely a consideration of an earlier published work by Alfred Marshall from the 1870s based on a lecture he gave to the Cambridge Reform Club. Alfred Marshall's intervention reflected on the nature of working-class citizenry and in particular how industrial labour had deadened cultural aspiration. It followed that the reform of work, the reduction of hours and compulsory education could improve the lot of working people and in particular allow them access to the full fruits of civilization; therefore enabling them to become fully fledged citizens. Alfred Marshall was attempting to think through the logic of the role of employment and perhaps more importantly the responsibilities of the state and employers in elevating working class sensibility to allow greater civic engagement. As T. H. Marshall notes:

His faith was based on the belief that the distinguishing feature of the working classes was heavy and excessive labour, and that the volume of such labour could be greatly reduced. Looking around he found evidence that the skilled artisans, whose labour was not deadening and soul-destroying, were already rising towards the condition which he foresaw as the ultimate achievement of all. They are learning, he said, to value education and leisure more than 'mere increase of wages and material comforts'. They are 'steadily developing independence and manly respect for

themselves and, therefore, a courteous respect for others; they are steadily accepting the private and public duties of a citizen; steadily increasing their grasp of the truth that they are men, and not producing machines. They are steadily becoming gentlemen'. (Marshall (1950 [1992]: 5)

T. H. Marshall suggested that Alfred Marshall's ideas were based upon a 'sociological hypothesis and an economic calculation'. In terms of the latter this was the idea that industrial society was capable of producing an adequate surplus that would allow the elimination of excessive heavy manual labour while at the same time providing education for all. In terms of sociological hypothesis, this lay in the shift away from seeing human development simply in the quantitative provision of material goods, towards an appreciation of the qualitative assessment of life – in civilization and culture. It was the capacity to enjoy and practice culture which enabled citizenship. This model does not deny continual economic inequality but does allow for the possibility of equality in terms of citizenry.

In *Citizenship and Social Class* T. H. Marshall sets out to examine the relevance of the other Marshall's ideas a full three-quarters of a century later, in the wake of World War II and the election of Atlee's postwar Labour government. T. H. Marshall made a tripartite distinction between *civil*, *political* and *social* citizenship. Civil citizenship consisted of the rights for individual freedom – liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, property rights and legal redress to uphold and confirm rights. By political citizenship Marshall meant the right to stand or take part in elections – the basic exercise of political power. Finally the social aspects of citizenship Marshall defined as 'the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full the social

heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society' (Marshall(1992 [1950]: 8). Historically at times these elements had been fused together in the same institutions of the state, but gradually these rights separated out and institutional forms grew up around them.

For the purposes of this article I want to focus on a minor aspect of Marshall's text – industrial citizenship. In his essay the term is only mentioned a handful of times and indeed does not even merit its own entry in the book's index. I want to argue however, that this concept is one that both animates Marshall's work but also helps to unlock contemporary ideas about the role of work in fostering citizenry. The concept of industrial citizenship speaks to a wider sense of workplace culture, norms and values that are emergent properties of economic life. He was attempting to identify both the role played by culture and how it emerged in the first place. Marshall saw the rise of trade unions as essentially a force that developed out of civil rights which saw the acceptance of collective bargaining removed from the political sphere, as Marshall says 'Trade unionism has, therefore, created a secondary system of industrial citizenship parallel with and supplementary to the system of political citizenship' (Marshall 1992 [1950]: 26). He makes the point that trade unionism allows workers to exercise civil and political rights collectively. Further he points out that with rights comes responsibilities, ones that trade union officials may recognize but not necessarily their members. It is this discussion around trade unionism that has tended to dominate the debate of industrial citizenship in later writing on the concept. For example Roche (1987) focuses on the concept in terms of trade unions in the context of post-industrial society; Zetlin and Whithouse (2003) examine the gendered nature of industrial citizenship and trade unions; Streek (1997) discusses industrial citizenship in the context of

European Works Councils; and finally and most recently Bagguley's (2013) article is centrally concerned with trade unionism and citizenship. There is absolutely nothing wrong with such a focus, my point is simply that this approach has crowded out other interpretations of the concept's use in Marshall's writing, one that stresses the relative autonomy of work groups.

Marshall's essay shifts towards a more general discussion about reward and effort around work. Put simply he asks if we accept the need to provide welfare as part of a civilized society how do we ensure workers collectively and individually fulfil their side of the bargain? While there is obviously a role for trade unions in such a discussion much of his essay does not concern their role or function directly but does involve a wider reflection on the organization of work and it is this aspect of his writing that this article focuses on.

Marshall himself pointed out this problem has exercised social commentators since at least the eighteenth century:

It is no easy matter to revive the sense of personal obligation to work in a new form in which it is attached to the status of citizenship. It is not made any easier by the fact that the essential duty is not to have a job and hold it, since that is relatively simple in conditions of full employment, but to put one's heart into one's job and work hard. For the standard by which we measure hard work is immensely elastic.

(Marshall 1992 [1950]: 46)

In identifying this issue of moral hazard Marshall was of course writing in a long tradition of thinkers on the relationship between work and welfare such as T. H. Green, Arnold Toynbee, Samuel Barnett, Robert Owen, Tawney and Beveridge amongst many others (see Parker 1998). Marshall was also anticipating a recurring theme within industrial sociology around how effort was to be measured given the indeterminacy of the employment relationship

(see Baldamus 1961; Burawoy 1979; Brown 1992). Here the role of industrial citizenship is in part to promote a set of norms and values and to provide a moral framework linking individual to community. Industrial citizenship played a key role in developing trust based on autonomous moral regulation. Marshall further suggests that while it may be possible to make an appeal to sacrifice in times of national emergency this type of selfless citizenship cannot be sustained as a permanent feature of civic life. As he continues:

But the national community is too large and remote to command this kind of loyalty and to make of it a continual driving force. That is why many people think that the solution of our problem lies in the development of more limited loyalties, to the local community and especially to the working group. In this latter form industrial citizenship, devolving its obligations down to basic units of production, might supply some vigour that citizenship in general appears to lack. (Marshall 1992 [1950]: 46 - 7)

So to recap, the concept of industrial citizenship seems at once marginal and central to Marshall's ideas; not indexed yet vital in solving the problems of the modern welfare state through citizenship. Industrial citizenship is elaborated as a bridge between the abstract and distant state and the individualistic view point of workers. Ensuring people work hard while developing as fully rounded human beings. Industrial citizenship is conceived of as a vehicle for animating *both rights and duties* around citizenship through employment and work groups. This conceptualization goes beyond simply a discussion of trade union representation. Marshall was writing in a well-worn groove of nineteenth and early twentieth century thinking on welfare, work and the avoidance of moral hazard – how does society ensure that the welfare safety-net does not deter effort? He was in many ways

invoking T. H. Green's notion of developing people's 'best selves' (Parker 1998: 161) – a moral ethic rooted in both individual and collective worker.

Marshall's ideas on the importance of work and work groups were not then novel and in many ways they are sociologically prefigured in Durkheim's writing generally in the *Division of Labour* (1964 [1893]), but especially in the more neglected *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals* (Durkheim 1992 [1957]). It is important to discuss Durkheim's writing here as it helps to fill out Marshall's concept of industrial citizenship. As Bryan S. Turner says in his introductory essay to the book:

Durkheim's purpose was to explore the moral problems of an advanced, differentiated, and complex society, in which the economy had become somewhat detached from other social institutions. (Turner in Durkheim 1992 [1957]: xiii)

Turner suggests that Durkheim's major intellectual concern was, as he puts it, 'how can we find a system of moral restraint which is relevant to modern conditions?' (Turner in Durkheim 1992 [1957]: xiii). The answer to this question, at least in part, lay in the workplace professional or occupational groups whose norms and values would act as the basis for moral regulation of the individual and group. Crucially such groups provided a space between the immediacy of the family and the remoteness of the state; '... professional ethics find their right place between the family morals already mentioned and civic morals ...' (Durkheim 1992 [1957]: 5). The increased division of labour had created a more marked diversity of professional ethics, each occupational grouping possessing distinct positions one from another.

We might say in this connection that there are as many forms of morals as there are different callings, and since, in theory, each individual carries on only one calling, the result is that these different forms of morals apply to entirely different groups of individuals. (Durkheim 1992 [1957]: 5)

Durkheim had two aims, first to understand what was distinct about professional ethics as opposed to other social forms and secondly to identify the general conditions needed to create and sustain their normal functioning. It is this second question that makes Durkheim's ideas relevant both in terms of Marshall's ideas and for the research material which follows. Durkheim recognized the importance of moral regulation as an emergent property of the group if it was to have traction over both the group as a whole and the individuals who constituted it. As he put it:

A system of morals is always the affair of a group and can operate only if this protects them by its authority. It is made up of rules which govern individuals, which compel them to act in such and such a way, and which impose limits to their inclinations and forbid them to go beyond. Now there is only one moral power – moral, and hence common to all – which stands above the individual and which can legitimately make laws for him, and that is collective power. To the extent the individual is left to his own devices and freed from all social constraint, he is unfettered too by all moral constraint. (Durkheim 1992 [1957]: 6 - 7)

It was then the economic sphere that was vital in creating the context for a wider social stability, filling in the context of the decline of religious observance what would otherwise be a moral vacuum for society generally as well as for the individual. Professional ethics filled this vacuum with a set of norms and values regulating individual ego and desire by

appealing to a wider intelligible collective sense, close enough to have concrete expression in workplace norms while distant enough to provide critical space between the individual and corporate group.

In pondering the dilemmas inherent in modernity both Marshall, and before him Durkheim, inhabit a strikingly similar intellectual space. Both sought an understanding of the problems of modern work and in particular the need to curb self-interest and to create the context where society is possible beyond the immediate family but without appeal to an abstract notion of the state or civic society. Each recognized the centrality of paid work in underpinning social order, and while Marshall used the term industrial citizenship surely Durkheim was describing a very similar social form in his discussion of professional or occupational moral forms.² That focus on 'professional' and 'occupational' can I think be broadened out both in the context of Durkheim's original ideas as well as in the current discussion. Both Durkheim and Marshall describe a moral order rooted organically in the workplace that both constrains and enables a civic engagement in economic, political, civic and potentially cultural spheres. Both writers recognize that this social engagement is an emergent property of group interaction, and can be witnessed at the level of the shop-floor and beyond. It is recognition of the importance of work to provide a platform that allows an individual and collective self-confidence, a social space, a place that nurtures the social; one that is broader than a focus on trade unions. The next section explores these ideas in a more concrete setting which is near contemporaneous with Marshall's *Citizenship and Social Class* the Guinness Brewery at Park Royal in West London in the years after World War II.

Guinness and industrial citizenship

This article is part of a wider project examining occupational culture and organizational identity through one landscape of work during seven decades in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries; telling a story about an organization and its workers from pre-cradle to post-grave. The Guinness Brewery at Park Royal in West London provides a wonderfully rich and complex insight in to a variety of themes, but I want to argue they speak to a larger set of important issues over and above those in a small corner of industrial West London, unlocking understandings about work: its place, its value, the way it is thought about and represented. For the purposes of this article the main focus will be on notions of industrial citizenship within an organization coming to terms with itself after the trauma of World War II. In researching this story I have drawn on a wide range of company archives and documents as well as oral histories and other material. The project has made use of a very large corporate photographic archive as well as drawing on a range of other visual material (Strangleman 2010, 2012). The focus here will be on the Brewery's staff magazine - *Guinness Time* - produced by Guinness for the plant between 1947 and the mid-1970s. In addition use is also made of an interview with Edward Guinness the editor of *Guinness Time* who was also personnel manager at the plant during this period and who later went on to become a senior manager and director of the Guinness Company. I fully acknowledge the limitations that this material presents us with. It does represent a top down account of the organization and its management. However, they do represent important texts which both reflect and aim to shape the way the Company is understood. The author has also carried out other oral histories with shop-floor staff from later decades. These broadly support the idea that the brewery was a 'good place to work', that employment was highly sought after and that multiple members of the same families enjoyed long careers at the plant. However, this

does not mean what is presented here was uncritically accepted by the workforce (Strangleman 2010, 2012).

The section that follows outlines the story of the creation of the brewery at Park Royal, and then briefly introduces the staff magazine itself. It examines in detail at some of the content of the *Guinness Time*, and in particular the way the management reflected upon the question of labour in the plant and develops an expanded notion of the role of the organization in seeking to create model citizens – indeed they spoke of the ‘Guinness Citizen’ - through corporate culture. The Company was clearly aiming for what one American scholar of Welfare Capitalism has labelled ‘industrial community’ or ‘*Gemeinschaft*’ (Jacoby 1997: 40) which is clearly evocative of T.H. Marshall’s notion of industrial citizenship.³

Creating an English brewery

Guinness opened its English brewery in 1936 at Park Royal in West London, built on the former Royal Agricultural Show Ground dating from the early twentieth century. Guinness purchased a substantial part of the available land in the area constructing the Brewery buildings on a plot while simultaneously creating a much larger area as a business park (Dennison and MacDonagh 1998). The company kept secret the Brewery’s existence and purpose until it opened, in part because it wanted to avoid inflating local land prices, but also it was desperate not to fall foul of Anglo-Irish trade disputes raging at the time. Such was the secrecy surrounding the project that few people outside the Company board in Dublin knew of the development. Even the architect was unaware of the intended purpose of the building until later. The Company employed one of the premier architects of the day, Giles Gilbert Scott, who could count Liverpool’s Anglican Cathedral and Cambridge

University Library among his many achievements, to design the buildings alongside consulting engineers Sir Alexander Gibb and Partners. The buildings were a dignified and restrained piece of design and echoed Scott's other industrial work at Bankside and Battersea power stations in London. The Brewery married traditional and modern styles architecturally while operationally the plant was rationally organized and managed (Dennison and MacDonagh 1998; Guinness 1988; Guinness 1999).

The Guinness Company was itself an interesting mix of tradition and modernity. It was a paternalistically run organization with generations of the extended Guinness family engaged in the management of the firm at middle and senior levels. In marked contrast to the original St James' Gate brewery in Dublin, which had expanded incrementally over decades, the Company's London site was designed for maximum efficiency where production could flow through the plant on one site: Raw material arriving by rail and road, being processed in to beer before leaving the brewery for distribution around the country. Virtually all the work within the plant was carried out by the 1,500 workers employed by the Guinness Company itself. The only exceptions to this rule were the transport drivers who themselves were later incorporated into the Company. Thus Guinness employed all the staff involved in brewing and processing its beer, and further directly employed a vast army of men and women on tasks as diverse as cooking, cleaning, washing, builders, scaffolders, engineers, painters, security guards, grounds men and agricultural labourers. The site had its own industrial fire brigade and ambulance service, its own laboratories, six different canteens, a power station, farm and laundry. This was all on a large site which was extensively landscaped, the Company was proud of the fact that it planted 1300 trees and 3000 shrubs around its modern manufactory (Strangleman 2010). The research material examined here

dates from the late 1940s through to the 1950s. The political and social context both internally and externally is obviously important. Guinness like other brewers was concerned with the prospect of nationalization in the sector. It also had a strong trade union presence at Park Royal and was concerned by left-wing and especially Communist Party members amongst the workforce. Edward Guinness was certainly on the more progressive wings of personnel management being heavily involved in the Industrial Society,⁴ introducing a number of reforms to labour management at the plant.⁵

***Guinness Time* and the invocation of industrial citizenship**

In 1947 the Guinness Brewery decided to create a staff magazine for Park Royal and this publication was sold to staff on a quarterly basis for the next twenty-eight years. Produced from the start to a very high standard under the initial editorship of Edward Guinness, *Guinness Time* featured an illustrated colour cover and copious amounts of photography and other visual material. At the front of each edition was an editorial of some two pages that ranged in subject matter from details of brewery life, reflections on the passing seasons but also consistently included wider consideration of politics and industrial relations. For the entirety of its run *Guinness Time* featured a photo-essay on aspects of work in the brewery, each piece reflecting on a specific trade or occupation, the staff in the department and an explanation of how this particular aspect of labour fitted in to the wider body of the brewery. There were also pieces on births, deaths and marriages, reports on the various sports and social clubs, visits and events at the brewery and articles about the trade. An important aspect of the magazine was the frequent historical accounts of various aspects of the Guinness Company, the Guinness family and the story of the brewery. In many ways the run of the Park Royal magazine maps incredibly neatly on to the classic era of the long-boom

and acts as an important source of reflections on that era as other researchers have argued when using such corporate material (Nye 1985; Heller 2008).

Through an analysis of the near three decade run of *Guinness Time* it is possible to trace how brewery management reflect on the role of work, its nature, and their responsibilities as employers of labour. This can be seen as going beyond a general sense that Guinness should be, and be seen to be, a 'good' employer. Rather, Guinness management felt it had a real responsibility to create a model workforce, not in a direct structuring sense but rather organically through creating an environment in which its employees could flourish. This can be read from the magazine in virtually every issue, possibly every page.

It is clear from the first editorial that the inspiration for the magazine was to make a new start after '... the social hibernation of the War and many of the old joys are returning' (*Guinness Time* 1(1): 3). In an obvious statement of the social the editorial went on:

Again most of us are now returned from the Services and are no longer just ships passing in the night. Gradually we are anchoring ourselves to this noble community, and any community that is worthwhile has a natural curiosity about the doings of its fellow members. Actual acquaintance is best achieved in the Social Club, but we need to expand that by a wider survey than can be there achieved. Thus it is with these objects in view that we have attempted to portray life at Park Royal. (*Guinness Time* 1(1): 3)

The magazine reflected on the division of labour and working life in a number of ways. The most obvious was the photo-essay on a particular aspect of work in the brewery. But there were a wider range of issues covered around working life. Pensions for instance, and the age of retirement were frequently discussed, as was long service. Across the years attention was

paid to younger people, both craft apprentices and what later came to be known as the Boys, and Girls Scheme. In an article in 1949 entitled 'Theirs is the Future' the issue of youth employment was reflected upon. In particular it noted the problem school leavers:

... young people are at once faced with a great temptation to accept the first lucrative job which presents itself, without paying much attention to the prospects this job may hold out for their adult employment. (*Guinness Time* 3(1): 17)

The piece makes it clear that the problem is compounded by National Service breaking up this important socialisation in to working and adult life. Further a particular group of youths were seen as potentially at risk, those not engaged in craft apprenticeship.

In a previous issue of *Guinness Time* we wrote of the Company's Long Service Award and of those who have received it. We now tell the other end of the story, how young people are recruited to the brewery and how they are trained and cared for here. It is our aim, not to provide mere blind-alley jobs for the newcomers, but by careful selection and suitable training to fit them into jobs to which they are best suited and to help them become useful members of the community. In doing this we hope they will become proud of their work and will become proud of their association with the Guinness Company. (*Guinness Time* 3(1): 17)

The photo-essay that followed this piece shows boys and girls at work in various parts of the Brewery. The aim was to move them around the Brewery giving them a taste of a variety of work and specific tasks. Ultimately, in the case of the boys, it was to provide them with work experience before undertaking National Service. The piece finished by wishing the young recruits well and hoping that they would one day enjoy long service awards. *Guinness Time's* editorials drew on a wide range of cultural and intellectual sources including playwrights,

political thinkers and even Greek philosophers. A later editorial, for example, began by quoting Aristotle on work:

... in the passage quoted at the head of this page Aristotle gives his solution to this problem – to find happiness in one's work, whatever that work may be. To do this it is necessary to have an interest in that work and to understand how one's own job fits into the general scheme. *Guinness Time* hopes to help towards both these ends, for we do not believe in the Shavian pin-maker, who, while tending the machine that makes the heads, neither knows or cares about the man who sharpens the points. We hold that men and women who spend half their waking lives working together must be interested in the results of their labours, and our pages are designed to foster this interest. We are proud of the organisation for which we work, and of the product which we produce and our stories and pictures help to make them better known to ourselves, and to other. (*Guinness Time* 3(3): 3)

The piece goes on to quote William Morris on the pleasure of life lying in taking an interest in '...all the details of daily life' before exploring how sport and various social activities played a role in creating a more rounded social space. Finally the editorial notes 'We spend more time at work than at any other activity, so let us make these hours as pleasant and interesting as possible' (*Guinness Time* 3(3): 4).

This concern is echoed repeatedly in the pages of *Guinness Time*. In 1952 for instance another article on the Boys' Scheme the magazine reflects of the possible fate of those working in non-skilled occupations:

The problem, however, is not so easy to solve in the case of those non-tradesmen, and all too often the individual is employed in some capacity which can have no

future for him in his adult life – the typical “dead-end” job. Our scheme is designed to overcome this problem. Its aim is to occupy the boy usefully during this period and to give him a thorough grounding in the work of the Brewery. It is also designed to bring him on physically and to simulate him in a sense of responsibility and self-reliance so that he will be best fitted to play his part, when an adult, in the industry and social life of the country. (*Guinness Time* 5(4): 12)

There are many instances of an innate conservatism in articles and especially the editorial think pieces. Often what was stressed was the organic and the rooted, a Burkean conservatism; often metaphors of stability were deployed in the resistance to abrupt change or radicalism of various shades. But what was returned to time and again was a concern for the modern worker and how monotony and repetition of tasks could be removed or ameliorated. In one editorial reflecting on the success of Roger Bannister in breaking the four-minute mile the editor ponders the role of sport in work.⁶

For sport is a wonderful medium for good international relations and equally is it important on the home front. If we were asked to comment on one aspect of this, we would say that in an age of increasing mechanisation it does give a most valuable outlet to young workers who are so often beset with the monotony of industrial life. No more awful picture of the present day can be given than of the young worker watching different products of the industrial machine go past him all day and then watching motion or television pictures go past him all evening. Yet we know it happens. (*Guinness Time* 7(3): 3)

This observation was used to highlight the 80 per cent membership of the Guinness Club amongst employees, the various sporting activities within the Brewery’s environs as well as

being a call to arms for more staff involvement in extra-work activities. It is interesting that industrial monotony is bracketed with the leisure activities of affluence, especially the television – it is a concern with the implied passivity and towards an active engagement a vision of a particular type of citizenry, one that is inextricably linked to the workplace. This fear of passivity can be seen as mirroring the views of contemporary politicians and social scientists over the issue of growing affluence and what exactly the working class would get up to when left to their own devices (see for example Hoggart 1957).

In the Christmas number of 1954 attention was paid to the issue of retirement and the then ageing demographic of society. It reflected on longer working lives and the social problem of intergenerational tension caused by younger workers being blocked for promotion by older workers. It also floated the issue of retired workers seeking employment elsewhere (*Guinness Time* 8(1): 3-4). Though used sparingly there is a real sense of Guinness citizenship and this phrase is actually used in an article on the merging of the transport undertaking in to the Guinness Company in 1953:

This change will extend to all transport workers at Park Royal what is probably best described as Guinness Citizenship, with all its advantages of Sick Pay, Service Pay and Pensions. (*Guinness Time* 8(3): 16)

This sense of citizenship can be seen in a later piece on the Boys' Scheme, as the piece stated, 'Guinness is a family firm and likes to foster a sense of belonging throughout the Brewery'.

It will be seen that the Boys' Scheme was not devised just to train a boy for work in the Brewery. It was framed to give him an opportunity to develop his character and to express himself in worthwhile and pleasurable pursuits. The training allows him to

be placed in a job within the limits of his own abilities and above all, it helps him to meet the many demands and responsibilities of a rich and full adult life. (*Guinness Time* 13(2): 11)

Later still the purpose of the scheme was explained as being to 'train boys in Brewery work and also as good citizens' (*Guinness Time* 16(4): 27). The whole run of *Guinness Time* from its foundation in 1947 through to its demise in the 1970s sought to tell a story about the purpose of the Brewery and the lives of the people who earned their livelihoods there.

There are many direct references to ideas of work based citizenship and the importance of fostering community and a social space around employment. Equally, indirectly, its pages reflect this citizenship, from pieces on births, deaths and marriages to photo-essays on a particular aspect of the Brewery's division of labour. The aim was to instil in its readership as sense of pride in the firm but also, I would argue, an industrial citizenship.

Discussion

So what can the Guinness Brewery at Park Royal tell us about industrial citizenship, what does it say both about notions of work in the postwar period as well as for our own era.

Does the notion of industrial citizenship still have any salience for making work and its meaning intelligible? This article is not claiming a direct link or influence between Marshall's ideas on citizenship and the labour policies of Guinness. The Guinness material reflects a wider concern about the nature of work and the role of both employee and employer in a wider collective endeavour. This concern for the industrial citizen has parallels between and strong differences with welfare capitalism as practiced in the USA before, during and after the war (Jacoby 1997). As has been noted at several points Guinness was, and continued to be until the 1980s a paternalistic employer. There is not necessarily a contradiction between

paternalism and the attempt to encourage an independent industrial citizenry in a workforce. The scholarship on industrial paternalism emphasises both continuity and change from early versions to later manifestations. Revill (1999: 202) notes the way in the nineteenth century early factory paternalism (the need to instil industrial discipline on a largely rural labour supply) notable amongst textile masters gave way to the 'New Paternalism' between 1850 and 1875 (the attempt to create ideological of co-operation in predominantly urban settings). Indeed Waller's (1983) research on the Dukeries Coalfield of the East Midlands highlights the changing nature of paternalistic management in the first few decades of the twentieth century. Therefore industrial citizenship could be understood as a conceptualization of workplace culture which sits alongside paternalism in its different stripes. What we see in the case of Guinness in the 1940s and 1950s is the emergence of a labour policy which while rooted in paternalism attempts to negotiate the social, political and cultural shifts occurring after the Second World War.

Marshall's notion of industrial citizenship played an ambiguous role in his wider thesis. It is both simultaneously marginal and central, being both elusive and yet vital to his vision of modern citizenship. Employment was the fundamental space in which an active citizenry was to be formed and nurtured. It was also a conceptualization of work rooted in a vision of adult male full employment, around which a welfare state and social services would be built. As noted above unpaid labour and those who perform it are therefore problematic in this model. It was in the workplace that norms and values were to be transmitted and reproduced. In just the same way the whole tone of *Guinness Time*, and especially its editorials, aimed at creating a social and cultural space which allowed people to grow. However idealistic, paternalistic or even instrumental these statements may seem what we

see across the magazine is an attempt to come to terms with the postwar settlement and with it the problem of work, monotony, of affluence and values. Guinness was thinking through these problems and in the process reflecting deeply about its own values and responsibilities. It saw its role way beyond simply providing wages for its staff in return for effort. It sought to create a physical and intellectual space for social development, for the creation and nurturing of the Guinness citizen.

It would be easy to draw superficial parallels to later ideas about corporate culture but a nuanced reading of the Guinness material within the intellectual firmament of the time exemplified by writers such as Marshall reveals a different type of social and economic space was being imagined. This space was conceived of as allowing autonomy to workers and recognizes distinct and urgent duties on employers to consider their role. This was a very different vision of capitalism than more contemporary forms but should be seen as building on, or emerging from, industrial paternalism rather being something entirely distinct. The ideas of Marshall in *Citizenship and Social Class* also speak to an expanded role for sociology and more broadly the public intellectual in the postwar period. Even in the context of biting austerity Marshall was unafraid to think on a bigger canvas and in positive ways about how society could be improved for its citizens.

The material presented here and its intellectual antecedents speak to contemporary debates in our own time in important ways. A feature of recent literature on employment is the emphasis placed on crisis, flux and instability. High profile writers such as Beck (2000), Bauman (1998) and Gorz (1999) have all stressed the corrosive effects of the 'new capitalism' (Strangleman 2007). Essentially their argument is that economic life can no longer act as a basis for the formation of individual or collective identity. Working life has

been hollowed out as a space for the social with identity and meaning being found and defined elsewhere. Most recently Guy Standing's (2011) writing, especially his *Precariat* thesis has talked directly to the erosion not only of work identity but also of employment as a source of social stability and citizenship.

In a slightly different register another related trope is that while contemporary work is impoverished there is none the less potential to rediscover the value in manual labour and blue-collar skill. For example Richard Sennett's (2008) *The Craftsman* reflects on the importance of embedding oneself in the work one does, in doing things right, and in taking pride. Equally Matthew Crawford's (2009) *Shop Class as Soulcraft* makes a broader defence of manual labour and the potential meaningfulness to be found more generally in blue-collar employment. This has led to a reflection upon the changing nature of work and the values that have been attached to it, especially the denigration of manual labour over the last three decades or more and the general instrumental squeezing out of the social from employment at the expense of intrinsic reward. Both Sennett and Crawford light upon the individual and social value of work in shaping character and forming identity, ideas which form part of a welcome broadening out of the interrogation of contemporary employment (see for example Budd 2011; Muirhead 2004; Svendsen 2008). To be clear both are concerned with the quality and nature of contemporary jobs and seek solace in older models of economic life which in their different ways see as a platform for nurturing civic life.

The portrayal of the modern workplace as devoid of meaning, as desiccated and unable to support social reproduction and identity has become a powerful trope. Here the types of identity built on industrial work are rejected as limited and superficial, as degraded models

of what humanity could be. Both these sets of commentators on the contemporary nature of employment share similarities as well as differences but arguably both rest on images of a stable past against which present instability is juxtaposed. Often the historical period that serves as a foil for contemporary discussions is not specific but is vaguely the time between the end of World War II up to and including the early 1970s – the ‘Long Boom’, the ‘Great Boom’ or the ‘Glorious Thirty’ – this is a period Standing (2009: 3), after Polanyi, describes as one ‘whereby the state would re-embed the economy in society by new forms of regulation, redistribution and social protection’. This is an era seemingly imagined as marked by growing and sustained affluence, rising pay and improved conditions for all. However, this lack of historical focus leads to various speculative narratives insufficiently based on data, being played out about the nature of work in the past and what it provided. As this article has shown it is vitally important to root our contemporary understandings of history in evidence rather than such broad brush accounts. The Guinness material presents a period of *both* stability *and* flux socially as well as economically and in doing so allows us to see the complexity of competing pressures and forces playing on those involved.

What ideas of industrial citizenry allow us to do then is to explore both historical and contemporary ideas and potential visions of work. Marshall’s industrial citizens, Durkheim’s professional ethics and the Guinness Company’s vision of an industrial utopia populated by model Guinness citizens may have been idealistic but they speak to an intellectual engagement with the problems and value of work, the role of the company, state and worker in modernity and the responsibility to create a social space to allow citizenship to be nurtured. This may be dismissed as impossible in the current era of austerity, instability and flux but it is worth acknowledging that Marshall, Durkheim and Edward Guinness were also

writing at a time of upheaval and change and in part this compelled them to think creatively about work, citizenship and economic life.

Bibliography

Bagguley, P. 2013 'Industrial Citizenship: A Re-conceptualisation and a Case Study of the UK', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 33(5/6): 265 - 79.

Baldamus, W. 1961 *Efficiency and Effort*, London: Tavistock.

Bauman, Z. 1998 *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Beck, U. 2000 *The Brave New World of Work*, Cambridge: Polity.

Brown, R. 1992 *Understanding Industrial Organisations: Theoretical Perspectives in Industrial Sociology*, London: Routledge.

Budd, J. 2011 *The Thought of Work*, Ithaca: Cornell.

Bulmer, M. and Rees, A. (eds) 1996 *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T. H. Marshall*, London: UCL Press.

Burawoy, M. 1979 *Manufacturing Consent. Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Crawford, M. 2009 *Shop Class as Soulcraft: An Inquiry into the Value of Work*, New York: Penguin.

Dennison, S. R. and MacDonagh, O. 1998 *Guinness 1886 - 1939 From Incorporation to the Second World War*, Cork: Cork University Press.

- Durkheim, E.** 1964 *The Division of Labour in Society*, New York: The Free Press [First published 1893].
- Durkheim, E.** 1992 *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*, London: Routledge [First published 1957].
- Gorz, A.** 1999 *Reclaiming Work: Beyond the Wage- Based Society*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Guinness, E.** 1988 *The Guinness Book of Guinness: An Anthology Based on the First 50 years of the Park Royal Brewery and its Connections*, London: Guinness Publishing.
- Guinness, M.** 1999 *The Guinness Spirit: Brewers and Bankers, Ministers and Missionaries*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Guinness Time** (Company staff magazine for Park Royal 1947 - 1975).
- Heller, M.** 2008 'Editorial Introduction. Company Magazines 1880 - 1940: An overview', *Management and Organizational History* 3(3-4): 179 - 96.
- Hoggart, R.** 1957 *The Uses of Literacy*, London: Penguin.
- Jacoby, S. M.** 1997 *Modern Manors: Welfare Capitalism since the New Deal*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Marshall, T. H.** 1992 [1950] *Citizenship and Social Class*, London: Pluto [First Published 1950].
- Muirhead, R.** 2004 *Just Work*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Nye, D.** 1985 *Image Worlds: Corporate Identity at General Electric*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Parker, J. 1998 *Citizenship, Work and Welfare: Searching for the Good Society*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Revill, G. 1999 'Liberalism and Paternalism: Politics and Corporate Culture in "railway Derby", 1865 - 75', *Social History* 24(2): 196 - 214.

Rouche, M. 1987 'Citizenship, Social Theory, and Social Change', *Theory and Society* 16: 363 - 99.

Sennett, R. 2008 *The Craftsman*, London: Allen Lane.

Standing, G. 2009 *Work after Globalization: Building Occupational Citizenship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Standing, G. 2011 *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*, London: Bloomsbury.

Strangleman, T. 2010 'Food, Drink and the Cultures of Work: Consumption in the Life and Death of an English Factory', *Food, Culture and Society* 13(2): 257 - 78.

Strangleman, T. 2012 'Picturing Work in an Industrial Landscape: Visualising Labour, Place and Space', *Sociological Research Online* 17(2): 20
<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/17/2/20.html>.

Strangleman, T. 2007 'The Nostalgia for Permanence at Work?: The End of Work and its Commentators', *Sociological Review* 55(1): 81 - 103.

Streeck, W. 1997 'Industrial Citizenship Under Regime Competition: The case of the European Works Councils', *Journal of European Public Policy* 4(4): 643 - 64.

Svendsen, L. 2008 *Work*, Stocksfield: Acumen.

Waller, R. 1983 *The Dukeries Transformed: The Social and Political Development of a Twentieth Century Coalfield*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zetlin, D. and Whitehouse, G. 2003 'Gendering Industrial Citizenship', *British Journal of Industrial Relation* 41(4): 773 - 88.

¹ I would like to thank the anonymous referees and the editor for their constructive remarks and encouragement on this article. I would also like to thank Jack Metzgar, Iain Wilkinson, Susan Halford, Bob Carter, George Revill and Chris Shilling for the advice and comments.

² Both Marshall and Durkheim focus on paid work undertaken in a formal employment relationship and therefore are by implication excluding any type of unpaid labour occurring in the economy. This obviously has profound implications when considering the applicability of these ideas to our own age. Standing (2009; 33) draws our attention to this point and the way the post-war welfare state formed around what he describes as 'Labour-based citizenship "rights"'. Thus predominantly male labour citizenship was buttressed and encoded by a social welfare regime for the whole family. For a longer and broader discussion of this see Standing (2009) chp. 2.

³ Julia Parker notes the way Tawney discusses the way a workman could become a 'citizen of industry' (Parker 1998: 141).

⁴ Later The Work Foundation.

⁵ This insight is based upon an interview with Edward Guinness carried out with the author in 2013 and also borrows from his unpublished autobiographical manuscript which he kindly allowed access to.

⁶ Roger Bannister trained for his record attempt on the Guinness running track at Park Royal. *The Guinness Book of Records* was also conceived of at the site, but that is another story.