

**Bolweg, J.F. , *Job Design and Industrial Democracy*, Martinus  
Nijhoff, Leiden, 1976**

**Fred Emery**

**February 1977**

My first reaction was much the same as when I first brought home a new suit. The cloth seemed not to be the same colour as when chosen in the tailor's shop, one shoulder seemed a bit sloppy, the button-holes seemed a bit too small etc. My fault was that I had an image of what I wanted but had not conveyed much of that image to the tailor. Similarly, I had an image of what happened in Norway and when I read Bolwen's book, I kept asking myself why we had not been told this and that, why he had not been given this and that reference.

In further readings, I tried to take the viewpoint of some of the people I know who would be very interested to pick up other books in the series. Looking at this way, I found that it highly commendable. It would certainly stir the learned but practical person to ask many questions and seek many answers that would not arise if they read only Emery and Thorsrud.

Before it goes to a second edition, there are some oversights that could be easily corrected and some matters on which further thought could be given.

In describing the beginnings of the program, he overlooks the fact that we already had some concrete evidence from British coal mines and Indian textiles to suggest that there might be a radically new way of approaching the idea of industrial democracy. Likewise, we had concrete evidence from Glacier on the dilemmas in representative systems. We certainly did not start the program with ideas plucked out of the air and charismatically propagated.

One important reason why we were not big news in the DNA was our conscious decision not to try and beat Anker Ording at his game and to provide protection to those attempting change.

He is quite unaware of the mimeographed documents on theoretical matters that circulated amongst us in the early sixties. Little wonder that he finds a dearth of theory. Apparently, no one thought to refer him to Paul Hill's report and hence little wonder that he thought his 'ID package' original. Some matters he should think about a little more are:

- a. The so-called fit of our ideas with social democratic thought (p. 31). They simply do not fit as G.D.H. Cole and we found to our discomfort. The establishment in the S-D parties and the unions get too many perks from a Westminster system.
- b. The so-called move from autonomous group concept to that of semi-autonomous groups. I am very much under the impression that we insisted on the latter right from the beginning. He should look again at any other 'information' that he got from that particular informant.
- c. The representative system. He gives a very confusing picture and one that beliefs his own quoted evidence. That is, his hang-up and I think the average reader will

see how confused, and biased, he is. However, I think he ought to think hard about the Hunsfoss voting (p. 63). He does not mention that they already had gained experience of representative system.

I see no point in commenting on more of the points where I find him inaccurate or unthinking (e.g. his pages, 4446 on the theoretical weaknesses. They are so ill-informed that there appears little point in replying).

The faults that I have found with this book will not do much harm so long as the reader bears in mind that it was an academic exercise to gain a PhD. I think we should as a rule look very closely at manuscripts that emerged as theses for a PhD. Particularly U.S. ones. They are generally produced under conditions that are neither conducive to good scholarship nor commonsense.