

Institutionum reformatio atque emendatio morum
Moral reform would take too long
institutionum reformatio means remodelling the social structure
or institutions, not the social order as the official trans.

When we speak of the reform of the social order it is principally the State we have in mind.... because on account of the evil of "individualism" as we call it, things have come to such a pass that the highly developed social life, which once flourished in a variety of prosperous institutions organically linked with each other, has been damaged and all but ruined, leaving thus virtually only individuals and the State. Social life lost entirely its organic form; the State, which now was encumbered with all the burdens once borne by associations rendered extinct by it, was in consequence submerged and overwhelmed by an infinity of affairs and duties. S. Anno, C.T.S. p. 36 (another example of the faultiness of the English translation; a whole clause is omitted—*parvo pro us reipublicae detrimento*—"social life lost entirely its organic form" is really "respublica... amissa forma regiminis socialis..." and "encumbered" is *susceptis*, a word with a hint of "unjust or inopportune usurpation" in it.

Modern democracy, our *respublica*, is nothing more than an oligarchy licensed for a certain number of years by the unorganized mass of citizens and dependent to a great extent on a reasonably competent and benevolent bureaucracy. Half-a-dozen Cabinet Ministers (the "stranger" personalities of a given Cabinet) and a dozen or so Civil Servants (heads of departments or "experts") literally dominate all the "social" and a great deal of the economic activity of the citizens of a country. The régime has not existed very long and certainly has not been a striking success. Citizens, deprived of any scope for the social side of their nature, became, unaturally, "individualists", each intent on his own affairs. The State, at the same time, found itself faced by the task of maintaining the smooth functioning of social relationships, a task requiring the whole-hearted cooperation of individual citizens. This co-operation, from the very nature and form of the state, has not been forthcoming; individuals, precisely because they felt themselves only "individuals" and not "members of a social body", became and remain individualists, paying their Cabinet Ministers and Civil Servants to look after the social machine. Simultaneously, they jeopardise the running of this delicate social mechanism by refusing to part with any of their individual liberty and by ruthlessly or thoughtlessly pursuing their own individual or class interests without any serious care whether these interests run counter to the common good or the whole. The result is that the State is forced to intervene especially in the economic sphere, endeavouring by technical economic adjustments (tariffs, bounties, social services, taxation, etc.) to rectify evils and injustices due not to economic but social causes. Were human society properly, that is, humanly and naturally, organized, the very existence and nature of this organization combined with the nature of individual man would tend almost automatically to regulate economic activity for the common good. In so far, classical economists are quite right; there is a *praestabilita harmonia*, there is much wisdom, given the necessary conditions, in *laissez faire*.

Q.A. p. 37 "Let those in power, therefore, be convinced that the more faithfully this principle (of subsidiary or auxiliary social activity) be followed and a graded hierarchical order exist between the various subsidiary organizations, the more excellent will be both the authority and the efficiency of the social organization as a whole, and the happier and more prosperous the condition of the State."

Ibid. "...it is an injustice, a grave evil, and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to appropriate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies. This is fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable, and it retains its full truth to-day."

National Economic Councils in France, Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and to some extent Spain.

Start from above downward seems most practical.

National Economic Council, France, Herriot gov't, January 1925
i) to examine and discuss all the major economic and social problems that arise or are likely to arise - a task of vigilant supervision

ii) to secure for the gov't the technical advice of persons who are at once specialists in their own department and representatives of practical business or professional organizations

iii) to maintain a permanent liaison between the actual economic and business world and the various ministers who have to deal directly or indirectly with economic affairs

This task necessary and useful; beyond ability of civil service
No question of Council usurping powers of Parliament or Cabinet nor even dealing minutely in detail with the solutions to various problems. Examines problems from gov't and from members

Directly under the Prime Minister

Consists of general assembly, permanent committee, secretariat
General assembly, 141 members elected

27 represent consumers; cooperative societies, savings bank depositors, and other large families, etc.

30 for labour; 9 for intellectual workers and education;

23 for manual work; 42 for wage-earners; 6 rural and urban artisans

24 for capital; 9 for industry; 9 for commerce; rest for landowners, financial interests.

Members receive travelling expenses.

Prime Minister settles which organizations shall be represented in the assembly and in what proportion.

Meets four times a year for ten days

Committee consists of four vice-presidents and ten members.
Secretariat is at disposal of committee; experts, etc.

Poincaré "qu'il était une de ces institutions provisoires qui gagnent tous les jours de nouveaux droits à l'immortalité
Jouhaux "ce qu'il faut, c'est organiser les rapports entre les éléments patronaux et ouvriers en fonction de l'intérêt général qu'ils dominent."

La Régie cooperative, defined: The exploitation of an enterprise (by workers, management and users) not with a view of realising an individual profit or of distributing dividends, but solely in view of the needs of the community and with no other end than to procure for the consumers the maximum of utility and economy.

Requests of the Nineteenth Century

William Graham Sumner

Yale Review, June Summer 1933

Article written in 1901

"Wherever there is a force in human society, the problem is to use it and regulate it; to get the use and prevent the abuse of it. The state is no exception; on the contrary it is the chief illustration. In all forms of the state which have ever existed, families, groups, classes, corporations have struggled with each other to get into their hands the power of the state. To get control of this power is to win the industrial products, after other people have made them, without labor of one's own."

It makes no difference which class is governing: monarch, aristocracy, middle class (bourgeois), or demagogues.

"The modern industrial state transfers millions on a punctuation mark in an act of the legislature. To get the legislative machine into one's control is worth ever so much more than it ever was before. To get the use and avoid the abuse of the state is harder than it ever was before. It is harder in the democratic republic than in any other form of the state. There are thousands of men in public life or in the lobby who suppose that this is all as it should be. They suppose that to elect a legislature and then work bills through it which will be to somebody's profit is the regular order of things. That, they suppose, is what it is all for. There is not a civilized state with parliamentary institutions which has not had a financial scandal within ten years."

"It is a great mistake to say, as we hear people say every day, that this abuse is perpetrated by capitalists and corporations. It is perpetrated by everybody."

"Some people are very eloquent against anybody who, as they say, bribes a legislator. It takes two to perpetrate a bribery."

..... It is possible that a man may buy a legislature to get what he ought not to have. It is also possible that a legislature may blackmail a man before giving him what he ought to have. There are many grades between these two extremes. Why does not the people elect a legislature who will do their duty and not take bribes at all?..... Our popular teachers and preachers will not entertain the possibility that the people are at fault. In fact, the people are altogether at fault. It has not done its first duty in the premises, and therefore the whole institution has gone astray."

Legislature merely a conflict of interests.

Representative gov't does not represent anything in particular.
Atomism of territorial divisions. Parties. Unintelligence