try, for a generation or two past. Some at least of the faces of this new formation seem reasonably clear.

Two men having formed a partnership may adopt any one of three plans for the conduct of the enterprise. One of the partners may be put in supreme command expressed or understood, or all matters of moment can be decided by joint action, or there may be an assignment of function as between the two partners so that one is supreme in selling and finance, while the other has the final decision as to manufacturing. This is a statement in very simple terms of a problem common to all management. Upon the relation thus established between the individual and the group depends the conduct of a city or a nation, of a single manufacturing establishment or of an industry.

A partnership of two men is admittedly a simple form of human co-operation, but immediately the question of individual versus group direction and control presents itself. To enlarge this group from two to the hundred millions of population in the United States does not alter the underlying philosophy or interfere with the scientific determination of the proper field in which group and individual action should each operate.

Government began with the unhampered will of the strongest single individual and under democracy's warming influence has broadened out until larger and larger groups eventually control political action. In this transition from a régime in which the administrative program of an individual was enforced by the self same individual, to the present time where in matters of government—if not of industry— all administration is supposed to find its warrant in the consent of the governed, we have not always made the sharp distinction which appears necessary between the administrative code itself and the authority which vitalizes it into action. The democratic ideal would appear to be administration by individuals with collective pressure when necessary rather than too much insistence on the part of individuals.

Recently there has been noticeable in the political thinking of the United States a demand for at least a partial return to administrative individualism as evidenced by movements favoring the short ballot, the city manager, longer terms for administrative officials, centralized responsibility, smaller legislative bodies, and the substitution of judicial decisions for those of juries in certain classes of litigation. In our political democracy we are beginning to admit that efficiency comes through giving authority to individuals and requiring performance from them. The initiative, referendum, and re-call are simply some of the checks and safeguards which are essential parts of this scheme of management in its application to government.

Scientific Management stands for the same tendencies in industry. It recognizes that one fact may invalidate a hundred opinions. Scientific Management seeks to set off the territory in which because the facts are obtainable, action can be determined by the facts rather than by caprice. A fancy whether it be the fancy of one or of a million is still a fancy. We cannot vote on a fact. Action by opinion ebbs and flows while action based on the facts can be reasonably consistent and permits of logical and continuous growth. The truth does set us free.

In our scheme of industry and of government the distinctions between these two territories — one of law and the other of judgment—will become more apparent. Collectively we shall gradually learn to trust individuals to read the facts. We may in time class many of these individuals as experts and ultimately revere them. Nor need we abandon the scheme because at this point and that we are occasionally betrayed by misjudged abilities and limited vision. On the other hand the Democrat will not be asked to *vote* once a year on town clerks or minor bond issues. Rather each hour in the day in industry and in life he will render his judgments made all the more necessary in a world broadened by the discoveries of science and deepened through our quickened insights and appreciations.

While the tendencies in our political democracy seem to be in the direction of a larger degree of individualism, certainly in that part of the labor movement which has become organized no such drift is as yet to be observed. According to what appears to be the code of the labor unions and of some of their most distinguished advocates the most satisfactory way to settle almost any question is to vote on it. If by its very nature it cannot be voted on it must then be deprecated. Democracy and voting are under this dispensation synonymous terms. It may be easy to prove that the leaders of the American Federation of Labor do not hold to this very consistently as a general philosophy of life but nevertheless it colors most of the relations of organized labor to the public. In fact the growing demand for what has come to be known as "Consent" under the most frequent interpretation seems to involve a maximum of *group action* rather than a maximum of *action by individuals*. "Consent" as nearly as I can discover involves a much broader application of the theories underlying collective bargaining. Our activity and loyalty even in minor matters is to be secured only after a collective measuring of the pros and cons.

The collective bargain has found its field principally in the agreements between individual employers and their employees and has concerned itself largely with hours and wages and only secondarily with the other conditions surrounding employment. "Consent" on the other hand seems to involve much broader relationships of the group which works for wages to government, to industry and to society. The relatively primitive struggle for higher wages and shorter hours gives way in a sense to a struggle for standing. Minor claims such as those for compensation on account of injuries are superseded by a claim to a share in the conduct of the business whether it be a manufacturing establishment, an industry, a city or a nation. I am picturing this widening of the front of the labor propaganda not because I lack sympathy with it but only to question the one phase which puts a premium on group administration and group decisions.

It may seem axiomatic that because in working out our political democracy we have been in the habit of expressing through the vote our collective pleasure on all kinds of matters—questions of judgment as well as questions of fact — that therefore we must necessarily pass through a similar period in working out our industrial democracy. But possibly we in America can, because of our growing respect for science and our dedication to co-operation, work out a system by which those who work with their hands and their heads and those who represent property interests will each have their proper share in the conduct of industry and in its rewards and this without the necessity of resorting to a vote on the length of a mine car, the proper shovel load for a day laborer or the use of instruments of precision such as the stop watch.

The growing demand for "consent" as voicing a natural re-action against a too autocratic control in industry is to be welcomed without any reservation. But if "consent" necessarily implies an unwillingness to follow the individual—except after a vote—and substitutes everywhere group action we will most certainly have stepped from the frying pan into the fire. For it is only through individuality in management that we guarantee to society the maximum of production and bring to each worker the largest possibility of joy in his work and more important still keep free the human spirit for those adventures without which it were better that this old world of ours should grow too cold for human habitation. As Robert B. Wolf has said "the *function of the group* should be the greatest possible amount of freedom for the development of the individual." Industrial democracy has forged the collective bargain to act as one check against the excesses of individualism. But we must be careful lest the check be used, as some of our political checks have been used, so as to destroy all chance of positive and strong and timely action.

One of the principal indications of an impending shift in the front of the labor movement in this country is found in the fact that many of labor's foremost spokesmen admit that in increased production lies one of the most hopeful routes to a higher social and economic status for those who work with their hands. In several recent reports—largely influenced by the American Federation of Labor—where this question of the effect of increased production was distinctly raised, labor's representatives refused to oppose increased production as such. This is a far step from the "ca canae" and "soldiering" recently and openly advocated and practiced. The laboring classes were of course partially forced to such resorts by the attitude of boards of directors in refusing to administrative officers the right to pay to especially proficient workers high wages—or at least to pay wages much above the district scale.

Scientific Management stands first, last and all the time for increased production. But production is interpreted in the broadest fashion as including everything that makes for human happiness. Thus Marshall points out that art and even the concepts of the mathematician may be production in the very highest sense. Scientific Management holds that equal opportunity and liberty itself are aids to production, that poverty is unnecessary and that labor does not even approximate being a commodity.

Anyone who doubts whether this matter of "Consent" is to be pressed should read articles on the subject which have appeared during the last few years in some of our leading periodicals over the signatures of Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Minor Chipman, the late Robert G. Valentine, John P. Frey, secretary of the Iron Moulders Union, Felix Frankfurter, Robert Bruere, and by the late Robert F. Hoxie. One finds of course even among this group of writers considerable variety of opinion as to the means which it will be wise for the laboring classes to use in giving voice to "Consent." But no one of them apparently has much faith in the possibility of a fairly rigorous individualistic administrative policy that is to be protected and even induced under group control.

This whole question has been brought to a focus recently through the passage by Congress of legislation absolutely prohibiting premium payments and the use of the stop watch in several important branches of the government service. At the last session strenuous efforts were made to broaden the field for this legislation so as to include all classes of government work. Of course there are only preliminary skirmishes in a legislative campaign whose real object is to forbid the use of these aids to a genuine science of industry in all establishments having government contracts, and finally to include industrial establishments generally.