

Gilson, I am not going over there any more, because they won't let us discuss things. One of the fellows told me to sit down. He said, 'There is your chair and there is the door—take your choice.' I said to him, 'Look here, don't you fly off the handle at me for asking a simple question.' He said, 'Young lady, I got daughters home; they don't use no saloon talk on me either and I am not going to have any saloon talk used on me here.' I said, 'I want to tell you that Mr. Richard Feiss once said to me not to fly off the handle when I get mad.' He said, 'Young lady, there is the door; you were sent over here by your manager, I know.'"

Someone said that after this girl left the room the organizer said: "You are all under the thumbs of Mr. Richard Feiss, you are knuckling to your manager, you are scared, you are scared to call your souls your own, you are afraid of your foreman, too." One of the Italian girls got up and said, "Afraid of my foreman? I should say not! You should hear me argue with him."

But the point is that several of our people said to me, "Miss Gilson, I am not going over there to be insulted. We discuss things over here and have a right to our opinions here, and why shouldn't we there?"

That is what I want to say right here, that unless you encourage people to "discuss things," unless you do sell it to the worker step by step, it won't last and it is not scientific and artistic management.

CARL G. BARTH: I have enjoyed the papers read this morning perhaps more than any others that have ever been presented to our Society. It was indeed gratifying to learn about this wonderful work that is being done in Rochester to settle difficulties arising between the employers and employees in the clothing industry; but as there are always two sides to every question, I was also glad to hear what Mr. Johnson has to say in warning us not to be too sanguine about the final outcome. The several examples given by Mr. Leiserson of the necessity of understanding national and group psychology in dealing with different nationalities and individuals were indeed instructive. However, when he takes it for granted that we all make the mistake of time-studying an operator without first telling him what we are about and obtaining his acquiescence, he displays the same ignorance of what the real scientific management engineer actually

<sup>1</sup>Consulting Engineer, Philadelphia, Pa.

does, as I have invariably found in academically trained men who gather their information from the limited source of the justly or unjustly aggrieved. What are the facts? That Mr. Taylor, the father of scientific management and time study, always contended that time study should never be undertaken in an establishment before some two or three years of preparatory work had preceded it.

To mention a notable case; I worked just two years in the machine shop of the Watertown Arsenal preparing the way for time study, by the introduction of suitable storage methods for materials, routing of work and orders, standardizing machinery and tools, making slide rules, etc., and in getting in personal touch with a large number of the employees, before I recommended that Mr. Merrick be engaged to take up the time study of the manual operations connected with the product of the shop.

On Mr. Merrick's arrival, a single machinist was selected for the first object lesson in time study; and before Mr. Merrick took him in hand, he was given a full hour's talk by me about what it all meant, in the presence of his leader, his master mechanic, the Captain in charge of the shop, the Major who was second in command of the Arsenal and who had also been in local charge of my installation work, and Mr. Merrick. As part of my talk I told this man that organized labor had got the idea that our work was detrimental to its best interest; and that, if in spite of what I had to say to the contrary, he felt that he preferred not to be the first one to serve as an object lesson in the matter, no pressure of any kind would be put on him to submit. His answer was that he could see nothing out of the way in what he had been told, and that he declared his willingness to go ahead.

Some time after this I gave a similar though more condensed talk along the same lines to two other machinists, but without requesting the presence of the Major referred to above; and I ended my talk by saying to Mr. Merrick that it henceforth would be up to himself to give similar initiating talks to the other men, as he proceeded with his work.

The strike that almost a year later took place in the foundry at the Arsenal, and which has been cited as the first strike to occur during the introduction of scientific management, was brought on by a thoughtless attempt to make a time study of a certain molding job for which the old price was suspected to be entirely too high, and on which the molders were accord-

ingly forced to waste a lot of time in the attempt to conceal the fact. Inasmuch as nothing in the way of preparatory scientific management had been developed in the foundry, the strike had nothing to do with the introduction of scientific management. I regret to say, however, that too much passes under that name which is only a reckless attempt on the part of somebody to cut down time allowances by the superficial use of a stop watch.

DR. JACOBSTEIN: Mr. Johnson raises a very interesting point. He asks this question: "Has the machinery thus far functioned successfully, only because we have surrendered to labor?" It is a perfectly fair question and I am glad he asked it.

I think the real test will come when the workers are demanding unreasonable things and don't get them; and where they attempt to push their union activities aggressively into fields where management does not want them to go. The crucial test will come with this severe strain placed upon the machinery that must necessarily come when the labor market pendulum swings the other way. I am perfectly frank enough to say that I am not ready to pass final judgment on the scheme until that time comes.

I will not admit, however, that our plan has worked thus far only because we have surrendered to labor. Our cooperative arrangement has tended to stabilize the labor market. For if there had been no organization of labor in Rochester cooperating with the employers, I am sure that wages would have been much higher than they are today. I know that is true because non-union plants are paying higher wages than union plants. We have used the union in a perfectly legitimate way to stabilize wages. The union saw the disastrous effect that might ensue if the law of supply and demand under unusual conditions were permitted to operate to boost wages abnormally high. If we had no collective bargaining in Rochester I know that a number of skilled operations,—notably sleeve sewing, pocket making, off-pressing—would today probably be receiving from twenty-five to fifty per cent more wages than they are getting today. The only reason why they were kept down was because the union believed it to be good policy not to permit too great a spread in the earnings between the various groups.

So that I do not feel that we have surrendered to labor at all. What we did do was to anticipate extravagant wage demands which were inevitable because

of an abnormal condition in the labor market, as happened in the munition plants and in the shipyards, where wages went sky-high during the war period. Collective bargaining has served as a stabilizing influence in the Rochester clothing situation.

Mr. Johnson voices a common belief in his assertion that the manufacturers have paid high wages and then shifted the cost to the consumer. There is this feeling on the part of the public that labor has joined with capital in the clothing industry in a conspiracy to fleece the rest of the public. I know that charge is made. Need I remind you that profits have gone sky-high in many industries that are not organized? Need I tell you that in unorganized industries wages have gone high where the law of supply and demand operated? I deny that there has been any joint profiteering by labor and capital as a result of any collective bargaining arrangement in the clothing industry in Rochester. The clothing industry in Rochester, as elsewhere throughout the country, was on too low a level prior to the introduction of collective bargaining. Union activity has operated to bring about a substantial increase in wages and has brought the industry up to a level justly comparable to other industries. Do you think that a skilled worker is entitled to a dollar an hour for his labor today? Is a dollar an hour too much for a man who has given his life to the industry? Forty-one dollars is the highest week-work wage operation in the Rochester clothing market. We in the clothing industry think that the workers in the industry are entitled to a wage sufficient to guarantee a decent American standard of living.

Having committed ourselves to that principle we pulled up the workers perhaps a little bit more rapidly than you have in other industries. You raised your workers' wage bit by bit. Through neglect, wages were too low in our industry. To put these wage levels where they belonged, we had to make bigger increases within the last fifteen months. I don't feel that we ought to begrudge these workers the wages they are now earning. Wages in Rochester in the clothing industry are higher on piece work perhaps than they are in the other industries, but I think those of you who have gone through a clothing plant where piece workers are engaged, will agree with me that they are entitled to all they earn. They work hard every minute of the day.

Mr. Johnson doubts the advisability of the employer turning over his management and his labor pol-