

icies to the unions on the one side and to the labor managers on the other. It is true we labor managers have unusual power, but our respective employers and the Labor Committee of the Clothiers' Exchange tell us how far we may go. For example, on December first there was negotiated a wage increase. That wage increase was very definitely fixed for the market by the manufacturers themselves. But in the practical administration of that award the manufacturers realized that they needed the services of labor experts armed with some technical knowledge of the industry. They therefore instructed the labor managers to spend the increase granted in the most equitable manner.

I am surprised, and regret, that an employment manager should urge, as Mr. Johnson did, this particular point of view, namely: that the employer personally is able to handle the labor policy of an industry and that there is no occasion for turning over some authority to a labor manager. It is my experience that the employment manager has too little authority in industry and is too often a mere clerk, or a rubber stamp, merely carrying out the orders of other executives. In the clothing industry we have made this contribution, that we have shown the employer on the one side and the union on the other, that someone must devote all of his time to the administration of labor matters. But if the labor manager does not properly and intelligently administer these labor policies, according to the wishes of the employer, he will surely have to make room for someone else.

Miss Gilson makes a point. Her question is this: "Can't you have scientific management sold to the workers without tying up with an outside organization?" In the first place, I didn't say it was necessary to tie up with an outside organization. I very carefully avoided saying that you cannot get industrial democracy through a company union, or a shop committee plan, through a Filene inside organization or through a Joseph & Feiss inside organization, or without any employees' organization at all. You have industrial democracy in proportion as your plan of operation has the willing consent of the governed; your industrial democracy will be efficient if it provides a development of leadership, a trained citizenship, and a factual basis for your democracy. If Joseph & Feiss is doing that, I say "Amen." Personally, I don't see how it can be done. My private

opinion is that you cannot get the willing consent of the workers until you let them give their consent. Mr. Feiss installed scientific management long before his workers knew what those words meant and I think you will agree with me, Miss Gilson, that perhaps later on they were won over to the plan by the fairness with which Mr. Feiss put it across; but certainly they didn't give their consent and allegiance to the plan with open mind and full knowledge of all the implications of scientific management.

I have not passed judgment on the democracy of other types of organization. What I do say is that we have a democratic plan in Rochester, in the clothing industry. You have it in your way; we have it in our way. To the extent that you think you have it, I ask you to ask yourselves these four questions that I have put to myself: Have I got the consent of the workers? Are we training leadership in the industry? Are we training and informing the individuals in the industry? And is the whole structure on a factual basis?

MR. JOHNSON: I am afraid that I might possibly have been misunderstood, judging from the discussion.

I see no chance for argument between my friend, Mr. Cursi and myself. I hope he hasn't left because I did not mean him to infer in my statement that the worker should not have a place to go to solve his problems or to tell the story. In fact, I think the organization of the employment managers' movement illustrates most forcibly that managers feel that the workers should have someone to whom they could go with their grievances.

We have such machinery in all organizations having a centralized employment department. None of our employees feels that his job depends on the will of the foreman, because they know the foreman cannot discharge them. They can only dismiss from their respective departments. I think that condition exists in almost every organization where they have centralized employment. The employee will have a hearing, certainly I want every employee to have the opportunity for a hearing, but my idea was this; these things can be settled within our own organization. We don't need an outside court with its staff of highly paid men, to argue over propositions that should and could better be settled within the individual organization where the proper machinery has been established.

THE CHAIRMAN<sup>1</sup>: The program today has to my mind been most significant and most appropriate. So far as the times are concerned, History very clearly tells a story that has been a common story down through the ages in all times and all civilizations. We find two forces in apparent conflict, if you please, on the problems of the day and age; the progressive forces which advocate the new, and the conservative forces which cherish the good old times and are trying to hold us back to those things which they think were so good under the old conditions; these two forces are always present and active. It is an interesting fact, however, to know that in the light of history we never go backward. We face our problems and are compelled to solve them. That has been the history of mankind.

The industrial relations problem is perhaps the most fundamental problem the world faces today. The definition of what constitutes the rights of the workers is the almost universal problem. It expresses itself in all industrial, economic and political policies. One organization after another is simply trying to secure in its own or in some particular way a better definition of the rights of the workers, so far as they apply to industry and human relations.

The effort in connection with the men's clothing industry is bound to attract attention and consideration. It is a venture along new and somewhat different lines. It is worthy of great thought and study. I wish that we might also have had here today, Mr. Weill of the Stein-Bloch Company, to tell you some of his thoughts in connection with this work. I can only repeat and very poorly repeat some of the points that I have heard him make.

The thought of the manufacturers of the men's clothing industry in connection with this undertaking is perhaps this: that there is an industrial relations problem to be faced. They are not so far proposing or affirming that they have found the ultimate solution of that problem, but they do face and are willing to face the problem cooperatively with their employ-

<sup>1</sup>Henry T. Noyes, Treasurer and General Manager, Art in Buttons, Inc., Rochester, N. Y.

ees. If a solution is to be found it is their belief it can be found by facing it together, facing it with honesty and sincerity on the part of both sides. It is an experiment, if you please, but an experiment from which some progressive advance must in the end be made, if the lessons of history teach us anything in particular.

It seems to me that the divergent views, pro and con, that might be held on these papers and criticisms presented this morning summarize themselves around one fundamental difference. Does the property ownership of business give to the owners the entire rights in industry? Or is there a certain inherent right that belongs to the workers when they give the large part of their lives and their efforts to industry? That is the problem the world has not solved, but one that we shall solve sometime. It seems to me that our political, economic and social discussions are really resolving themselves around the one thing;—do the workers have a certain inherent right in industry equal, or equivalent in some senses, to the property rights of the owners? That is the question that is still to be solved and the differences of opinion that this audience may hold on the subject presented this morning will be influenced by their ideas on this one point.

The big point, it seems to me, in any such undertaking as we have had described this morning, is that it is founded on one big fact,—faith in mankind, faith in human beings, faith that employers and employees can with honesty and sincerity face their common problems in an effort to reach a solution.

The solution of the problem invites the best effort of the Taylor Society,—and the Society is worthy of the effort. I have been in contact with Taylor men in this country for nearly twenty years, and I have never found them in their daily work confronted with the difficulty of securing the cooperation of labor. They may have had difficulty in securing the cooperation of employers; but of the workers, no. The objects of their methods of management are just and fair, and they win the appreciative cooperation of the workers.