

in an incipient strike, and this despite assurances to the workmen that interference with any condition in the existing agreement between the Manufacturers' Association and the Union was in no wise contemplated.

After a number of ineffectual attempts to win the workmen, it became evident that no further progress could be made unless cooperation was secured from the union—and I was in a decided quandary as how best to frame an approach.

As an initial step the shop steward, who happened to be one of the foremen, was summoned to a conference during the course of which I carefully explained to him the nature and purpose of the methods still to be installed; gave him every assurance of good faith in regard to maintenance of the existing agreement relative to wages, hours, conditions, etc., and then formally invited cooperation from the union in the conduct of whatever steps were necessary to complete the remaining stages of the reorganization. After manifesting some distrust and raising a few objections—which were, fortunately, smoothed out—he seemed to feel the sincerity of the invitation. Before the conference ended, I had his promise to bring the matter up for discussion at the next regular meeting of the Local, and to apprise me quickly of the result.

In a few days the shop steward informed me that he had broached the matter at headquarters, and that it had occasioned considerable dissension among the union membership, causing their division into two factions, one of which was strongly in favor of formally accepting the invitation, the other faction just as emphatically opposed to having the union commit itself by any action whatsoever. There was encouragement, however, in the fact that, according to the shop steward, a majority of the members seemed to be in favor of endorsing the introduction of improved methods, and that this majority included both the President and the Secretary of the Local.

On the following day I received a visit from the Walking Delegate who, it quickly transpired, was most decidedly of the dissenting faction. He proved to be an agreeable chap, well informed on the labor question, and, I might add, on industrial economics, and very positive in his conviction that it would be contrary to the very essence of trade unionism to accord the desired cooperation. For three hours we debated the pros and cons of scientific management from the union standpoint, and during this period my adversary, in support of his position, advanced most

of Professor Hoxie's analysis. Scientific management would, he said, eventually destroy trade unionism by minute specialization of workmen and consequent destruction of crafts. Experience had shown, moreover, that it tended to drive workmen out of the union, and from this standpoint could operate only to the disadvantage of labor. He held to this point of view despite every argument, and did not seem at all impressed by the oft-repeated declaration that there would be no interference with the union agreement on wages, hours and conditions. He finally departed, giving me a farewell assurance that when the matter again came up at the next meeting, he would strive to the uttermost to defeat any favorable action on the part of the Local.

The reorganization, as intimated, could not proceed unless the necessary time studies were obtained; the latter could not be secured without cooperation from the working force; and this cooperation could only come by fiat of the union. It was therefore of first importance that the union be, by some means, won over.

As a final expedient the shop steward was invited to a second conference, during which a new and different type of appeal was used. This consisted of reading to him excerpts from the 1923 report of George W. Perkins, President of the Cigar Makers' International Union. Most important of these is the following:

No power on earth can stop the at least gradual introduction and use of improved machinery and progressive methods of production. Any effort in that direction will react against those who attempt it. Our own condition proves that our efforts at restriction were futile and ineffective and injurious. Without any exception any organization since the beginning of the factory system that has attempted to restrict the use of improved methods of production has met with defeat.

This and other quotations from the report of a well-known labor leader were, as stated, shown to the shop steward who now exhibited great interest. He finally requested that I give them to him in the form of a verbatim copy for presentation at the next meeting of the Local, and concluded the conference by assuring me that he was now on my side and would do everything in his power to obtain favorable action from the union officers.

This final argument carried the day, and the dissenting faction, unable to withstand the logic of one of their own labor leaders, either gave in or were over-ridden. In a few days the steward informed me that the union had decided to extend full endorse-

ment, and that he would, personally, accompany a time study observer into the shop and himself enlist the cooperation of the working force by putting, as it were, the "union label" on the investigation. This he did and time study thenceforward was conducted without any hostile manifestation from the workmen.

It should, perhaps, be stated that no attempt was made to install any form of piece work or bonus system. All other elements of modern production control including an adequate time-keeping system, a perpetual stores inventory, a cost system, advance scheduling of orders through manufacture, time study, etc., were, however, successfully introduced. As the various stages of this reorganization, and the economies which were effected through it, have been described at length in a series of articles appearing recently in a leading industrial magazine,⁸ I will not, at this time, dwell further upon them, save to add one detail which has not, I think, yet been published.

Glancing back over the entire investigation which extended over a period of more than two years, and measuring the various results against each other, it becomes evident that the most important single gain lay in the establishment of a spirit of cooperation and what might be termed *same* relations between management and union. The absence of this characteristic had undoubtedly for many years been a source of heavy expense and demoralization to this business. As evidence of the fact that different relations were established, I submit a letter (see next column) from the Local Secretary received by me shortly after the union had extended its endorsement to the introduction of improved methods in this plant. I regard it as an interesting "sign of the times."

Since receiving this letter I have been conscious of a growing sense of its significance and it is my deep conviction that the spirit of cooperation thus conveyed is of incalculable importance to industry today. If, abolishing ruinous strikes, endless friction and an assumed divergence of interest between industrial management and organized labor, these two great forces might be reconciled to a common interest in producing the things that we need in the most efficient way that modern science with all its resources can devise, would not organized labor, management, industry and society at large benefit to an immeasurable degree? This proposition would seem self-

⁸"Profitable Methods for the Small Factory," by G. C. Brown, *Management and Administration*, February to July, 1924.

TRAINING DIVISION 4578

Glass Brevlers, Mirror Workers and Cutters Union Local 528

OF THE I. O. O. F. & A. M. U. O. F. A.

MADE EVERY FRIDAY AND THURSDAY

HEADQUARTERS, 92 EAST 4TH STREET

New York, May 1st, 1924

G. C. Brown, Esq.
Chief Engineer
Jacques Kahn Mirror Co.,
531 West 37th Street
New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir:—

We are in receipt of your request for cooperation from Local #528, Glass Brevlers and Silverers Union, re the introduction of Improved Management and Shop Methods, in the factory of Jacques Kahn, Inc. We wish to state that we will gladly extend to you every form of co-operation and indorsement in our power provided that we have your assurance that the existing agreement between the Union and the Metropolitan Mirror Manufacturers Association will in no wise be interfered with.

We are instructing our Shop Steward in your factory, Mr. A. Fitton, to this effect, and thank you for the courtesy of your request.

Yours very truly,

Secretary *Chas Lawrence*

Local No. 528—Glass Brevlers & Silverers Union

evident, yet we have been taught in the past that organized labor and scientific production management are fundamentally incompatible, that they are irreconcilable from the economic standpoint, and that any attempt at cooperation between them is in the nature of wasted time and effort. I humbly submit that these old beliefs are rapidly becoming obsolete, and that the logic of events is throwing into constant relief the fact that the troublesome problems in our human industrial relations may be adequately solved only by development and exercise of this same principle of cooperation.

In order to ascertain in a general way what the probable outcome would be, if, as in the case of the mirror factory just described, I were to seek, under different conditions, similar cooperation from other unions, I decided a short time ago to communicate with a number of the important affiliated crafts, and explaining the details of my recent experience, ask for a candid statement on this general subject of cooperation, from some responsible officer in each organization. So I had transmitted to the President or General Secretary of fifteen of the largest trade unions in the American Federation of Labor a let-