

that "a code of natural laws equally binds employer and workmen"—by all of which Taylor meant genuine cooperation.

The employer-employee get-together movement, so encouragingly revealed by Mr. Brown's evidence of the willingness of organized labor and management to cooperate on the vital problems of eliminating waste in industry, is a natural by-product of the newer conception of the employer-employee relation. The fine spirit of cooperation, which is the surest test of progress, regards the old traditional conflict between employers and workers not as *inherent* in the work relations, but as an opportunity for constructive integration of the hitherto supposedly divergent aims of those who function in industry.

It was my privilege a year ago to read the 372 essays submitted in the *Railway Age* contest for "the best methods for bringing about cooperation between railways and their employees to promote efficiency"—the central theme of Mr. Brown's paper. Our railways are among our most highly unionized industries. I was greatly impressed and heartened in going over these essays to note the eagerness on the part of the writers (from all ranks of railway workers) to be "let in on" the vital and interesting problems outside routine duties. Many constructive suggestions looking toward the development of a genuine cooperation are revealed in these essays. The invitation of Mr. Lee to the Railway Executives and Brotherhood leaders to convene in Conference at Cleveland, the 29th of this month, "to find the right way" to cooperate is further evidence of the readiness of organized labor to assume a greater degree of responsibility for the success of the industry of which it is a part.

The same fundamental desire to create wholesome employer-employee relations is revealed in the best aspects of the employee representation movement.

There is no more wholesome tendency in our economic life today than the emancipation from many of the earlier doubts, suspicions, misgivings, ulterior and secretive motives on the part of both employers and workers. All this is now gradually giving way to a wholesome, constructive, mutual confidence and respect. This growing emancipation is in large measure due to the fact that this get-together movement has allied itself with the scientific method. As I have said elsewhere: "Science is a great solvent of prejudice and misunderstanding. Cooperation is being understood more and more as a growth . . .

Emphasis is being placed upon methods and means, not ends. Questions of constitutional form occupy less time and energy, and methods and technique of smooth, effective operation are emphasized." There is a conscious growing conviction that the proper and true relationship between employers and workers is not one of continual strife, but one with an underlying foundation of harmony, mutual respect and accord. Such a relationship is conceived and developed on the basis of mutual faith, facts scientifically established and a keen sense of the square deal.

De Toqueville, the master mind of democracy, tells us that "whatever exertion may be made, no true power can be founded among men which does not depend upon the free union of their inclinations." Is not this the essence of cooperation? Does it not mean that reliance upon power, force, secrecy, hero worship, autocratic method must give way to open double-track channels for the free flow of facts; knowledge, hopes, aspirations, wisdom? Does it not mean that if we are to have true efficiency and harmony in the employer-employee relations, managers and workers, or their representatives, must exercise, not superior force but a *right*; that authority must rest upon proved worth and wisdom; that obedience must increasingly be rendered, not to a *man* but to improved industrial law and to justice? And will not the problems of production—waste elimination and all the rest—be most constructively observed, analyzed, interpreted and most safely directed along cooperative lines at the points *where they arise and by those whom they most directly affect*?

Industry is crying out for a more conscious, deliberate, jointly responsible, thoroughly scientific attitude on the part of all its participants. We need new inventions, new solvent concepts, a cooperative industrial statesmanship to lead us into the abiding conviction that conflict is a life-giving creative opportunity. The time has come to inform, instruct, stimulate, teach *principles*, not fixed rules; make industry an "adventure in creative enterprise"; put vital meaning into work; make it scientific, pro-social and *human*; keep the work relations in harmony with fundamental, *individual* life needs, and protect ascending social standards; trust men and encourage them to manage themselves; aim to realize in industry the ideals of self government; and remember that the core of constructive cooperation is an honest *redistribution* of men—a fair chance to make personality count.

Spencer Miller, Jr.²⁰ There is one aspect of Mr. Brown's paper on "Scientific Management and Organized Labor Today" that I should like to stress. It is the social significance of the new policy of cooperation between management and labor to which he refers both in his own experience at the Jacques Kahn Mirror Co., Inc., and in that highly important cooperative experiment of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. In the case of the B. & O. plan one sees abundant evidence of the shift in position from educating men for production to a position of drawing forth the educational possibilities of production itself. Cooperation thus conceived becomes more than an administrative technique to reconcile differences: it becomes a dynamic example of reciprocal education to both management and men. Psychologically the shift is from the position of "they" to "we." Both groups become consciously participants in the process as well as in the results of production. Just such creative activity with real problems is the fulfillment of an elementary pedagogical principle that men learn by doing.

The resistance of labor to scientific management in the past was due in the last analysis to the denial of the very cultural and educational opportunities that seem to be inherent in the B. & O. plan. There was a genuine fear that under scientific management, if generally applied, "the craftsman," in the words of Mr. John P. Frey, "would pass out of existence, and the workers would become dependent for their existence upon the scanty and insignificant industrial knowledge and experience afforded them by their limited opportunities, regulated by those who, in addition to ownership of machinery, had also acquired possession of craft knowledge and the skilled workers' methods."

Contrast this attitude of labor as ably set forth by Mr. Frey with that on the B. & O., where workers became not only responsible for the efficiency of the shops but jointly for the morale and efficiency of the entire railroad. As a well conceived program of training for citizenship in industry, nothing could be more illuminating than these new developments that Mr. Brown presents.

And it must necessarily follow that when such organic partnership has been effected, the scientific organization of business will result not because

labor is "unable to stop its progress" but because labor recognizes the immense cultural and educational product that comes to both labor and management when both join to bring science to the service of business and both to the service of the community.

Noel Sargent.²¹ Both the main paper and the discussions which have followed have been exceedingly interesting and, in addition, provide many points upon which it is evident there is great agreement. I propose to inject a few points upon which some disagreement or doubt may be felt.

Remarks of Mr. Frayne, in particular, present many questions to which several hours of discussion could be profitably devoted. For example, his statement that the highest efficiency existing in industry today is found in those industries which are operated under predominantly closed shop conditions (which is meant by his references to union agreements) could, I am sure, be seriously disputed. It is significant and much more than a coincidence that the three American industries in which prices have increased most during the past eleven years have been those industries which, to the largest extent, have been dominated directly or indirectly by closed shop production methods insisted upon by organized labor. I refer to the coal, clothing and building material industries of this country. If, as has been asserted here tonight, union agreements resulted in great efficiency, the operating costs in these industries should have been lowest and prices should have increased least.

There could, moreover, be a serious and perhaps worthwhile discussion as to what collective bargaining is and whether any form of organization can justly claim to have a monopoly upon the type of collective bargaining which should exist in industry.

In common with the President of his organization, Mr. Green, Mr. Frayne describes at length a wonderful picture as to harmony in industry which exists when union agreements are entered into.

I am reminded that recently, I believe at Harvard University, the President of the American Federation of Labor spoke of the wonderful peace existing in closed shop industries and that the following day 22 million dollars of construction work was tied up in New York, Philadelphia and Chicago because of a jurisdictional dispute between rival unions,

²⁰Secretary, Workers' Education Bureau of America, New York City.

²¹Secretary, Employment Relations Committee, National Association of Manufacturers, New York.