

work people than he would have recognized a representative of his horses.²⁶ Twenty-five years ago the term "collective bargaining" was still anathema to the majority of employers. Since then, and most notably during the past decade, the right of workmen to maintain their own organizations and to bargain collectively has had a constantly widening field of recognition, has been confirmed by courts of justice, and has been publicly affirmed by three Presidents²⁷ of the United States. Progress seems to point toward ultimate general recognition of the unions and of collective bargaining.

Mr. Sargent questions certain statements made recently by President Green of the American Federation of Labor, before the Harvard Union, and by Mr. Frayne this evening as to "the wonderful harmony existing when union agreements are entered into." He draws attention to the fact that a large amount of construction work throughout the country was recently tied up owing to jurisdictional disputes between rival unions. It must be quickly admitted that disagreements within the unions have been an expensive nuisance. As the American Federation of Labor develops and adjusts its vast organization, however, these internal disputes grow rarer year by year. When we consider that the Federation now comprises 108 great national or international unions, representing 36,000 local unions and about 4,000,000 workers, it is evident, despite Mr. Sargent's example of internal discord and other examples that I might cite, that remarkable harmony has been maintained. Mr. Gompers was very proud of the record of American Labor in this respect.

It would be difficult to imagine a more untenable position than that assumed by Mr. Sargent when he declares that the experience of England, where the labor movement has had its most conspicuous growth, demonstrates conclusively the disastrous effect of trade union conditions in her industries on trade and prosperity. Until the war England was—for many years had been—generally prosperous. During this period, the British labor movement was successful in lifting the industrial masses out of the deplorable nineteenth century conditions described by Carlyle in "Past and Present"²⁸ into conditions which were also reasonably

prosperous, although not comparable, perhaps, to the conditions enjoyed by American workers. It is important to note that British labor did this without economic injury to British industry. Labor leaders in England are among the first to admit that some past ideals of the movement have been mistaken and that there have been unwise practices on the part of labor in its effort to learn cooperation and better its condition. These practices have, however, been largely due to obstacles, raised by management, to the betterment of labor's condition. During the war British labor cooperated in the fullest way with British industry in the manufacture of munitions and other war material, even to the length of abandoning agreements which it had fought for and established for its own protection. Since the war England has been in an adverse condition economically. This, however, is due to maladjustment of world economic relationships and not at all because of the existence or activities of the British labor movement. I have heard of cases in England where organized labor is working shoulder to shoulder with employers in just such efforts to increase productivity as the American example which I have described tonight.

Mr. Sargent next draws attention to the fact that while the American Federation of Labor at one time demanded that unions should be allowed to incorporate, it now opposes vigorously any proposals for incorporation. The reason for this change in front is, I believe, that the unions know that if they were incorporated, interminable lawsuits would tie up union funds when they were most needed to pay strike benefits. Because they are not incorporated, it becomes necessary to sue every member separately, a very arduous proceeding from the employer's standpoint. It should be stated that the American Federation of Labor constantly urges upon its members that agreements should be faithfully observed.

Concerning Mr. Sargent's next statement that the manufacturers of the country will continue to take

conditions which were a part of the average worker's life in England during the first half of the nineteenth century. It is generally recognized that the measure of prosperity attained since then has been due to economic protection afforded by the British labor movement. A recent book, "Everyday Problems of American Democracy," by Greenan and Meredith (Houghton Mifflin, 1924) says, page 455, "The labor union has been the greatest single factor in lifting the worker out of a life of endless toil and misery to one of real human existence. In order to test the truth of this statement, it is only necessary to contrast conditions before and since the establishment of organized labor, or to contrast the life of the average person today in those countries in which labor is organized, with those in which it is not."

"cum grano salis" any profession as to the willingness of labor to permit the use of "so-called" scientific management, it is evident that he recognizes two sorts of scientific management—the "truly" and "so-called" varieties. To quote again from his discussion. "In the first place, it should be noted that *really* scientific management implies the most economic use, with the least waste, of the labor, machinery and materials, including within this the elimination or prevention of health-impairing methods or practices. That is to say, management of a *truly* 'scientific' nature embraces, as we all realize, much more than studies of the best methods of using available labor or of the best tools to use." Scientific management to me comprises all the elements that Mr. Sargent includes in "truly" scientific management, and a number of others, such as utilization of the findings of experimental psychology as fast as these accumulate, the recognition and development of industrial democracy, and cooperation with the labor movement. And I will venture a prediction that neither the manufacturers of the country nor the labor movement will continue indefinitely to take this kind of scientific management with Mr. Sargent's classic grain of salt.

Mr. Sargent next quotes the late Mr. Gompers to the effect that "Trade Unionism rejects wholly the false doctrine of restriction of output as a means of helping the worker," and then devotes the balance of his discussion to a citation of instances proving that certain of the unions still insist on such restrictions and are still actively opposing progressive methods of production. This part of Mr. Sargent's discussion convinces me that he has totally misunderstood both the contents and purpose of my paper.

In an early paragraph I carefully affirmed antagonism on the part of the unions to progressive management methods and then introduced what I believe to be conclusive evidence that this attitude of antagonism is rapidly disappearing, and that organized labor is moving toward a new policy of cooperation with management in a warfare on waste. Mr. Sargent apparently accepts only the antagonism. My paper was designed to show *first*, the great desirability of such cooperation; *second*, that there is in fact no fundamental incompatibility between the ideals of prevailing trade unionism and scientific management, and *third*, that when the cooperation of a union is invited by management, in all sincerity and with cordial recognition of the right of the workers both to their organization and to collective bargaining, this cooperation is obtainable. Mr. Sargent does not allude to any one of these three major ideas.

I would now like, in the friendliest way, to inform Mr. Sargent that I have discovered by actual experience in union shops that getting along with organized workmen and securing their cooperation is very largely a matter of the spirit. If a truculent attitude of non-recognition and refusal to deal with the union is assumed by management, the response, "as in a mirror face to face," will be in kind. If on the other hand a friendly approach is employed, based on full recognition of the right of workmen to organize for their own protection, the response will also be in kind, and to quote from Mr. William Green's letter reproduced earlier, "the way is then opened for practically limitless opportunity for cooperation between management and employees for the development of more efficient practices and processes."

A PROPOS of the subject matter of the preceding article, the reader's attention is called to the review by John A. Fitch of Copley's "Frederick W. Taylor," reprinted by permission from the Machinists' Monthly Journal, on page 171, and to the reviews of "The Women's Garment Workers: A

History of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union" by Louis Levine, "Employees Representation in Coal Mines" by Ben M. Selekmán and Mary Van Kleeck, and "Sharing Management with the Workers," by Ben M. Selekmán in the review section, pages 175 to 180.

²⁶Sidney Webb on "Recognition of Trade Unionism" in "The Works Manager Today," Longmans, 1917, page 35.

²⁷Presidents Wilson, Harding and Coolidge.

²⁸See also Arnold Toynbee's "The Industrial Revolution" for an account of the long hours, low wages and horrible