sure, liberals like Hume, Dudley North, and George Berkely, raised their voices in the wilderness in favor of the doctrine that new wants would spur the worker to new efforts which would result in the production of goods or services which would raise the general prosperity of society. Said Berkely, "Whether comfortable living doth not produce wants and wants, industry, and industry, wealth . . . Whether the way to make men industrious, be not to let them taste the fruits of their industry."[6]

But, as a whole, the chorus of voices advocating the utility of low wages as a means toward a favorable balance of trade drowned out the few dissenters, and the welkin rang with protests against workers who so far forgot their proper station in life as to indulge in "snuff-taking," "tea-drinking," "ruffles," "silks," "ribbons"[7] and other wild excesses. Vanderlint, a representative writer of the early eighteenth century, held that the standard of living should be "suitably low" to conform to the "rank and station" of the laboring man. In fact, the doctrine of the utility of hard times was founded on a belief that long hours and low wages disciplined the worker to greater effort and that it was his duty to labor unceasingly.

Said one author of the times, "Nor is it easy to conceive or invent anything more destructive to the interests of a nation than the giving an education to the children of the lowest class of her people that will make them contemn those drudgeries for which they were born."[8] Does this sound familiar to the ears of those of us who have heard many present-day employers wax pessimistic over the dangers of educating the masses, thus lessening our supply of hewers of wood and drawers of water?

Another writer of the times said, "The employment of the women and children is drinking tea with white bread and butter twice a day; an extremity that may surely be called luxury in excess!"[9] And William Temple in 1770, said, "The laboring people should never think themselves independent of their superiors, for, if a proper subordination is not kept up, riot and confusions will take the place of sobriety and good order."[10]

[6]"The Querist" (1755 edition), p. 12 and p. 38.
[7]Thomas Alcock, "Observations" (1752), pp. 45 ff.
[8]"Considerations" (1763), p. 25.
[9]Arthur Young, "Eastern Tour" (1771), 1, p. 306.
[10]William Temple, "Essay" (1770), p. 56.

Because of the disciplinary attitude of the employing class, the fair, the alehouse gatherings and other amusements of the laborers were decried because they were regarded as means of enticing the laborer away from the "drudgery to which he was born." Henry Fielding in 1751, said, "Besides the actual expense in attending these places of pleasure, there is a loss of time and neglect of business . . . To be born for no other purpose than to consume the fruits of the earth is the privilege of the very few. The greater part of mankind must sweat hard to produce them . . . Six days shalt thou labor was the positive command of God."[11]

These and many other expressions of mercantilist philosophy may be found in that thrilling work of Mr. Furniss on "The Position of the Laborer in a System of Nationalism."[12] a book every one interested in the philosophy and attitudes of employers should read.

You are smiling at the condescension and snobbery with which these quotations from the eighteenth century reek. Now let me read you some statements issuing from some of our twentieth century employer-philosophers: You may say that they do not represent our American employers. I say they are as representative if not more so than are the members of the Taylor Society. The quotations I shall read are published by an employers' organization representing a membership of over six thousand, and it is quite fair to assume that opinions of a large number of members of an organization published in the official documents of that organization represent its general opinion as a body.

Here are a few statements concerning the five-day week, appearing in the official publication of one of the largest organizations of employers in the United States. Please remember when I read them that they do not date from the eighteenth century, but they bear the date of October, 1926.[13]

> Mankind does not thrive on holidays. Idle hours breed mischief. The days are too short for the worthwhile men of the world to accomplish the tasks which they set for themselves. No man has ever attained success in industry, in science, or in any other worthwhile activity of life by limiting his hours of labor.

[11]Henry Fielding, "Enquiry" (1751), pp. 6-7.
[12]Edgar S. Furniss, "The Position of the Laborer in a System of Nationalism," Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1920.
[13]*Pocket Bulletin*: official publication of the National Association of Manufacturers, October, 1926.

> . . . The dangers of the five-day work week, in the opinion of others, who are equally qualified to judge, are that the workman—particularly the foreign workman, who is only partially trained in the advantages offered by this country—would abuse the additional time; would waste it in unnecessary pleasures, if not in vicious habits; it would mean a waste of the workman's energy; encourage a disposition to loaf; create a desire for many things that would be, not only unnecessary, but burdensome as to purchase and payment and involve men in debt.
>
> It would also create among their families a desire for luxuries and to use the additional holiday for display and injurious amusement.
>
> In other words, this time is wasted if employed in the doing of things which lead to injurious habits.
>
> The *work* of this country cannot be done in forty hours a week. I see in the movement a trend toward the Arena. Rome did that and Rome died. Most people who work do so with their hands and feet, with no joy in their work, forgetting their heads—except their mouths.
>
> The instalment plan of buying is so prevalent throughout the country that there may be no reduction in the pay envelope, and with so much more time for the Arena the demand for things will increase while the production of things will decrease and without production there will be no profit, without profit there will be no work. Then we may all go to the Arena. The men of our country are becoming a race of softies and mollycoddles; it is time we stopped it and turned out some regular he-men—too many paternalistic laws by City, State and Nation. Any man demanding the forty-hour week, should be ashamed to claim citizenship in this great country. I see in it a gradual sinking into decay.
>
> . . . If God-given daylight and time is wasted by American industry, as it will be on a five-day week, somebody else is going to take advantage of that waste.
>
> . . . If the employes motor with the family on Saturday, the roads and highways will become congested and impassable on the last day of the week as they now are on Sundays.

And again, in the New York Times of October 17, 1926, appears the following jeremiad from the president of this organization, "'Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work.' So reads the fifth of the great commandments and for sixty centuries it has been accepted as the divinely prescribed standard of economic effort. It is the perfectly fixed basis of human achievement and social contentment. It has served America admirably in building the greatest political, social and economic system known to history. And all through the Great Book the importance and sacredness of work are emphasized as life's first and continuing obligation.

"Notwithstanding the unremitting assaults upon it as a curse to the human race, it cannot be reasoned or legislated out of existence or into an unworthy position without disastrous consequences. These constant attempts to amend the Decalogue and to adapt by alterations the moral law to the appetites developed by easy and loose living constitute the outstanding peril of our unprecedented prosperity."

If, as someone has said, the problem of industrial unrest is the problem of the attitudes of executives, then such pronunciamenta as I have just read should give us grave concern. Ideals and philosophies need to be formulated which will shame men out of such viewpoints. While it is quite true, as Mr. Lewis says, that "the point of view of management and men has changed for the better," large numbers of us evidently need to examine ourselves on certain important issues. Many of us still have that eighteenth century doubt of the propriety of the worker's enjoyment of material welfare. We shake our heads ominously over his increasing prosperity. The wife of a wealthy employer said to me recently, "It seems to me that the greatest problem facing our country today is this rapidly increasing prosperity of the working class." Until we lose this condescension toward the "working class" and unless our sense of humor jolts us into seeing clearly how absurdly funny we are when we are disturbed over the normal ambitions of all classes of people, whether they be college professors or employers or workers, we shall not have advanced fast enough to cause much ruffling of the status quo. We shall certainly not be comparable with the horse Dickens' hostler described who "rendered surroundin' objects inwisible by his extreme welocity." On the contrary, are we not in danger of becoming smug because we have attained to a position of comparative national prosperity due to many factors in our favor by the grace of chance; only too few by the grace of wisdom and planning, and practically none by the grace of a real philosophy of fair distribution of income? And without the last of these we rest on unstable foundations indeed.

As for the third of Mr. Lewis' planks, the inspiring of both managers and workers to collaborate in order to improve the technique of production and distribution,—while we have made progress in this, the examples of enlisting workers in such efforts at collaboration are pathetically few. Witness our pride in quoting our few instances of