

and told his father of the new philosophy. "Dr. Elliott," he said, "wants us to think for ourselves like he thinks." Could it be that Dr. Person was applying the same principle to those of us asked to take part in the discussion when, at the close of his paper, he gave those short steps for little feet to follow?

The Taylor Society sifts out exceptional people—scientific managers, personnel directors, engineers, progressive employers, labor leaders, economists, social workers—whose planning is inventive and experimental; but for the most part American industrial policy has taken confirmation from the pressure of economic circumstance.

Since the Civil War, we have had spiritual development of productive enterprise in the United States, with our great natural resources, with the modern corporation as a tool to work with, with mechanical advances, with immigration year after year supplying cheap labor. The employment practices of not a few of our great industries during their period of greatest growth was governed by the idea that you could take labor on and turn it off without responsibility. There were always new immigrants to take the place of the old, to undercut them if they got out of hand or to employ to smash a union. In that situation labor naturally developed an under-dog philosophy. A minority became idealists, socialists, communists, or whatever you will, and dreamed of a far paradise ahead. The majority centered on the realities of the day's work and of the week's wage. Recognizing that they had no stake in the industries they had helped to create and that they might be turned off tomorrow, they struck out for shorter hours and larger pay today.

Then with the World War we had the shutting off of immigration. That has had such remarkable consequences that at a meeting like this we are discussing not what we should do to protect young and green immigrant hands, but what shall we do with middle-aged Americans who are half out of a job. The railroads, for example, are today cutting out waste, installing mechanical systems to take the place of back muscles, and otherwise doing things which Louis Brandeis and the scientific managers urged upon them at the early rate hearings, and at which they then turned up their noses. Our new high-wage-low-labor-cost doctrines have been brought into vogue by a complex of forces—by enlightened management, mechanization, appre-

ciation of the wage earner market, the constricted sources of common labor, the rise in living costs, pressure of the unions, the efforts of employers to keep the unions out by "beating them to it." On the part of the workers, on the other hand, you have had a natural reaction to the changes which immigration restriction and mechanization have ushered in. They find themselves at once in a more favored position to make demands collectively, more insecure individually. Therefore, they turn to shorter hours and higher wages as their current claim on the increased production.

If, in this situation, these demands lead employers to wake up and reckon in new ways with what it is, fundamentally, that the workers want, then we may be in for human advances as radical as our mechanical advances have been in the last seven years.

Just as in the case of the elimination of waste, economic pressure will gain a hearing for some of the things which scientific managers and social reformers have urged but which have remained outside the ken of the immediate self-interest of employers and employees. We all remember the story of Brandeis and the shoe factory, where there was constant friction because there was constant broken time—alternating rush seasons and lay-offs. He discovered that what the people were really striking for when they went out for higher pay per day or piece was a dependable year-round income for their households, and that if this could be worked out nine-tenths of the friction would be eliminated. If we can somehow or other help frame proposals that will mean a larger measure of security that people can pin to, in the working life of America, we shall bring a new element into the industrial bargain that will be decidedly constructive and helpful.

As editor of a journal of social work, there are three or four developments in the fields we touch in *The Survey* which have a direct bearing on this situation that industry is facing, and which are as revolutionary as the changes in machinery and motive power. First are the advances in health that are lengthening the norm of life. This does not mean that we are spinning out old age to four score years and more, but that the bulk of middle-aged people is increasing. We are stretching the span of the effective years so that industry must reckon with higher age groups—with a

larger proportion of people who at forty and fifty and sixty want and need work, who are fit, as their grandfathers were not at that age, who can make their contribution, whose average life is longer and whose increment of effective working years should be turned to account. At present, when our mechanization turns them adrift, they are out of luck in looking for a job. And when they have run the course of their working life, the added years which science offers them are a dry bone, if our industrial system offers them no nutriment for their old age.

Then, in the field of education, we have Dr. E. L. Thorndyke's study, blowing into bits all our old preconceptions that adults cannot learn—if they have the chance and the incentive. We used to be told that our minds did their growing in the teens and that we had no new ideas after twenty-five or so. Now we have scientific authority for the assurance that our capacity for education goes on: a man in the fifties has almost the same potency for learning that a boy of twelve or fourteen has. We can change with a changing world. So there's new hope as to what these new accessions of healthy middle-aged people can and will do with themselves. They need not be such brittle, set individuals as we have been accustomed to think. And they are not going to be shelved without being heard from one way or another. Our sharp awareness of the problem of the unoccupied mothers of grown children is likely to be matched with conferences on wayward gray-beards.

For a third thing, we are in a period where there is an altogether new and refreshing appreciation of leisure as an individual and social good, as never before since the days of the industrial revolution. Working people have tasted it. I agree with Professor Smith as to what it may mean to them, and as to the high significance of the American Federation of Labor's coming out for a long week-end rather than a fatter pay envelope. Here we are just on the threshold of something that may be as important as those new discoveries in health and education in freeing vast numbers of people to share in a bigger way in what leisure means to life—what, as they get the hang of it, it may mean in opportunity for thought, in cultural enrichment and in the pursuit of happiness.

The Ford, the movie, the shorter working week and what it holds are realities which can be weighed and wanted by wage earning families.

They register changes going forward in all walks of life with respect to that philosophy of individual thrift which Benjamin Franklin handed down to us. I share in Dr. Person's concern for security in old age, for a long plan of life, but I am not sure that his analogy of the hard working, frugal citizen, who lives sparingly that he may enjoy his declining years, gets at the springs of motivation that will carry with the oncoming generation. They are re-examining the going values of life as preached by their elders. And while Poor Richard made hay while the sun shone and laid by for a rainy day, old Ben himself had a rattling good time as he went along. On the deck of every ocean liner you have watched, as I have, the knots of wistful middle-aged Americans who have saved up their money all their lives and now, having retired, are out for a good time. You know the good time they are having does not measure up to their dreams. You know their leisure would have meant a great deal more to them if they had taken it, or parts of it, when they were twenty or thirty, and not laid everything by like the squirrels. They find they were not squirrels, after all; squirrels frisk in the process; they were the nuts.

This brings us to a fifth thing. As Dr. Simon Patten pointed out prophetically twenty-five years ago, we have entered an age of social surplus rather than deficit. That may prove the most revolutionary change of all. We no longer face such rigid "either's" and "or's." In the popular distribution of that surplus, who can say that labor cannot and will not choose both a lessening of the week's toil and a lengthening of the life's income?

All these factors will enter in, as I see it, to our treatment of this fundamental problem that Dr. Person has put his finger on so deftly and with such freshness of approach. I take off my hat to the benignity with which, like Dr. Doolittle, he throws into discussion these amazingly revolutionary things.

In his synopsis, if not in his paper, he made the point that in the early days progressive managers centered on one specialized factor and then another, as things by themselves—cost accounting, routing of work, etc. Around 1910, with the coming in of scientific management, he pointed out that you had a synthesis, a realization that the management problem is a whole and that all these factors relate to each other.

Something of the same sort happened in the