

of the workers will be employed in making things for their own satisfaction, and also developing all kinds of new handicrafts? I have seen indications that there are some kinds of goods, now greatly in demand because of their quality, which it is actually cheaper to make by more old-fashioned methods than by power machinery and mass production. You can go through New England and find little furniture shops; you can buy all kinds of hand made pottery today, coming from small communities throughout the country. The handweaving of textiles is coming back. That may be merely an incident, but I think possibly it points the way to a new development for society.

When we have come to a common agreement as to how much time is to be spent working for someone else in industry, and have brought in all these other human factors as well as the scientific factor, then, of course, we can build up the fund necessary to support those who are superannuated or who have become, in some way, useless to industry. But there may not be any necessary conflict between these objectives. Is it not true that modern technology, if it were allowed to accomplish its full promise, would be capable of creating a large enough surplus to give the workers pensions and still as short a working period as anyone would desire at a wholesome type of work? It seems to me that that is the direction in which industry is heading, and that we do not necessarily, for a long time to come, have to balance industrial pensions on one side and a good deal shorter working period on the other.

F. L. Sweetser.\* I ask if you can imagine the feelings of a manufacturer from up-State New York, a small manufacturer, when asked to discuss a paper along with two professors and two editors of well known publications? A little manufacturer with practically no formal education! (I will admit that I acquired socialistic tendencies through my eldest son's going to the University of Wisconsin, and that my education was increased due to the fact that my daughter graduated from Mount Holyoke and later married an instructor in economics at New York University.)

This proposition and the points brought out by Dr. Person in this excellent presentation of a mat-

\*General Manager, Dutchess Manufacturing Company, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

ter of prime importance, remind me of a story. There was a bunch of men who loved to go camping. They were at camp and, as men will, were trying to avoid the work that attends camping. They wanted to work out some scheme by which each would get all the benefits without the dirty job of cleaning up the camp. One man proposed that if any man asked a question and was unable to answer his own question, he should be the victim. It was not very long before some man—say, Bill—said, "Why is it that a ground squirrel, when he digs his hole, leaves no dirt outside the hole?" That was pretty good, and someone said, "Well, why is it?" You answer that." He replied, "Yes, I can answer it. It is because he begins at the other end of the hole." Instantly Jim asked, "But how does he get to the other end of the hole?" Bill said, "That is your question; you answer that." I do not know whether Dr. Person is asking me that or not!

I recall a conference of an association in which I am interested. During a heavy program which lasted for several days and extended into the nights an address was given by my friend, Arthur Young, of the Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc. Mr. Young said, in the course of his talk, "If I were addressing a sermon to a bunch of accountants, I should take as my text, 'And I heard a voice from Heaven saying, "Don't take yourself so damned seriously."'" You understand what I mean. If I were going to preach a sermon tonight, I should take as my text, "The old order changeth."

I have been impressed a great many times lately with the fact that we little manufacturers at least are constantly forced to change our minds. We set up propositions, and make schedules, and plan plans, and then discover with the passing of time that we did exactly the wrong thing. Of course, men with more education and better advantages often avoid that. I do not know anything about psychology or the beliefs of the economists. Therefore, I do not know how it is with you. We often have to change our minds, however.

I was very much impressed by a talk I heard Mr. Kettering, president of the General Motors Research Corporation, give in Boston in May. One of the things that impressed me was his statement that we might just as well get used to things changing, because they were going to change anyhow. He gave a very good reason for this, and

here is the reason. He said, "The day you were born every person in the world was older than you were, but in one year from that day, in the United States alone, there were two and one-half million people younger than you; and in ten years that number had grown to twenty-five million. The average or fifty-fifty point comes in about twenty-six years. And if you think that all that host of young people is going to keep on doing the things that you old fogies are thinking about, you are mistaken." I think that is good stuff.

Some industrialists—the better, more successful, thinking industrialists of today—are not afraid of any idea connected with a shorter working day or a shorter working week. Neither are they failing to take cognizance of the welfare of their workers. Quite the contrary is the case. And I think it is perfectly safe for me to say that if the psychologists, labor leaders and other similar groups—and even the churches—do not watch out, some of these better industrialists are going to beat them to it.

In support of what I am saying, I remember a talk given a number of years ago by the then ex-Senator and now Senator-elect, Theodore E. Burton of Ohio. He was talking on a subject on which he is as well informed as any other person, and that was "investments of insurance companies." He stated that at a certain time the insurance companies were somewhat doubtful as to whether or not the investments they held were as sound as possible. They called together all the bankers and financial people in the country to advise them what to buy and sell. After a considerable time the advice of these people was taken—and it was not six months before everything they had bought went down in price and everything they had sold went up. You never can tell. Things do not remain stationary.

And here is another thing. When I went into business thirty-odd years ago, if anyone had proposed a forty-four hour week instead of the sixty-six, or longer, that was then worked, he would have been considered crazy. And yet industry is now running on about a forty-four hour week, and seems to have withstood the shock. Even more recently than that—some fifteen years ago—I think I am safe in saying that industrial managers would have considered anyone crazy who had suggested that low wages did not mean low costs. Everyone thought that they did. The people of New Eng-

land were particularly slow about this, and they are suffering right now the results of their slowness. As a matter of fact, good industrialists have discovered that low wages are not productive of low costs. On the contrary, high wages have produced low costs. The lowest costs we have in this country are produced by people making the highest wages.

Still more recently, some of us have experienced a violent reversal of opinion on a very important matter. We have discovered one of the sources of our enormous prosperity that we hear so much about. It seems peculiar to me that all of us have been so slow about this. The discovery is that people can buy more things if they have more money to buy them with. It seems so simple when we look back that we wonder why someone did not look forward and see this coming.

When one of the previous speakers talked about luxuries, the idea came to me that perhaps this was all propaganda started by the manufacturers of automobiles and radios. They require a lot of leisure. These manufacturers employ five or ten thousand people, make a lot of their stuff, and then throw the employes all out of work. They have to have time to enjoy these things. I am wondering about this. It might be; I am not sure!

I want to take just a little practical illustration from the industry in which I happen to be interested. The company I happen to be with has been busy right along in spite of adverse conditions in the industry. We have no unemployment. We have something like one thousand people in our employ, about one hundred more than we had a year ago. One of the reasons we have had continuous employment, I think, is because we believe in this thing which I am bringing out as a very important point. It is the thought I want to leave with you. If you want to make progress with practically uneducated industrialists you must, in some way, create in them an "open mind." The trouble with men in industry today is that their minds are closed. They do not think about things with which they are unfamiliar. I have related the foregoing incidents because I believe that industry is about like the old man up north. He said he had lived to be a very old man and had had a great many troubles—most of which had never happened. That is about the case. The thought I want to leave with you is this. Help industry and managers in