

business by trying to create the "open mind," so that when they approach a proposition they will not first think of all the objections to it. (Incidentally, I have an objection to Dr. Person's paper. I did not like the list of objections he raised to it; he might have left those to us!)

The thing people in business need to do is to open their minds—the employe as well as the employer. If the employer has his mind closed, the employe follows suit; if the employer is open-minded and will listen to and try whatever comes along, it is surprising how the employe follows after. Example is all important. Get yourself imbued with the idea that the open mind is all that is necessary.

In our factory we have not found it impossible to get the same wages per week and the same production per week on a five day week or a thirty-nine hour week—sometimes on a seven hour or a seven and a half hour day—as we have on longer hours and more days. I think we have the confidence of the employes because we try to keep an open mind to anything from anyone. I believe thoroughly that industry would be better off if everyone had more leisure. I wonder sometimes why people are so selfish about things. We have been taught the contrary for a great many centuries and still we do not quite believe it. It is a fact, however. If you want to have friends you have to make yourself friendly. I wonder why men who have amassed fortunes want to go on making more money. If you can get the industrialists to open their minds, to be unselfish and think about the real proposition, I think Dr. Person's ideas will pass through the same channels as compensation insurance. The same objections, and others, were raised on that question. Similar things have also been said about pension plans and unemployment guarantees but they will prevail.

Mary van Kleec¹. I feel like reminiscing, as Mr. Sweetser does, because I can think back very nearly twenty-five years, when a group of us in New York had to get up a delegation to go to Albany to prevent extending the working hours of women from the sixty hour, week limit then prescribed by law. There was a proposal before the legislature for a sixty-six hour week in the

¹Director of Industrial Studies, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

canneries of New York State and in other seasonal industries, and the manufacturers were arguing that only by this provision could the widows in New York State live and support their children. That really was a situation, for the proposed amendment to the law was backed up even by the Commissioner of Labor of New York State, at that time.

Since then we have come a long way in the serious discussion of shorter and shorter hours, and a five day week. And we have come a still longer way when Dr. Person, using the five day week or shorter hours only, I think, as an illustration, actually suggests the consideration that each generation as a group so organize the distribution of the social income that wage earners collectively may enjoy the benefits of the individual who plans his whole life-span. That is a perfectly tremendous idea.

Professor Smith seemed to feel that Dr. Person was suggesting that the employer plan the worker's life, and he pleaded for the right of the worker to plan his own life. At that point I turned to Dr. Person's manuscript, which he had very kindly given to me, to find out where he talked about the employer's planning for the security of life, and I did not find it in that hasty look. I found that it proposed that each generation was to make that plan. In other places I found that society was to plan for it. That is something very much bigger. If we accept the idea that any single problem of industry like shortening hours, which involves individuals, hence reaches out into the life of the community, concerns itself both with production and distribution of income and with adult education and recreation; and if we accept the fact that one cannot consider any single problem without considering all its related phases, then we are committed at once to a comprehensive thinking by society itself in that entire generation. That means that management is no longer going to have the picayune problem of working for John Smith, Inc., at a certain address on Broadway, New York, because if its job is really conceived in relation to the community plan, then its task, even though carried out at John Smith's, Inc., has much wider reach than that particular establishment. That does not mean that the manager takes his feet off the ground—though he may take an airplane—but it does mean that there is an

entirely different direction of thought, and that entirely different factors are considered. It means also that he assumes an entirely different relationship to other people whose job it is to think, however weakly we may perform that job. It means that the engineers in the community, the manufacturers, the workers, the whole group in the community, have got to think together upon this job of security of life for individuals, just for the reason that no individual can set a mark and say, "The task is finished with what I do about it." For, if we accept at all the idea that these problems are related one to the other and therefore must be considered in relationship, we must accept the idea of larger planning for community life.

And that brings me to another point which I should like to bring up, though it has been touched upon by other speakers. Mr. Kellogg said something about not thinking of law as such an adverse factor in the life of the business man. Why is the American business man so gun-shy of the state? Before we can answer that question, we have to do a lot of thinking along the lines of political science. I suppose the little difficulties we had in 1776 gave us an idea that the state was something to guard against. We had to establish checks and balances in case the executive or the legislators should overstep. The result is that every proposal in law brings about a certain amount of lobbying of one interest against another interest, and we proceed, by methods of negation, as far as possible in the face of opposition. How much do we do in a free kind of constructive thinking about the relation of the state to industry? We know the relation of the state to industry in the Sherman Act, for instance, which is designed to remedy the shortcomings of individuals by putting shackles on industry; but because there have been some very bad boys in industry, we dare not take off the shackles and set industry to adjust itself in, for instance, coal mining.

Is it not about time we began to think of these problems of industry as not stopping with the factory door, and least of all, as not stopping with the door of the particular manufacturer? Is it not about time we, really thinking freely and with the open mind that Mr. Sweetser talked about, consider what is the particular function of the state which can best serve the entire plan of the community? If, of course, we are continually in the

mood of saying, as do our great political leaders—even engineering political leaders—"Beware of state socialism," and "Beware of politics in business," and "Let us maintain the individual initiative of the American business man"; if we are going to be controlled by formulae like that, and are going to be so gun-shy of any legislative proposal, we shall get just the kind of limited, negative legislation that industry is continually complaining of. To remedy such a situation, we have to take the shackles off our minds, tackle the problem that we have and see it in its relationships.

Why cannot the engineers set up the problem in all its ramifications, see where the business man comes in, where the local community comes in, and where the state comes in; see what kind of legislation is going to be necessary in order to prevent the hazards of individual action, and see, on the other hand, where individual action must be left free? Cannot the engineer think through the problem and then relate the various factors, one to the other? But, as long as labor on the one side says, "We will not trust the manufacturer to do anything"; as long as the manufacturer says, "Keep the labor union out of my plant; I will have nothing to do with it"; and as long as our political leaders, in order to win votes, say, "We promise that the state will have nothing to do with industry; that we will, on the other hand, economize by cutting down governmental activities," just so long shall we be in a condition of ruling our lives by formula instead of really facing our problems and working them out.

Dr. Person has opened the doors for a plan which is much more comprehensive than even the membership of the Taylor Society.

G. E. Schulz.* I attended the 1920 joint meeting of the Taylor Society and the A.S.M.E., at which meeting a very well prepared paper on a shorter work-day was presented and discussed. I felt that, because of that meeting alone, the Taylor Society had won a claim to represent the larger interests of society. Dr. Person's paper, I believe, will renew that claim. As a member of this organization I want to express most heartily my appreciation of the presentation of this paper. It has made my trip here well worth while, apart from any other interests that I have had in these meetings.

*Lancaster, Pa.