

it gives the individual in his weak position. I am not sure that we have struck twelve in our phrasing. There have been lengthy discussions by the Committee on the subject and numerous suggestions have been received. Mrs. Kelley suggests that Dean Pound's and Mr. Frankfurter's opinions might prove valuable and Mr. Edelman calls attention to the somewhat more positive statement of the Federated Council of Churches. If any of you have further suggestions we want to have them.

Mildred Fairchild.¹² Mr. Young's remarks brought to my mind a later action of the Supreme Court, in May, 1930, I believe, in the Texas and New Orleans Railroad case. In that case the Supreme Court for the first time required that the railroad company deal with the recognized trade union rather than their company union, under the federal act requiring mediation between carriers and employes through their recognized agents.

Mr. Young. I should like to reply first to the last speaker. The Supreme Court has made many mistakes, but it did not make the mistake of requiring, under a federal act, the unions to deal with the railway or the railway to deal with a particular union. What happened in the New Orleans case was that the Court decided, since the law guaranteed the employes the right to choose their own representative, they must not be interfered with by the employer. The law does not require the railways to deal with any particular union and this—if I may refer to my refrain after each verse—is exactly what I am pleading for here. You should have greater elasticity in your Code.

Why should the Taylor Society place in its Code a deprecation of the one thing without mentioning the other which Mr. Sparks has called to your attention (closed-shop contracts)? We are working for the freedom of the worker. We desire to stimulate initiative, the craftsmanship instinct. How can he have interest and initiative if he is not free?

I want to return also to the phrase "with clear responsibility for the accepted objectives of the business." This covers a whole lot of things that the workers do not assume responsibility for. And Mr. Cooke has mentioned several instances in which

¹²Assistant Professor, Social Economy, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

successful appeal has been made to the union for co-operation in essential matters of management. It is not necessary to have a dictionary in order to point out that there is a difference between co-operation and "clear responsibility."

Ordway Tead.¹³ In my opinion, though I am not on the Committee, Professor Young seems to have misunderstood what the Committee was trying to do. It was not seeking so definitely as he assumes to establish and protect the *individual* relation of the workman to industry. I should say quite the opposite. It was seeking to establish for the workers a basis for *collective* or *group* activity that would enable them, by virtue of the protection which organization gives, to feel free to co-operate and to participate in the fulfillment of the objectives of industry. It was seeking to establish the truth that only in collective dealings can there come that equality of negotiative power, which is the necessary prerequisite of full co-operation.

Two suggestions have occurred to me. One is almost grammatical. The word "joint" is one that I am rather fond of. In Section II, I should like to see it put in to modify the word "objective" and also to have that word changed to "objectives." I am a pluralist! This is the way I personally, in the interest of greatest explicitness and philosophical accuracy, should like to see the phrase appear: "for the attainment of jointly agreed objectives." My philosophical point is that the objectives are only going to be valid when they are jointly agreed to.

Similarly at the end of Paragraph 1 in Section IV, I should like to see the statement made explicit, as I am sure it was implicit in the Committee's thought, by the addition, at the end of the italicized matter, of such a phrase as, "which is safely carried out only as it is a joint enterprise between labor and management."

Alice S. Cheyney.¹⁴ As I listened to this discussion it occurred to me that all the major points advanced before the International Labor meeting of the League of Nations in 1927 have been advanced here. If anyone thinks it is going to be easy to formulate a statement which will allow people

¹³Business Book Editor, Harper & Brothers, New York, N. Y.

¹⁴Washington Branch, International Labor Office, Washington, D. C.

to join trade unions and at the same time satisfy those who want to protect them from the closed shop, he should read the record of those discussions of employers, workers and government representatives over a period of three weeks four years ago. They were left stranded in trying to define the right to organize. This was one of the three proposals for international agreement that in the whole period of ten years has been tabled, and it is on the table still.

H. V. R. Scheel.¹⁵ As I worked on the Code Committee it seemed to me that quantitative and qualitative, as well as ethical, standards of measuring management should receive some consideration. Thinking about it developed in my mind that sort of pernicious, stubborn activity that

¹⁵Vice-President, Botany Consolidated Mills, Inc., Passaic, N. J.
¹⁶Limitations of space prevent the publication of this paper in this issue of the *Bulletin*. Until such time as it is possible to publish it in the *Bulletin*, it is available for consultation in the Taylor Society office, which also has a limited number of copies for distribution.

sometimes keeps us awake. I am sleeping now because ideas have been reduced to writing and diagrams. These are an amplification of the theory I presented when the Code was discussed at the December meeting of the Society (BULLETIN OF THE TAYLOR SOCIETY, Vol. XVI, No. 1, February, 1931, p. 28). I have called this amplification "An Outline of the Life History of an Imaginary Concern with the Effectiveness of Its Management Measured from the Social Viewpoint, Period by Period, by Means of Measuring Index Figures."¹⁶

I compare industry's social function to the wheels of a wagon. The smoothness with which the wagon rides depends on the roundness of its wheels. If in the three-spoke wheels (Investor, Worker, Consumer), one spoke is larger than the others, the riding cannot be as smooth as it should be. If all the wheels on society's wagon are lopsided, it is shaken in all its members. When, as at the present time, Investor and Worker have no spokes, the wheel does not turn at all and its sledgelike dragging slows up the wagon.

STEADY wages, ample for a respectable standard of living, are an element of social justice, and as such are or should be a satisfaction in themselves. They permit the family to control its own activities and circumstances to a great degree. The provision for responsible living and the free acceptance of it constitute an indispensable preparation for the acquirement of other values. . . .

Sickness and old age are legitimate fields for insurance in the true sense of the word, and the wage provided and the service rendered by public or private organizations should take care of these factors.

Steady work in itself is more of a satisfaction than most people would believe who have never tried it. And this is true even when that work would appear to an onlooker to be monotonous and uninspiring. The satisfactions of function and of objective achievement are real, effective and widespread.

Much can be done to make work more interesting and absorbing, but the most neglected opportunities are to be found in our leisure; and if leisure is to be increased we can neglect it no longer. For, as with wealth, an increased leisure will not automatically bring increased satisfaction. . . .

The requirements are elastic, for one thing. The productivity of our machines can be directed toward little leisure and much goods, or toward more leisure and less goods. The determination is not one of mathematical calculation, but of balancing human desires and satisfactions. It is highly probable, however, that nothing that would properly be contemplated would interfere with our present progress toward a five day week. At the same time it is sure that this might ultimately be reduced to four days or even less, if we can simplify our tastes along with the progress of efficiency in production and distribution. . . . (Ralph E. Flanders, *Taming Our Machines*, pp. 210-211.)