

their consent to the program was wanting, and a ring of political tricksters put it over on the government, on scientific management, and upon the workers. It was a case where we were forcibly reminded that "there are facts of democracy as well as facts of efficiency."

Frederick W. Taylor, in my opinion, had a very clearly defined conception of this element of "consent." Consent upon the part of the employer and the practical old time manager was first in order, and twenty-five years of education, training and organization has not entirely achieved it. Progress has been made, however, and principles which would have been the subject of discussion a few years ago are now matters of common acceptance. The element of consent has been evolving. From personal experience I know that it has been evolving in the minds of the worker as well. This consent, however, has been born of a confidence in the principles of scientific management, as a science, and not as a political football.

Mr. Valentine condemns the Rockefeller plan in Colorado as a sociological joke and says it may prove to be a sociological tragedy. It seems to be a sociological joke because it was practical. It was worked out where the coal miner, as an individual, sat face to face with the man from 26 Broadway. They met as men together. I care not how long that agreement may last, it is a demonstration that employer and employee can get together, and agree, without the sanction of an international union.

In conclusion I deny that the principles of scientific management do not contain the principle of consent. That principle is there, and consent has been slowly evolving. It is a consent based upon the principles of scientific management in all their purity, in their very essence.

If we, in our lifetime, cannot realize the fullest statement of consent, we shall pass the good work on, knowing that in the end scientific management will receive the confidence and consent essential to the permanent progress of any science.

MR. H. K. HATHAWAY: From Mr. Valentine's definitions of Scientific Management, and statements concerning Mr. Taylor, I think he has not sufficiently familiarized himself with Mr. Taylor's conceptions of scientific management and its present application;—much less as to its value and application in the future. And when Mr. Valentine says, "The standard by which to judge is to ascertain whether any particular application of the principles involves a recognition of a truly independent and organized consent on the part of the workers," I feel we need a very much better definition as to what consent is. I do not think that is at all an adequate definition as to what consent is. I do not think that is at all an adequate standard upon which to judge whether scientific management is true or not.

It seems to me that consent and responsibility are, at least of equal importance. In the plan outlined by Mr. Valentine we have certain boards, shop councils and one thing and another, finally boiling down to a determining board upon which there is only one out of five who is in any sense directly responsible for perpetuating the business. Any man who has had to run a business, who has had to make sure that he was going to have money in the bank to meet his pay roll from week to week would object to appearing on a board of five if he had no more power than each of the four others who were absolutely without responsibility in that respect.

Mr. Valentine shows a willingness to accept trades unions in their present form as being satisfactory and beyond criti-

¹Vice-President, Tabor Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

cism. I am not willing to accept trade unionism in that sense. No doubt trades unionism has been an agency for great good. On the other hand, the strength of trades unionism lies in conditions which are largely eliminated when scientific management is developed and applied. Mr. Valentine was rather willing to assume that scientific management is wrong in not taking his view on that point, without definitely outlining what the trades unions stand for, what their qualifications are for participating in the determination not only of the question of consent, but in the determination of the methods to be followed in the operation of the establishment.

I think without defining the qualifications, that such a plan as Mr. Valentine lays out would not only be impracticable but dangerous, not only to capital, to those interested financially in the business, but to the consumer and the very men whom he aims to benefit and safeguard. It has never been brought to my attention that trades unionism has anything to offer to any one excepting those who are immediately in the group, those governed by the union or who compose the union. In its present form, trades unionism is based and founded upon selfish motives. You have the bricklayers organized, and they try to force up wages without regard to the effect that it is going to have on other groups. One group will often take action which is inimical to the welfare of society at large. That cannot go on and be a good thing for the world. Before such a plan as Mr. Valentine outlines could be made practicable, trades unions have got to be organized in such a way as to be economically sound and progressive. At present trades unions have nothing to offer.

It strikes me that if trades unions were in a position to go to the employer and say, "We are prepared to submit a plan and to offer means for carrying it out which will enable you to give higher wages and shorter hours to the men and at the same time satisfy the stockholders in the matter of dividends," the present opposition of most employers to trades unions would disappear. The thought also occurred to me that if the money that is today spent on strikes and spent in other ways by trades unions were devoted to securing an interest financially in businesses, that, perhaps, would be a channel through which trades unions might secure their representation in the carrying on of business.

MR. CHARLES W. MEXTER: I am not going to attempt a definition of democracy; but I wish to state two facts about it often overlooked. It is commonly assumed that democracy means progress and liberality by its very nature. Sir Henry Maine brought out years ago the fact that under stable conditions, democracy is the most ultra-conservative, stand-pat thing in the world; that it becomes just opposite of liberality and progress. On the other hand, under unstable conditions democracy is apt to disregard the experience of the past and rush headlong into rash innovations and experiments. Rarely is democracy in practice, over considerable periods, other than one of these extremes.

All of us who have talked with Mr. Taylor and studied his ideas recognize that what he stood for, and what scientific management on the human side stands for, may be summed up in this way: To treat men like men. That means consent, of course,—a certain kind of individual consent founded on leadership and a system of things in the shop which is to a degree "a government of laws." A law means "a standing rule to live by," not necessarily of democratic origin.

¹Aeme Wire Co., New Haven, Conn.

But Mr. Valentine wants group consent,—an organized and even artificial consent giving labor an equal voice in the management. In the "discussion" reprinted with *Shop Management*, Mr. Taylor said: "In any executive work which involves the co-operation of two different men or parties, where both parties have anything like equal power or voice in its direction, there is almost sure to be a certain amount of bickering, quarrelling and vacillation, and the success of the enterprise suffers accordingly. If, however, either one of the parties has the entire direction, the enterprise will progress consistently and probably harmoniously, even though the wrong one of the two parties may be in control." That is moderately stated and it is common sense.

Under the system Mr. Valentine advocates, if I understand him, there would be dualism of control in industry,—a dualism which would bring endless confusion in industrial society at large as well as in each particular establishment. We have a striking historical example of how that sort of dualism works, in the case of the Roman Republic during the period when the Romans tried to run things, by means of the tribune of the patricians and the tribune of the plebs, each with a veto on the other,—an absolutely impossible, disastrous arrangement.

In any discussion of consent and control in industry we are dealing with matters essentially governmental. Private business is private government. The greater part of the ordering of the affairs of the world is carried on not by what we ordinarily think of as the Government, but by the many private governments. They are the agents of society to secure discipline, order, economy. They are clothed with power by society to get the world's work done. But each of them stands on its own feet and must be self-supporting; they cannot draw on the tax-payer for support. In any dispute in the conduct of an industry the final say at present is with the financially responsible owners of the business, or their representatives. That is the entrepreneur system of industry under which we live; that is the prerogative of management resting on ownership sanctioned by law. It means an undivided sovereignty.

Now it is this whole order of things that is challenged by all radicals today. The socialists say, man fashion, "Let us have public ownership"; but the idea of the syndicalist, the latter-day industrial democrat, is to control industry by mass action without public ownership. The syndicalists would let the private industrial governments go on after a fashion but would have the workers enjoy an equal voice in their management through Valentine's form of consent. They have a hankering for power without responsibility, an itch to control things which they do not own. If they had their way it would bring a divided sovereignty, a dualism, into industry that would be fatal.

MR. WILLIAM L. LYALL: Many employers, ourselves among others, are considering how we can make the employee still more interested in the business by giving him a sense of partnership and ownership. It is extended in our plant to those who have developed in the work to a certain position of responsibility where they appreciate what it means. We hesitate to extend it to the rank and file for one reason, that we feel that the ordinary industrial enterprise in these days, unless it is a monster concern, is subject to the possibilities of shipwreck and trouble and that therefore with the rank and file it is a question whether it is wise to ask them to put their savings into an enterprise which may be subject to some hazard.

¹Treasurer, Brighton Mills, Passaic, N. J.

MR. CARL G. BARTH: Mr. Barth expressed his hearty approval of the beautiful theories propounded by Mr. Valentine, but related some experiences tending to show the impossibility of living up to them under the present attitude of workers towards their employers. He thus related a case of a company whose employees had been benefited to a remarkable extent, and showed pretty clearly that the results would never have been obtained, if he had gone about their attainment by first attempting to obtain the consent of the workers in the manner proposed by Mr. Valentine.

MR. VALENTINE: There are two things that I particularly want to leave on this record: One is that I think one of the reasons our minds have not met on a good many points is that I am looking at the matter from an entirely different point from that from which you are looking at it. I am looking at it from the belief that it is the duty of industry and consequently the duty of every particular branch of industry to be a part of the educational system of the world. Just as I believe that it is the duty of industry to pay a minimum living wage, so I believe that it is the duty of industry to provide certain minimum conditions of education. I am afraid that if industry and each particular concern in industry does not attempt to work out some educationalizing form of industrial citizenship, there will be a great many more cataclysms in the re-constitution of affairs in the coming century than need be.

The reason I hold that belief in education in industry is that I am not accustomed to divide my thinking along the lines of practice and theory as those two terms have been suggested here. To my mind there is not a very valid distinction between theory and practice. I am asked questions, sometimes by employers, sometimes by employees and unions and sometimes by one form or another of governmental bodies as to what is likely to happen to them next. That is the practical question that is frequently put up to me. "Here is a certain rotten condition in which we find ourselves. Is it due to our own lack of capacity, lack of intelligence? Is it due to this rotten selfish demand on the part of the unions? Is it due to unwise state legislation? What is it due to? Can you help us in any way to find out?" My job is to investigate and see if I can furnish any evidence at all to help them find out. It is a very practical, immediate matter. I am no more interested in general conditions and theories as dreams than you are, but if we can see ahead, to keep from butting our heads into a stone wall, it will be a good thing for us to do a little thinking. It is most important to try to find some way out. These cases come up in innumerable different forms. I do not believe that Mr. Sanford Thompson will mind my mentioning the fact that he and I together are doing a job where we are employed by both the trades' unions and manufacturers who each pay us half of the amount of money that is paid to us for our services. So I want you to see that this is an absolutely practical matter, using that word with all reverence for it that you have.

In speaking of shoe organization I want to try to clear up, if possible, one or two misconceptions. I have not been advocating any new mechanism. I have been trying to indicate, not any particular terminology or form of mechanism, simply the fact that these various forces did exist. I wished to suggest a line of thinking, a line of scientific questioning in your minds, which might enable you to meet these practical propositions that come up from day to day. If it be true that you as a continuing society are going to be confronted with and have to think these things out, the

¹Consulting Engineer, Philadelphia, Pa.