

of such and such a labor leader; and I want to see him try out his theories there, and run that business according to his ideas,—bearing in mind, of course, that he has got to keep the business going and that the plant must be made to run out of the earnings of the business."

I would like to see that tried. I would like to try a lot of the things advocated, mostly by the labor leaders. I would like to try a lot of things advocated by the social scientist. But I cannot. The owners would not let me do it; and if I owned the business, myself, I would not dare do it—if I were absolutely dependent for my livelihood on that business.

But I would like to see it tried. I would like to see someone who has a business set it aside and say: "Here is a business; turn it over to a social scientist and let him run it." And then let him turn another business over to a representative of organized labor, and let him run it. And then have them come together and discuss Dr. Person's paper.

PROFESSOR FELIX FRANKFURTER.<sup>1</sup> (Introduced as a Professor of Humane Law.) I must ask the withdrawal of the intimation that there are two kinds of law, law and humane law. There is law based on facts, and law not based on facts, and that is just as true of the law I am dealing with as the law the Taylor Society is dealing with.

Professor Metcalf said, as I came in, that he would like to have President Person's paper spelled out in detail, and translated into action. He hoped for a contribution of specific instances to illustrate and vindicate the point of view expressed by President Person. No more effective answer to Professor Metcalf's request could be made than the remarks Mr. Hathaway just made, because Mr. Hathaway demonstrated that nothing is more practical than one's point of view and approach to a problem.

It seems to me that Mr. Hathaway has a fundamentally wrong point of view toward industry. Mr. Hathaway has a fundamentally wrong interpretation of President Person's paper. President Person is here to defend his own thesis, but it is such a neat opportunity of driving home the point of view of his paper and the point of my remarks, that I know the generosity of your Society will permit me to be as free as I shall be, and President Person will not be offended if I address myself briefly to Mr. Hathaway's remarks.

Of course, nobody thinks, and Mr. Person the last person in the world, that a factory should be run by a labor leader, and a social scientist and the man-

ager, and that every decision with respect to management should be submitted to the decision of those three men. Nobody thinks that a factory should be run independently by a labor leader, nobody thinks that a factory should be run by a social scientist, and the result of these separate runnings be compared as a basis for judgment. The purport of President Person's paper is a plea for an integration of the judgments of the manager, the workman and the social scientist. You cannot get down to details, Professor Metcalf, until you reach a definite conviction, whether President Person is right or Mr. Hathaway is right, for I believe that those two points of view represent clashes of two sets of opinion.

As I have been able to follow the history of the Taylor movement, it represents even in its short years, three distinct stages. There was the period of pioneer days when Mr. Taylor had to fight for recognition even from those in his own profession. That was the period of great, lonely fighting on the part of a single man, gradually clustering about him such devoted followers as Mr. Cooke and others that are here tonight. Next followed the stage—and it is the usual history of great ideas—the stage where the pioneer movement has become a dogmatic faith, and some of Mr. Taylor's followers became more Catholic than the Pope. That was the period, and it is still lingering on, when the Taylor System was conceived to be some private and confidential kind of a system, an esoteric cult, from which some of the rest of us were excluded, even from being allowed to comprehend it. Whenever any criticism was suggested, it was sometimes intimated and sometimes candidly said that that is beyond the pale of the understanding of all except the initiated.

Those days are gone by. It is a very disloyal tribute to Mr. Taylor to think that his utterances were divinely inspired, and that he himself has said the last word on industrial engineering. No, we are now in the third stage of the movement, the stage where criticism is permitted, the stage where we realize that it is not the science all by itself but only part of a larger field; the stage in other words when "scientific management" must become completely scientific. It must become completely scientific by taking into account the other factors revealed by other scientific studies and integrating them into a unified system. I really do not belong here tonight under any classification. I am not an employer; Mr. Hathaway has seen evidence of that already in my remarks. I am not a workman. I am not a social scientist, because my own profession has still to fight for recognition as a social science.

But the truth of the matter is that the thesis presented by Mr. Person in his paper is the thesis which applies through the whole field of social science. The

nineteenth century and on into the twentieth century was the great period of scientific specialization. Every field of science, and every partition of the field of science, flocked by itself. It is true of law, that the job immediately ahead is to integrate, and to realize that law must draw on economics, must draw on sociology in order to be a living law, to be what your Chairman called a humane law. The same is true of economics. And it is evident that industry must draw on various other social sciences in order that industry may be scientifically conducted industry.

I dislike to think that life presents insoluble antitheses as often as we assume. I was grateful to President Person for pointing out the shallowness of the kind of reasoning which assumes the old antithesis between "theoretical" and "practical." I also dislike Mr. Hathaway's antithesis that the social scientist is interested in something different from what the manager is interested in.

Thinking thus, I find myself distinctly in sympathy with the paper of President Person. His paper marked a distinct movement in the third stage of the Taylor method. I find myself in sympathy except in matters of detail. I need say nothing as to the manager's side of it. I would like to say a word or two as to the comment on the worker's and the social scientist's contribution.

President Person admits that the worker has both a contribution to make and an interest to represent. He says the worker has an "intuitive faculty." He senses certain things which only he can sense. And that sense, that "intuitive faculty," is an element in the problem which ought to be drawn upon. Nevertheless, just as soon as President Person comes to the only way by which this intuitive faculty of the worker can express itself, he is full of hesitation and full of questioning. In other words, just as soon as you come to the effective means of expressing the worker's particular contribution, which is by organization, President Person, naturally enough, raises all the difficulties and presents all the doubts; all the outs, I might say, about the organized labor side of the industrial field.

I hope the time will come, and I do not think it is very many years off (and if, as is inevitable to the minds of most of us at this moment, we are drawn into an international conflict, it will come within a period shorter than any of us dreamed), when there will take place in this country what has taken place already in England and Australia, the countries we know most about: namely, a frank and candid recognition that organized labor, or let me say, the organization of labor, is not a necessary evil, but an indispensable adjustment in the right of industry. And I hope the years are not far away when the Taylor

Society will line itself alongside of thinkers the world over in the recognition of that truth.

I hope the time will come when the Taylor Society will do the thing that manufacturers have done in this community and other cities, namely, oppose—not trade unions as such,—but the mischievous tendencies of trade unions,—oppose not the organization of labor as such, but the misdirection of organized labor.

And for two reasons: The first reason is because, as President Person says, labor to such a large degree is industry. They have a relation to industry which cannot be represented by Mr. Hathaway, no matter how conscientious he is; they have a grievance which cannot be presented by Mr. Hathaway however desirous he is of representing their point of view. It is not within the human capacity of managers, as managers, to represent those outside, diverse interests.

But further, labor represents not only an interest which in itself must be protected; but labor represents a contribution which it ought to make. As a friend of mine put it, labor has a contribution to make other than mere protest; and no one who has studied industry, as it is open to a social scientist to study it, can fail to be struck with the fact that industry in his country has to this day lamentably failed to draw upon the great contributions that inhere in masses of working men and women.

For those two reasons, trade unionism or labor organization must be drawn into your field: first, because it must itself have a share in the field; and secondly, because it has an affirmative contribution to make to the processes of industry. And the same thing is true as to the social scientist.

President Person recognizes that the social scientist is on the mountain top, he belongs to the aviation corps, and can see the situation in the way that those who do the fighting in the daily field of battle cannot see it. But there, again, my emphasis would be a little stronger. I would lay on the paint a little bit thicker, than President Person laid it on, in that part of his paper. In fact, Mr. Hathaway, and managers generally, are themselves social scientists, but too often their science is partial or antiquated. Every manager, every day, acts upon some theory of human nature. Every manager, whether he agrees or disagrees with the claims of labor unions, makes certain assumptions as to social psychology. Every scientific manager when he makes an adjustment as to what speeding up will or will not do, makes a certain decision upon certain philosophical theories.

Now, I say that the manager actually occupied and pre-occupied with the great diversity of detailed problems is not in a position to make those adjustments justly and fully apprised of all the data which should enter into the making of such decisions. I take it that

<sup>1</sup>Professor of Law, Harvard University Law School.