

business. He is working, a hired man, as I am a hired man, trying to accomplish results with the same sort of fellows.

I like to think of Jim Mooney, who, a few years ago, was getting fourteen cents an hour, working fifty-eight hours a week, which brought his earnings to something less than \$10 a week; a man sixty years of age who had raised a family of seven children, of whom all of the sons have been through college. All of the sons were professional men, lawyers and doctors, highly respected in their communities, first-class citizens. Jim was a first-class citizen. He was a machine operator, and had one of these monotonous jobs that we sometimes worry about; but he was contented and happy and useful. If his sons had had a little different sort of vision, they would have been managers.

I have known many other workmen, known them intimately, who are of the same sort. I know a man who was only moderately successful in a small business. Through successive illness and deafness he was obliged to retire, and for many years was inactive. Then a man who had confidence in him appointed him to a position of much financial responsibility; not in active management, but where that man was entrusted with the responsibility for many millions of dollars—in company with other men. These other men were rich, financial men, and all of them men of the highest reputation in a large city. The man told me that the principles of doing a large business were exactly the same as those of doing a small business; that the men with whom he was associated in his new enterprise were in no way different from the men with whom he had been associated all his life. They made the same sort of judgments.

A famous consulting engineer who has known hundreds of managers and thousands of workmen says that the manager is in no way different from the workman; that he makes the same mistakes that a \$12 a week clerk makes, that his skill is no greater and no less; that his judgment is just as likely to err at any moment; that he is just as likely to lose his head, for he is the same sort of man.

Now, I may be all wrong, but any picture which presents a different view of managers and workmen does not look true to me. I hope that that may not be considered a criticism of Dr. Person's paper; but it is the result of an experience which I cannot wipe out. So much for the workman and manager.

Of the social scientist I know nothing by experience and only very little by hearsay; but so long as he is truly scientific, as Mr. Fitch has pointed out, he is a safe counsellor. To be scientific means to get at the true facts, and to marshal them in an orderly manner. If he does that he will be a big help. If he will get

these things together and look at them from the standpoint of the managers of to-day, and for the good of the future, he will be a help in our counsels, when we get together and look a long way ahead. How much help he will be day by day to Mr. Hathaway and to me, I very much question.

In connection with the value of committees, you know a famous admiral said that one of the difficulties with the navy was that so many things were done by boards, and that a board was rightly named because a board is long and narrow and is wooden.

Another man,—I think it was one of the big steel men,—said there was no use in trying to get a thing done by a committee, because you had somebody on the committee who was able, or you did not. If you had a man who was able, you could appoint him alone, and get it done better and quicker than if you appointed a board or a committee of whom some at least knew nothing about it, and who might not get it done anyway. And I think that has something to do with the contention by Mr. Hathaway that one man must be finally responsible.

I cannot take seriously this thought that we are to be governed always by a determination of whether or not it pays. That rule has to be the criterion of a business as a whole over a long period, but one of the great difficulties with our business to-day is that if we keep that thing before us ten hours a day it will never pay. The progress of the world has been made by people who were too busy to decide whether it would pay, but who were occupied doing the right thing. The people who came here and settled these shores were not asking that question. The communities of the west, the people who went there to make their homes, were busily engaged in other pursuits, and they did not ask this question. They were interested in doing something, and they did it, and were well paid for doing it.

We have to thank Professor Jones for his admirable book on "Business Administration," which points out the fact that the leaders in industry to-day require all of the characteristics which have marked the leaders of civilization in all times, or the leaders of the world in all times. That is, courage and honesty and diplomacy and chivalry and ideals. The leaders in industry to-day are inheritors of those qualities, and it is only by the exercise of those qualities that the business world will get anywhere. No one can succeed if somebody is whispering in his ear all the time "Does it pay?" If he knows that he has the right thing, he will work it out, and it will be a success. He may not have the right thing, in which case his failure will stop the experiment. But if you keep whispering in his ear, he will not have the opportunity to find out whether it is good or not. And that

thing is perfectly well demonstrated in many industries which are under the ban of absentee ownership.

I live in an industrial city—Lowell. Reading over some old papers recently I saw the account of a man with a famous name, highly revered in Boston to-day, who went into the wilderness in Lowell and built some mills. All the old mills in Lowell were started between 1825 and 1835, by one group of men. They wanted to make money; they saw the opportunity and went after it. They saw undeveloped water power, and they said that some fellow ought to come along with enough nerve to go out there and cash in. They had the nerve and they went out there and did cash in; and those fellows, having seen the thing with their own eyes and believing in it, went out there into the wilderness of Lowell and made fortunes. Their descendants in some cases—although this is not a general criticism,—their descendants in some cases are sitting in Boston to-day and whispering to hired managers "If you do thus and so, will it pay?" because every six months they want their dividend.

There are very few old, neglected, run-down businesses that can pay a dividend every six months. Somebody with sand has got to come along and see what is needed and say to the manager "I want to spend a million dollars on that plant and do it within a year, and in five years we will have it all back again."

The manager needs that assistance from his owner or financier. Because the banker wants his dividend every six months, no matter what may be the business conditions, no matter how bad, he says "Cut down your stock so that we can pay our dividend." And when business becomes good again he says "Hurry up now and get in a large amount of material." So they pay half as much again as they would have paid when the material was cheap; and they cramp that business and cut down the profits—just to make it pay every six months. What is needed is the personal responsibility of some man with initiative—he may be one of the managers, but preferably he should be one of the owners,—a man who has financial responsibility, who will come to the plant, who will have the vision to see what is wanted, who will have the courage to do what is needed, and who will forego his profit this time for the sake of the profit in the future. He will be paid his price; because he had the business courage and the ability to put things through. That is the sort of man who will succeed; because he has the vision to put aside temporary profit for permanent good.

MR. ROBERT THURSTON KENT. Mr. Fitch in his discussion brought out one point of considerable interest. He stated that it seemed to be the tendency

of scientific management, and of the development of modern industry in general, to force a greater automaticity in the work; that the laborer is confined to one operation in this work. We have heard a great deal about this, and the workman has been made the subject of a good deal of sympathy; but has it ever occurred to you people who have criticised us and criticised managers that many of the working people do not want your sympathy and do not thank you for it? And has it ever occurred to you that they want that very automaticity?

Mr. James F. Hartness in his little book "The Human Factor in Industry" has pointed out that there is a type of mind which is very prevalent in industry that wants nothing but the steady job. The man with that type of mind wants nothing but the one thing to do. If he has nothing else to do but that one thing, and can hold that job for his normal lifetime, he is far happier than if he were given a job which requires thought, initiative and responsibility on his part. I know that is the case because I individually have had experiences along that line.

In my little force I have two girls of just that type of mind. They are good, steady, industrious workers, and I tried to promote them to jobs requiring a little more initiative and a little more responsibility. They would not have it. They threatened to quit if given a job where they would have to work more with their brains and less with their hands. They were perfectly satisfied to go ahead and make their \$10 or \$11 a week with their hands, rather than to get \$15 a week and use a little more initiative.

MR. L. H. BALLOU. Those of us who have attended Taylor Society meetings in the past, and have heard the papers and their discussions dealing with the social and labor problems, must recognize that we owe to Dr. Person a debt of gratitude for the classification of these ideas. I think for the first time he has pointed out the relation which these things bear to each other. He has given things their true value as I have never heard them presented in any paper, and after listening to the other speakers, I feel that Dr. Person's paper is still the meat of the whole thing. All of the other papers presented in the past dealing with workmen, labor and social science, seem to have resolved themselves into a discussion of the ideal against the practical; rather than ideal against ideal, and practical against practical. Throughout all of this talk, we have been confronted with the same situation which was presented in Mr. Valentine's paper and Mr. Portenar's talk,—the theoretical against the practical. In Dr. Person's paper it seems that things have been given their true value.