

What is this intangible something for which we are reaching? There is unquestionably something. Dr. Person has not pointed definitely to it and none of the other speakers have described it. I think, however, that every manager feels that there is a certain something that is necessary; and I believe that the greatest danger lies with the man who is so self-satisfied with his condition that he does not recognize it. He is like the man of whom Mr. Hathaway spoke last night, who was so satisfied that his equipment was in the pink of condition, that he never worried about its maintenance.

I feel that Dr. Person has presented a thought which every manager must recognize as a portrayal of what is inevitable in the future.

MR. RICHARD B. GREGG.<sup>1</sup> I simply want to develop further a suggestion Mr. Fitch made. If industry, through scientific management, is going to become gradually more and more automatic,—if the individual jobs are going to be more and more specialized and machine-like, so that the worker does merely a few monotonous motions all day long,—the worker who cares about something more than that can find his way out by obtaining shorter hours and larger pay, so that in his leisure hours he can live a larger life. In addition to that, if he is given a greater representation in certain phases of the management, he will be able to find expression in that way for his higher interests, and be able to grow and make his views more and more useful to the management and to industry as a whole.

MR. WALTER D. FULLER.<sup>2</sup> One gentleman has mentioned the fact that there is really not a great deal of difference between the worker and the manager—that we are all pretty human, anyway. Another gentleman a moment ago said that he had frequently found employees who were unwilling to take responsibilities.

I want to say that I have found that true also, but that in most cases it was because the particular worker lacked confidence to take the responsibilities. With some encouragement and advice employees frequently can be induced to take the work.

I remember one case, about seven years ago, where a woman whom I thought was capable of taking executive work refused, and said she would quit. I finally persuaded her to make an effort. She did so but was in tears frequently for several weeks. That was seven years ago. To-day she is the best woman executive that we have in the plant.

<sup>1</sup>Valentine, Tead, and Gregg, Industrial Counselors, Boston, Mass.

<sup>2</sup>Secretary, Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

LIEUTENANT FREDERIC G. COBURN.<sup>1</sup> I have a very high appreciation of the value to society of the social scientist, and particularly of the value of the work of the university professor. His detachment from the industrial world makes it easier for him to see things in proper perspective. His ability to treat matters objectively, his knowledge of history, political and industrial, his knowledge of economics, and his trained reasoning powers, enable him to deal with the problems of the industrial world.

I regret to note, however, that many social scientists and university professors have formed the habit of reasoning from incorrect, or at least incomplete, premises; and this habit they should correct. The same criticism is doubtless applicable to managers, engineers, and workmen; but it is particularly applicable to the social scientist, because when he lifts up his voice to comment, criticize, or suggest, he must know that on account of his detachment he is particularly liable to be accused of being a "theorist," as if the word "theorist" were a vile epithet. Knowing that such criticism is bound to be forthcoming, it would be wise for him to make sure of his facts. If he should submit his statements of fact to those in the industrial world who are in a position to know what the facts are, and get their approval of the statements, of fact and include such approval in his statement of his premises, he would be in the position of having complete and accurate facts, and could then stand on his reasoning; and the social scientist has no cause for conceding place to anyone else, in respect of reasoning powers.

The Taylor Society, representing the science of management, should be particular to see that the statements of facts in its papers are correct. It is one thing to disclaim responsibility for statements of fact, and another thing to take responsibility for statements of facts; and I suggest that a way to do it be found.

MR. WILLIAM C. DART.<sup>2</sup> The tendency of the advocates of any one movement is to claim a cure for all ills. In medicine the specialist is, however, beginning to admit that the old-fashioned general practitioner, provided he was an able man, had his place in the world.

What I am getting at is that in all things the human element, or the soul, is the important thing. Each group, the manager, the workman, and the social scientist, is apt to believe that his work is the most important.

The relative position of the manager and the workman in the last twenty-five years has become more and more complicated, and through this very compli-

<sup>1</sup>Naval Constructor, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.

<sup>2</sup>President, Rhode Island Tool Co., Providence, R. I.

cation they have grown farther and farther apart in their understanding of each other's problems.

The responsibilities of the manager have increased, for in addition to the problems of manufacturing and merchandising, he has been surrounded by laws passed by the various states and by the Federal Government compelling him to assume expenses and to pay taxes which twenty-five years ago would not have been countenanced. In addition to this, laws have been passed prohibiting him from making any agreement with his competitors as to selling prices and requiring that competition shall be open and free. His position to-day is not only one of great responsibility, but from his very position he is more or less conspicuous in the community, and the community knows of the results of his management. In case of failure, it is extremely difficult for him to obtain a relatively good position.

The workman, on the other hand, takes no responsibility and is free to come and go as he pleases. During the past five or six years he has availed himself of his freedom, often leaving his employment with no previous notice that he was going to do so. There seems to be a complete misconception on the part of the workman of the fundamental principles of economics, and as a class they seem to have an idea that the corporations have a fixed and stable income, and that the only obstruction to the workman getting increased wages is the will of the manager.

The only hope that I see for industry in the future is the education of all. The manager must study the workman's point of view and be able to see the problems through the workman's eyes. The workman, on the other hand, must have a general knowledge of the varying elements of the manager's problems and must have due respect for them. The social scientist has his work cut out for him in the problems of the manager and also of the workman and in bringing the two elements together.

For this reason I think the programs which have been carried out by the Society during the past eighteen months have been most wisely planned.

DR. PERSON. [Author's closure.] Your discussion of my paper has been so generous, it has reached out into so many fields and made headway towards solving so many problems, that it is not easy for me to reply. It will help me some to start my rebuttal with a confession; then when that has been made, I will take up *seriatim* some of the things asked me, closing finally with remarks of a more general character regarding industrial philosophy.

The confession which I wish to make is simply an explanation as to the limited but quite serious purpose which I had in mind in preparing this paper. It had

been a long-standing, self-imposed rule of mine not to address or participate in discussions of this society. But late in the final session of the New York meeting, it occurred to me that the occasion had arrived when I could properly break this custom, and by an address of the kind presented this evening nail once and for all to the mast of this society a flag already raised by its membership. I wished to make secure as the eternal standard of this society the policy of drawing out the most generous and hospitable discussion, from every point of view, of the problems in which it has a particular interest. I am convinced, after listening to the discussion of this evening, that this Society can never become narrow in its views.

In preparing this paper, therefore, it was not my primary purpose to raise large questions of industrial relationship. My purpose rather was to bring to your attention for intellectual justification a principle that any society having to do with problems of industrial mechanism and human relationships is bound to adopt; and which in practice you were already following instinctively. Any such society must in organizing its discussions be most generous in inviting and most tolerant in receiving every possible point of view. I wished to emphasize this point by an analysis, to prove why each is essential, of the three points of view usually presented in the discussions of the society. In making my point, however, I could not avoid raising a number of large industrial questions; and it has turned out that the consideration of these questions has been the most interesting part of the discussion.

I was asked by Professor Metcalf whether I believed the disadvantages which I attributed to the manager are inherent in him and in industry. In answer to this question I would say that it depends upon what one means by inherent. We must remember that we are now speaking of large groups of individuals. We know of individual managers who seem to have forced themselves from all four of the disadvantages enumerated, and a larger number who have freed themselves from part of them. I believe also that managers as a group are experiencing a favorable evolution with regard to these limitations. But I fear that we are likely to err by attributing to the whole group the rate of change which we observe and admire in a conspicuous few. For the group the change is by small increments, and I know of no data which justifies our concluding that the group will ever be free of them, or which justifies us, in our generation, in reasoning on the basis of any other assumption than that to a considerable degree these disadvantages will continue to exist.

In connection with the discussion of the disadvantages of the manager, the question was raised whether