

sufficiently modified your point of view to meet that demand for industrial democracy, which I hold to be a relative and not an absolute term. I do not associate it with any fixed Maxian conception of the use of the State machinery, the political machinery, for production and distribution. I do not think that it need be so associated. It is a relative term. Have you in your conception of the relation that should exist in industry incorporated as much of the element of industrial democracy as present conditions demand in our American communities should be incorporated? That is the single question I would raise.

I do not know that I can do any better than refer to a remark of the President of the British Trade Union Congress held in England this year. He pointed out that there are two specific questions that have to be dealt with in business. There are questions relating to the purchase of materials, accumulating, gathering together of materials, and the marketing of the product. He said that those are questions for capital, as industry is now organized, to settle. The laborer does not think that he has any particular standing in the consideration of those questions. But there are many other questions in industry, questions of wages to be paid; as to the hours of work; as to the protection to be given from the dangers of machinery; as to the conditions under which new machinery shall be installed, and a whole lot of other questions of that kind in which the laborer feels that he is a partner and should have an equal voice in determining with the man who represents capital.

As I listened to this discussion it seemed to me that the remark of the president of the British Trade Union Congress was not complete. He should have put along with the question of the assembling of materials and the marketing of products as business questions for the management to decide, such questions as, "What kind of instructions should be given?" as indicated by the diagram placed before you, which was typical I suppose, of the chief questions that engineers and scientific management are interested in. I can see that instructions are better than traditions, even if you have to choose between those two in absolute form. I can see that the man who is responsible for the maintenance and carrying on of the business has to have probably a preponderating voice in determining what the instructions shall be. Therefore, to carry this analysis made by the President of the British Trade Union Congress a step further: you managers will probably have the greater part in the decision as to what instruction shall be given in technical processes, along with the question of assembling of materials and marketing of the products. Even when you do that, you will have a large number of important questions which should not be settled on the basis of deciding in your own mind how it should

be done, even by subtle persuasion or psychological processes, which may be imposed upon the employees personally one after the other until they believe that your decision is right. You will recognize that there is a process of thinking and wise decision going on among the laboring men themselves, and it is essential that they should be taken into a kind of ground floor partnership for decision as to how these questions shall be decided.

I recognize that instructions are better than traditions, and yet—it may be old-fashioned on my part—I have a certain liking for, and I am inclined to give a certain recognition to, the value of tradition in industry. I believe that it would be a good thing if every man who buys any commodity in a retail store could feel that there is behind the manufacture of that commodity not only the very best judgment which a business man and engineer could form as to how that commodity could be produced, but also a long tradition, a high and honorable tradition, on the part of the working men who have co-operated with the business man and manager in the production of that commodity, as to how that commodity should be produced. There was something of value in the old traditions in regard to manufacturing. A tradition might include the idea of initiative; a tradition may include the notion that the very best method of producing the thing should be worked out in co-operation between the manager and the employees. So, in any general conception that we have as to how industry should be organized in that ideal state of the future to which we all look forward, it seems to me that there will be a large place for instruction, also a certain place for tradition.

MR. HENRY P. KENDALL: This series of meetings has been a great joy to me, for several reasons. Every year that this Society goes on its conception of industry grows beyond the four walls of the shop. I am particularly glad that Mr. Portenar is here. I am glad to have a trade union leader—a man who has intellectual candor and honesty and courage. I am glad that he could step in to this inner shrine of scientific management and hear from those within what they think about; what their ideals are. I am glad to have the college professor, the sociologist, the man of sociological and economic viewpoint introduced here, particularly so in view of certain semi-facetious allusions to modern economic thought and its place in the practical affairs of us engineers, and of the sociological viewpoint in the practical affairs of running a machine and getting the greatest output. I do not believe that scientific management is going to be truly scientific in its broadest sense, until it appropriates the best there is in fundamental economic

¹Norwood, Mass.

thought and the fundamental principles of the social sciences, because, as Mr. Feiss and Mr. Wolf as well as others, have said, the machines are only part of the plant, and the operating of the machines and the making of the product in its final analysis comes down to the work of the men. So I am more than glad to see the economic and the academic viewpoint linked up with the best there is in science and engineering.

I cannot help feeling that the kind of a reception that Dr. Devine's remarks got tonight was a very different kind of reception from that which the same idea got one year ago to-night. I will confess that our viewpoint toward organized labor, toward the responsibility and rights of the community, towards the rights of the employees, toward the responsibility of the management among those of us who are responsible in a way for the management of the Plimpton Press has undergone a very decided change in complexion in the past eight or nine years during which time we have been working in the spirit of scientific management. I believe part of that is due to the fact that we all, men and management alike—and you cannot tell where one stops and the other begins—have gotten into the habit of looking for the best way of doing things, and have gotten in the habit of keeping an absolutely open mind toward every element of fact. That I think more than any other has been the cause of our change of viewpoint. I hope that Dr. Person, in his wise and somewhat autocratic leadership of this organization will make an effort to mix in a little more even proportions in the future the viewpoint of organized labor, the training and the viewpoint of the economist and the sociologist; and if it is true that the perpetuity of the principles of scientific management are bound to rest more or less in the future with the colleges and the technical schools, and universities, that is even more reason why we, the practical engineers, should now begin to undertake the training of college professors and the sociologists. I thank you very much for letting me exceed the few minutes which our autocrat allows.

MR. PORTENAR: When I received the invitation I was informed that the title of Mr. Cooke's paper would be "Who is Boss of your Shop?" When I heard that title I was like a war horse about to go into battle. I thought that I scented battle far off. I did not think it would be nearly as peaceful as it has been.

In the Hoxie report it is said—and I have no doubt it is truly said—that there are men in the scientific management movement who are actuated by the highest and most humane motives. But it said a whole lot of other things. The last word that I want to say to you is this, that the Taylor System is not tried out in this room in speeches, but in your shops.

I will admit that I do not know all it is, unless and until I can get into those shops. The opinion I have formed, as I told you before, was based on the reading of Mr. Taylor's books, the correspondence that I had with Mr. Taylor and finally I assure you it was clinched by reading the Hoxie report and when I found Mr. Valentine had joined in it. I have heard several allusions to-night to a paper read by Mr. Valentine which seemed to have been the cause of more or less disagreement. I will never be satisfied until I see a copy of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will see that you get a copy of that.

MR. KENDALL: I would like to relate a bit of history which I think Mr. Portenar would like to know, and which I would like to have this group know. Mr. Cooke wrote to Mr. Brandeis, now Justice of the Supreme Court, and asked him if he could tell him which was the best book on organized labor. Mr. Brandeis wrote back that there was only one book, unfortunately, and that was "Some Problems of Organized Labor," by Mr. Portenar. Mr. Cooke bought that book. He wrote me and told me about it. I bought the book. I could not take exception to anything that appeared in that book. Afterward Mr. Portenar met Mr. Taylor. Mr. Taylor was very much impressed with the interview. He long had wanted to get the leaders in the trade union movement to see the thing from the inside, which Mr. Taylor stood for, but he could not get leaders in the trade union movement to do it. I never yet have been able to get a leader in the trade union movement to come out to the Plimpton Press. Mr. Portenar has probably explained why this is.

Now what happened after this somewhat heated correspondence between Mr. Portenar and Mr. Taylor was this: we were at that time at the Plimpton Press having some labor difficulty. It was represented to us, "Here is a man, a strong trade unionist, in the typographic union who had been a leader or a chairman in the strike committee in New York." Mr. Taylor said, "Here is a man of intellectual honesty. Give that man a position in the Plimpton Press. I will personally pay whatever he cannot earn for you, if you will pay his going rate of wages. Will you give him the opportunity to go to the Plimpton Press and of working as a working man, and let him form his own conclusions from seeing scientific management somewhat badly applied and imperfectly applied at work in the Plimpton Press, so that he can see it without the guidance of any manager, absolutely by being a workman with the workmen, a trade unionist with the trade unionists in that establishment?" That was a mighty difficult question for us to answer. We got