

- b. The rate prescribed for a driver of an engine with a cylinder under 12 inches in diameter is 1 s 4½ d per hour. Nothing extra need be paid to a driver who is required to clean windows, etc., but the rate mentioned must be paid in any event.

* * *

- c. An assistant is an employee other than a pastry cook, packer, apprentice carter, or motor-wagon driver as above defined, and who does any or all of the following work, viz.: bring in raw materials; wash, clean and grease pans, tools, tins, and other utensils; clean and wash machines; label tins and boxes; wash and sugar goods; wrap cans and pastry; crack eggs; clean fruit and cut peel; put on and take off peels; attend reel, traveling and draw-plate ovens, provided that a journeyman is in charge; place goods into and take goods from tins, trays, pans, trucks, racks, bins, and cupboards, before, during and after the manufacture; pack goods in bake houses; clean bake houses, yards and premises, feed and take from machines, put on and into and take from tins, trays, and pans any goods in any stage of their manufacture; top and bottom pies.
- d. Men working in wet places are to be paid 1 s per day extra irrespective of the time so engaged. Note: Such wet places are to be determined and declared to be such by the employer and employee by mutual arrangement. In the event of the parties failing to agree it shall be referred to the chairman of the Board for his decision.

It should be a matter of deep concern that except for the labor unions there are almost no routine agencies in American industry through which may be obtained an expression of shop opinion—individual and collective. The typical employer claims that he knows what his men think. But as a matter of fact it is impossible to get the real attitude of mind of a worker or a group of workers from the employer as it is from the labor leader. The machinery through which complaints can be safely made and shop justice gradually established is yet to be devised. As new problems will always be coming up the settlement of present ones is first of all necessary. The struggle must be to keep at a minimum matters on which debate is desired. The effort must be to anticipate any proper demand of an individual worker or group of workers as to hours, wages or anything else. The plan for this kind of thing is the function of the highest officers of a company. The average foreman is too preoccupied with the day's work to do it.

The labor unions have for years been quoting Carlyle in using the words "Organize, organize, organize." Without going further they are misquoting him. However, when Frederick W. Taylor wrote "Co-operation" into the world's industrial creed and into the mechanism of industry he altered, and to an extent weakened the argument for organization as this has been practiced by labor unions in this country, and more especially in England.

To admit a labor union to a plant not previously unionized or to go through the forms of co-operating with one already there does not necessarily mean co-operation in the sense in which Mr. Taylor used it. Sometimes it is easier to admit a union than to keep it out. Again it may be easier to appear to co-operate than to reveal an actual attitude of opposition. The fundamental test is not whether you have unions or do not have them. In some sections of the country and especially in the larger industrial establishments the complete absence of unions would indicate something peculiar in the management. It is equally true that most manufacturers having unions and taking credit therefor are claiming something to which they have slight title. Ninety-nine manufacturers out of 100 who have unions have them only because they cannot help themselves.

I have heard of one plant in which the employees are treated in enlightened fashion that was forced by pressure of a peculiar kind exerted from without the establishment to go through the forms of unionizing on practically the standard basis because, as the national leaders said, it was such a good place to work that the very fact that it was a non-union shop constituted a constant reflection on the organized labor movement. This means that employers who treat their employees in the matter of wages, hours, safety appliances, etc., even below the average may easily be immune from labor agitation while those who study and sacrifice to produce improved conditions become the more liable to interference on the part of organized labor.

If Scientific Management stands for anything it stands for cutting out the "bunk" in every relationship. It is a mockery to call anything short of this scientific. I can understand acquiescing quite wholeheartedly in the establishment of one or more typical unions in my shop. I can even picture sitting down and planning with their leaders for their establishment. But no matter how convinced we may be as to the desirability of organization for the workers of the world, an unquestioning acceptance of all present-day labor union methods and objectives is obviously impossible. This makes all the more necessary, however, a generous sympathy with their ultimate purposes and an appreciation of the difficulties and achievements of their leaders.

An employer should welcome every possible check on his honesty of purpose, breadth of view and genuine efficiency. The solidarity of the employees is one of those checks which every right minded employer should both covet and cultivate. But to advocate in industry a type of labor unionism which prohibits the use of the stop watch and the payment of rewards for high performance is to advocate ultimate industrial slavery—however novel the type. A labor union propaganda which does not provide for constant experimentation and the encouragement of new types of organizations is short sighted and not big and broad enough to hold within itself the germ of a republic both politically and industrially free. Research should be as vitally necessary to the wise solution of the problems of labor as to those in other fields of human endeavor.

The labor movement must inevitably seek a new alignment—along which efficiency will become one of labor's own demands—eventually its cardinal demand. The employer who clings to an antiquated machine or one whose system of management is not of the best will ultimately be as obnoxious to labor as are today those who work long hours and pay low wages. In the Great State production will be made a part of the responsibility of labor. And here is where Co-operation comes in. Because, as Taylor has pointed out, you can drive men into working hard but it is impossible to drive them into working efficiently. The friends of labor are sometimes tempted to fear Scientific Management simply because it is efficient. Formerly the *New Statesman* and sometimes our own *Survey* have viewed it as a chain newly forged about labor's neck. Such an attitude fails to take into account the fact that true Scientific Management is a closely articulated, delicately adjusted mechanism such as is clearly impossible in an atmosphere of dissatisfaction and discord. It cannot be built out of collective bargaining, even though individual and collective consent are inherent in its practice.

Do not let us put the onus of reform on the already over-burdened workers of the world. If men ever learn to work together and live together efficiently and happily it will only be as we develop a new technique for the individual, yes—a new reverence for the individual. But this is only indirectly the problem of the group or the mass or the "mob," if you must call it that. The responsibility for leadership lies first of course at the door of the leader. In the development of a true leadership lies the great hope of democracy—whether it be political or industrial. Only through enlightened leadership can we establish a proper relation of the group or mass to the individual—and the leader is he who points the way and pushes on, and gaining one eminence uses it only as the basis from which to climb higher.

We can be reasonably sure that the leadership of the future will be far removed from the military ideal which has stood civilization in good stead to date. Even in military affairs it begins to look as if we would hear less about the martinet and more of the man with genuine knowledge, imagination and enthusiasm. I rather think that for the highest efficiency we have too little instructing and too many instructions in industry and business. We work on the fiction that an instruction once issued is carried out to the letter. As a matter of fact most instructions especially in the higher and therefore more important reaches of industry are only imperfectly understood. Then again each worker in the last analysis executes only that part of what he understands to be his instructions, which he feels to be essential. Occasionally he does something because he is afraid not to do it. Now if you make a practice of never issuing orders as such it puts it up to you to keep your man convinced. The result is that your associates in practice actually carry out what has become their own purpose as well as yours. You undoubtedly lose here and there—especially in the matter of military precision. But your gains are infinitely greater than your losses. Notice is given to your associates that you do not mind being shown wherein you are mistaken and do not expect anyone to do the foolish or inefficient or dishonest thing simply because it was your order or they thought it was your order to do it. So commands make way for orders, and orders for instructions, and instructions for information for employees. The argument is in no wise weakened even if we admit that this system "has still to establish its mutual disciplines and possess its mind," to borrow a phrase from H. G. Wells. It will become increasingly difficult for concerns operated on anything like a military basis to attract to their employ the best class of employees. Industry and government today can have in them adventure and romance—in fact must include both if they are to be properly conducted. More and more our young men of promise will demand the opportunity to associate themselves with industrial undertakings dominated neither by the anti-efficiency propaganda of the English labor unions nor by the militaristic know-nothingness of certain types of big business.

To analyze the leadership of the future we must recognize in it a twofold quality. We are told that there can be no sound where there is no ear to hear. In some such sense it is true that there can be no leadership if there is none to follow or none to follow gladly. This following is just as important as the leading. To be a leader a man or a woman must first *KNOW*—know what his job is, and then have the experience, the ability, the judgment, the enthusiasm and the vision to execute this allotted task. Just