

In my opinion there is another department in which coordination and central control must be effected and that is the general inspection department. This department to-day, in my judgment, is decentralized. Each department is doing its own work without any central control. In other words it does not present the ideal picture. There has got to be a central body controlling the general inspection, not interfering with the inspection of the various depots and units, but simply helping them solve their problems which come up every day, some of which seem almost impossible of solution.

(Mr. McElwain presented the following letter he had written to a member of the Council of National Defense, as a specific suggestion emanating from his point of view.)

"In reference to my conversation with you I am of the opinion that there should be established immediately a Central Inspection Department located at Washington, preferably under the direction of the Quartermaster's Manufacturing and Purchasing Office, or if this is not advisable the Department should be closely allied with it. The organization should consist of experts in each line where the volume purchased or to be purchased is large. These experts should have not only a thorough knowledge of manufacturing but of materials to be used. The functions of this new department would not in any sense supplant or change the present plan of inspection in the various depots. Its function would be to supplement, assist and suggest; being closely in touch with the Quartermaster General and the Purchasing Department it would naturally have a broader viewpoint of the problems involved. It would be instrumental in establishing a uniform standard throughout the country. There is criticism today that one section of the country exacts a different standard of quality from that of another section. This department would be instrumental in eliminating this criticism. By frequent reports to the Quartermaster General and Purchasing Department both would be constantly posted as to whether contracts would be properly executed and would assist where difficulty arises in solving problems of quality and material. It would also detect laxity of inspection. Successfully managed industries controlling numerous units have found it necessary to have a strong central control where planning and policy is decided. In order to eliminate criticism it must have a centralized plan of management without affecting the efficiency of the various depots."

MR. ERNEST MARTIN HOPKINS:<sup>1</sup> I understood that this function was to break up at half past four

<sup>1</sup>President Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

and I had not expected to be called on now. I have not much to add to what has been said. It does seem to me, however, that there are certain points involved in this discussion that are perhaps as fundamental to democracy as they are essential to the present war; and this is said while recognizing that there is nothing more essential than victory in the present war. But democracy, I think we all agree, is desirable in spite of its defects, and not because of them, and I doubt if there is anybody here who will apologize to any large degree for democracy having as many defects as it has.

All of this goes back to a very large fact in connection with our national welfare, namely, that we have been a nation of individualists and have been extremely slow to understand that prosperity and welfare were coming to us in the last analysis by disassociating ourselves from the theories of individualism that have prevailed, and accepting an entirely new view in regard to cooperation, which eventually must be the basis of effective democracy.

We have an old gentleman of whom we are very fond who has been a benefactor of Dartmouth College, whose grandfather many years ago settled in New Hampshire. He was a pioneer. He made a clearing, built himself a log house, raised crops, and finally became prosperous. That was in the township of Union. At first he was the only resident. In course of time another settler came in and built a house a little way down the valley, I think about six miles away. Thereupon the first settler packed up his things and moved further into the wilderness because, he said, the world had not become so crowded that he was obliged to see another man's smoke every day. Now, I think we have too little to do with our neighbors, in theory, and we want our neighbors to have still less to do with us except at such times as we may prescribe that it is desirable. We are engaged in a struggle where there is on the opposing side a cooperation such has never been seen before in the world's history. We are now getting into the conflict when one nation after another has learned its lesson, but we have yet to learn ours. It seems to me that the question is largely in regard to the organization for the war, and I intend to confine my remarks to that subject.

I find myself largely in sympathy with Mr. Cooke in regard to the theory of democracy as a long-time proposition. I find myself, however, in sympathy with Mr. Kendall in so far as there is any distinction between them, as to the present proposition, how it shall be accomplished.

I perhaps am radical in regard to this, but it seems to me that the only thing before us at the present time is the winning of the war, and I am almost ready to

say that I would accept any kind of organization, and any kind of a guide for that organization until this job is done, and then take up the question of social readjustment in the country.

Now if we are to accomplish this thing we have to find the common denominator between the needs and the possibilities and I believe another theory of Government comes in here—I do not know whether Mr. Cooke referred to this or not—but I think the whole question comes in, which is largely a political question at the present time, of whether the Government is going to lead or going to follow the public will. I personally cannot see any reason at all for having a government on the scale that we have government in this country unless the Government is going to assume that it is to lead, and that in leading it must assume some responsibility for moulding public sentiment. I should agree entirely with Mr. Cooke that you cannot move much faster than public sentiment, but I should likewise feel that the public sentiment must be influenced by every means available, even if it meant putting some publicity man on the expense account.

There is, in other words, a need of mobilization of the whole country as it has never dreamed of being mobilized before. During the last two or three days I have been discussing mobilization under a theory that some of us have, and I am going to throw it out, because I would like to hear the criticism of it.

We have a job of mobilization on our hands that is so big we cannot spare any possible means of efficiency. I think meanwhile that the most democratic

thing that has been done in this country is the carrying out of the selective draft law. If that is so, I do not see why we should not make the selective draft law a real selective draft, why we should not have universal service, and why universal service should not include everybody, no matter what he is doing, between some ages, say between 18 and 45. Thus the Government would no longer depend upon volunteers in civil life or industry or anywhere else, but it would say to men like Mr. Cooke and Mr. Kendall, and it would say to bank presidents and owners of great industries and the men who work with their hands alone, "You have one thing that must be done now, that is, to serve the Government where your services will be most effective." I believe that there is a great opportunity open to the United States of America now to mobilize for this proposition, mobilize and commandeer war-profits, labor and everything else. Thus, for instance, we would do away with the situation in the cantonments of having here a man who has been drafted and who works for \$1 a day, and there a man who has not been drafted, who is getting \$5 or \$6 a day. In other words, I think the labor conditions of the present time, and everything that tends to decentralize and work against united effort, is a thing that is bad for the country as a whole, and that there is nothing to do except to make a complete democratic move, to commandeer everything and everybody and every resource in this country for the common purpose. If that is centralization of authority, it seems to me that that is what we ought to have.

#### DISCUSSION: SECOND SESSION

MR. KENDALL: Mr. Cooke has spoken most ably about the importance of fostering the spirit of democracy and reconciling it with the efficiency of science. I do not advocate sacrificing anything of value which democracy has. I do not contemplate the loss of the benefits which come from decentralized control. The best organization involves not only centralization but decentralization quite as much, because of the vastness of the problem. I believe that we must have every separate entity, every individual department of the Government, organized as completely and as efficiently as is possible, utilizing the best that is found in scientific management or elsewhere.

I have nothing but the highest praise for some departments and the way they are attacking their problems. Sections of the Ordnance Department, for instance, will set a pace for any industry in the country. I have visited other departments, however, departments on which the fighting forces of this country

depend just as much as they do upon the Ordnance Department, and have seen a complete lack of grasp of the situation, a complete helplessness before the problems with which they are faced, and it has driven me almost to despair because I know that the Ordnance Department or any other efficient department cannot get very far and cannot accomplish much unless the other departments match it in efficiency and work with it shoulder to shoulder. This is seen not only in the Army, but in shipping, transportation, and private industry as well. One of the worst handicaps under which the Ordnance Department is laboring is the lack of production on the part of some of our industrial plants.

You have heard Mr. Halligan's paper at this meeting. Mr. Halligan is from the Western Electric Company and that company is being leaned upon more than any other company for guidance and assistance in the handling of stores because more than any other