

Now why are the engineers and managers as distinct from owners, the technical experts, not free? Is not the answer to that question to be found in this other question? Why have the scientific managers been so frequently distrusted by the public at large, by the workers and to a large extent by the employers themselves? Is not the answer suggested by the fact that they call themselves managers and not administrators? They have traditionally associated themselves with one party in industry only—with the management. They have not so organized themselves as to be able to put their technical knowledge and skill at the free disposal of both parties in industry and of the general public. It is for this reason it seems to me that their mind is not recognized as the mind of the public on the problems of science in industry, that they were not recognized by the President's Conference in Washington.

Today the management engineers and managers are not free men. How can they become free men? Is not the answer that they must so organize themselves that they can exercise their science and their technical skill as public servants independently of the arbitrary wills of either of the principals in industry?

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to use my five minutes to make just this one point in the hope that it might serve to open the discussion, to focus attention upon the fundamental problem of production in industry, upon the fact that the public at large, like the Public Group at the President's Conference in Washington, are, as Miss Tarbell said, so incoherent, so vague, that they have no plans for the organization of industry at once scientific and democratic. As an outsider, as a member of the Taylor Society who is not a management engineer, I probably admire and esteem the engineers, particularly in this group, more than they admire and esteem one another. They know one another's foibles, they are conscious of their own and one another's shortcomings. To me they represent one of the great constructive forces in America. I look to them with the greatest respect, with the profoundest appreciation of the work that they have done and are doing, and with the confident hope that they will so organize themselves as to be able to function as the mind of the public on the problems of science in industry. If they do so organize themselves, no future industrial conference at Washington will dare to ignore them.

RICHARD A. FEISS¹: I came up here because I could not let go unchallenged the implication by Mr. Bruère

¹The Joseph and Feiss Co., Cleveland, O.

as to the part this Society could or was supposed to have been able to take in the late conference. If Mr. Bruère had attended the last meeting in Boston, he would know not only that there had been efforts on the part of individual members of the Society to get the kind of set-up that he suggested, but there was also a united effort on the part of the Society at the last moment to have representation of the real interest in industry—the management group. I think Mr. Bruère's point is well taken to this extent, that it is up to the management group and it is up to this management Society to give the kind of service that is needed to solve these problems. Here in this Society are the men with the brains and knowledge to do it; and I wish to say that they were willing and ready, and I know personally that there were many members in each conference group who had in their hands information necessary to the functioning of the conference which was furnished by men in this Society. We would have been called upon when the time came if the conference had gone on.

I wish to say just one word more about the conference, a word from one who was on the outside but who was looking in, and that is this: it was not any lack of willingness to serve on the part of the managers of the country, and it was not that there were some bad breaks in the set-up of the conference, but there was one big failure that made sure the defeat of its purpose, and that was the failure shown, not in the personal set-up, but in the moral set-up of the whole conference. In order to solve the problems that confront every group in industry, it was essential that it conceive industry in the right moral aspect and that aspect is a very simple one. If the men from whatever walk of life, whether they were real or unreal representatives, had come to Washington with the understanding that industry like every other human activity must be a public service, and had come with the idea of public service, and that group service was subsidiary to public service, the conference would have been bound to get along regardless of the meaning of words or regardless of the suspicions of each other.

F. A. SILCOX¹: The two addresses of the evening hour come very close to home to me, because we have for the past six weeks been going through the process of collective bargaining in detail here in New York in the adjustment of wages, hours and working conditions in the allied printing trades group.

¹United Typothetae of America, Chicago, Ill.

The big question involved is whether or not we recognize collective bargaining as essential to industrial progress and stability. If we do, then the details can be worked out and no one feels that they involve any insuperable difficulties. A new series of conferences should be held based essentially upon a different plan of organization from that of the late lamented conference. The idea would be to have the industries themselves which are organized properly represented. For example, the printing industry already has a national joint conference council, made up of equal representatives of the International Employing Printer's and the International Unions, which can express the general policies of the printers and can secure proper representation at a national conference. Similarly other organized sections of industry can be represented.

If representatives can be selected from those industries which are organized, it seems to me that you can in this way get a well-balanced representation of the various industries and let them express themselves on what policies they think should be followed. If the unorganized group feel that they do not want to go along on the policy outlined then let them express the policy they want to follow and see if any reconciliation can be made between the two.

I want emphatically to subscribe to the broad democratic approach outlined by Mr. Dennison. I think that he has brought out the essence of the problem.

CHARLES W. MIXTER¹: I was not at Washington at the conference but I have had occasion to read a great part of the stenographic reports of the proceedings, had occasion to study and take notes on them. Also I have had conversations with some of those who were there and who told me what went on behind the scenes which didn't get into the stenographic reports of the proceedings.

Mr. Dennison and others have maintained that the employers did not break with the conference on the principle of collective bargaining. Also, it has been said by some people, and hinted at by others, that the resolutions on collective bargaining which were presented to the conference, now in one form and now in another with slightly different wording, were unnecessarily fussy and legalistic. I cannot agree with these views. I think the resolutions on collective bargaining embodied very well the vital issues at stake, and the vital issues at stake were two different economic philosophies; not merely different philosophies

¹National Industrial Conference Board, Boston, Mass.

of industrial relations, but economic philosophies in general. The Employer's Group, or rather that section of it which dominated that very unhomogeneous body, was opposed not to the abuses of unionism but to unionism itself. Because real collective bargaining involves recognition of the union, and dealing with union representatives, they are opposed to any endorsement of real collective bargaining; that was the issue on which the conference broke up. The employers were willing to endorse collective bargaining if it meant mere shop committees, or so-called company unions, with no intervention of outside representatives of labor. Of course such acceptance of limited collective bargaining—group bargaining with a string to it—was rejected by the Labor Group as not constituting acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining.

And now for a brief consideration of the deeper economic reasons for the position taken by the Employer's Group. For one thing they realized that in competitive industries with many small employers, if there is dealing with strong unions, the employers themselves must unite in employers' associations. The dominating section of the Employers' Group is not ready for that. They think that means danger to our competitive system as a whole, and they want to keep that and the old employer's paternalism intact. It is not using an abusive term, but scientifically descriptive, to call them reactionary. After the Napoleonic Wars, when the Holy Alliance undertook to put everything back where it used to be before, that was reactionary. Now, after this war, with its immense forces of upheaval and change, these employers we are talking about (not all employers) want to put things back. They expect that presently unrest will blow over, that people's nerves will calm down, that things will come back and be back to normal, and that that "normal" will be the old nineteenth century unmitigated competition with the employer holding substantially the position he has had in the past. These beliefs and this program are founded, in my opinion, on ignorance. For one thing, those who entertain these views believe that England, before the war, was being absolutely ruined by unionism. Therefore, don't talk about Whitley Councils to them. If England wants to commit industrial suicide that way, that is her affair. We don't want any of that sort of thing in this country.

They get their information in great measure from biased and unreliable sources, as, for example, from that series of articles in the London *Times* some fifteen years ago, republished in book form. I have forgot-