

means make large successes in the needle trades, that the union has the labor power and the necessary funds, and that by going into business on a large scale, the union will satisfy labor's demand for a voice in the management of industry.

Clothing Union to Pass on Bank Plan

Boston, May 7. Preliminary to the opening of the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America here on Monday, the general executive board is in daily session at the Hotel Bellevue, formulating its recommendations to be acted on by the delegates.

That these recommendations will include a plan for the establishment of a cooperative bank for clothing workers is practically a foregone conclusion. This and other cooperative enterprises, the nature of which is not disclosed, will be laid before the convention for action.

However, I am diverging from the discussion of the papers presented this morning, but take the liberty of doing so simply to illustrate the possible danger, as I see it, to the industries that seem so completely to have turned over the management of their business to labor managers and union leaders.

I question the advisability of such an elaborate industrial relations organization as outlined here this morning—especially in organizations where we are not contending with absentee ownership—for surely the owner of the business giving his own time and attention to the details of management, should be recognized as having something to say about his own organization. I cannot conceive of an owner of a business being dictated to as to whom he shall or shall not employ. Imagine, if you will, an employee refusing to do certain work assigned to him, and upon refusing, being given one week's notice of dismissal by his foreman and then at a hearing of this High Court, the worker is ordered back to his old job until investigation can be made. I do not wish to infer that I believe in summary dismissal by a foreman, but I do believe that machinery within an organization can be established to very quickly and justly handle such cases as these without the necessity of submitting to an outside tribunal of justice.

We will admit that it is quite advisable in large organizations, especially where there is absentee ownership, to have machinery whereby the employee and the employer may be brought closer together in their business relations, but many of us are connected with the smaller industries which have grown from a very small beginning when the owner has at one time worked at the bench with his employees. In an organization of this kind, the personal touch has not been lost, providing, of course, the management has

been alive to its opportunity; and in such an organization as this, the elaborate machinery of shop committees is not needed, for the individual worker feels free at all times to discuss his problems with the management (now generally through the employment manager). I can hear some say, "They will not do this," and to them I say, "My experience shows that they will."

A square deal from the management is what the worker wants. He cares not whether it be acquired through an elaborate system of industrial democracy or scientific management or plain common sense management,—which, by the way, can be combined with scientific management,—just so long as he receives a square deal. There surely is no cure-all for the present unrest through any system of industrial democracy, but only through conscientious effort of the management to be square with the worker.

I was amused at Dr. Leiserson's description of the Jewish worker who described so vividly his impression of scientific management and perhaps there are those in this audience who can recall some individual, of course not himself, but someone who has gone about setting piece rates or introducing a scientific process in some such crude way. We must not forget that after all, the worker is only human—that he is just the same flesh and blood as the rest of us and that all he wants, is an opportunity to do his best.

So let us consider not only the worker's reaction to scientific management, but let us consider his reaction to the common sense management, the management of the square deal. Give him this square deal and the reaction will be all that we may hope for, and you gentlemen who are so closely connected with the mechanical end of industry and whose job it is to get out production and show profit, can do more than anyone else to help create the conditions in industry that we all hope for.

LEROY E. SNYDER¹: It requires a violent effort of will to resist the temptation to reply to Mr. Johnson's comments on the two papers, but I will confine myself to the real job of discussing the two papers. I shall leave the rejoinders to Dr. Jacobstein and Dr. Leiserson.

When I went to work as Labor Manager for

¹Labor Manager Rosenberg Bros., Rochester, N. Y.

Fashion Park a year ago the first of last month, I supposed our principal job was to find the best methods in which to apply (with justice, of course) the principles of sound economics to the solution of the problems of management and labor in the clothing industry. But I hadn't been in the work very long until I began to realize that the most important factor of all was the question of human relationships. I found the principal question to be one of psychology, rather than pure economics or social science.

I am deeply interested in scientific management because I believe the finest thing in the world is the scientific spirit. I do not see how civilization can endure and how man can make progress without the help of the scientific spirit. But those of you who have read the recent literature on the subject of social psychology realize, as I have begun to realize very strongly, that psychology is just as valid and just as legitimate a science as is the science of biology or of chemistry or of physics. It is only recently that the psychologist has been admitted to a front seat in the row of scientific men, men whose word can be accepted as a part of that which we need for our guidance in solving the problems of life. With me it has come down to this: that the most important thing in helping to work out the difficult problems of industry is that we recognize the necessity of understanding the psychology of the people with whom we deal. Of course, we cannot do that coldly, dispassionately, as the scientist may in his laboratory; we have to do it with a sense of justice and of fairness which is very keen and very real.

That, I believe, is the thing Dr. Leiserson has given you. I believe, if you wish to carry away with you the spirit of the clothing industry, the thing that is at the heart of our effort in Rochester today, you must take this with you: First, let us try to understand the human problem, let us try to understand the social values that are there. But I place second, in an only slightly subordinate position, the fact that we are quite as genuinely interested in production, in making our industry function effectively for the community, as any body of men could possibly be in any industry. We put the other thing first because we believe it has been so long neglected that a little over-emphasis at the present time will not do anybody any harm.

Dr. Jacobstein referred to the quite informal nature of the agreement or contract that the clothing

manufacturers have with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. I find in the minds of the workers a decided antagonism to legalism, to formalism. They are more interested in equity than they are in law, and I am entirely in sympathy with them in that point of view. This was excellently illustrated to me a few days ago when I was in court, in this suit of Michael Stern and Company against the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. It is unnecessary to go into details; and they wouldn't be particularly interesting if I did, but the defendant was seeking to introduce certain types of evidence to which the plaintiff was making strenuous objection and a witness was on the stand who was trying to say things that the counsel for the plaintiff didn't wish him to say. The plaintiff's attorney objected often and vigorously. I was seated in the last row of chairs and just behind me were standing some clothing workers. One man said: "They ought not to have any lawyers in these things. The judge just ought to let both sides get up and talk. He ought to hear all they have got to say."

According to the rules of evidence that remark was decidedly beside the point, but if they were seeking equity in the case I am inclined to think the workman was right. What harm can come from telling all that you know about a situation on either side? That is what we have tried to do in the clothing industry in Rochester during the last year. No doubt a lot of our discussions are "irrelevant;" I am sure entirely so. But that doesn't do any particular harm, and I believe there is a growing relevancy in the discussion, because we are trying to show that everything must have a point, that things must get somewhere. We are trying to work out the thing by giving the present psychology of the worker free play in discussion, while aiding to direct it into proper constructive channels.

Time studies have been referred to here. Last summer our company was, I believe, one of the first in the market to introduce time studies. We were in considerable doubt as to how they might be received. The first time we tried time study was in a contract shop. There was a controversy over prices to be paid for certain pockets, and I suggested that our time study man, who had just come to town a few days before and had not yet done any work in our shops, should come over to this contract shop and make studies. Much to my surprise, the suggestion