

would be even thought of in the clothing industry generally today, if it had not been for the stimulus which has been brought about during the past year. The clothing industry has moved very, very slowly up until now. It is just on the breaking point of issuing forth. I attribute its awakening greatly to the stimulus which has come from the workers' side. Of course, in time it might have arrived had the workers not been organized, but I think the arrival would have come very slowly. Therefore, if this present arrangement under which we are operating had not done anything more than this, to my mind, it has been entirely worth while.

Dr. Leiserson has touched with emphasis upon the factor of human psychology in industry. I have been interested during the past two days in listening to some of the addresses and particularly in noticing the two charts of organization which have been put forth. I noticed that on both these charts very, very little space was given to handling of the human element in industry. There were three things considered,—machinery, labor, tools,—and they all seemed to be put on the same plane. I think that some of us who have been interested in the scientific end of production have simply forgotten a little bit the fact that human beings do not act like machines and that they do not act like tools. Machines are more or less fixed in their action or reaction. You build a machine to do a certain thing and you know that under certain given conditions it is pretty certain to do just exactly what you wish it to do. The same thing applies to tools. When you go into the third phase of production, that of labor, you find an entirely different situation. Some of us have been inclined to classify the three in the same way and it is there where we have made some of our mistakes. Labor, as represented by the human element, is very, very pliable, and uncertain in its reaction. No one knows what is going to happen in the immediate present as compared with what happened before. Dr. Leiserson's illustration of the same sort of bullets entering the wooden head and the steel head illustrates that far better than I could. You can readily go into your own experience and find this to be true all the time. I think I know something about driving an automobile. I continually drive in a certain way and therefore have formed certain habits. I realize perfectly well that if I come to a steep hill, one of the best things I can do is to brake on the motor, yet I never think of this until I

get to the bottom of the hill, then I figuratively kick myself off the seat because I hadn't thought a moment previously of the best way of doing it. I rely upon two brakes where I might have relied upon a third agency. So, in the same way all through production the human being has learned a certain method of doing things from which it is mighty hard to change. No wonder we find trouble when we introduce some of the newer things. Anything that is changed is terrible and fearsome and the less you have thought about it the greater the danger seems to be; the greater the unknown the more terrible the thing is. Such a condition is not true of a machine; it is not true with a tool. Once they have been designed to do a certain thing they are pretty nearly apt to do it. Such is the point that I wanted to bring to the focus of your attention.

Of course, we have made a lot of mistakes. We expect to make a lot more of them. I like to make mistakes because I feel the more mistakes I make the more I am going to learn, and therefore I should like to outline a program where I should make about fifty mistakes every day so that at the end of the day I would know fifty things a little bit better than I did before. We are making mistakes all along the line. Some of us even think that our impartial chairman is making mistakes. I am in that class possibly more so than some of the other labor managers. I can realize a little bit more why I couldn't understand some of the decisions he has rendered. Some time ago he said that all his decisions were handed down to him by God, and I being only a mortal being, naturally I couldn't understand why some of these things were not as I thought they should be. I was looking at things almost entirely from the technical viewpoint—machines, labor, tools;—I had forgotten about the human point of view. I was simply acting in an impersonal way, attempting to classify all things in their proper classification. But now I am coming to one of two conclusions;—either the human element in industry is of far greater importance than some of us had supposed, or else God handing down his decisions through our impartial chairman, cares nothing for the technical side of things.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under the rules of the Society the discussion is now open to the floor with only one restriction,—the remarks of each individual are limited to two minutes.

ALDO CURSI<sup>1</sup>: I am tempted to spend these two minutes discussing the remark made by Mr. Johnson. He seems to be of the impression that the workers can really have justice in the shop without the union and I intend to try to disappoint him, if I possibly can.

First of all, consider what a terrible thing you have with this machinery. A person is discharged, goes before the impartial chairman, the impartial chairman hears the case, and then the impartial chairman may decide to send him back. Isn't that terrible! If the chairman decides to send the person back it means that he has decided after hearing the evidence, that the employer was wrong in discharging the person. If the employer was wrong why shouldn't the person go back to work? Is it better to have a strike involving one thousand people, as we have had for the last six months on the question of discharging a person, or isn't it better to have machinery whereby the girl can have her grievance heard and if she is right go back to work, and if she is wrong, remain out of work? I think the latter is the best way.

Another thing: Mr. Johnson says: "I do believe that the people should have some hearing, but not by someone from the outside. The employer should give the people a square deal." The employer is not in a position to give a square deal even if he wanted to. A man who employs one thousand people cannot know personally each and every one of them; cannot know every day what is going on in the shop. He does not know that in many cases a man, in order to get a job, has to go to the foreman's house with a nice present. It may happen that the foreman has a friend who arrived from some other city to whom he would show preference. The employer has not the time to acquaint himself with all the facts and because of this, and other reasons, you cannot have justice in the shop where there is no union.

I assure you that nobody is so scared as the man who knows that his job the next day depends on the will of the superintendent or the foreman. You say you are not going to discharge any person until the person has a hearing. He will not have a fair hearing. Who is going before the employer to take the side of that person, knowing that he also may get the same medicine as the other fellow?

I want to tell you that I am under the impression that the experiment in Rochester is working out all

right, and to you gentlemen I may tell this frankly: the employers have done many things that they have never dared to do before.

Prior to the time when the employers were dealing with the union, there was very little scientific management in the shop. They felt that the employees would object, perhaps stop work and strike if new machinery or change in the system were introduced. When the employers try to introduce a new system now, we simply go to them and find out what it is about. If no harm is done to the workers, we tell them it is the privilege and the right of the employer to improve the system of work in the shop, and we do not desire to prevent it.

I want to say in conclusion that I have respect for an employer who takes the old position,—"I am the boss here; you are not compelled to work here; if you want to work you will work under the conditions I want, or you don't work at all." But if the employer tries to be good and says, "You can have your representation but I am going to tell you the kind of representation I want you to have," we don't believe he is sincere.

MARY GILSON<sup>2</sup>: I do not want to assume a superior attitude toward Dr. Jacobstein and Dr. Leiserson, but with all their wealth of experience they haven't had some of the experience that a few of us old war-horses have had. They have had a good deal, but they haven't had the joy of working in a shop where the manager is both artistic and scientific. It can be done,—they can combine the qualities. I want to say, when Dr. Jacobstein says you must sell scientific management to the workers as well as the executives,—that you cannot put scientific management through successfully unless you *do* sell it to the workers. I do not know any organization in this country where it has survived, where the results are real, where there is scientific management that is both scientific and artistic, in which it has *not* been sold to the workers, step by step, and in which they are not convinced that it is the right thing.

We had an experience not very long ago (with due respect to Mr. Cursi,—he has a right to his opinion and I have to mine) which convinced me that there was quite a bit of autocracy exhibited in a recent Cleveland labor meeting. One of our workers came in the next morning after the meeting and said, "Miss

<sup>1</sup>Labor Representative, Rochester Joint Board.

<sup>2</sup>Employment and Service Supt., The Joseph and Feiss Co., Cleveland, Ohio.