

sylvanians managed to send \$370,000, in contrast with \$2,936,000 from New South Wales. The inhabitants of New South Wales were proportionately 38 times as generous as the frantic sympathizers in Pennsylvania. Illinois poured out \$143,000 in the course of twenty months of high emotion about Belgium. New Jersey sent \$19,000 in 20 months.

Most people feel that the first impulse aroused by needless suffering is the impulse to assuage it, that if the remedy for suffering is made clear, decent human beings cannot fail to apply it, cannot go on in negligent consciousness of damaging want. Back of all the platitude and hypocrisy and convention of public expression, there is this persistent belief in the fund of human goodwill, this belief that it will be applied if it is once excited—a belief to which Christmas, for all the irony of war and the strategy of "peace," is still the recurrent witness and testament.

If this is the case, the stark need of Belgium should pierce every American consciousness this Christmas. A country in such plight as Belgium is an appeal to more than easy indignation. It is a real appeal for urgent help, for lack of which children must die.

Democratic Control of Scientific Management

ORGANIZED labor's hostility to scientific management, culminating in a successful congressional campaign to exclude it from government plants, is a serious menace to productive efficiency in America. In discounting the great contribution which scientific management has made by reducing the wastes of production and in bringing a blanket indictment against scientific management because of the undemocratic elements in its application, organized labor is doing a disservice not only to industrial progress, but also to society, including labor itself.

But there can be no doubt that the arbitrary hostility of labor is largely a reflection of the arbitrary and unscientific dogmatism of the efficiency engineers. Their science is new; it was born and had its development within the walls of individual plants, so that not unnaturally they were preoccupied with the internal medicine of production. They have made the mistake of assuming that the problem of productive efficiency is co-extensive with the problem of industrial reorganization. The attitude of these doctors of industry closely resembles that of physicians in the early days of specialization when the medical profession concentrated upon the diagnosis and treatment of disease in the patient, neglecting the social and economic

conditions which are the culture beds of disease.

Organized labor claims that scientific management treats the workman merely as part of the productive mechanism and ignores his rights as a citizen whose major interests lie outside the walls of the plant. In a recent magazine article, Mr. Benjamin A. Franklin, a distinguished scientific manager, says:

Any plea that labor is to be taken into the free and complete confidence of the executive, and have a full knowledge of his plans would be as little heeded as a plea that the privates of an army should know the detail assignments and changes of the corps as it moves and shifts. . . . What, then, does every executive desire from labor? He desires from labor, first, a hearty coöperation in his daily work; and, second, an increasing skill from day to day.

This disposition to regard the workman exclusively as an integral and relatively unsatisfactory part of the productive mechanism, and to deny that his status as a citizen outside the plant gives him any right individually or collectively to a voice in determining the conditions of production, was strikingly exemplified in the recent annual meeting of the Taylor Society. Here were assembled the most devout adherents of scientific management as taught by Mr. Taylor "when he walked among us on earth." They had given proof of their desire to be open-minded by setting aside two sessions for the discussion of the criticisms of labor. But no representative of organized labor was included in the program, and the term "collective bargaining," if mentioned at all, escaped our close attention. That labor individually or collectively has any right to a voice in management was not explicitly denied, but totally disregarded as being outside the range of scientific consideration. The prevailing exception of democratic control and of the right of the workman in the scheme of scientific management was most clearly expressed by Mr. Robert B. Wolf who paraphrased from an earlier printed address in which he said:

My own experience has indicated that 90 per cent or more of the manufacturing operations which tend to make men animated machines can be made interesting by giving each individual a record of the performance of his work and by making comparisons with others. . . . He then feels that he is creating something and is happy. . . . The sooner we build a philosophy upon this basis the sooner will the present destructive social and industrial unrest be replaced by a constructive condition tending toward the true democracy—a democracy which is based upon a recognition of the true value of leadership and a willingness to be led by those whose main desire in life is to be of service to their fellow men.

Underlying this inverted conception of democracy is the fallacious economic theory almost universally professed by scientific managers, that

scientific production establishes a complete harmony of interest between employers and employees. The most efficient production must include the wage and working conditions that will elicit the maximum product from the workman, who will therefore serve his own best interest as well as the best interest of his employer by yielding consent to the "natural law" of efficient production as revealed by the impersonal scientific analysis of the efficiency engineer. When impersonal science thus supersedes fallible human opinion, the worker, it is said, no longer needs the outside protection of his union, whose leaders, being without scientific knowledge, can interfere only to the detriment of himself and of the perfectly adjusted productive mechanism, in which scientific management has made him an integral part.

So runs the argument of the scientific managers. But organized labor contends that so long as industry is privately owned and science is applied primarily in the interest of shareholders, science, instead of being impersonally and comprehensively just, is likely to become an instrument of autocratic tyranny. For this reason, labor stresses its distinction between science in management, which it heartily endorses, and scientific management, to which it is cordially hostile. Labor insists that workmen as consumers and citizens have interests which are sharply opposed to the interests of the employer, and for this reason demands an equal voice with the management in controlling the conditions under which scientific improvements shall be introduced. For example, in using time-and-motion study as the basis for task-setting and the payment of wages, scientific managers, according to labor, have been neither just nor impersonally scientific. This contention has been given wide support by economists and notably by the late Professor Robert F. Hoxie, who wrote:

When it comes to the actual setting of base rates, practically no consideration is given (by scientific managers) to any theory of accuracy and justice. The rates are fixed almost universally with reference to the prevailing wage levels of the region. . . . Scientific methods *per se* have a tendency to shift workers into lower paid grades. . . . Most scientific managers are possessed of a naïve faith that in some mysterious way, competition, unhampered by the "unnatural" efforts of labor unions, works out a just adjustment of absolute and relative base rates. That is to say, scientific management in this connection accepts consciously or unconsciously, an abandoned theory of economists as a common sense proposition and practically on this basis rears its claims to scientific accuracy and justice in the establishment of wage levels.

When such statements are made by organized labor, they are set aside as the maunderings of ignorant and self-seeking labor agitators; when

they are made by trained economists, they strike blank amazement into the minds of efficiency engineers. Since wages are inexorably fixed by the "natural law of supply and demand" why make all this childish fuss about them! Among the guests of the Taylor Society was Professor Robert M. Haig of the Columbia University School of Business, who made a mild plea for economics as a science that might possibly have something to contribute to the problem of efficiency in industry. The sole response to this suggestion was from a member who leaped to the floor and cried with tense emotion:

Professor Haig has told us that efficiency engineers ought to study economics; I want to tell him that it would be better if economists devoted themselves to the study of scientific management.

This narrow professional insistence on the all-sufficiency of their science to solve not only the technical problems of machine production, but also the problems of industrial society, is primarily responsible for organized labor's conviction that the disguised object of scientific management is to destroy their unions, their power of collective bargaining and their dearly won rights as citizens in a democracy. It is unfortunate that Congress, in its readiness to meet the protests of labor, should have gone to the extent of excluding scientific management from government plants. Mr. Taylor and his followers have made a major contribution to civilization. Society cannot afford to have this contribution sacrificed to the arbitrary unwillingness of organized labor and of scientific managers to reconcile their differences in the public interest. Our greatest need in America to-day is a working agreement between democracy and science. It is incumbent upon scientific managers and organized labor alike to discover a basis of understanding.

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1916, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL

WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

The Religious Revival: I

I

ONE of the indisputable things about the war so far as Britain and France goes—and I have reason to believe that on a lesser scale things are similar in Italy—is that it has produced a very great volume of religious thought and feeling. About Russia in these matters we hear but little at the present time, but one guesses at a parallelism. People habitually religious have been stirred to new depths of reality and sincerity, and people are thinking of religion who never thought of religion before. But as I have already pointed out, thinking and feeling about a matter is of no permanent value unless something is *thought out*, unless there is a change of boundary or relationship, and it is an altogether different question to ask whether any definite change is resulting from this universal ferment. If it is not doing so, then the sleeper merely dreams a dream that he will forget again.

Now in no sort of general popular mental activity is there so much froth and waste as in religious excitements. This has been the case in all periods of religious revival. The number of people who are rather impressed, who for a few days or weeks take to reading their Bibles or going to a new place of worship or praying or fasting or being kind and unselfish, is always enormous in relation to the number whose lives are permanently changed. The effort needed if a contemporary is to blow off the froth, is always very considerable.

Among the froth that I would blow off is I think most of the tremendous efforts being made in England by the Anglican church to attract favorable attention to itself apropos of the war. I came back from my visit to the Somme battlefields to find the sylvan peace of Essex invaded by a number of ladies in blue dresses adorned with large white crosses, who, regardless of the present shortage of nurses, were visiting every home in the place on some mission of invitation whose nature remained obscure. So far as I was able to elucidate this mission, it was in the nature of a magic incantation; a satisfactory end of the war was to be brought about by convergent prayer and religious assiduities. The mission was shy of dealing with me personally, although as a lapsed communicant I should have thought myself a particularly hopeful field for Anglican effort, and it came to my wife and myself merely for our permission and countenance in an appeal to our domestic assistants. My wife consulted the household; it seemed very anxious to escape from that appeal,

and as I respect Christianity sufficiently to detest the identification of its services with magic processes, the mission retired—civilly repulsed. But the incident aroused an uneasy curiosity in my mind with regard to the general trend of Anglican teaching and Anglican activities at the present time. The trend of my impartial inquiries is to discover the church much more incoherent and much less religious—in any decent sense of the word—than I had supposed it to be.

Organization is the life of material and the death of mental and spiritual processes. There could be no more melancholy exemplification of this than the spectacle of the Anglican and Catholic churches at the present time, one using the tragic stresses of the war mainly for pew-rent toutting, and the other paralyzed by its Austrian and South-German connections from any clear utterance upon the moral issues of the war. Through the opening phases of the war the established church of England was inconspicuous; this is no longer the case, but it may be doubted whether the change is altogether to its advantage. To me this is a very great disappointment. I have always had a very high opinion of the intellectual value of the leading divines of both the Anglican and Catholic communions. The self-styled Intelligentsia of Great Britain is all too prone to sneer at their equipment; but I do not see how any impartial person can deny that Cardinal Vaughan is in mental energy, vigor of expression, richness of thought and variety of information fully the equal even of such an influential lay publicist as Mr. Horatio Bottomley. And one might search for a long time among prominent laymen to find the equal of the Bishop of London. Nevertheless it is impossible to conceal the impression of tawdriness that this latter gentleman's work as head of the National Mission has left upon my mind. Attired in khaki he has recently been preaching in the open air to the people of London upon Tower Hill, Piccadilly, and other conspicuous places. Obsessed as I am by the humanities, and impressed as I have always been by the inferiority of material to moral facts, I would willingly have exchanged the sight of two burning Zeppelins for this spectacle of ecclesiastical fervor. But as it is I am obliged to trust to newspaper reports and the descriptions of hearers and eye-witnesses. They leave but little doubt of the regrettable levity and superficiality of the Bishop's utterances.

We have a multitude of people chastened by losses, ennobled by a common effort, needing sup-