

Title	Theoretical excavation of the sociological problems in industrial society : American and German angles
Sub Title	
Author	Ishizaka, Iwao
Publisher	
Publication year	1971
Jtitle	Keio business review Vol.10, (1971.) ,p.49- 82
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	Only in an industry of the highest standing was it possible to demonstrate the existence of untouched human problems at depths far below the superficicals of current industrial organization- E. Mayo. "The deep-lying fact of ethos, being combined with daily events of business life, becomes the decisive element of class consciousness and antagonism"-G. Briefs.
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AA00260481-19710000-03919616

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

THEORETICAL EXCAVATION OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY—AMERICAN AND GERMAN ANGLES

by

Iwao Ishizaka

“Only in an industry of the highest standing was it possible to demonstrate the existence of untouched human problems at depths far below the superficials of current industrial organization”—E. Mayo.

“The deep-lying fact of ethos, being combined with daily events of business life, becomes the decisive element of class consciousness and antagonism”
—G. Briefs.

Foreword

Our current society is generally defined as the industrial-business-oriented society, and it may be said that today all sections of social science are essentially wrestling with problems surrounding it. When the term industrial-business society is spoken, the implication is that the society is organized predominantly on the base of giant industrial businesses and their activities, and the science dealing with the social structure and behavior of business as the major stage of study comprises “industrial sociology” and “Betriebssoziologie.” These two theories were founded between the first half of 1920s and the second half of 1930s respectively in America and Germany, and that quite independently. The American industrial sociology is linked with the name of E. Mayo while the German industrial sociology (Betriebssoziologie) with G. Briefs; the former as the theoretical start while the latter as the theoretical systematizer. The American theory, being encountered with World War II, remarkably displayed a social function in answering the supreme wartime requirement of expanding production capacity, and well established its position in the world of social science. The German theory was originally oriented to removing social unrestness and solving industrial disputes, with the flower of theorization blooming at Briefs, but just for this reason was subjected to oppression as the forced closure of its organ, *Institut für Betriebssoziologie und soziale Betriebslehre der technischen*

Hochschule zu Berlin in 1938 immediately before the Nazi political capitalism, connected with Ruhr heavy industry capital, disclosed its character of pillage.

International intercourses after War, both material and intellectual, naturally brought about influx into Germany of the industrial sociology developed in America. On the other hand the German Betriebssoziologie, which had been compelled to suffocation, gradually began to breath again. Of course these two theories flowed also into Japan, though with different weights. In a sense this was derived by the colonial color traditionally prevalent in the Japanese academic history, but more directly it was promoted by the postwar internationalism of capitalism (in both positive and negative senses). The importation of the industrial sociology into Germany had to be faced with some adverse wind on account of the familiar tradition of Betriebssoziologie, in contrast with the state in Japan where the influx took place raising few questions. In Germany there was exhibited a kind of confusion, different from in Japan. It was rather natural since historically there had been commonness of subject themes between the theories of two countries.

In Germany today views are divided into two, the one treating in the same sense the American and German theories, or more generally two terms of industrial sociology and Betriebssoziologie, the other wishing to distinguish them clearly. The latter intends to confine the scope of Betriebssoziologie to business-social organization (Betriebliche Sozialgebilde), its theoretical representative being L. H. Ad. Geck who was once G. Briefs's associated student.¹⁾ He divides Betriebssoziologie into general and special, saying that the general Betriebssoziologie has a broader scope than industrial sociology in that the former involves governmental administration, and the special Betriebssoziologie comes under a section of industrial sociology when it takes a form of Industrielle Betriebssoziologie. Again T. Pirker, S. Braun et al., define Betriebssoziologie as a partial science of industrial sociology—side by side with labor sociology or regional sociology—in their 686-page report on the study of workers' attitudes and organizations under the Mitbestimmungsgesetz, which they undertook in six blast furnace works, two rolling mills and two processing plants for three years being stimulated by positive researches in America.²⁾ On the contrary H. Schlesky³⁾ and R. Dahrendorf,⁴⁾ the representative theorists now, use the words of industrial sociology and Betriebssoziologie indiscriminately or jointly. H. Schlesky, however, thinks that Betriebssoziologie of prewar days limited its object of study too narrowly within the bound of business, and asserts that observation should be actively extended over relations between society and business or labor

1) L. H. Ad. Geck, "Industrie," *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*, 1955, p. 230.

2) T. Pirker, S. Braun, B. Lutz, F. Hammelrath, *Arbeiter, Management, Mitbestimmung*, 1955, p. 27. The definition shown here is Pirker's.

3) H. Schlesky, "Industrie- und Betriebssoziologie," *Soziologie*, ed. by Gehlen-Schlesky, pp. 159-203; H. Schlesky u. H. Böhr, *Die Aufgabe der Betriebssoziologie und der Arbeitswissenschaft*, 1954, pp. 7-40.

4) R. Dahrendorf, *Industrie- und Betriebssoziologie*, 1956, p. 11.

union. A still more unique view has been shown by L. V. Wiese, the greatest father of German sociology through prewar and postwar days. He says that today in America, France and Germany Betriebssoziologie is being discussed as a sector of economic sociology; sometimes the term of industrial sociology is used as if a new word; but in Germany it is an old thing; it is nothing more than the theoretical activities on social policy performed in Germany between 1871 and 1914; thus he judges.⁵⁾

Thus diversified standpoints have been expressed on industrial sociology and Betriebssoziologie even with formal aspects.⁶⁾ So we cannot receive the German Betriebssoziologie unconditionally, as was with the case of the American theory. For instance, H. Schlesky is of opposing view against importation of the American human-relations theory, which makes the core of American industrial sociology, for the reason that it is founded on the American society characterized by racial multiplicity whereas in Germany the trunk factory labor is charged on native workers.⁷⁾ (By the above-said report on the laborers' state under Mitbestimmung a particularity of German steel workers lies in their long service; a large portion of them were those servicing for more than twenty five years.) In view of such inconsistency of opinions in Germany around industrial and Betriebssoziologie, unconditional importation of the German theory, as was done with the American theory, would be useless for our intellectual advance. On the other hand even in America itself there are critical views on the American industrial sociology by scholars outside sociology; for example, Lasswell accuses that industrial sociology is a "well-fed cow" approach; it aims at levels of foreman mood; it pays no regard to those influences that latently govern laborers' fortune beyond their scope; it is a foreman-type viewpoint intending to fill their shops with satisfied workers who are obedient in daily affairs; it speaks nothing about laborers' weapons to defend themselves against monopolistic business concerns, that is, trade unions and other controlling organizations.⁸⁾

By the by our task is to see how scientifically has been carried out the excavation of the problems of business society. From this angle the writer shall contrastively consider the American industrial sociology and German Betriebssoziologie, by which their theoretical features will better be brought into relief. We shall take up E. Mayo as the theoretical founder in America and G. Briefs as the theoretical systematizer in Germany, and our problem is to inquire into

5) L. v. Wiese, *Soziologie*, 1954, pp. 45-6.

6) A well-arranged perspective on this problem is found in P. Atteslander, *Konflikt und Kooperation*, 1959, notably 1st and 2nd part.

7) H. Schlesky u. H. Böhr, op. cit., pp. 20-1.

8) H. D. Lasswell, *Power and Personality*, 1948, p. 1943.

the heterogeneity between them taking account of the homogeneity.⁹⁾

Chapter 1. American Angle on Industrial Society (E. Mayo)

Section 1. Meaning of "Industrial Civilization" as a Human and Social Problems

It is well known that for E. Mayo industrial civilization itself involved no problems. Nevertheless our analysis of his theory must first be directed to what he calls "industrial civilization." This is not because of the *objective* order that his human and social problems made a debut by the stage of industrial civilization. Rather it is because to clarify E. Mayo's posture toward industrial civilization highlights his angle toward "men and society," the central phase of his thought. In other words, the features of Mayo's human-social problems can be taken out by utilizing as clue his *Theory on Industrial Civilization*.

Now the problem for E. Mayo was not inquiry itself into the structural features of industrial civilization. Industrial civilization was looked to be essential as a figure to be accused, and as such its relevant problems were discussed. The focus of prosecution was on the destruction of social cooperativeness. This angle, however, it not so lucid as it appears in the following two points. First, although it had primarily been figured in his problem sense, at first the main concern was placed on the destruction of "human balance," in whose context was born the issue of the ruin of human cooperativeness, which later came to be emphasized. Second, why the weighty significance of this social cooperativeness? In spite of the strong value-accent E. Mayo attached to it, the substance of such accent is not fully clear.

The shift in his problem sense in the context of the first point is exhibited in the presentation of *Human Problems*¹⁾ and subsequently of *Social Problems*,²⁾ through which a delicate and essential change was seen in treating industrial civilization, though unconsciously. As to the second point, which relates to the first point, although in the *Social Problems* "social skills" for social cooperativeness is repeatedly asserted, the reason for emphasizing social cooperativeness is not clearly described. In any way, while he maintains that industrial civilization has a relation with the collapse of human balance or the social disorganization, it is not always consistent to what an extent it is responsible, or can be

9) Japanese literature is too abundant to list here, notably including Dr. K. Odaka's work. M. Fueki's book presents a criticism to the human-relations theory. A pertinent historical review of the American and German theories is found in R. Hamajima, "*Amerika Rōdō-Shakaigaku no Seiritsu to Hatten*" (*Foundation and Development of American Labor Sociology*) and "*Doitsu Rōdō-Shakaigaku no Kihonteki Seikaku*" (*Basic Characters of German Labor Sociology*) compiled in K. Odaka ed., *Rōdō-Shakaigaku*, 1952. As a recent publication K. Ichihara's *Seidoku Keiei Shakaigaku* (German Industrial Sociology), 1966, touches new trends.

1) E. Mayo, *The Human Problems of An Industrial Civilization*, 1933.

2) E. Mayo, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, 1945.

responsible, in other words, whether it raises human-social problems intrinsically, or it merely lies in the background as a condition given.

Anyhow, E. Mayo's letter of prosecution about industrial civilization involved two points as follows:

- 1) Is some experience which might be described as an experience of personal futility a common incident of industrial organization for work?
- 2) Does life in a modern industrial city, in some unrealized way, predispose workers to obsessive response?³⁾

As to the first point E. Mayo says, "There was no great evidence of that "deadening" effect of machine minding or routine work which literary critics commonly⁴⁾ suppose to be the chief problem of a mechanical age." Thus the relation between laborers' helpless sentiment and industrial labor system is grasped by E. Mayo, physiologically and psychologically, as a paralytic effect worked by mechanization. His physiological study on "fatigue and monotony" corresponds with this phase of problem. The conclusions drawn from it were that in modern industries there is no remarkable collapse of organic functions of laborer, and hence if there are industrial obstacles that might bring about such collapse and render laborers impossible to maintain effort of working, they would be those relevant to mental responses to outer environments, not to organic functions of living body.⁵⁾ Thus the first issue of prosecution is negated, and the industrial labor system disappears from E. Mayo's problem sense.

By contrast he definitely affirms the second point, that is, the relation of urban life to laborers' obsessive responses, which implies the issue of psychological responses to outer environments. He says what destroy personal balance or deprives mental resistance to unfavorable work conditions "must be attributed to the developing social disorganization and consequent anomie which is in these days typical of living conditions in or near any great industrial centre."⁶⁾ He established this viewpoint by the interview at the Hawthorne plant. Thereby his new finding was that "the problems of human equilibrium and effort are *not completely contained within the area controlled by factory organization and executive policy.*"⁷⁾ (italic writer's). That is to say, on the one hand he grasps laborers' discontents as loss of personal balance or mental resistance, while on the other hand overrides inside-business labor-management issues by searching the spring of this problem outside of factory or business.

In this way by the negation of the first point the problem of modern labor system in the sense of mechanization disappears while by the affirmation of the second point the problem of business realm or factory system is placed outside of the framework of the problem. Accordingly is ignored the issue of

3) *Human Problems*, p. 114.

4) *Ibid.*, p. 118.

5) *Ibid.*, p. 22.

6) *Ibid.*, p. 172.

7) *Ibid.*, p. 172.

inside-business labor-management relations, the primary phase where laborers' discontents emerge. Thus industrial society with business concerns as its essential components vanishes, leaving society in general behind as simple human relations. And laborers, who should represent the substantial emblem of human being (Menschenbild) under industrial society, are cut off from machines they operate and reborn as abstract human individuals deprived of fatigue blouse. In other words, here both the human problems of primitive society and the labor problems of giant industrial society are dealt with on the same plane. This is the reason why cultural anthropology, which has developed with human problems of primitive society as its major theme, serves as an important assistant player in the stage of industrial sociology. That mechanized labor and wage system, that is, the characteristics of modern capitalist society, have been taken away from E. Mayo's problem scope, in other words, the loss of "historical property of society" corresponds with the "abstract view of human beings" with no historical property; this we must keep in mind as the essential logical feature of Mayo's theory, hence the American industrial sociology.

The basic thesis of E. Mayo is that the inner collapse of human beings can be reduced to social confusions typical of life in big industrial cities. Such confusions are reflected in the frequent occurrences of suicide, offense, crime and so on. He mentions the following four points as the cause: (1) rapid industrial and economic development, (2) high-rate labor mobility in boom period, (3) immigration and (4) defects of education system.⁸⁾ Among these the most serious is of course the rapid industrial development. The modern industrial system has made a rapid progress on the base of new science and technology, yet at the same time its systematic logicism has come to govern society, through which the most important aspect of humanity has been ruined deriving social confusions.

By E. Mayo the industrial system is a system based on an assumption that "every participant will be a devotee of systematic economics and a rigid logic."⁹⁾ He calls this assumption a "blackboard logic," whose carriers are scientists and engineers, and as these men "dominate industrial system"¹⁰⁾ the possibility of social cooperation diminishes. It is because such an assumption is unpracticable and has never been realized in America, Soviet or any other place in human history. By this view it seems to us that the intensification of rationalism and the systematism of industrial civilization, and scientists and engineers carrying these as well, are responsible for the loss of humanity and the social confusions.

However, E. Mayo has written in his *Foreword* to a book of Roethlisberger, his assistant, "in the strict sense, it cannot be said to lie in science, or mechanics, or economics, or industrial organization. The work that has been done, and

8) *Ibid.*, p. 142-3.

9) *Ibid.*, p. 180.

10) *Ibid.*, p. 181.

is being done, in these areas, though necessarily limited, is admirable. But, beyond all this, some essential determinant of order in human affairs has been left out of account in two centuries of rapid development."¹¹⁾ In other words, the responsibility of industrial system and its development for the humanity collapse is explicitly negated. This conforms with his second work *The Social Problems* in which he divides industrial system into system of labor and that of life for many people,¹²⁾ and says the former should be improved in technological efficiency; the latter is a system of human cooperation, for whose advance social skills are immature; this immaturity as against technology makes the cause of inner collapse.¹³⁾

Thus in the process of development of E. Mayo's theory industrial civilization changed its position from the accused to the praise-worthy. That is, at first it was regarded as ignoring laborers' sentiment and destroying humanity by reason of its rationalism, but later the weight of problem was shifted to the backwardness of skills for social combination that cannot follow up the progress of industrial civilization. At the same time the value-accent on social cooperation was strongly pushed forward, yet the ground of such accent was wholly out of his consciousness, as was the grasp of issues underlying industrial civilization. In this point lies the reason for the criticism of "managers Ideologie," that is, the cooperation he advocates is merely that from a managerial standpoint.¹⁴⁾ This, however, may be said rather an unintended result in view of his problem sense mentioned above. Anyhow, here we must clearly realize for our discussion below that E. Mayo's attitude to industrial civilization changed from criticism to esteem; that he himself could not understand the significance which such a change gave to his theoretical development; that this unconsciousness in problem sense resulted in "history-less view of society" and "society-less abstract view of human beings"; and that such social-human emblem underlies his logical equipment of "balance and its collapse" of men and society under industrial civilization. In the following analysis we shall omit description of the Hawthorne experiment, whose details have been given by Prof. Sakurai's work.¹⁵⁾

Section 2. Meaning of "Men" in the Human Problems of Industrial Civilization

In the above we have seen that Mayo's interest began with human problems under industrial civilization, that next it shifted to social problems, that thereby unique human emblem and social emblem were born on which his theory was

11) F. J. Roethlisberger, *Management and Morale*, 1941, Foreword XVI.

12) *op. cit.*, *The Social Problems*, p. 54.

13) *Ibid.*, p. 116.

14) For example, H. L. Sheppard, "The Treatment in Managerial Sociology," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2.

15) N. Sakurai, *Ningen-Kankei to Keieisha (Human Relations and Top Management)*, 1961.

developed, that a weight change was seen from human to social problems, and lastly that his methodical diagram of inquiry was "balance and its collapse." In the following we shall dig up the features of his human emblem. It will first clarify the relation of Mayo to the now thumb-marked human relations theory, and secondly cast light on his standpoint that somewhat lacks lucidness.

Primarily the "men" in his human problems was formulated as a physiological emblem of human beings. The Hawthorne experiment was originated as a study on the relation between factory lighting and output undertaken at a Western Electric plant in three years 1924 to 26. This study was a failure in the sense that no relation was discovered between the two. It had a meaning, however, because it disclosed that fatigue, i.e., collapse of balance in organic functions, rarely occurs in industry. This result has been theoretically supported by various researches on industrial fatigue. They taught that insofar as regarding the relation between physical labor and temperature-perspiration-salt, i.e., organic replacement of men, in the modern industry there is no failure. Fatigue in this sense raises no problem; laborers are working on a "steady state." The said steady state means that "in the case of labor at a constant pace and not so hard a very stable state of physical functions is seen, that is, the functions of respiration, circulation, etc. sustain a steady tone."¹⁾ Physiology teaches us that men can continue labor only while maintaining inner balance among various variable elements which jointly constrain-human organic body. Accordingly, provided there is no failure in the physiological sense in labor, any obstacle that impedes continuance of work, or decline in efficiency, must be considered to be not of organ-functional nature but be derived from outer conditions. Hence the problem of industrial fatigue does not concern mere physiological functions; it ought to be considered in connection with both outer conditions and individual persons, that is, as an expression of multiple factors. Thus Mayo grasped fatigue from the aspect of physiological balance and, finding incompleteness of such study, arrived at the issue of balance between outer conditions and individuals. And further reached the discovery of human psychology responding to outer conditions, and the formulation of the "human emblem as psychological existence." This purports to his study of "monotony" in the modern industry.

In monotonous repetitious work occasional rests give psychological, rather than physiological, effects. This formation of psychological human emblem further develops to the problem that the decline of ability relevant to monotony varies between individuals as well as by environments, in his words, "The work remains the same; it is the general situation and the individual emotional changes that way."²⁾ If thus monotony is differently felt by different individuals or environments, we cannot regard "the worker as a performer of a repetition process."³⁾

1) *Human Problems*, p. 24.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 38.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 37.

Hence we must leave a mechanical view on men and study laborers as "the entire personality of people," i.e., the human being. Herein is established "sentiment."⁴⁾ As the decline of efficiency governed by outer conditions is called fatigue, so is monotony a means of explaining human positions under various conditions. Hence monotony as an industrial labor problem must be taken to represent some collapse of balance that obstacles continuance of work, as is fatigue. In this context its relation with outer conditions and personal differentials is essential, as has been explained already.

Thus, beginning with the physiological human emblem in fatigue study, via the finding of the psychological human emblem in monotony study, gradually came to front the angle of the intertwinement of personal differentials (i.e., personal inner elements) and outer conditions, in other words, balance between individual persons and outer environments and its collapse. The human emblem underlying E. Mayo is stamped as the intertwinement of personality and outer conditions, and the phase of such intertwinement is just the sentiment. It need not now to mention that for E. Mayo the practical issue concerning this human emblem consists in the stabilization of sentiment well balanced with outer conditions, or the formation of balanced men of this sense.

This formation of his human emblem was relevant to the Hawthorne experiment as follows. The first finding was that, in the relation between manipulation of various work conditions and output in a relay assembly plant, the highest efficiency was marked at the twelfth test period when all conditions were put back to the start and, as a conclusion to be drawn from this, what is definitely essential is not improvement of individual conditions but of environment as the whole. Furthermore, in order to confirm this point again, following a stage of mica research room, interview with all employees numbering twenty-one thousand persons was conducted to investigate the nature of whole environment viewed from the side of them. Its objective was the like-or-dislike sentiment about the actual state and method of management, as a precondition for producing a new environment. The result of interview disclosed much uncertainty of individual statements. Letting alone criticisms to material conditions, those about personnel affairs were uncertain and unreliable. Here it was found that individuals display diversified responses to conditions given or their changes, in other words, "sentiment" as the phase of response was discovered and established. Then the relation between such uncertainty and sentiment was inquired, by which existence of biased explanations and responses was recognized. From this emerged in concrete the angle of "collapse of inner balance" and resultant weak resistance power to environments, that is, collapse of outer balance. There was born the "psychopathological human emblem" the biased sentiment as fear-complex thinking.

Thus the result of interview was the abstraction and foundation of the

4) *Ibid.*, p. 37.

human world of sentiment as a mental dockyard that produces complaints and discontents. The next step was to analyse these complaints and discontents of laborers as biased sentiment or obsessive thinking. For this study E. Mayo borrowed from French psychopathology (P. Janet) its analytical theory on obsessive attitude and from German mental pathology (S. Freud) its genetics theory. By P. Janet the characteristic of obsession lies in the inability of proper response to immediate situations, especially social conditions. By the interview at the Hawthorne plant, however, such "invalids" numbered only a little more than ten persons among more than twenty thousand employees. Then the issue turned to how the numerous biased interpretations and responses, contrastive to such few invalids, should be explained, in other words, what the cause of "a tendency to exaggeration and distortion in statements made by sufficiently normal people."⁵⁾ On this point the French theory taught that (1) in case of tension even a true invalid can perform an important task but after performance the ill condition comes back again; (2) even a man with no symptoms falls into obsession if he experiences his inaptitude many times; these facts tell that a man becomes obsession if his mental balance with his surroundings is impaired. In other words, inability to adapt oneself to environments drives him to exaggerated and biased views on himself as well as other men. And S. Freud grasped obsession as annoyance of memory on past unfortunate experiences on which sentiment could not find proper social expression, and taught that personal misadaptation of a man means misadaptation in the family he was brought up and further that of the family itself to social life.⁶⁾ In short, nervous disease is social misadaptation, hence a social problem. From this Freud's theory Mayo picked up the importance of personal history and social environment and founded his problem sense of the inter-connection between "one's personality, personal history, industrial condition and social environment." In a word it is the foundation of "industrial-sociological human emblem."

In this way E. Mayo came to his realization that laborers are not simple isolated individuals in job places, but are men living and laboring in group under complicated environments such as relations among themselves, those to managing persons and jobs as well as "firm's business lines. The core of the problem is that laborers' obsession is not an issue concerning intrinsic irrationality of individuals; rather it rests on the entire environment including men, work and business line. Herein lies the theoretical significance of the direct inspection undertaken as the last phase of experiment. However, as S. Freud has sought personal misadaptation in family misadaptation and further the latter in social misadaptation, so also E. Mayo, whose theory is grounded on S. Freud, has to throw off laborers' misadaptation in job place into environmental misadaptation in business, and further into whole-social misadaptation

5) *Ibid.*, p. 112-3.

6) *Ibid.*, p. 132.

in industrial civilization. That is, the transfer of problem to the outside of business area described in the preceding chapter has to arise here again as logical inevitability. In correspondence with S. Freud's development of individual→family→society, by E. Mayo the problem of collapsed personal balance goes away from business and factory and is directly connected with social balance. There the angle of social human-emblem and social responses of individuals comes to stage.

E. Mayo classifies individuals' responses to society into three: (1) logical responses based on the ability of independent judgment, (2) non-logical responses directed straight to social norms, and (3) irrational responses which arise in face of new situations to which customary social norms are unadaptable. Among these E. Mayo emphasises (2) non-logical responses. Irrational responses (3) are confusions the constituent members of society show when they meet new facts they cannot cope with behavior conforming to customary norms, and in this sense a state of social misadaptation. By E. Mayo such a state is exhibited just in the relation of rapid progress of modern industrial technology to old social norms. The sense of impotence of society members is the product of social crevices emerging between the two. Should the problem of inner balance of individuals be thus that of Social balance and response, and the human problem of industrial civilization be a social problem, then our question would be as follows. What is the society by E. Mayo, and can be?

Section 3. Meaning of "Society" in the Problems of Industrial Civilization

E. Mayo's emblem of society consists of two elements fundamentally, formed on the base of two opposite properties of men. The one is that men have by nature will to enter cooperative relations.¹⁾ The other is that they have inherent mind to fear and hate without reason those groups of different character or to which they do not belong.²⁾ However, since the latter point presumes a certain group the former, the will to enter cooperation, should be regarded as the basic factor of his view of society. Accordingly for him society is a cooperative system prior to being anything else.³⁾ He says in a civilized society such cooperation is founded on mutual understanding and will to cooperative work whereas in a primitive society cooperative systems are born from fear and force even if there is will.⁴⁾ Although there lies such difference of principle of organization between civilized and primitive society, society is firstly a system of cooperation. From this standpoint he is opposed to the so-called atomistic view of isolated men, and to the basic view presumed in economics that men have nature of behavior for self-conservation and self-interest. He holds that it is only in the case of personal

1) *Social Problems*, pp. 113-123.

2) *Ibid.*

3) E. Mayo, *The Political Problem of Industrial Civilization*, 1947, p. 6.

4) *Ibid.*

crisis that men make self-interest pursuits separately; in normal cases they show property of cooperation.

On this substantive theory of society, he divides society systems by two principles. The one is an established society, the other an adaptive society.⁵⁾ The established society is one whose system is well known to constituent members, forming blood and flesh for every member. Therein various patterns of life—politics, economy, occupation—are reproduced amid stabilized daily routine of life. It is a society in which each person can easily maintain his daily life of reproduction by responding like the so-called conditioned reflex, i.e., without clear consciousness of his social status or role. Hence the keynote in his labor or job is to succeed to already-established skills. It is a society that was most typically represented by the apprentice system of medieval handicraft. By contrast the society of industrial civilization is characterized by scientific progress, technological innovation, application of new sciences and techniques to production and business system, labor migration relevant to these, qualitative and quantitative changes in labor, fluctuations of social strata, in short, constant fluidity in technical process as well as in human relation. The principle constructing such a society is “change and adaptation.” In this sense the adaptive society is spoken.

However, E. Mayo speaks of this adaptive society as the should-be principle of future society, not with respect to the actual figure of present society. He looks the present society rather as a confused society as is shown in his remark “if a sepcialist group develops scientific knowledge and applies it to technical practice at too high a speed for general social adjustment to the change, one effect is to transform non-logical social organization into irrational disorganization.”⁶⁾ He explained this by the concept of anomie. The anomie is by his own words “the planlessness in living which in one form or other relates itself to the disorganization of the communal life”⁷⁾ and “the weakened collective beliefs and customs” as the weapons of social integration.⁸⁾ It is loss of social functions due to confusion of social structures. Suicide, crime and acquisitiveness are included in the symptoms of anomie. Such a state of anomie—non-logical control power of traditional social norms has been broken by industrial civilization, constituent members of society have lost sight of individual's role as its member, individual's creed about group combination, i.e., ability of cooperative work, is being discipiated—this is what E. Mayo regarded as the characteristic feature of modern society.

Thus on the one hand industrial civilization is grasped with its aspect of rationalization, while on the other hand the view of men is grounded on the idea that they do not always think logically but are strongly affected by sentiment

5) *Social Problems*, p. 11.

6) *Human Problems*, p. 165.

7) Roethlisberger, *op. cit.*, Foreword. XIX.

8) *Human Problems*, p. 133.

and furthermore they have intrinsically will to cooperate; from these the view follows that in the modern society two currents of systematization are whirling. The one is the phase of "rational systematization" brought about by industrial technology and the other is that of "non-logical cooperative systematization" in the sense of men dominated by instinctive emotion of cooperation. These two phases have been given formulation as formal and informal organization by Roethlisberger, White et al., as is well known. When E. Mayo asserts the correspondence between the progress and completion in technical and rational systematization and the backwardness and powerlessness in skills for cooperative systematization, and says that the promotion of social skills is the way to save social anomie, his fundamental thesis about human sentiment and esteem of cooperation inevitably turns to mean conformity with industrial-technical rationalization, at least conclusively if not intentionally. In the earlier period his concern was placed on the dissolution of humanity but it was shifted to developing social skills that can cope with the advance of rational systematization of industrial civilization. We have already mentioned that such social skills means ability of grasping and organizing human preference of cooperation. And he expected birth of new-type administrators. Such administrators must be "able to understand the human-social facts for what they actually are, unfettered by his own emotion or prejudice. He cannot achieve this ability except by careful training—a training that must include knowledge of the relevant technical skills, of systematic ordering of operations, and of the organization of cooperation."⁹⁾ It was just the formation of "new administrator emblem" to meet the requirements of mass production system which industrial technology of monopoly stage was going to develop on the base of Fordism.

Anyhow, he rejected the philosophy of society that takes it as the grouping of fragmental individuals, that is, the idea of isolated individuals or of atomistic society. His philosophy of society, however, is merely conglomeration of presumed individual men; conglomeration as a simple human relation cut off from historical terms. When modern sociology speaks of collective organization such as state, nation, company, family or army, what are in mind are certain processes of social activities to be conducted by individuals—either actual or supposed as such—; there can be no "acting" collective personality such as state, nation, etc.¹⁰⁾ In this respect E. Mayo's view is not out of line from the fundamental viewpoint of modern sociology. However, in E. Mayo we cannot find the "sociological self-consciousness" of Max Weber; M. Weber says, while regarding it as the most basic category to look social groups as multiple relations of individual men's behavior, unitary treatment of such groups as social organization in concept is not only an effective method of observation for economics, political science

9) *Social Problems*, p. 122.

10) M. Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 1948, 3rd ed.

or jurisprudence but also is unignorable for sociology.¹¹⁾

Due to lack of such sociological self-consciousness in E. Mayo, two characteristics were attached to his theory, one in contents, another in idea.

The characteristic in contents is that, while industrial civilization is presumed in his philosophy of taking society as multiple relations of human behavior, thereby was lost the angle that industrial civilization is a specific historical product being carried by specific social structure, and accordingly observation did not appear on the hierarchy or the relation of governing—dependency between superior and inferior which accompanies to every social organization. This may be said to have defined the later course of American industrial sociology. That is to say, although in American theory the problem of loyalty of employees to top-management in the business society has been given an important position, at best it has been substituted for a problem of supervisor's level and hence analysis on the nature of managerial authority has been missed.

The second characteristic about idea is this. His "social system" was the group of individual men abstracted away from social-class relations and deprived of historical dressings. This is in itself not a mistake as a sociological viewpoint, as has been mentioned already. However, few considerations were paid on why such a viewpoint can form a unique category of sociology, and on the sociological significance of the collective idea that regards business as "group organizational body." Such lack of methodological self-reflection caused the connection that, while the backwardness of skills of social conglomeration was emphasized, therein unconsciously governed the value accent of social cooperation. In his emphasis on the non-logical responses of individuals the idea to weave individuals into social groups is dominant. However, the reason for the importance of cooperation lies at most in the point that otherwise social anomie would arise. The value idea of cooperation does not come out straight from anomie. Social anomie is but social conditions to impede or foster certain objectives of human activities. If so, the idea of cooperation must be born in a different dimension. E. Mayo's social problems were nothing but human collectivization required by industrial civilization—the significance of such requirement itself being not questioned—and the only problem was that individuals, i.e., laborers, are not smoothly entered into groups in factory in the psychological sense. In other words, the angle of social value that took up industrial civilization was implicitly changed into the argument on social function. This is the fundamental feature of E. Mayo's social theory.

Section 4. E. Mayo's Position in the Social Problems in Industry

Today no one can deny the existence of the scientific field called industrial sociology. It is again undeniable that the formation of industrial sociology

11) *Ibid.*

started with the name of E. Mayo. Although the criticism is plausible that his intention and study program cannot be called sociology in a proper sense because as a matter of principle sociological observation and treatment are lacking, it is unquestionable that the result of his study, especially the Hawthorne experiment, made a definite contribution to the formation of industrial sociology,¹⁾ even if the result of Hawthorne experiment was unexpected one.²⁾ Speaking generally it is to be positively appreciated that a moment was given by him to open eyes on sociological implications inherent in the world of industrial labor, for instance, the complexity of motives to labor or the relation between group labor and personal behavior.³⁾ Again it may be said important that E. Mayo's viewpoint to take account of exterior social environments beyond the bounds of men, work, business policy, etc., disclosed the issue of relations with regional communities which later has become a particularity of American industrial sociology. Of course in this context the merits of Warner and Low should be esteemed,⁴⁾ yet it must be acknowledged that the so-called sociological compensations theory started from E. Mayo's theory.⁵⁾

However, there are many points to be criticized. The largest fault lies in the point that social problems of labor-management dispute are solved into human psychological relations.⁶⁾ H. L. Sheppard, who put most comprehensive and systematic criticisms on American industrial sociology, suggested a point that E. Mayo confined observation to inside-factory as if in vacuum shutting out the outside world.⁷⁾ By E. Mayo, however, the main concern was the society of industrial civilization beyond the scope of business, as we have seen. Rather the most serious difficulty lies in his grasp of laborers' discontents as mental biases (psychopathological defaults. On this point an appreciably proper criticism has been placed by G. Friedmann, the representative theorist of French industrial sociology.⁸⁾ He says, E. Mayo explains discontent, resistance and antagonism against the social structure in business as "irrationality" in laborers' sentiment. These responses of laborers, however, are sometimes rather rational if viewed from their relationship with social conditions, i.e., relations with social groups to which they belong or by which they are affected. This derives from the sociological complexity of firm or business. Individual laborers belong not only

-
- 1) J. B. Knox, *The Sociology of Industrial Relations*, 1955, pp. 4-5.
 - 2) R. Dahrendorf, *Industrie-und Betriebssoziologie*, 1956, pp. 34-5.
 - 3) D. C. Miller and W. H. Form, *Industrial Sociology*, 1951, pp. 72-3; R. M. Lepsius, "Industrie und Betrieb," *Soziologie*, 1958, p. 126.
 - 4) W. L. Warner and J. O. Low, *The Social System of a Modern Factory*, 1957.
 - 5) W. H. Form and D. C. Miller, *Industry, Labour, and Community*, 1960, pp. 654-6.
 - 6) Dahrendorf, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
 - 7) H. L. Sheppard, "Approaches to Conflict in American Industrial Sociology," *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 4, pp. 326-7.
 - 8) G. Friedmann, *Industrial Sociology*, 1955, pp. 322-4. Of course a similar criticism was made by Sheppard too.

to diversified groups within firm but also still larger outside organizations such as trade union, social class or nation, in which they play particular roles according to occupational skills and degrees of assimilation. Laborers' attitude is defined by these socio-economic factors whose influences do not stop at the gate of factory. Thus G. Friedmann asserts. Such ignorance of the relation between socio-economic factors and laborers may be a decisive point to be criticized, the more so because E. Mayo discusses the balance with outer society. This fault derives logically from his abstract society-emblem of simple cooperative system neglecting specific, historical socio-economic structures that carry industrial civilization, and on the other hand is attributable to the fact that the Hawthorne experiment group are almost entirely natural scientists, members of social science being only those studying human life in continents or islands far remote from the modern industrial society.

Originally America is a country of low-rate unionization. By the study of Simiand,⁹⁾ in Britain and France already before the First World War 50 percent of male workers were organized, while in America the rate was as low as 20 percent by 1920 (35 percent in Germany). Since then it further declined, becoming lowest immediately before New Deal. Table 1 shows the move of membership of the American Federation of Labour and 2 comparison of unionization rate by countries shown in the work of Ross and Hartmann.

Table 1. Membership of American Federation of Labour

		(in 1000 persons)	
1897	50	1929	340
1904	200	1932	300
1917	300	1933	297
1920	500	1938	800
1922	400		

Source: A. J. Youngson Brown, *The American Economy, 1860~1940*, 1951, p. 227

As is seen in Table 2 the rates of northern European countries are relatively high, while America's rate is near to the lowest. By contrast the number of labor disputes, is smallest in northern Europe and largest in America, for instance, 14 cases in Denmark and 2,000 in America, in 1935, and 22 in Norway and 4,320 in America 1955.¹⁰⁾ Anyhow, the fact that at the period of Hawthorne experiment American labor movement was at the ebb due to the misapplication of the Antitrust Law and to the divergent strike regulations by states hid the problems of laborer and trade union from E. Mayo's angle. The American society had been faced with the serious issue of social fluidity caused by the increase

9) F. Simiand, *Cours d'economie Politique*, 2^e année, 1928-1929, p. 491.

10) A. M. Ross and P. T. Hartman, *Changing Patterns of Industrial Conflict*, 1960, pp. 194-5.

Table 2. Unionization Rate of Non-agricultural Workers (%)

	Denmark	Polland	U.K.	Norway	Sweden		
1927							
1929		29.3	29.3		32.3		
1930		35.2	30.5	21.2	35.1		
1932	47.5	49.6	29.3		46.2		
1933	46.2	52.9	27.9		47.0		
1935	40.9	48.4	28.9	32.7	43.8		
1939	42.3	41.9	32.3	46.3	51.0		
1945	59.0		44.8	51.3	55.3		
1955	56.3	41.1	46.8	57.2	62.4		
	France	Japan	U.S.	Australia	Finland	South America	
1927		2.7	11.3		18.2	16.4	
1929		2.8	10.3	55.5	16.8	8.5	
1930	17.7	3.3	10.8	56.6	4.1	8.8	
1932	16.7	3.6	12.7	61.6	5.3	8.9	
1933	16.7	3.4	12.0	55.5	5.0	8.2	
1935	21.0	3.1	13.1	48.7	7.0	9.1	
1937	43.2		24.8	52.9	12.1	12.7	
1945	84.9		30.5	62.7	46.3	17.3	
1955	24.6				28.3		

Source: A. M. Ross and P. T. Hartmann, *Changing Patterns of Industrial Conflict*, 1960, p. 203.

in Asian immigrants since the end of last century, prohibitions of Asian laborers by the act of 1917, increasing south-European immigrants, racial confusion (in 1920 foreign-born population accounted for 36 percent in New York), and religious complexity. These facts made obstacles to labor unionization,¹¹⁾ and at the same time provided the ground of the human-relations theory. By H. Schlesky, German sociologist, this particular social structure of America was the mother's body of E. Mayo's industrial sociology.¹²⁾ On the other hand America in the 1920s was one of the countries with the highest frequency of labor dispute. Already in 1911 a committee on industrial relations, and the idea of labor relations or industrial relations, side by side with personnel management, came to the fore in the 120s and 30s, being oriented to social policies. In view of this social ground the Hawthorne experiment undertaken by Western Electric may be said appropriate in a social and historical sense. However, the experiment group, including E. Mayo, did not intend to realize the existence of such problem on account of their problem sense lacking in social and historical angle. This resulted in the above-said criticism of "managers" Ideologie. This

11) A. J. Youngson, *The American Economy 1860-1940*, 1951.

12) H. Schlesky, *Aufgaben und Grenzen der Betriebssoziologie*, 1954, pp. 20-1.

is natural even if his thesis on industrial civilization had been established several years before the experiment and merely fortified by it.¹³⁾

Chapter 2. German Angle on Business Society (G. Briefs)

Section 1. Starting Point of G. Briefs

The problem G. Briefs took up was in a word pursuit of the relation between actual process of modern big business and social issue of business. The initial point of problem was pessimism on social policy.¹⁾ That is to say, it originated from the feeling of powerless social policy that the more it was developed, the more was it faced with violent labor movement and social unrestness. By G. Briefs the social background of this pessimism was first the influence of Marxism, by which laborers tended to make socialist-wise explanations on their discontents and tensions, and satisfactions which social policy measures might have materialized were counteracted over a wide range. Secondly protective regulations and security measures did not permeate business as the area of social and psychological problem.²⁾ Accordingly social policy either remained to function as behind-the-front Red Cross for the labor problems of the 1880s, or followed a line to deal with social needy positions, which were the mental spring of social unrestness, only subjectively, emotionally or superficially, in other words, from the outside and diagrammatically.

These facts underlying G. Brief's start tell that on the one hand there were psychological grounds among the labor classes to be readily affected by Marxist-wise explanation of discontents, and on the other hand recognition was generally insufficient on business as the socio-psychological mother's body that prepares and brew up such mental grounds. Such self-reflection means an approach to business as a social problem, and an idea that those problems that can be solved within the bound of business should be so treated therein.³⁾ The problem phase that G. Briefs met with such sense was as follows. The cause of problem does not lie in the wage system itself; the problem is that laborers' "*deep-lying fact of ethos*, being combined with daily events of business life, proves to be the decisive element of class consciousness and antagonism" (italics writer's).⁴⁾ We have already seen that this deep-lying human problem was by E. Mayo that of sentiment. It is interesting to compare this italicized part with the following words of E. Mayo. "Only in an industry of the highest standing was it possible to demonstrate the existence of untouched human problems at depths far below

13) R. Bendix, *Work and Authority in Industry*, 1956, p. 316; E. Mayo, *Democracy and Freedom, An Essay in Social Logic*, 1919, p. 37.

1) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben in der Industrie*, 1934, Vorwort.

2) *ibid.*, Vorwort.

3) *ibid.*, Vorwort.

4) G. Briefs, "Betriebssoziologie," *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. by Vierkandt, 1931, p. 164.

the superficials of current industrial organization.”⁵⁾ By E. Mayo laborers’ discontents were grasped as “mental psychological bias,” while by G. Briefs this ethical ethos was taken as “Marxist-wise bias.”

We feel a big rolling of history in the fact that these two approaches to the laborers’ socio-physiological phenomena concealed within modern big business were undertaken almost simultaneously and independently. And at the same time our intellectual sociological concern is drawn by the fact that the one approach, being naturalism (participants to the Hawthorne experiment were physiologists and other natural scientists) and a social-function theory ignoring history, was able to utilize its theoretical fruits for increasing productive capacity during the war, while the other was destroyed by Nazi because of its social-system argument. By the by, our problem now is as follows. What are the said daily matters of business life which, being combined with laborers’ deep-sitting ethos, constitute the decisive element of class consciousness and antagonism? And next what is the way of such connection as brings about class consciousness? We will disentangle these problems raised by G. Briefs from three aspects: (1) actual process of modern big business, (2) basic principle of human connection in big business, and (3) problem of social phenomena in big business. Of course the said modern big business is nothing but the Briefs’s edition of E. Mayo’s industrial civilization.

Section 2. The Actual Process of Modern Big Business

G. Briefs’s eyes cast on the modern big business caught first the wage system as a capitalist system, and second the mechanized mass production system. The problem was that, in the actual economic and social process which these two moments in close combination produce, laborers miss personal (or moral) relations with other men and at the same time lose personal sense to their own labor. The factual ground of economy and society shot through by the two moments is by G. Briefs the modern big business, and the concept representing the fact that laborers fail to have connections with other people and to find the significance of their occupation is “alienation.” His discussion is centered on these two points, as will be described in the below.

G. Briefs takes the modern big business as the capitalistic wage relation. In the pre-capitalism age producers were either owners of production means working for their own profits, or unfree laborers owning no production means and working for other person’s profits. In the subsequent capitalism laborers, the direct producers, are connected with personal freedom, non-ownership of production means, and non-profit.¹⁾ This is what is generally called the wage system, on which business constructs “combination of mass people who operate regular, repetitious and continuous movements, being subject to no other duties

5) E. Mayo, *Human Problems*, p. 100–101.

1) G. Briefs, “Betriebssoziologie”, p. 44.

than contract clauses, and guaranteed free move between business."²⁾

The process in which traditional communal life is dissolved, as described above, and big-scale groups of population are organized from the standpoint of business³⁾ is just the actual process of capitalist economy. Here the business standpoint aims at "production of goods and technical supply of service for the sustenance of human life in line with the idea of economy, that is, deliberate disposition of limited means of satisfying wants."⁴⁾ When this business aim is combined with joint life and behavior of men oriented to unitary objects, there emerges the business organization as a particular social unit. And this, combined with the actual development of capitalism, has brought about unification of large-scale human groups, as mentioned above. Hence by G. Briefs the actual state of capitalism is characterized by "voluminous pile-up of men and non-relevant existence of numerous individual persons accompanying with mass production."⁵⁾

The mass production system has generated big groups of homogeneous laborers as well as mammoth businesses. Inherent relations based on production stage have receded, production phases have been dissolved into sub-phases of similar type, and operational connections of men carrying production have disappeared, although there remain material connections of part products. Especially where the work is operation in group using specialized machines, human connections by production process itself (called endopone Beziehung by L. Hellpach) or by the sameness of work room (exopone Beziehung)⁶⁾ become faint. In place of smooth and fluent connections of cooperating men, there appears simple pile-up of delivery of specialized labor. This massive pile-up of men and non-relevant coexistence of individuals in labor makes the characteristic of modern factory. That affluent pattern of humane group is lost, being replaced by simple mechanical coexistence.

Then, as the second characteristic, there arises mechanization of management discipline. Instead of personal direction and management, a material series of operation slip, letter, convet conveyor, signal, measure instrument, standard work, etc. is developed between direction and operation. Or else, purely specialized divisions enter which control throughout from office to detailed end, that is, the birth of Taylor system or functional master.⁷⁾

Such rationalization process of business in conformity with mass production, side by side with the mechanization of discipline, reduces personal approach. Laborers are connected only with partial work, and can neither look nor know over the whole, being simply left in the overall current. This, G. Briefs says,

2) *Ibid.*, p. 36.

3) G. Briefs, "Sozialform und Sozialgeist der Gegenwart," *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. by A. Vierkandt, 1931, p. 164.

4) G. Briefs, "Betriebssoziologie," p. 36.

5) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 72-3.

6) L. Hellpach, *Gruppenfabriken*, 1922; G. Briefs, "Betriebssoziologie," p. 41.

7) G. Briefs, "Betriebssoziologie," p. 40.

makes them inevitably lose occupational self-consciousness. On this point E. Mayo has noticed that "the work a man does represents his most important function in the society; but unless there is some sort of integral social background to his life, he cannot even assign a value to his work."⁸⁾ Thus amid the actual process of modern business laborers lose *personal connections with other men* and *personal sense on their labor* as well.

Section 3. Basic Principles of Social Combination in the Modern Big Business

In the accompany with the growth of massive human labor developed by big business and mass production, there arises the problem of combination and discipline among men employed in business. Prior to the examination of the issues involved in such combination, we must inquire into its basic principles. This is the essential point of problem for G. Briefs and hence most clearly represents his attitude toward the social problem of modern business. He grasps these principles in the form of "alienation," and considers this dividing into four categories of (1) alienation in ownership, (2) that in labor, (3) that in work place and (4) that in cooperative workers. Among these he places weight on (1) and (2).

(1) Alienation in Ownership (Eigentumsverfremdung)

G. Briefs asserts that the fact of laborers' alienation in ownership is not accidental but fatal since it inevitably extends over the whole scale.¹⁾ Modern machinery and equipment have increasingly become of large scale and accordingly investment has enormously swelled up, being too expensive for laborers to own. Such emancipation of laborers from ownership of indispensable production means is in itself relevant to the core of modern industry. Apart from where technical conditions for such process are lacking and high labor-intensity prevails, the technological status of big business makes this alienation process an imperative order. Business and work means are held in the hands of employers, and hence factually as well as legally emerges the so-called business patriarchy (Herr in Haus), by which laborers alienate themselves in the sense that their need of dependency on business derives merely for the reason of subsistence. Thus in the modern business there is an encounter of ownership linked with patriarchy on the one hand and heteronomy linked with modern labor relations on the other.²⁾

This ownership alienation, so to speak heteronomy of wage system, further dissolves personal combination of laborers with job and through this bears their anti-economic attitude. Generally speaking ownership or property gives its owners the base of personality and social appreciation by cultivation of particular sentiment. Robinson-wise ownership is alien to personality or social status. In social life, however, ownership constitutes the ground for personal autonomy

8) E. Mayo, *Human Problems*, p. 136.

1) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 18.

2) G. Briefs, "Betriebssoziologie," p. 44.

and the substantial condition of social behavior. Medieval craftsmen grew as humanity amidst tools or instruments they own, and at the same time directly realized economic logicity. In the modern business world machines or instruments not under laborers' ownership can provide neither the mental base of personality nor the condition for social promotion. True laborers' daily passion to production means resemble employers' attitude, but it is almost nil for laborers' status in social terms. At the same time the scale of big business lies outside the bound of laborers' perspective. They are concerned only with specific and technical aspects of business individually and particularly; the problem of economic-ness of entire business, if important, is irrelevant to their experiences, and hence appears as if it were an exterior order requiring realization from the outside. That is to say, subjection to managerial will is forced. Employees see meanings as entire business no more, but only employers' one-sided free will and arbitrariness. Hence they do not accept post conversion or discharge arising from economic need of business. In this way dissolution between job, ownership and personal combination diminishes laborers' personality, economic sense and ability. Briefs's problem here is that a mood surrounding employees has a nature to cause frictions readily within business, being theoretically equipped with the surplus value doctrine.³⁾

(2) Alienation in labor (*Arbeitsverfremdung*)

The introduction of mass production system has led first to the adoption in a wide range of mechanical labor in place of human labor, and then narrowed the phase left to the latter, confining it to work of removing irrational elements impeding production. The ground of this labor mechanization was primarily specialization by division of labor, which cut off laborers from spiritual connection with the whole. They can see only partial work presented before their eyes; as regards the whole production they can grasp only as idea through abstract observation. Of course such ability of abstract thinking is provided only for a limited portion of laborers. In this situation⁴⁾ (M. Halbwachs said that personal and autonomous portion of laborers' work is becoming more and more limited) it is natural that labor willingness shrinks, flowing to monotony. We inevitably see joy and pride of labor diminishing, from independent craftsmen to skilled workers and then to unskilled workers. Indeed "labor has ceased to absorb what is creative in human beings."⁵⁾

(3) Alienation in work place (*Verfremdung des Werkraums*)

This alienation in work place is connected with ownership alienation and labor alienation. This connection often makes one overlook the natural fact that work place, where laborers work daily and spend the essential part of life, has unnegligible importance on their spirit and character. Yet the work places of

3) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 22.

4) M. Halbwachs, *Esquisse D'une Psychologie Des Classe Sociales*, 1955.

5) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 26.

modern industrial laborers are built merely from the standpoint of material technology. Laborers have their work places in other people's factory which are constructed primarily for machinery, not for men. In factory construction priority is placed on technical and rational viewpoint, consideration on worker's sentiment being neglected, which invites inner as well as outer unpleasantness of laborers' or increase it. When laborers above exploitation by employers, the ground of such feeling is the limitation put on what is instinctive and personal caused by the separation between work and living places; thus Briefs considers.⁶⁾

(4) Isolation in cooperative workers (Verfremdung der betrieblichen Mitarbeiterschaft)

Isolation in people working cooperatively in business is unescapably increased by mass production. Such relationship as between medieval master and apprentice cannot exist. Joint working may invite disputes but can produce amity and friendship also. However, "in mass-group labor the relation becomes fluid."⁷⁾ The lack of friendship means not only the loss of animity but also a possibility of oppositive relations. Here G. Briefs points out a situation that constitutes the American condition of the human-relations theory. That is to say, where immigrant laborers with different culture are involved, understanding between domestic and foreign workers meets linguistic obstacles leading to antagonism. The same situation holds also as regards the difference of native place and social class. This bears common consciousness among some part of workers but often disputes with other groups of different social structure. True this issue is not so important as that concerning general employees, but in an atmosphere prone to dispute isolation will be more intensified and expanded. The strongest one of such effect is seen with the case of division among employees by trade union or political party.⁸⁾

Thus G. Briefs grasped the basic principles of human combination within business today under the idea of alienation. This idea was not so clearly expressed in his first essay on "Betriebssoziologie" in Vierkandt's *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*. It took systematic form as described here in his second essay, and major work, *Betriebsführung*, 1934. His idea, however, has been criticized by modern German theorists of Betriebssoziologie in that, although his theoretical system is freed from Marxist illusion of class-less society, it is still constrained by Marxism and hence cannot reach realistic recognition of social life in business.⁹⁾

However, we must appreciate his clear realization of the issue of sentiment which laborers under modern big business hold or can hold. In the context of the first point of ownership alienation he took out laborers' mentality liable to Marxian thought of class struggle or the surplus value doctrine. By the second

6) *Ibid.*, pp. 25-6.

7) *Ibid.*, p. 27.

8) *Ibid.*, p. 28.

R. Dahrendorf, *Industrie-und Betriebssoziologie*, 1962, p. 30; R. M. Lepsius, "Industrie und Betrieb," *Soziologie*, ed. by R. König, 1958, p. 125.

labor alienation, the shrinkage of labor will was explained. By the third workplace alienation, the existence of laborers' instinctive and human desires was sharply picked up. And the fourth, isolation in cooperating workers, touched the problem initially presented by the Hawthorne experiment itself. That is, when E. Mayo began the experiment the nationality of employees of the plant counted more than sixty. This complexed racial composition is just the American mother's body that beared the human-relations theory that is intended to formulate smooth relation of transmission by the logic of understanding. Thus for G. Briefs the focal phase of problem was "laborers' original and direct affect to labor of his own."¹⁰ Briefs said elsewhere "harmful business atmosphere produces biased explanations on managerial directives which are proper in themselves."¹¹ The difference between E. Mayo and G. Briefs is only that E. Mayo grasped mental positions of laborers as biases in the sense of cultural anthropology (an American science) or psychopathology, while G. Briefs as biases of alienation, that is, under the traditional German concept of social system. Both were alike faced with the problem of mentality or sentiment lying deep within laborers.

Section 4. Social Phenomena in the Modern Big Business

In the above we have seen that by G. Briefs the combined effect of actual process and human-combination principle has derived the loss of human relations, produced frictions in business, and makes the source of infection to Marxism that widens frictions. Next we must examine the daily relations of business life, which G. Briefs points out, born on such business process and human combination, in other words, social phenomena in business.

(1) Superior-inferior-even status in business organization

The problems here comprise hierarchy, discipline, obedience, dependency and so forth, in short, what is generally called the social structure in business organization. In terms of sociological concept it is the superior-inferior-even relation (Überordnung, Unterordnung, Nebenordnung). The concept of even-order holds an important position for our study. In every business the relation of command and obedience, or superior and inferior, arises.¹⁾ Especially in big business the processes of enormous expansion of enterprising, formation of homogeneous big groups, narrowing of administrator's authority of decision and limitation of worker's autonomy, all being combined with the mechanization of discipline, produce the relation of superior-inferior-even order in the form of command and obedience, or direction and execution, or sometimes Lechtape's vertical relation.²⁾ True in this sense we might say with G. Briefs "hierarchy

10) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 35.

11) *Ibid.*, p. 76.

1) G. Briefs, "Betriebssoziologie," p. 40.

2) H. Lechtape, "Soziale Prozesse im industriellen Betrieb," *Kölner Vierteljahrschrift für Soziologie*, Jahrg., VIII, 1929-30.

belongs to the entity of big business.”³⁾ Hence it is in no way strange that the problem of hierarchy makes still, or rather increasingly, the major theme of Betriebssoziology today.

Nevertheless the relation of even order is essential, too. G. Briefs says as follows. In the ladder of hierarchy the horizontal even order exists as against the said vertical order. It is a group subject to the same object or directive. And again within this horizontal group there is born a vertical relation. Differences are naturally produced according to occupational ability, esteem on job, responsibility on work, prestige of posts, service length, irrational human factors, etc.⁴⁾ So the even-order in a proper sense is formed within a very narrow bound. Herein is pointed out in a germ form the relation expressed as status, prestige or Sociometrie, which are important conceptual tools of modern industrial sociology. For Furthermore he says “under the cover of apparent even-order in hierarchy, there is a superior-inferior relation which is often not formalized but exists only as a fact, and yet is more steady,”⁵⁾ explaining clearly the existence and importance of informal relations as against formal ones. Laborers intend to formulate combination with fellow workers in the same room despite many obstacles. It is supported by the consciousness of common fortune, and generates the feeling of solidarity which may lead to a group body consciously organized.⁶⁾

By paying attention to this informal-group relation—as a modern concept—G. Briefs noticed also that management discipline must pay regard to laborers’ inner attitude.⁷⁾ And by levelling up this to a sense that “to lead men is to understand men,”⁸⁾ he met the problem of outer (i.e., social) balance. From this was born the twin conceptual equipment of the series of organic discipline, inner authority and organic dependency and that of mechanical discipline, exterior authority and unorganic authority, and further on this equipment the concept of business atmosphere was constructed.

(2) Problem of organic discipline

The actual process of big business formulates hierarchy, its entity, as a system of material institutions, and deprives personal relations as a human group body. Correspondingly management discipline loses its inherent moral relations (recognition of superior’s authority of direction). That is to say, the recognition of directive authority connected with personality disappears, being replaced by obedience to mechanism. And material requirements for operation become decisive. The bigger the business, the more objective and diagrammatic becomes the discipline, appearing with unchangeable, absolute effectiveness. Then of course superior persons also must be subject to discipline, yet it is usually,

3) G. Briefs, *ibid.*, p. 39; do, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 41.

4) G. Briefs, “Betriebssoziologie,” p. 40.

5) G. Briefs, “Betriebssoziologie,” p. 41; ditto, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 53.

6) *Ibid.*, p. 74.

7) *Ibid.*, p. 84.

8) *Ibid.*

say, self-discipline and hence its meanings are obvious. Laborers, however, are often lacking in preconditional knowledges for understanding directives. Furthermore, occasionally on the side of managers sympathy toward laborers is insufficient. Here arises the problem of organic discipline.

Primarily the implication of management discipline is to arrange cooperating individuals in accordance with the material requirement of operation and make them obedient to factory system and business plan, in accordance with categories of directive-execution and command-obedience. In this connection sometimes execution of directive is required simply on the base of subordinate status of workers. G. Briefs calls it "mechanical discipline" (mechanische Disziplin).⁹⁾ Under such discipline managers give directives according to what they think right at the moment regardless of the way of direction. Workers are scolded if they are not obedient. Mechanical discipline in such a sense exists still in the underdeveloped stage of capitalism. As contrasted to this, G. Briefs calls such discipline as he thinks indispensable to big business of today "organic discipline."¹⁰⁾ This denotes discipline based on an intention to weave workers' free will into execution of directives. The primary prerequisite of organic discipline is personal element of managers. And with it should be combined a policy of business to select and promote men of aptitude. By this, "social balance" is created within business.¹¹⁾

Organic discipline requires that excessive tension in directives be avoided, unnecessary orders be evaded, and in the execution of directives workers be given freedom to the extent compatible to the requirement of business. So what is necessary and decisive here is "consideration on laborers' inner attitude" (innere Einstellung).¹²⁾ Directives mean switching of one's will to other men. Sometimes it will become necessary for those who give directives to curve mental facts of the inferiors in order to weave them into an aim. A prerequisite for this is understanding of the inferiors' psychology and justifiable human contact. As E. Smith has put, "to lead men is to understand them."¹³⁾ And the understanding of workers' psychology is "realization of the fact of ownership and labor-alienation, the fact or constrained personal mentality by business climate, and other general facts moving workers. It is the ultimate base, and any appeals or frictions in a concrete place can be removed only when their causes are realized; they cannot be satisfied by any concrete words (konkrete Äusserungsform).¹⁴⁾ This last phrase "cannot be satisfied..." corresponds with E. Mayo's remark "The fact is that those who refer to such matters as imponderable are themselves ignorant of methods by which they can systematically set

9) *Ibid.*

10) *Ibid.*

11) *Ibid.*

12) *Ibid.*, p. 84.

13) E. Smith, *Psychologie für Vorgesetzte*, 1930, p. 1.

14) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 84.

about the task of improving the cooperative morale in working department, and are irked by any implication that this is a proper duty of the administrator. Such men therefore rely upon a confident, or even jolly, manner, upon knowing everyone's first name and using it, upon expedients such as saying "Good morning" to everyone they meet."¹⁵⁾ Righteous managers are instinctively aware of this. Anyhow, by G. Briefs, such organic discipline originates from profound considerations on business and human relations, and never can be born diagrammatically. "The decisive matter is whether the problem lying here is known or not."¹⁶⁾

The grasp and remark by G. Briefs of the existence of such social problem in business are just what was emphasized by E. Mayo as the human issues under industrial civilization which statesmen and businessmen must first know. Thus by G. Briefs as well by E. Mayo, frictions accompanying the fact of dependency can be solved if laborers' desire for self-respect is cautiously dealt with. And laborers find what they should do in affirming discipline, and feel stability in fulfilling their individual tasks.¹⁷⁾

(3) Authority and dependency

For the foundation of organic discipline naturally the way of selecting managers must be considered. Formerly technical ability has been too much emphasized, the ability of human leadership being neglected. Under organic discipline, however, the ability of emotional influence on the inferiors' psychology should make the base of selection.¹⁸⁾ For managers, mental liveliness, ability of organization, and character to go with workers are more important than handicraft-wise ability.¹⁹⁾ So the ways of using manager's authority should pose a problem. When managerial authority is pushed forward simply by force of manager's status backed by the authority of whole business, it is named by G. Briefs as "outer authority" (äussere Autorität).²⁰⁾ Such outer authority cannot have directive effectiveness in face of labor isolation. By contrast where intercourse with laborers is so well maintained that directive authority seems to stem from managers themselves, such is called "inner authority" (innere Autorität) or personal (or moral) authority.²¹⁾ When laborers follow managers not by reason of their status but on account of respect to personal and professional ability, e.g., inner authority, laborers' dependency goes beyond a forced relation and becomes organic dependency in the sense of mutual complement. G. Briefs calls such complementary dependency, as seen among family members, "organic dependency" (organische Abhängigkeit).²²⁾ Contrastively such relation of force

15) Mayo, *Social Problems*, p. 118-119.

16) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung Betriebsleben*, p. 84.

17) *Ibid.*, pp. 84-5.

18) *Ibid.*, p. 79.

19) G. Briefs, "*Betriebssoziologie*," p. 68.

20) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 68.

21) *Ibid.*, p. 68.

22) *Ibid.*, p. 55.

as typically seen between slave and master, namely dependency by outer oppression, is made unorganic dependency (unorganische Abhängigkeit).²³⁾

Then, can any economic mutuality exist in the modern wage system, that is, between wage-earner and business object? G. Briefs holds that no such mutuality exist in principle. Since firms are diminishing in numbers by concentration, opportunities are limited for unemployed workers to find a new job in the same enterprise group. This is, so to speak, emergence of new factory slaves due to closed labor market produced by big business.²⁴⁾ Furthermore, there are several objective moments which by themselves enforce systematization of one-sided dependency of laborers. First, modern technology, which concentrate numerous laborers in individual firms, is apt to be connected with labor-and-work place-alienation, and hence laborers are turned to means of business, their human dignity being neglected. Secondly, by ownership alienation the objective ground of dependency is not realized by laborers, and so arbitrary imagination readily governs them. Third, laborers have disconformity with modern business which supports orderliness and opinions of society, because of their biological and mental feeling of self-despising. The fourth is existence of those laborers who have above-average ability yet cannot make it respond to business or manager, in other words, discrepancy between degree of dependency and gifted ability, which fosters unorganic sentiment. The fifth is the case where increased dependency on business welfare facilities such as housing or lodging turns these to extra benefits that may promote business superiority and new constraints. Of course this is a problem of balance between benefit and constraint; it is alike possible that fulfilment of employee services dissolve existing unorganic sentiment.

Anyhow, through the substantial and attendant conditions of modern business as described above, laborers' dependency on business comes to carry a character that may easily generate mentality of resistance and friction.²⁵⁾ Especially when, in addition to these moments, managers' attitudes rely on outer authority as background, laborers' unorganic dependency is intensified still more. So it becomes an inevitable task for business to establish organic dependency by means of well-established welfare facilities, managers' inner authority and organic discipline. To G. Briefs this means also formulating inner and social balance of laborers, and the way to "Betriebliche Sozialpolitik" which serves to diminish the infection source to Marxism and social unrestness.

Section 5. Focus of the Social Phenomena in the Big Business

(Problems for G. Briefs)

The actual process of modern business techniques of functionalization and specialization, being correlated with underlying wage system, produces the

23) *Ibid.*, p. 56.

24) *Ibid.*, p. 57.

25) *Ibid.*, pp. 58-60.

management principles of material discipline, outer authority and unorganic dependency. By them laborers' inner balance is ruined, social balance within business organization is dissolved, and business organization as a melting spot social unrestness is framed. Such is the thesis of G. Briefs we have considered above.

It is said that medieval people of economy grew up along with the growth of humanity in general. Human spirit matured absorbing soul amid human relations, while at the same time constituting the labor process of apprentice—craftsman-master in the master's workshop. Spiritual maturity was at the same time occupational maturity. By contrast the modern mechanized and specialized labor retains only a little trace of what is human. It is said that H. Ford, for example, analyzed its in-plant work into some eight thousand parts,¹⁾ which tells that a worker's operation is confined to details and simplified to typical work. In abnormal work also he must be subject to rules and manager's directives, with personal experiences or skills increasingly diminishing their phases to function. Accordingly laborers' efficiency curve declines as they grow older and economic ability becomes inferior to younger workers. So, "the prevalent wage system does no more conform with the rhythm of self-development of what is human in laborers, rather opposes to it. This inevitably reacts on their appreciation on business and brings about their discontents both inside and outside of it."²⁾

It is not only as regards agedness that the rhythm of self-development collapses in face of the actual of big business. Functionalism and specialization confine the use of human ability merely to its small part, and occupational labor is not connected with full potentiality of laborers. Thus the inner balance of laborers is destroyed.³⁾ This is because human potentiality endeavors to find a well-balanced and harmoniously connected expression. Forced loss of this balance endangers pleasure of labor and entails discontents to social conditions.⁴⁾ Further, social promotion of laborers is almost closed, being constrained by ownership alienation and intensified by the qualification system. If promotion is possible, it is at most limited to foreman class, which deserves almost nil in big business. This again fosters the atmosphere to revolution. Independent enterprise is all the more difficult. True it may not be a rare case to attain promotion by finding jobs in some economic organization, trade union, political party, social-political institution and so on. For the activities in these fields, however, particular social thoughts are required which must be limited to particular people. Thus most of general laborers cannot find any appropriate form of activity, even if having above-average quality. Their ability, if any, cannot

1) Exactly 7,882 parts. See H. Ford, *My Life and Work*, 1923.

2) Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 37.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 39.

4) *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

be developed, rather is forced to shrink. Accordingly they are impressed a blame as if they were worthless creatures with little contribution to social progress. Or else, they become agitators of social unrestness as if fuels piled up in many places of gigantic production which may readily come to activity.

Thus they substantially destroy social balance both inside and outside of business.⁵⁾ G. Briefs says this is the more so when awkward treatment of human affairs—which is primarily to be evaded—is added to material management of organization.⁶⁾ He intended to dissolve harmful atmosphere which by itself might lead to biased interpretations of proper managerial directives by medium of his conceptual equipment of organic discipline—inner authority—organic dependency. It is because the actual, concrete process within business, or actual human relation, produces a certain mental content,⁷⁾ and this atmosphere is a product of social dynamic in business and at the same time the socio-psychological mother's body of dynamic in the whole society.

Section 6. Homogeneity and Heterogeneity between E. Mayo and G. Briefs

(1) Homogeneity

The problems which E. Mayo took up in connection with industrial civilization and G. Briefs with actual processes of modern business were alike human and social issues in the industrial society. Simultaneously yet quite independently they threw the involved problems on the stage of scientific study through the common angle of human inner and outer balances, and their collapse. Their knives were similarly worked—by their own words—on the facts underlying inner depth of men, namely the world of sentiment, and grasped laborers' discontents as biases in the emotional and mental world, respectively as obsession and alienation. The collapse of inner balance of men or laborers was not simply taken as individual's psychology, but was based on the problem sense that it is directly related with social unrestness and confusion, in other words, collapse of social balance. Thus E. Mayo put forth the "logic of understanding," which should realize and deal with nonlogical emotions, that is, confusions and biases in social responses that surpass logicity. As if corresponding to E. Mayo, G. Briefs also set as his theoretical axis the need of grasping original and direct sentiment, in other words, inner attitudes of laborers who are moved by various facts of alienation. Hence the criticism, which appears to say that G. Briefs remained at formal grasp of social process of business neglecting its social structure,¹⁾ may be said incorrect if this means that he did not know the existence of the so-called informal group. We have already seen G. Briefs's remark that in business hierarchy superior-inferior relation is formed among

5) *Ibid.*, p. 40.

6) *Ibid.*

7) *Ibid.*, p. 74.

1) For instance, R. M. Lepius, "Industrie und Betrieb," *Soziologie* ed. by R. Köning, p. 125.

even-status employees, but below shall make some additions. For this will illuminate the course of arriving at different theoretical results between E. Mayo and G. Briefs despite the commonness of subject.

G. Briefs explains clearly the establishment of informal relations in connection with the formation of business climate. In deciding some common matters, an inclination is born among employees to shape a leader according to gifts of individuals. General employees are lacking in courage to undertake leadership or in outlook toward a best disposal possible. This is expressed as a mood of indifference among them. So they are satisfied with fellows who make decisions in place of them. Whatever the form, factually leadership is formed always. Men charged with such leadership may be of distinguished human gifts, but anyhow employees' appreciation on business depends on them. They can have special power by giving advice to fellow employees about important matters inside and outside of business and make them feel reliable. However, in business they are hardly above common workers since they have no function of substantial importance to employees. The function G. Briefs mentions here may be understood as formal one in business. And G. Briefs says such leaders are not apparently distinguished among fellow workers because they are neither materially pushed up nor are possessing any particular means to fortify their position. They are always exposed to criticism by fellow workers and replaced by competitors whenever necessary, and "this is the more so because formality is completely lacking." Thus he points out the existence of informal relation.²⁾

So we can fully agree with H. Stirn's words that G. Briefs has reasonable recognition on the significance of informal group in relation with the formation of common-interest consciousness is group work.³⁾ Nevertheless it must also be realized that he did not attempt further systematic pursuit on such group phenomena. As to this reason, however, we cannot so readily accept H. Stirn's remark "it is not due to the weak empirical nature of his study but attributable to his view that such relation can never exist because of the orderliness inherent in modern business."⁴⁾ We think rather that the reason rests on G. Briefs's attitude to the problem, that is to say, although he had proper evaluation on the phenomenon of informal group, his theoretical start existed primarily in the social-political pessimism; he was exclusively devoted to investigation of society as the mental dock of social unrestness, and strived for excavation of inherent laws of modern business that inevitably reproduce the combustibility of such unrestness.

So G. Briefs sought his phase of inquiry in the emotional fact of individual laborers as the source of infection to Marxism. In other words, G. Briefs arrived

2) G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, pp. 79-80.

3) H. Stirn, "Die kleine Gruppe in der deutschen Soziologie," *Kölnerzeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozial-Psychologie*, 1955, 7 Jahrg., Heft 4, p. 59.

4) *Ibid.*

at human problems from social problems while E. Mayo discovered social problems within human problems. E. Mayo, from his problem posture to attain smooth harmonization with the systematization of group labor which industrial civilization required, received the fact of laborers' discontents—which he did not fail to grasp—as being relevant to their inner desires around group labor, found the heavy significance of informal group phenomenon therein, and pursued it systematically. Hence, to speak basically, it is apt to invite errors to divide business structure simply into formal and informal organizations and put them on the same line, as is often seen today. Informal group or organization was discussed insofar as it has relation with the problem of formal group as has been expressed by the words of T. N. Whitehead, scholar of E. Mayo's school, "the social contour *within* formal group is the determinant of the group's will of labor,"⁵⁾ or by F. Roethlisberger's remark "Individuals in their associations with one another build up personal relations. . . . They come together in informal social groups within the formal framework of the company."⁶⁾ (italic writer's)

(2) Heterogeneity

Anyhow we have seen that both E. Mayo and G. Briefs were faced with a common phase of problems. E. Mayo's problem of industrial civilization was given by G. Briefs the expression of the actual process of modern big business, that is, the particular process beginning at certain period of modern society. It was a problem of the age when cooperative labor—the reverse side of the division of labor—i.e., the principle of organization, began to embrace society and human life with its gigantic tentacles.⁷⁾ It was a problem of the historic period when mass laborers began to be organized as social groups everywhere in factories with huge equipment and rows of single-purpose machines. They were no more crowds of gentle bees but groups of men with will and ability to express their attitudes about discontents on labor conditions, if any, by organized actions, whether by formal labor unions or as moral decline in shops. Thereby E. Mayo desired birth of "new emblem of managers" with social skills, and G. Briefs expected formation of organic discipline by managers with inner authority.

True their desire and expectation may be said a product of powerful dynamic of human history, exceeding the exhibition of their personal intellectual activities. This dynamic we name industrialization today, and that E. Mayo and G. Briefs

5) T. N. Whitehead, *Leadership in A Free Society*, 1936, Introduction, p. 8.

6) F. Roethlisberger, *Management and Morale*, 1941, p. 122.

7) In the society of today with advanced organization, the concept of anomie, the axis of E. Mayo's theory, has changed its contents. By E. Mayo it was a "transitional" concept representing discrepancies between developed industrial civilization and old social system. In the modern sociology it has been turned to a "structural" concept referring social confusions caused by discrepancies between objectives of life and social means that underlie every society. This theory is represented by R. K. Merton. See R. K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 1949, Pt. 11, ch. 4, 5.

were faced with problems of the same condition—simultaneously in different countries and without knowing each other—may be the expression of such historical horizon. It must be noticed, however, that we cannot solve everything into industrialization, a universal phenomenon of human history.

It is undeniable that some universal problem (that is, overriding political or economic system) is involved in industrialization in the sense of mechanized mass production since concentration of mass laborers is accompanied by particular problems. However, the appearance and solution of such problems are much diversified by whether business, where industrialization is undertaken, is managed as the place of fulfilling people's wants on economic life or exists as the place of pursuing private interests. The start of G. Briefs was that "business is the combustion point of social relations,"⁸⁾ and "class movements and struggles are given characteristics by social facts within business which are rooted in business facts and extended over the whole field of society,"⁹⁾ in short a class problem. And the said business facts denoted the combination of wage system and mechanized mass production. Accordingly within the problem sense of G. Briefs was always whirling the philosophy that "the formulation of movements or organizations aiming at social revolution or reform is worked a decisive impact by the social structure in business,"¹⁰⁾ and hence he was unable to go into pursuit of the problems of industrial civilization in general, i.e., outside factory, and further functional social theory for cooperative organization which industrial civilization requires, as E. Mayo did it. Thus he looked business as the birth place of class problems, and hence took up managers as the carrier of organic discipline in business. It was natural for him, however, that businessmen, who "are the party to labor contract side by side with laborers and constitute a social stratum of particular sense in capitalism,"¹¹⁾ are responsible for social problems, in other words, they are the bearer of social formula and spirit. His standpoint was that, if business makes a potential front of class antagonism and a place of social tension, those social problems that are soluable within business should be dealt with therein, as cited before. This is what G. Briefs called the "new social policy" of business for the solution of business social problems, hence class antagonism. The word "new" came from his recognition that customary social policies of state were unable to show actual effects for the class struggle problem due to general formality and exterior regulations on business. In this sense the above-cited remark represents the idea of social policies to be enforced by businessmen themselves who are the partner of labor contract, in other words, "Betriebliche Sozialpolitik," "business social policies." This idea may be said a common feature of the theories of Betriebliche Sozialpolitik formed in this

8) G. Briefs, "Betriebssoziologie," p. 51.

9) *Ibid.*

10) G. Briefs, *Sozialform und Sozialgeist der Gegenwart*, p. 166.

11) *Ibid.*

period, along with his recognition of the sociological problems in business.

In concluding our analysis on G. Briefs, we must say a word about the above-referred economic-system solution of problems. This will still more clarify the difference between E. Mayo and G. Briefs, illuminate G. Briefs's problem sense.

G. Briefs considered that the strongest resistance to "alienation" in big business was arising in the Soviet Union. He thought as follows. Especially after NEP, new leaders have insight into management organization as well as conditions beyond it; they have passion in overriding economic difficulties; they hold steady foothold among workers as party cells or union leaders, though being executives; they are minority elite yet are intending to be harmonious with the masses; though they stand on the side of management, they maintain mutual sympathy and confidence with laborers through similarity in life habits. At the same time they direct workers' concern toward production and increase their pride on business results through criticism by production meeting or wall paper. G. Briefs says that such laborers' pride on business results is a matter impossible in the modern business world,¹²⁾ (which should be read as capitalism). It is, he says, Soviet's Soziale Betriebspolitik, and unable to import into other countries; it is a component of the unitary political system of Soviet government.¹³⁾

From the above remarks we can suppose G. Briefs's philosophy that firstly the problems attached to big business under mass production have universality beyond economic system, secondly the front phase of such problem lies in the attitude and behavior of managers who hold contact with laborers, and thirdly despite the universality of problems, their appearances or ways and directions of solution are definitely different between political systems. At the same time, apart from his appreciation on the Soviet system, his remarkable concern on the social problems in business, and the significance of the role he gave to the "Betriebliche Sozialpolitik" for the solution of business social problems under capitalism, may be said to suggest clearly that his problem sense was not limited within the bound of inside-business problems.

12) Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, p. 103.

13) As regards the problems in Soviet see G. Briefs, *Betriebsführung und Betriebsleben*, pp. 101-5.