

erative work, and the fact that management is an art, calling for leadership, cooperation and human skill as much as for a broad basis of science—because I believe that, without an understanding of these two ideas, one cannot fully appreciate the progress which the art of management is making in this country. Owing to circumstances which would take far too long to discuss in this paper—circumstances arising out of the exceptional mentality of Labor, the form in which the social consciousness has developed, and, still more fundamentally, the particular temperament of Britishers generally—the developments of recent years in industrial management have been and are still rather in the two directions indicated above than in the direction of what one may call "material" science. There is far more being done, more thought being applied to, firstly making management efficient as distinct from making the worker efficient, and secondly, the human relations of industry, than to either the application of the physical sciences to industry or the study of operative processes, as exemplified by the work of Taylor, Gilbreth and many others in America. The progressive British employer is more impressed with the fact that management is a synthetic art than with the equally true fact that it is founded on analytical study. His attention is, therefore, much more drawn to problems of higher organization on the one hand and problems of human association on the other than to the broad basis of operative efficiency on which these must be founded. One finds, therefore, much thought and experiment applied to wage systems, profit-sharing schemes, the question of unemployment, the application of Christian principles to industry, copartnership, industrial welfare, Works Councils, etc., arising from his concern in the problems of human leadership and association. One finds again considerable attention given to such questions as the relation of production to sales, the duties of the higher officials, the training of executives, the organization of control, the use of committees, etc., arising from his concern in the efficiency of his managerial organization. But one finds slow progress in the use of time-study, motion study, the application of science to materials, or the standardization of operative processes. (Progress there is, of course—probably more than one hears of—but it is not moving with the same assurance in this as in other directions.)

The comments of Mr. Herbert N. Casson—the writer above whose name the *Ledger* of Philadelphia inscribed such startling headlines—may perhaps appear more comprehensible in the light of what has been said. He writes:

Naturally, the British business world is packed full of exceptions and contradictions. Everywhere you go, you will see patches and makeshifts. There is virtually no such thing in England as "scientific management" outside of half a dozen exceptional firms.

An Englishman rejects the scientific method, not because he fails to appreciate its advantages, but because he values still more highly the human element in his business. He does not regard his workers as automatic and never will. He will break up any scheme of improvement to make it fit a foreman or a sales manager.

He does not put output first. He cannot understand mass production. He persists in making exceptions that destroy the efficiency of any plan of increased production.

There is a spirit of give and take in Britain which many people think is carried too far in business life.

(The English) regard science as only one of the factors that must be considered in the solution of any practical problem.

In the main, these are comments to which I can subscribe, but they do not in any way damp my belief that the art of management in Britain is on the move forward. This movement may not be just on the exact track which it is following in the United States, nor is the movement so rapid. But it is movement, growth, development of an unmistakable kind. As will be gathered, in some directions we are only just beginning, but in others I think we have, at any rate, passed more than a few milestones. Management is certainly in the midst of its "growing pains." Beneath the somewhat hard and weather-beaten skin, there is every evidence of growth. There is a reaching after new ideas, a deeper delving after facts, a more deliberate founding of policy upon scientifically won data, a closer examination of detail, a wider appreciation of costs and measurements of one kind or another, and, perhaps, most significant of all, a slowly developing search for the underlying purpose of industry—a search stimulated by the wide understanding of the need for the human milk of cooperation.

This stirring in the camp of management, is singularly unobtrusive. One has to look for it; it does not force itself into the open to be seen by all. Here, we find a firm with a singularly exact costing system; there, a firm which has a carefully developed planning scheme; this firm with a successful profit-sharing scheme; that firm with an effective council system. Yesterday, there was perhaps a conference on foremanship; today, maybe, a conference on salesmanship. Here is a firm developing a carefully devised organization of its higher staff; there is a firm undertaking detailed research into processes. Quite generally, there is an increasing tendency to employ a certain proportion of university and similarly qualified men for the managerial work which, in a decade, has vastly increased in complexity.

Then, apart from the activities of individual firms, beginnings are being made on a more corporate basis. An Institute of Industrial Administration has been begun. A similar body, studying allied problems in a different sphere, is the Institute of Public Administration. The Institute of Industrial Psychology is a very flourishing body of recent growth. The British Association (contrary, I suggest, to Mr. Casson's comment that "the scientific men made no pretense of being of service to the world of trade and commerce") has established a Psychology section which is largely concerned in the industrial application of the science, in addition to its Economics section which again cannot be regarded as a sphere alien to industry. The Industrial Welfare Society has a large membership, and is becoming recognized as the headquarters of the so-called "welfare" work—a branch which administrators, I submit, cannot fail to regard as an integral part of management. A Sales Managers Association has been formed. The Industrial Fatigue Research Board is conducting research of immeasurable potentiality. Some twenty odd research associations have been set up under the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research. The London-Cambridge Economic Service is another recent venture, bringing economics into close touch with administration. Other societies indirectly helping to promote a higher standard of skill in management are the Institute of Chartered Accountants, the Institute of Cost and Works Accountants, the Chartered Institute of Secretaries and various engineering and statistical societies.

Furthermore, this activity is being reflected in the expansion of the curricula of some of our universities. The Manchester College of Technology is not only conducting research work, but is setting up an educational standard in industrial administration and the application of various sciences to industry. London University now includes business administration in its curriculum, and as a part of its economic degree. Leeds and Birmingham Universities are promoting similar study.

Again, in the development of the art of industrial management, one cannot by any means disregard the activities of such societies and bodies as the Industrial League and Council, the Labour Copartnership Association, the National Alliance of Employers and Employed and the Workers' Educational Association, to take a few prominent examples. In promoting the study of the human side of industry and of the problems relative to the place and functions of industry in our social commonwealth, such societies as these are definitely

contributing to a wider basis of knowledge, an encouragement of experiments and a higher standard of managerial skill. That these activities are carried on in happy cooperation with Labor is an indication of what Labor may yet contribute to the promotion of the art of management.

All this activity, inchoate as it may appear, indicates a very real stirring in the life of industry, and, more particularly, in all that concerns its direction and management. Unconsciously almost, there is a spreading appreciation of the fact that industry is vastly more complex than it was some years ago, that the difficulties are greater, and, perhaps most of all, that Labor is a mare far more difficult to guide. Consequently, there is a corresponding appreciation, on the one hand, of the increasing need for the application of science to industry and the use of the scientific method in management, and, on the other hand, of the great human responsibility of management and the need for relating that responsibility to some dominant ideal and purpose, some code of ethics which shall be applicable wherever industry is carried on. Management is beginning to feel the intricacy of its task and the weight of its responsibilities. Slowly, with painstaking effort, by cautious experiment, and in a somewhat haphazard fashion, a new management is emerging—a management with new ideals, new methods and new personnel. The tips of its fingers peep out here and there through the old encrusted surface, breaking new ground in this direction and in that. Progress is truly slow. For those who look only for the application in practice of definite systems and recognized mechanisms, there is practically no progress at all. But for those who are prepared to look a little deeper and scan the wider horizon, for those who regard management not only as the function elaborating scientific methods and standards but also as the function charged with the high task of leadership and the pioneer in the development of our daily shifting social order, there is a stir of life which tells unmistakably of the passing of the old order. That this advance will come in conformity with the traditional British caution, use of compromise, and regard for continuity one may be certain. But of its coming, all the stars of heaven are singing, if we could but hear them.

What is lacking in this growth of our art of management is a corporate feeling. Each business is feeling its own way; each society or institute is ploughing its own lonely, rather narrow, furrow. There is little which the manager in one plant would regard as linking him in any way to the manager of another plant. There