

Let us examine Taylor's underlying philosophy and determine as far as possible how it affects the happiness and prosperity of workers. In "The Principles of Scientific Management" he says, "Scientific Management, in its essence, consists of a certain philosophy which results in the four great underlying principles of management:

1. The development of a true science.
2. The scientific selection of workmen.
3. Their scientific education and development.
4. Intimate friendly cooperation between the management and men.

I. The Development of a True Science

Taylor defines the development of a true science as "knowledge so collected, analyzed, grouped, and classified into laws and rules that, it constitutes a science." There is no "get scientific quick" about any of the recommendations Taylor makes for the evolving of these "laws and rules." On the other hand, he advocates careful, accurate, painstaking effort in the work of *developing* a true science. Over and over Taylor deplores the tendency on the part of impatiently eager managers to plant a system before the ground is tilled.

In the matter of personnel work this is peculiarly important. Because of traditions concerning the "handling of workers" which have become encrusted like barnacles on many executives, major and minor, movement with the times in both the thought and action of these executives has been much impeded. Management, consequently, must assume the responsibility for scraping off the barnacles and exposing such executives to sunlight and fresh air.

Taylor had no use for the lazy manager. How many plants, there are where the manager boasts he has selected competent men to supervise the various departments and that policies and methods are "up to them." There is a pretty little game of buck passing in most of those plants. Everyone knows that, in the final analysis, the manager is responsible for putting through certain policies and he need not delude himself into thinking that the workers do not hold him responsible whether he is on the golf links or in his office. And everyone knows that if this chap (who in pretty phrases tells people he is developing men by expecting them to do his job) wakes up to find himself and his plant in the rear of the industrial procession he will have only himself to blame.

For workers in plants as well as citizens in cities want constructive leadership in the development of a

true science which will reduce chaos to order. Do not tell me workers do not like "system," which is their common expression for this science which Taylor says it is the responsibility of industry to develop. Many times have I heard the intimate expression of workers' opinions on this subject. Just a short time ago a very intelligent man left an assistant's position in our receiving and shipping department to become head of such a department in another organization at a much higher salary. In a few days he called me up urging me to let him have his old job, and when I saw him he was full of disgust with his new job because "The management didn't even know what the word system meant." He went on to say that there was something peaceful and satisfying about our place because it breathed order throughout.

Most human beings like order. And you can't have physical or mental order without a "true science." In my experience I have found that numbers of the applicants who come to us come because they hear that we have a "clean place," a place where there is "system" and where they can "make money and work up." If more plant managers had their ears to the ground there would be more applicants at their gates whether labor be scarce or plentiful. They would see the economy in spending time, money and energy on the "development of a true science" which would advertise the working conditions of their shops without the help of newspaper advertising and would repay them tenfold in securing for them a more desirable class of applicants as well as in reducing turnover. But the barnacles must be scraped off slowly—even off some managers. Count Korzybski flatters us by calling us humans time binders. Sometimes I think we need a little time study on time binding in order to speed us up a bit. We might then decide that we need no further experience to prove that workers like order and "system."

One of the greatest gains resultant from the analyzing and codifying of data is that where this is the practice there is constant questioning of present methods with an idea of improving them. And this questioning is not by any means limited to the higher executives in a plant. For when research and study on the part of people whose business it is to plan and methodize result in certain recommendations, there is no hesitation on the part of people affected by such recommendations to question them. There is, however, a vast difference between the plant where managers have at any time attempted to double cross

workers or to put in "efficiency schemes" without careful and scholarly research, and the plant where the management has the reputation among the workers of being on the level because of a long history of conscientious work and of square dealing. In the latter type of plant, while the workers insist upon full and clear explanations of any new method or policy affecting them, there is a general spirit of giving new ideas a fair trial. In other words, suspicion is supplanted by a spirit of honest and cooperative experimentation.

Critics of scientific management often charge its exponents with crushing initiative in the worker. On the contrary, Taylor at various times urged the encouraging of workers to offer suggestions. But oh, ye suggestion systems! How much bunk has been perpetrated in your name! In house organs we read how Mamie Jones was paid for suggesting that a broken window be mended so the rain would not blow in on her machine, or how Tom Brown was awarded a few dollars for suggesting that a broken board in the factory floor be mended, or how Stazie Berenlov was honorably mentioned because she suggested that the lockers be properly ventilated. This is all very amusing to Taylorite executives and I feel safe in saying it would be more amusing to the rank and file of workers in Taylor shops. For they have learned to expect something of management and they are justly impatient if management is not awake to its responsibilities. They would not expect awards for suggesting that loose boards be nailed down, but they would raise a mighty howl if a plant were not so organized as to have such things discovered and remedied as a matter of course by people whose duty it was to discover and remedy them. So it is that one does not get in Taylor plants the piffing suggestions of this nature which delude many plant managers in rule of thumb plants into thinking their workers are exceptionally interested and responsible. But one does get, in scientific management plants, a fine sense of confidence on the part of workers which is born of the fact that they have evidence that management acknowledges its responsibilities for organization and execution of obvious routine.

In most scientific management plants there is what is known as standard practice which consists of an outline of plant policies and methods up to date. Please notice I say up to date. For workers would have but little respect for a book of law which bore the stamp of finality. Matters affecting human beings

are seldom static; so standard practice must be a constantly growing and evolving thing as mechanical improvements come about and as ideas change. One of the greatest inspirations I received from Taylor when I heard his remarkable course of lectures in Boston many years ago was his reiteration of the basic philosophy of change and of the constant evolution from old to new. Many people have accused him of subscribing to a doctrine of rigid, cut-and-dried formulae but to those of us who know his real philosophy such a conception is absurd.

He did, however, recognize the fact which all of us who have intimate and daily contact with workers recognize, that while times change and men's ideas change, nothing can cause such widespread discontent as a variety of policies in the same organization at the same time. One policy, subscribed to consistently and sincerely, will do more to inspire confidence in workers than two policies, administered by two officials, no matter how earnest and honest both of these officials may be. There may be differences, and very honest differences of opinion, all up and down the line and through the various strata of an organization. But we all know we cannot run our cities by having one law for one man and another law for another man. Nothing causes so much scorn for law as any hint of lack of consistency in its application. And when once "knowledge is classified into laws and rules," as Taylor says, these laws and rules must hold until amended. Obviously workers have confidence in a management which does not waste time haggling frequently over matters that have already been discussed and satisfactorily settled for the time being. To anyone engaged in the complex routine of shop management the relief of being able to refer people who are confused over minor matters to "Standard Practice" is self evident. There are too many conclaves being repeated ad nauseam in our business organizations today over matters which should be codified and put in black and white. In thus codifying such material not only is time saved but workers are content in the conviction that various personalities do not apply rules and regulations affecting them according to the whims and fancies of the day. This is what John R. Commons means by "organizing for good will."

In some scientific management plants the importance of organizing for good will has been evidenced in employee representation as a means toward this end. During the past ten years experiments in this import-