

level, lack of co-ordination between supply and demand, unemployment and other symptoms furnish food for grave reflection as to the soundness of the basic economic organization.

We do not maintain that our plan is perfect or final, but we believe it is a constructive contribution to the solution of a large and vital problem. With Count Keyserling, we feel that "the ambition to frame the last word never indicates anything but narrowness. As long as mankind lives, the absolutely last word will never be uttered; for ever and ever the problem of mankind will present itself anew, and life will forever remain a thing of problems."

It is our creed that the fullest, and happiest mode of business life is attained by a continuous and never-ceasing effort to contribute to the solution of this "problem of mankind" by finding ways to shed the light of intelligence on the dark spots of industry; by seeking new light and developing courage to follow the lighted way; by creating new ideals to strive for; by seeking the best way of doing things; and by bringing our industrial conduct into harmony with the finest aspirations of men.

Discussion

Morris L. Cooke.² Our technical societies seldom get as intimate a view of interesting and important industrial experiments as we have had of The Kendall Company—first from Mr. Kendall's paper of a year or two back and now from Mr. Lamson.

In reading this paper I was struck with the parallel between shop operations and organization work. Definition of process is always a prerequisite to standardization. I am not quite in sympathy with the author's assumption, however, that things are always so obvious about shop processes. I believe there are intangibles all along the line from the simplest shop operation up to the combination of top executives.

I am in a position to sense the time factor in all of this more than some of you perhaps because I have known Mr. Kendall since 1909 and have followed his career ever since. He has been a particularly hard-working, forceful and intensive executive who has got a tremendous kick out of his work. (He has only recently taken up golf!)

²Consulting Engineer, Philadelphia, Pa.

When we hear of the marvelous results being achieved after but a few months of effort by the more usual type of American executive I think we may conclude that God has been very good to at least some of them.

Mr. Kendall was fortunate not only in his native abilities but also in the number of different businesses with which he was associated early in his career. Back in 1908 he was in the book business, the foundry business, the book cloth business and the textile business. He may have had interests in other enterprises. At any rate he shows the results of having had intimate, responsible contact early in life with a number of different businesses and these contacts gave him, right from the start, a breadth of vision that he might not otherwise have had.

One of the best sides of Mr. Kendall has been his willingness to train men in his organization. When I first knew him he had just taken a man out of his shipping department and tagged him as a man he was going to stay with. This man came of good American stock but he had had no college education. One of the first things Mr. Kendall did was to send him over to the newly opened School of Business Administration at Harvard. The man's reaction to his course of lectures was that each man interpreted success in the light of his own experience. There was nothing fundamental about it. He went back to Mr. Kendall with the feeling that he wanted to tie up with a man who really had confidence in the philosophical approach to industry. When Kendall was still a very young man he had already demonstrated his confidence in fundamental thinking and doing.

Mr. Lamson and I, knowing Mr. Kendall as we do, could hardly avoid emphasizing the importance of the top man in this organization. I believe, however, that we American industrialists are going to have to get away from this emphasis on business as the lengthened shadow of one man. I believe in industrial leadership. But I believe also that we must more and more pave the way for the authoritative leadership of many individuals in an organization of this kind. We must get out of the way of constantly patting one man on the back and saying that everything good comes from him. I know Mr. Lamson and a great many other men in Mr. Kendall's organization and in my opinion this organization is carrying out this idea.

Taylor's idea of a partnership expresses what our attitude should be. He believed that two partners should allocate between themselves the things on which each was to have the final authority and then, when the time came to act, each man should make his own decisions. It works largely this way in the Kendall mills and I believe it will in any fundamentally organized establishment. If it does we shall be able to spread the credit down the line and let people with special responsibilities reach decisions. Those of you who remember Miss Follett's excellent paper, "The Illusion of Final Authority," which was presented before this Society some years ago, will have a further understanding of what I mean by this.

There is a point in this connection that I think increasingly important for Americans to emphasize. What are the top men in our huge business organizations getting out of life? They are usually driven like machines; and they are not always thinking machines. If American industry cannot so reorganize itself that the men who hold important positions can be good members of their families and of society, accepting as well their fair share of public responsibility as citizens, it will be a particularly unfortunate thing. We cannot make machines of people at any level and at the same time get from them what their environment expects. Nor is it safe to separate industry from life. History teaches that a forced and artificial mode of living usually breeds disaster.

Mr. Lamson might have given greater emphasis to the care that has been exercised over a long period of years in the Kendall organization in adhering to predetermined standards in choosing men. I have had the pleasure in the last three months of recommending three men to the Kendall organization. One of them was a candidate for a very subordinate job and the other two for higher ones. Even the youngster was subjected to interview by a number of people before he was chosen.

Mr. Lamson mentioned the word "loyalty." I wish to add that the loyalty to which he refers is quite different from that which we see so constantly referred to in other industrial organizations. It grows out of a commonly shared reliance on facts and on defined policies, as contrasted with expediency. There is no harm in the fact that there is in

³Bulletin of the Taylor Society, Volume XI, No. 6, December, 1926, p. 243.

addition that personal loyalty that men who have worked pleasantly together build up for each other.

I have been impressed over a number of years with the way in which the men in the Kendall organization have been self-disciplined and disciplined by the organization to the point where they do not need Mr. Kendall or someone at the top to tell them what they have to do. On the other hand everyone in the organization is approachable on matters that come within his province. I think it is one of the most serious accusations that can be brought against an executive when he cannot be reached either by his own people or by people on the outside who have good reason to reach him.

I have been in Italy, Russia and other countries outside the United States in the last few years and know that our system is being challenged. We must meet the challenge by more democracy.

This paper shows the value of one outstanding example of excellent management, as contrasted with the codified results of a whole lot of plans. Taylor liked the influence of the outstanding example. We owe a very great debt of gratitude to Mr. Kendall and his associates, and to Dr. Person, who was influential in getting them to expose themselves, for giving us this story.

King Hathaway.⁴ In spite of the fullness of tribute that has been paid to Mr. Lamson and his paper, and to Mr. Kendall and the great work they have been doing, I feel that I should add my own. Mr. Cooke in his discussion of this paper and his references to Mr. Kendall was too modest to take any credit. I am not so modest. To me this demonstration—and it is a demonstration rather than an experiment—is one of the most gratifying things that I have experienced during the years that I have been identified with the scientific management movement.

Mr. Kendall is very generous in frankly attributing the success that he has had in this undertaking, first, to his contact with Taylor, and second, to his contact with those of us who worked with him during the period when he was learning scientific management and during the period in which we were working out the earlier adaptations of the Taylor System to industries other than the metal working trades.

⁴This demonstration points the way to a continuation—Manning, Maxwell & Moore, Inc., New York, N. Y.