

It is a question, then, whether the emphasis should be from the top down or from the bottom up; the latter being a gradual process of evolution.

I wonder whether Mr. Kendall has emphasized as strongly as he should the question of functions. Many conditions that we are confronting to-day have their parallel in industrial life, beyond question. We are dealing with human individuals and it seems to me there are always essential functions in organization to be recognized. It also seems to me very true that central control in the present situation could operate only through functional lines. If this is so then the difficulties Mr. Cooke foresees are not so real.

I as one business man and Mr. Kendall as another do not feel at the present moment that we in America in this world's conflict are laying the emphasis we should on central control and coördination which should intelligently, definitely and clearly be trying to establish functions through all the manifest activities that are being carried on and through the various departments. He would have a definite power at work now endeavoring to carry those functions consistently down through the different departments and activities. Am I right, Mr. Kendall, in saying that now under strong central control the emphasis would express itself in and through the clear definite observation of functions with which we are all to some degree familiar and which exist, unquestionably, in all problems dealing with men and human nature?

I must confess that it has been a great pleasure to me to have heard Mr. Cooke give his presentation. His ideals of democracy are inspiring. I do feel, nevertheless, from the word of those who have the subject best in hand, that the time element is of tremendous importance. To us, if we are going to win this war, that time element cannot be emphasized too strongly. There has been an agreement to-night among a number of the speakers that, building on democracy as the sound base, we also need control from the top or centralized control expressing itself along functional lines. And yet what is being done? Is anything being done positively to get that centralized control? Mr. Kendall feels that an obligation rests upon us as individuals and as a group to emphasize the need of central control. If things are proceeding rapidly and well along the lines of gradual evolution, as Mr. Cooke and Mr. Inglis and others have said, why nevertheless should we not now emphasize strongly the importance of this central control and coördination? What harm? And will it not even hasten the progress of evolution? Can not Mr. Cooke agree with Mr. Kendall that it is wise now to emphasize the importance and need of central con-

trol? As I have listened to the stories of both Mr. Cooke and Mr. Kendall as to the need of central control here, that need seems to be more real than any other need.

A strong centralized control would not set up different departments of business and permit them to run, for illustration, their "personnel" divisions in these different departments without central control and definite clear policies.

It seems to me that Mr. Cooke simply counts on it that in the due course of time, with his tremendous belief and confidence in democracy, there will evolve a common policy for each and every function. He has not yet indicated when or how those functions are to be brought under one control. Now, then, it seems to me because of the very fact that our problems, more and more, day by day, are going to involve all activity, all industry, all labor, that we have got to have for efficiency running through the whole structure common policies for the different functions, running more towards a common head. It seems to me that is obviously the case, and that Mr. Cooke and Mr. Kendall can agree on this. If so, why should we not emphasize now the need of that control?

I should think that if Mr. Cooke is so confident of his position as to what is coming through gradual democratic processes of evolution that he would gradually join with Mr. Kendall in emphasizing the need of central control in order that it might be developing the more rapidly to meet the situation adequately.

There are some factors that we should face. It seems to me that we must recognize history more clearly to-day than ever. I have been in Washington a good many times in past years and the bugaboo of precedent, the insistence on the rights of Congressmen and Senators, has always been a tremendous bar to quick action in the past, as it is undoubtedly to-day. Nevertheless, it is a fact that under the leadership of President Wilson, and because of his leadership, we have at least taken one step that is decidedly revolutionary, and would have been unbelievable two or three years ago, namely, the establishment of the system of selective draft. I was especially delighted to hear Dr. Hopkins express on this subject the views he did this afternoon. I think that under the power of the leadership of President Wilson he could to-day "put over" anything that is really necessary, and this particular time is probably the best time in the war to "do" things and to get things done. His leadership can probably do more to-day than it will be able to do in the future. I look upon the power of President Wilson's leadership to-day as so strong that if he tells the people of the United States that a thing is necessary and indicates the way, his

leadership can accomplish almost anything even in spite of Congress, even in spite of precedent and other drawbacks. I say this the more because at the present moment, due possibly to reverses in Italy and due possibly to the fact that we realize the problems we are facing better than we have at any other time before, the people of the United States almost unanimously are willing to make now big sacrifices. I emphasize thus the need of action now, and that action can be now had under President Wilson's leadership. If President Wilson has this power and if central control is needed, why should we not now emphasize the need of central control and coördination? To emphasize the importance of quick action now, I would point out from the experience of other countries that criticisms are bound to arise, that they will gain headway here and momentum there. We have the experience of recent history in the other nations to prove this to us. This, then, is the time for leadership to act, and strong, positive leadership asserting itself to-day will be the one best means of preventing the rise of criticisms. To-day I think we would all respond to such leadership more than we will later. Thus if central control is desired and needed, President Wilson can through his powers of leadership take steps now and get results now he would not be able to later.

It seems to me that if it were in our individual hands to-day to really win the war, we would want to even go to some such extreme as Dr. Hopkins has suggested. Well, why not? If we really believe that we must win this war, and if we believe those who know best, that the time element is of importance, why should we not take those steps now—at least some positive steps towards better central control and coördination?

We have, moreover, got to recognize that if we are delayed and have to wait for evolution, evolution is usually a long, long time in coming; and in the meantime there are forces that are going to assert themselves, are going to work underneath against many of those things we want now to accomplish. Those forces are at work even now; they are going to gain headway, and I am not mistaken when I say they are going to work against the splendid spirit that exists at the moment. They are going to work against democracy coming out in the way Mr. Cooke would have it work out. It seems to me, therefore, that we should emphasize the need of strong, positive leadership now, and not trust merely to gradual evolution and to the developments of democracy.

After all, Mr. Cooke does not think of democracy or does not believe in democracy just in the way he

may have seemed to express it; he has confidence in the way things are going to work out because the authorities are willing to listen and to accept the advice of experts like himself, who can give good advice. That, however, is not democracy in the sense that they have democracy in Russia. He finds here in Washington among authorities a responsive spirit which is grand, fine; and yet Washington is only part of the country, and other elements are at work in the country dealing with social and economic problems that they may develop to block us and to hinder us in winning the war.

It seems to me that this is both time for strong, positive central control, and a time for strong leadership to assert itself. We can hope for the best results if we hold strongly to the ideals of democracy and emphasize the ideals that Mr. Cooke has laid down; but at the same time appeal to all in the spirit of sacrifice and their obligations to democracy to respond and permit the rapid development of this control which is essential if we want the extreme efficiency, and if we want it quickly; if, moreover, we truly believe it is the essential and one thing necessary to win this war.

I am concerned about our winning the war now at this time not 500,000 years from now. I believe we have a destiny bigger than we can conceive of now. We want to win the war now, not sometime in the future.

As I say, I am concerned about winning the war, vitally concerned. I wish there were leadership asserting itself strongly, appealing to us and even commanding us all to do everything we individually can to win the war; and to secure efficiency in every line and activity in this United States of ours not through a long period of evolution, but at the very quickest hour and date it is conceivable.

MR. HENRY W. SHELTON:¹ May I be the first spark of spontaneous combustion here to-night? I have the highest personal regard for Mr. Noyes and his work, and yet it seems to me that his argument for a central control imposed from the top down is one which could be presented by the Kaiser himself so far as his view point as to leadership is concerned.

We have been talking about centralized control and Mr. Noyes made the statement that both Mr. Kendall and Mr. Cooke are interested in the same kind of control. I cannot see it that way. Mr. Kendall has also said that it was only a question of procedure. My mind keeps going back to what Mr. Taylor used to say repeatedly; that scientific management is not a procedure or a set of forms or a mechanism; it is a point of view.

¹Assistant Professor of Organization and Management, Amos Tuck School, Dartmouth College.