

forms, devices and routines. True enough, there is a limit to just how much of such standardization is possible, or even practical, but just as in Mr. Lichtner's illustration of the discussion of the "Bulletin Board," so in many other ways is the client misled by erroneous or hazy names.

Furthermore, as members of the Taylor Society are we not guilty of a sin of omission as long as we close our eyes to the responsibility of perpetuating those features of scientific management that can best and only be handed down from generation to generation in unmistakable terms?

Is it not time that something concrete is done to pool the knowledge, information and experience of all the members, and to so tabulate this data as to make it possible to have in the archives of the Taylor Society the great volume of valuable data that simply needs some organized effort to collect and prepare? Even though a complete set of forms, routines and all of the books on the subject do not make it possible to install a scientific management, such an accumulation would be of considerable value as a medium of reference.

The recommendation that a committee be appointed to handle this matter is certainly one that should be favorably acted on immediately.

The list of standard terms embodied in the paper is undoubtedly the result of much study, and although it may not be adopted in its entirety, undoubtedly offers a basis for such refinement as such a committee might suggest.

Another good-sized task would be the modification of the mnemonic symbol classification,—in the machine classification alone there is ample room for improvement, for the question as to how, when and where to use numerals as part of a machine symbol is one that is still very much unsettled.

Another important feature to be considered is the organization chart. Such titles as Works Manager and Production Superintendent are far from conveying the exact functions of the people to whom they are assigned, and at present are not universally used or recognized by the various schools of management.

I agree absolutely with Mr. Lichtner when he claims that the Maintenance Department Planning Room should be a part of the regular Production Planning Department, even though the actual work is done in a separate part of the factory, for it seems reasonable to assume that the Maintenance Planning

Room could use the identical planning boards, time tickets, route sheets, etc., that are used for regular production.

As to the feature of Time and Job Analysis and Task and Bonus there are certainly well defined policies and principles that can be almost universally applied.

Regarding the library on scientific management, this is an important feature and I believe is so universally recognized by all members of the Society that I want to suggest that such action is taken as is necessary to accumulate a copy of all approved books, for filing in the New York office of the Society. I would further suggest that each member of the Society be assessed one dollar per year to defray this expense, for probably almost every member will be only too glad to contribute this amount since it would open the way to preserving those good expressions which are apt to be lost sight of unless a standard list of management articles is compiled and revised and the members are kept advised as to changes or corrections in the list.

BOYD FISHER¹: Permit me to contribute a cautious word, which I hope will be helpful, in sympathy with the idea of standardizing terminology.

Very little discussion—I won't say debate—is necessary to establish the desirability of having standard terms. It is a proper subject of discussion, however, to consider how we can really secure standard terminology.

I am impressed with the fact that it is a thing that can hardly be done by a committee or by a society in any legislative way. You know how the English language was built up,—by no common agreement, but by gradual accretions and perhaps by certain capstones of literature, such as Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales," King James' version of the Bible, Shakespeare's plays and Noah Webster's spelling book. And I think Noah Webster's spelling book had as large a part as any of these in creating the standard terminology and spelling of the present day. You may not realize that that spelling book had a larger circulation than any book ever printed in English, aside from the Bible. Webster offered that as an individual contribution. No committee evolved or could have approved it. It was the subject of violent debate and vituperation on the part of rival

¹Philadelphia. Recently with Aluminum Castings Co., Detroit.

lexicographers. It was adopted in America and favorably received in England over the opposition of all the other text-book writers. Noah Webster shot up his lightning rod, so to speak, and the lightning of popular approval hit upon his little rod. All the labors of the Simplified Spelling Board have been unable to amend it.

With regard to any standardization of terminology, it must be ventured, I think, first of all as an individual contribution, as some wise and authoritative person's proposal, which will be in part accepted and in part rejected. Even Noah Webster was unable to secure the adoption of some of his proposed spellings and later had himself to abandon some of his offerings.

I think that Mr. Lichtner, by proposing a set of definitions, has advanced the idea of standard terminology farther and more rapidly than he could by promoting any committee whatever, because it gives us something to shoot at and we have already seen some shots.

With regard to the standardization of some of the mechanisms of scientific management, I fully agree with Mr. Barth that you have to have some common agreement as to what scientific management is. It is useless to try to agree upon terms about a thing until you have got the agreement on the thing. There, again, I think that the agreement is promoted by the efforts of some wise man, some part of whose work is accepted and some part of whose work is rejected. Dr. Taylor has been the greatest standardizer of management, not by promoting agreement, but by going out and doing something. Therefore, the most practical suggestion seems to have been made by Mr. Hathaway, when he suggests that Mr. Barth be set to work on writing some of the standards. It is quite likely that most of what he would write would be accepted. An individual can create, but a committee will do nothing but discuss.

I read the other day of one exception to that statement. A group of Chinese and a group of American scholars have just completed the revised translation of the English Bible into the Chinese mandarin tongue, and, at that, it is the result of twenty-five years of labor and was a matter solely of translation. I think that if they had set out to write a Bible they would have gone a good many more years.

SANFORD E. THOMPSON¹: I want to take exception to the last speaker in saying that a committee would not do anything. I happen to be a member of several other societies, one of them the American Society of Civil Engineers, another the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and another the American Society of Testing Engineers. All three of these societies have committees which are framing definitions of engineering terms and these definitions are being accepted generally throughout the United States and the world. That is what is being done by committees at the present time. Similar committees also in these societies are establishing standards of various kinds which are being accepted and adopted by municipalities and by our United States Government as well as by private citizens.

It seems to me it is up to us to get busy on this. Not to wait for any fund or to keep this idea stagnant until something else happens. Why shouldn't we get to work the way the members of these other societies are getting to work where men who are as high in standing as our own members meet once in three months or even oftener, and study these things and work them out without paid assistance?

SPEAKER IN THE AUDIENCE: In the Industrial Management Council's Superintendents' Group of One Hundred this subject of terminology has been up for two years. We believe it is a very vital subject. It seems to me that Mr. Lichtner's paper is very opportune. We have been hoping to hear from him.

My belief is that the matter rests something like this: that most of our disagreements are because we do not talk in common terms. If we could get a definition of terms we shall certainly shut off a lot of discussion and I should like very much to endorse Mr. Lichtner's paper. It seems to me that it ought to be followed and everything possible done to bring the plan to a head.

SPEAKER IN THE AUDIENCE: I have been interested in this subject of terminology. It seems to me that perhaps our immediate objective is not so much to agree upon the meaning of various terms as it is to set them down, to set down those at least upon which there is agreement. While I see the force of Mr. Fisher's remarks that a committee perhaps cannot be put to work effectively upon creating suitable definitions, a committee could at least be put to work ef-

¹The Thompson and Lichtner Co., Boston and New York.