(Continued from page 152)

either Mr. Emerson or Mr. Gantt, belongs also the credit of having primarily recognized the shortcomings of the average cost accounting methods, while an even greater credit is due him for having taken the pains to remedy those shortcomings. It is an additional proof of Mr. Taylor's truly scientific and professional attitude towards his own work, that he did not make use of this to advertise himself, but solely depended on the recommendation of former clients to provide him with new ones.

Mr. Harrison also makes the assertion that cost accounting should be prospective and not merely retrospective as heretofore, and commends Mr. Emerson as having first called attention to this some ten years ago; but this assertion the reviewer declares to be unfounded.

Accounting pure and simple cannot, as indeed the term itself implies, be anything but retrospective; and if an accountant as such undertakes to do anything in the way of predetermining costs, he can do so only as a reflection of work first done either by an engineer or by a person employing engineering methods. Indeed, repeatedly in his book, the author seemingly contradicts the statement referred to, by making other statements directly in line with the present writer's contentions regarding this point.

While the reviewer cannot claim to know every iota of what Taylor succeeded in accomplishing and thinking out in connection with his efforts to develop a unified plan to cover every managerial activity of an industrial plant, he knows from his intimate association with him covering the period from 1899 to his death in 1915, that what Taylor wrote about these matters for publications covered only a limited portion of the whole. Thus, of course, it is in a sense Taylor's own fault that he has so far received public recognition and credit for only that portion. But so great was his reluctance to writing that he forced himself to write his "Shop Management" paper merely to forestall possible incomplete and incorrect statements of his point of view and methods, in papers which younger engineers at that time began to publish, and he was never inspired to make a complete detailed statement of his treatment of all phases of the management problem, merely for the sake of such a complete statement. Please, therefore, do not draw the conclusion that Mr. Taylor had developed only the things he personally wrote about for publication.

To those who were close to Mr. Taylor to the end, and know of his dreams of the ultimate applicability of scientific management principles and ideas, not only to every industrial activity but to every conceivable human activity, the following passages certainly make strange reading:

"Even Frederick Taylor himself did not fully realize the far-reaching possibilities of the principles he developed—essentially a shop man, his horizon was in the main limited to shop problems, and later exponents of these principles have largely followed in his footsteps."

"Whatever the world owes to Dr. Frederick Taylor—and its obligation is great—it is to Mr. Harrington Emerson that we are indebted for our conception of the far-reaching importance of the scientific management idea. To Taylor, the pioneer, scientific management was essentially a system of shop management; to Emerson, the scientist,[3] scientific management is infinitely more than this for to his mind, as the author reads it from a study of Mr. Emerson's published works, scientific management represents a revolution in our attitude toward life in general as well as industrially, and a light on the path which mankind must follow if it is to realize its utmost possibilities."

However, they also know that Taylor always kept his feet on the ground and his vision on those departments of industry that most needed betterment; but when the author for this reason refers to Taylor as only "essentially a shop man," he thereby demonstrates a high degree of ignorance of the man.

But aside from the, under the circumstances perhaps fully excusable though regretable ignorance on the author's part of Taylor's comprehensive work, he proves himself to be an accountant of the highest type, entirely free from the narrow views on cost accounting entertained by the average accountant met with in industral plants.

He, for instance, calls emphatic attention to the very thing that guided Taylor in his detail cost finding methods: viz., the folly of a finical distribution of overhead expenses, in connection with which the average accountant often overlooks facts and relations that have a far greater adverse influence on the final cost figures than have a less theoretically exact but simplified method of distribution. He at the same time calls strict attention to the incontrovertible truth that a cost system, to cover a complicated product, must by necessity reflect this complication, though this does not necessarily imply complications in its application. No truer demonstration of this is likely to come forth than that afforded by Taylor's little known but truly wonderful method of expense distribution.

But now for the main subject of the book; viz., what the author refers to as standard, or predetermined cost. It is this that the reviewer contends, and that the author indirectly admits, is more the engineer's work than the accountant's, and which the reviewer contends is no cost at all, as it is only what the cost would be under certain ideal conditions that exist. They are therefore not usable as true costs are intended to be used, but partly as a means of measuring the effect of the inefficiencies that exist in the several variable "group factors" that influence costs during a particular cost period, in terms of an ideal 100 per cent efficiency; partly as means for obtaining true costs more promptly at the end of any cost finding period.

To the reviewer's mind the latter use constitutes the only true merit of the author's methods. To obtain the true cost of production as early as possible after the close of a period, with the consequently earlier closing of the books and presentation of the executive reports, is, however, of such benefit[4] that the author need have made no other claim for his methods in order to merit universal recognition for this valuable contribution to modern cost accounting.

But the reviewer cannot agree with the author's contentions that such standard costs are also of the fullest value to the management in discovering existing inefficiencies apparently indicated by the high "group factor" by which a particular "group part" of a standard cost has to be increased in order to get the true cost of that part for the period, in virtue of a low efficiency in the total group cost affected. While it undeniably is of some value, it does not, in case of labor at least, point to the inefficient individual or individuals, but merely to a group of individuals that may also contain a number of highly efficient individuals. The direct and immediate tracing of an inefficient individual by the scrutinizing of his every task, as insisted upon by Taylor, not only for the sake of efficiency of production as an end in itself, but fully as much for the purpose of being able to help him to become efficient for his own benefit, has long since come to be looked upon as an integral part of a system of scientific management by the direct pupils of Taylor.

If we do not do this we fail in the thoroughness for which Taylor always contended, as against the spreading of his ideas thin over a wide field, which he dreaded, and the coming of which he painfully observed as a consequence of such writings as those that have emanated from the facile pens of a number of writers on industrial management.

Carl G. Barth.

[3] This certainly makes strange reading to those who know that Mr. Taylor has been recognized as a genuine scientist by such noted scientists as Le Chatelier, of Paris; Wallichs, of Germany, and Sederholm, of Finland; while to the truly scientific reader, Mr. Emerson's works are in the nature of exhortatory essays.

[4] In this connection I cannot refrain from mentioning the great stress Taylor placed on the value of such early executive reports, as exemplified by his oft-expressed admiration for an executive of a certain moderate-sized plant who put a money value of $3,000 on every day he could gain in getting his reports after the close of each month. He, for this reason, employed several clerks who had but little to do during the month, but whose business it was to work almost superhumanly during the following few days of closing the books and drawing off the reports—books and reports drawn up by Taylor himself. This was at least as far back as 1897.

BULLETIN OF THE

TAYLOR SOCIETY

A SOCIETY TO PROMOTE THE SCIENCE AND THE ART OF ADMINISTRATION AND OF MANAGEMENT

Engineering Societies Building
29 W. Thirty-Ninth St.
New York

OCTOBER, 1922 VOL. VII., NO. 5