

One of the really big questions we must face in the future is that of getting back more nearly, not to the one-man organization itself, but to the essence of it so far as coordination, control and personal touch go. The manager in one-man organizations has many advantages in these respects over the manager of large plants. As soon as a manager is forced to sub-divide his duties and departmentalize his plant, he loses much in control which he formerly held. Recognizing that this specialization is necessary in large establishments, it then becomes a matter of prime importance to set up some means by which this unified control and per-

sonal touch may be restored.

Finally, as regards our responsibilities as managers, I wish to quote the manager of one large establishment—an establishment to which we commonly refer as being one of the very finest examples of the application of Taylor principles and methods of management. In reply to my question as to the probable future trend of developments in his plant, he writes:

The most important development in our management methods in the near future will probably be improvement in management itself. We have an idea that in general the efficiency of the management is less at the present time than the efficiency of labor.

Business Meeting

THE annual business meeting of the Taylor Society was held in the Engineering Societies Building, New York, January 24, 1924. The first order of business was a report of the letter ballot for officers for the year 1923-1924. The balloting resulted as follows:

President—	Richard A. Feiss.....	420
	Scattering	5
Vice-President—	Percy S. Brown.....	416
	Scattering	6
Treasurer—	Edward W. Clark, 3d.....	423
Directors—	Mary VanKleeck.....	412
	Wm. B. Ricketts.....	411
	Scattering	10

Then followed an informal report by the Managing Director concerning the affairs of the Society; after which the Treasurer's report was presented and explained. It was voted that the Treasurer's report be accepted and placed on file. This financial report will later be printed and sent to members. The last order of regular business was the election from the floor of the Nominating Committee for the coming year. The following were elected: Richard H. Lansburgh, Philadelphia, Chairman; Wm. H. Leffingwell, New York City; Henry H. Farquhar, Cambridge, Mass.; Robert J. Andersen, Auburn, N. Y.; Howard G. Benedict, Hornell, N. Y.

The remainder of the business session was devoted to a general discussion of the affairs of the Society, the problem of membership promotion receiving especial attention. No motions were presented.

MORE and more it is becoming necessary (in buying an industrial security or participating in the refinancing or reorganizing of an industrial) to examine into the labor situation; the supply of labor and the quality available, living conditions and cost of living, the history of existing labor difficulties, whether the business operates under the open shop or closed shop plan, the method of payment for labor, the average earnings of the labor in comparison with past records and with the average earnings of similar labor in the vicinity, and the relations between the management and the working force. (F. G. Coburn, *Financial Investigation of Industrials*, in Harvard Business Review, January, 1924.)

THE day of the so-called "desk-hand" is passing, as his work becomes more specialized and even professional. The Costing and Planning clerks are clearly engaged in occupations calling for more than routine ability. With the development of the Facilitative functions, clerical work is rapidly becoming the stepping-stone to positions in the management—not the management of manufacturing departments, but of the functional activities supplementary to manufacturing. Modern developments indeed indicate that, at a guess, some 50 per cent of the managerial positions in the industry of the future will need to be filled by men trained and qualified in various branches—statistical, analytical, investigational, and coordinative—of clerical work. This tendency places clerical work in a new light. (Oliver Sheldon, *The Philosophy of Management*, p. 276.)

The Influence of Scientific Management Upon Government—Federal, State and Municipal¹

By MORRIS L. COOKE

Consulting Engineer, Philadelphia

GOVERNMENT perhaps even more than industry is in the unsystematized state. However, in view of the relatively small progress made by private industry in appropriating the philosophy and principles of Scientific Management, it is not strange that the introduction of system and science into public work comes so slowly.

In any such inquiry as that assigned to me we should be quite as much interested in studying out broadly the causes of failure as we are in citing specific illustrations of success. By far the most potent reason for such inferiorities as are found in our government appears to lie in the fact that the interest of the average individual in government cannot be very great as contrasted with his interest in his home and his work. For the contact of the great body of citizens with government is at best intermittent and finds expression only in isolated acts such as voting, paying taxes, rendering jury duty and military service. In addition to their intermittancy the character of these contacts is not such as to give the average citizen any sense of proprietorship in or responsibility for the results achieved. In this condition, I take it, lies our greatest difficulty in making government conform generally to our ideals and in having public work done in a manner that will stand close scrutiny.

In education we are coming more and more to build on an existing interest rather than to set up even what we might consider an ideal curriculum, if respect and desire for it must in any large measure be cultivated in the pupil. And so in private as well as public affairs progress appears to come through utilizing at least a genuine, even if not a sustained, interest rather than through appeals to tradition, authority or duty.

Therefore, without any abatement in my personal interest in or endeavors toward the improvement of municipal government, I have come to feel that the

result of any direct attack upon this group of problems is bound to be disappointing. On the other hand, there are good grounds for believing that improvements in government—municipal, state, national and international—will come about quite naturally and inevitably as a result of the development of a well-ordered but democratic organization for industry, and perhaps only in that way. We have the workers' day-to-day and sustained interest in industry. If through arranging for the worker some responsible share in the conduct of industry he can be led first to understand and then to have confidence in justice and order and effectiveness in industry, and to appreciate their relation to democratic control, sometimes called consent, then and then only I believe will the workers by hand and brain demand and know how to get the same things in government.

If, as I believe, Scientific Management is both a spiritual and material force that must ultimately conquer and humanize the industrial machine, then it, in so doing, is in the way of making a very real contribution to government. For a democratized and effective industry will mean good government. Speaking quite broadly, we today see in the methods of our government hardly more than a reflection of the methods of business. The moral and other levels of public and private life are usually pretty much the same. But I believe that we can raise these levels more surely through an attack on industry because that is where we have the major interest on which to build.

There are, however, many other causes advanced for the failure of Scientific Management to make progress in government which to me seem distinctly secondary. For instance, one friend writes:

Scientific Management is seldom given a fair chance in the affairs of government and for two principal reasons; first, the absence of strong central directing control, and second, lack of continuity of tenure.

Neither the "big stick" nor the continuance of any individual or group of individuals in office seem to be

¹Paper presented at a meeting of the Taylor Society, New York, January 26, 1924.