

dustry (Ministre du Travail et de l'Industrie); Dr. Leaf, President International Chamber of Commerce; M. F. Mauro, President of the permanent committee for International Congresses on Management (Comité de Prague); M. Ch. de Fréminville, President de la Conférence de l'Organisation Française, member Taylor Society, honorary Vice-President, American Society of Mechanical Engineers. These speeches were followed by a lecture by M. H. LeChatelier on Scientific Management and Education, and a lecture by M. H. Fayol on the point of contact between Scientific Management and "La Doctrine Administrative," of which he is the founder. The large meeting room of the Palais des Académies was absolutely crowded.

The Congressists then attended section meetings which were chiefly concerned with "production cost." These sections were: "Section Industrielle," "Section des Services Publics," "Section d'Agriculture." Important papers were read before very large audiences, and then discussed.

The mornings were filled by film presentations. One of them, very important, showed the organization of the French "Messageries Hachette" for the delivery of Paris newspapers and periodicals all over the country.

It may be said that for all those who were present at the meeting, Frederick Winslow Taylor was saluted as the Father of Scientific Management. They were particularly pleased by the patronage of the Taylor Society and of the A. S. M. E. to which Taylor delivered his early papers on management and of which he had been President.

I had a good time with my old friend, Henry Fayol. M. Henry Fayol, who is now 84, has had one of the most splendid industrial careers that any engineer has ever had, taking the great mining and metallurgical Society of Commentry Fourchambault in a most critical state, years ago, and making it extremely prosperous for a long time. When he retired from active life he determined to make himself useful by preaching sound principles of administration. These are extremely simple but he is surprised that they are so little known or regarded. He calls his doctrine "La Doctrine Administrative" and the public calls it Fayolism. He has made great efforts to have it taken into consideration in government circles and applied to the work of the Council of Ministers and so on. He has succeeded in a small measure.

As far as ten years ago, he has been asking me for the analogies and differences between his ideas and those of Taylor. As a matter of fact, Fayol is trying to call the attention of general management to the most elementary duties pertaining to the general administration of business, but he does not go so far as to include consideration of the detail work of the individual workman. What he says is certainly very good and notice of it can be taken while work according to Taylor methods is undertaken at the other end.

Now, at the Congress, Fayol was asked to say a few words on the distinctive characteristics of Fayolism and Taylorism, and he told me that he believed Taylor had denied the unity of command and that he wished that, speaking before him, I could say something to the contrary, if it was my conviction. That is what I have done, stating that Taylor had really instituted the unity of command in a shop where—authority being scattered between many omnipotent foremen without any uniform line of conduct—that unity did not exist, and the management did not fulfill its duty. This argument pleased him immensely and he stated in public that after what I had said he was happy to state that the difference was not in the principles involved but only in the means used and the field of action. He considers that I have made possible the alliance of Fayolism and Taylorism and that this is an epoch-making event!

This Congress has provided a very good opportunity for the Frenchmen interested in scientific management to know each other and to keep in closer relation in their own country in the future. They have decided, Fayol included, to enlist in the Conférence de l'Organisation Française. This is all very well, but this Society has very little means and will have very much to do to keep pace with the circumstances.

Besides myself, the members of the Taylor Society were M. René de Vallière of Edouard Dubied & Co. in Switzerland and M. Paul Devinat from the International Labor Office in Geneva.

WANTED—Copies of the October, 1925 Bulletin. This issue is unexpectedly exhausted. Readers who do not bind their issues may render a real service to libraries by returning copies of this issue and also of the December, 1924 issue.

Labor's Ideals Concerning Management

Labor's Attitude Toward Industry and Industrial Processes Is Changing—Understanding and Cooperation Will Serve the Best Interests of All

By WILLIAM GREEN

President, The American Federation of Labor

Introductory Remarks of Henry S. Dennison, Presiding

I AM here to introduce. May I not take the job literally and really attempt to make known the Taylor Society to William Green and William Green to the Taylor Society.

The Taylor Society believes that the managing of business is an activity capable of supporting the severest demand for professional behavior which may be put upon it; that the profession of management is taking form and must continue to develop as business units grow big and stock holdings scatter. Even when hired by capital—as is as yet most often the case—it is not capital; and though working hourly in the shop or mill with labor, it is not labor. "The Management," as the Taylor Society must conceive it, is not simply "the Old Man" or the Old Man and his staff—but that whole group of men and women who must devise such ways for keeping the whole organization going as will most efficiently compound the varied motives and meet the complex desires of consumer, dealer, investor, supplier, laborer and staff worker.

The Taylor Society knows that business management can never properly be said to be managing, much less be accorded the respect due a profession—unless it recognizes the bald fact that business, besides bringing materials into new relations with each other and so making, as we loosely say, new commodities—brings human beings into alike relations to each other and so makes new men. The Society knows, therefore, that true management cannot suffer the obsession of production or dividends, but must see

both of these and plenty more of the possible fruits of a healthy organization in their true proportions.

Management must see and know the areas of common interest and the areas of conflict among the half dozen great classes of live men and women with which it deals, and as it casts off its chains of ignorance, will know how increasingly well to integrate them. It must, moreover, learn how to enlist their powers more fully in its service—how to gain discrimination from the consumer, cooperation from dealer, constructive suggestion from supplier, and real interest from workers. And it alone can hope so to inspire and to integrate because—(and only so long as)—its own chief interest is in the joy of a great job well done.

Recognizing dispassionately these natural areas of mutual and of conflicting interest, management could not do else but acknowledge the appropriateness and the many social values of association among them. It expects to find and to deal with associations among consumers, dealers, supplying trades, financiers and workers; to learn from them to hold clearer views of their fundamental needs; and to find them seeking their own share of social progress most intently.

Any man reading history unblinded by his prejudices must be grateful for what associations of workmen have done during the past one hundred years. They have saved, I believe, the dignity of human labor. Yet no man caring for the future of his kind would on that account absolve unions of any social wrong they may commit; to acknowledge the past is to challenge the future.

The dispassionate student, seeing some near-sighted employers of yesterday and today, may expect an answering irritation from workmen tomorrow; but in all professional honesty he must nevertheless point out its ill effects and work to allay it. To remove the causes of such irritation the Taylor Society has always striven. Up until tonight, Mr. Green, we have, indeed, confined our tender ministrations to the em-

¹Paper presented at a joint meeting of the Taylor Society and the Management Division of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York, December 3, 1925.

²President, Dennison Manufacturing Company, Framingham, Mass.