

The same is true of England. It is not the employers who are indifferent to labor and its developing status who are most interested in scientific management. It is the Renolds and the Rowntrees—the men who are most willing to accord full recognition to trade unionism and to co-operate with its leaders in working out in practice those measures by which the workers may collaborate critically and creatively, and take a growing part in the running of industry.

Many of the leaders of the Labour Party appreciate this. Mr. Bevin's signature appears under the report of the Mackenzie Commission. Mr. Pugh recently said at a conference at the Guildhall: "Rationalization involves scientific management, a much misunderstood term. This does not mean the regimentation of labor, a sort of goose-step to the time of the machine; it means the science of good management, good government in industry, applied to the workshop, winning the co-operation of labor for the elimination of waste in human effort, material, and organization, and in getting the best results in productive enterprises and services. Combined with this is the acceptance of the principle that in the science of good management, cutting down wages and extending hours of labor is the last and not the first resource."

Turning to the left wing, it may be noticed that one of the first actions of the U.S.S.R. was to establish in Moscow an institution for the study of F. W. Taylor's work, and of the developments which have flowed from it. Is any further evidence needed that the science of management is not integral with the present political organization of industry, an employers' dodge to be dismissed with a shrug, but is something essential to any form of effort in which men must co-operate?

But the prejudice remains. Many workers seem to be totally unaware that the chief motive which drove Taylor to try to evolve a new approach to questions of industrial management was the disgust of a sympathetic and sensitive man at the bullying methods which were the common currency of foremanship in the American machine shop of the '80's. To say, as has been said, that Taylor desired "to remove all initiative, all thought, all criticism from the workshop," and to "degrade the

worker into a productive machine" is preposterously wide of the mark. One wonders how many of his critics have studied the standard biography of the great reformer.³

Now, this prejudice is important. Because it blinds some of the ablest minds in the labor movement to the strongest line of attack against many of the inequalities and injustices under which the workers suffer, an attack on the obsolete methods of management which give rise to them. Moreover, it prevents a proper understanding between the worker groups and those groups of managers and technicians who, economically, should be in sympathy with them. Collaboration is a social fact. It will remain a social fact whoever owns the industrial capital of the country, or on whatever system our industry is organized. Today, co-operative societies, municipal undertakings, and government departments have their problems of management, no less than capitalistic undertakings. They can only be solved with the consent and willing co-operation of all concerned.

But men cannot collaborate, they cannot even negotiate or discuss a question intelligently together unless the words they use have the same meaning for all of them. An effort to introduce a common language into the industrial babel is probably the most important problem which now confronts the world. The only progress which has ever been achieved in this direction has been in the established sciences. In mathematics, physics, and chemistry, men of different races and different social status can speak together on their problems of common interest. Because they have used the intellectual technique of the investigator—analysis, definition, measurement, and proof—they have established a currency for the rapid and easy exchange of ideas in the search for truth. There is no other path by which we can march to the solution of our industrial and social difficulties.

When, therefore, representatives of the workers say that "they do not believe in scientific management," when they misrepresent the essential work which F. W. Taylor performed—the application to industrial problems of the scientific intellectual technique—what they are really saying is this:

"We do not believe in definition. We do not want analysis. We abhor measurement. We are indifferent to proof." They are shutting the door on the only real hope, the progressive discovery of

truth. They are denying at the start any possibility of collaboration, because they will not use the intellectual methods by which alone the verbal instruments of collaboration can be forged. They leave the manager and technician feeling like a Darwinian biologist trying to talk to a fundamentalist from Dayton.

News of the Sections University of North Carolina A New Student Section

After spending two weeks, May 6 to 17, in Ames, Iowa, where he delivered a course of fifteen lectures on scientific management at the School of Commerce, University of Iowa, Dr. Person went to Chapel Hill, North Carolina, on May 28, and addressed several groups of students and faculty in the Department of Economics, and Commerce at the University of North Carolina.

At the invitation of the University he lectured to a class in Personnel Management on the subject of scientific management's attitude toward the problems of industrial relations, and to a class in Business Organization on the demands of modern management on young men entering industry; in the afternoon he met a group of faculty members and graduate students and led a general discussion on the importance of management in industry. In the evening he gave an address on the origin and nature of scientific management and its influence on American industry. The address was delivered before the new University Student Branch of the Taylor Society which was organized under Professor G. T. Schwenning's guidance in March.

Central New York

At the meeting in Syracuse on April 26 Henry S. Dennison, President of the Dennison Manufacturing Company and former President of the Taylor Society, addressed the group on "Major Problems Which Executives Will Have to Face in the Next Five Years." Jason Westerfield of the New York Stock Exchange spoke on May 24 on "What the Stock Exchange Is and Does."

New York Metropolitan

The meeting on May 16 at the Fraternity Clubs was given over to a discussion of "Cost Control, with Fluctuating Production, Through Predeter-

mined Cost Standards." Floyd F. Hovey of the Department of Industrial Economy of the Eastman Kodak Company had prepared a most stimulating paper which was discussed by John H. Williams, Consulting Engineer, and W. S. Powers of Miller-Franklin and Company, Inc.

A slate of officers for the coming year was presented by the nominating committee and accepted by the membership. Mr. R. G. Wagenet was re-elected as Chairman and Miss Chalice M. Kelly of the Union Carbon and Carbide Company was elected Secretary. The Executive Committee consists of the officers and John M. Carmody, Editor *Factory and Industrial Management*; Homer C. Holland, Irving Trust; Mrs. Rita Hillborn Hopf, H. A. Hopf and Company; Howard M. Hubbard, Royal Baking Powder Company, and John E. O'Gara, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.

Reviews

New Way to Net Profits. By Fred W. Shibley, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1928, pages xxi, 213.

First analyze your situation, determine its elements; then put together the necessary elements so as to accomplish the result most speedily and most economically. Analysis—synthesis. Thus were we taught who as apprentices began twenty to thirty years ago to follow the lead of the founders of the philosophy of scientific management. "Who knows? Nobody knows! Let's find out!" was said again and again as various situations were encountered, and accurate knowledge was demanded. At that time we were thinking of shop management, of motion study, of standardizing operations and jobs, of developing and perfecting that technique of factory practice which has made possible in later years production planning and the nice balancing of output of one department or process against another.

Some of the apprentices wondered why the same kind of thinking was not being applied to the major policies of business. They hated to see judgments made and policies decided on half facts and on hunch. But industry prospered. Prices were rising. Frequently anyone who owned an inventory made money before he sold it. The depression of the panic of 1907 and that at the start of the World War in 1914 were only temporary setbacks. Then followed the enormous inflation of the war and post-war periods, both of commodity prices and of producing capacity.

And then followed 1920, and then 1921. And the executives, many of whom were the apprentices of the earlier period, began to think, and to ask, "Why?" The answer to this "Why?" on the part of executives and of bankers is what Mr. Shibley so clearly brings out. His book is a very clear, simple statement of the application of the old principle of analysis and synthesis to the major problems and policies of a business. It is not technical. There are

³Copley, Frank Barclay, "Frederick W. Taylor, the Father of Scientific Management," New York, Harper & Brothers, 1923.