

represented in the international picture by institutions whose function and equipment are unworthy of business leadership. But suppose there was created an international planning department properly equipped to do its work from the scientific standpoint. Imagine it organized not along national lines, emphasizing hour by hour and day by day the national differences which you have welded in a few short years into a new nation, but industry by industry, trade by trade, and function by function. Picture it as a clearing-house of vital statistics, statistics which were no longer the by-products of administration, but the figures which business really needs. See it as a meeting ground of the business men of all nations; the hat manufacturers and distributors one day, the steel men another, the production engineers a third. Each of these groups would meet to forward, not the interests of this country or of that, but the common interests of their-common industry or profession. Commerce today knows no frontiers save those the politicians have put there. America has colonized a continent. She is used to pushing frontiers westward. Why not push them around the world?

There are volumes of objections: But that is what international planning really means. And is there any alternative? Let me read you a little passage by way of epilogue. It is from a war correspondent's dispatch. "I went to see the new armies learning their lessons in frightful places. Always the worst place was the Ypres salient where the enemy had the advantage of ground and observation so that he could shoot at our men from three points of the compass and even hit them in the back. The names of all these places are a litany of death—Pillekem, Potijze, Hooge, Zillebeke, Vlamertinghe, Sanctuary Wood—and Hooge was the concentration ground of all that was devilish. Dead bodies were heaped there, buried and

unburied. Men dug into corruption when they tried to dig a trench. Men sat on dead bodies when they peered through their periscopes. They ate and slept with the stench of death in their nostrils. Below them were the enemy's mine shafts; beyond them were our own. It was a competition in blowing up tumbled earth, and men fought like devils with bombs and bayonets over mine craters which had buried another score or so of their friends. The story of Hooge was a serial carried on from week to week, but the place was only one of our little schools of war for bright young men."

That is the alternative—for your boys and mine. America can no more contract out of the consequences of a breakdown in western civilization than can Belgium. I went to that school. But I had the good fortune to learn other lessons as well as the lessons of war. In the company command post in the ruined cellars of the stables of Hooge Chateau I first read "Shop Management"—just at the time when that message was written, and a few months before Frederick Taylor died.

Co-operation, co-ordination are difficult. They demand sacrifices. But Frederick Winslow Taylor belongs to the ages. Nothing that we or others can say or do can add or detract from what he has done. If, for our own sakes, in love on the part of those who knew him and in gratitude on the part of those who were not so privileged, we wish to build him a memorial, what form should it take? Shall we make a little chapel where friends and disciples may quietly come and go? Or shall we do as he would have done? Shall we go down into the fight with lies and ignorance, blindness and disaster? Shall we try to build a temple for all the world—a temple in which peace can dwell at length, for truth stands at the gate with a drawn sword?

The View of an Officer of the International Industrial Relations Association

By C. H. VAN DER LEEUW

Partner, de Erven de Wed. J. van Nelle, Rotterdam, and President, International Industrial Relations Association, The Hague

THIS is the second occasion on which I have to thank the Taylor Society for inviting me to speak at one of its meetings. Five years ago, I came to this country in search of all possible

information about methods of production in relation to building and equipment. We were about to build a factory in Holland and wished it to be as up to date as possible. I enjoy recalling the

charming and liberal way in which busy Americans helped a stranger by giving all the information he asked for and even more. This is one of the many reasons why I like this country and its people, and I shall feel indebted to you always. In particular, the Taylor Society and Dr. Person—whose quiet helpfulness (and his pipe) I note are still with him—gave me what I needed.

It is here in the Taylor Society that I gained my first clear understanding of what you mean by scientific management. Moreover, I got at one of the most important and far-reaching ideas which Taylor gave to the industrial world—that scientific management is an *attitude of mind*. Though methods and systems may be part of it, Taylor and the Taylor Society after him stressed this fact: We are not creating a creed or a dogma of systems or methods; these are merely the outcome of an attitude of mind. To quote Taylor's own words (from Hearings Before a Special Committee of the House of Representatives): "Without a certain state of mind scientific management cannot exist."

What I liked in the Taylor Society from the beginning, and still like, is the philosophic outlook along with a most practical view—more practical, as a matter of fact, than the view of many who insist that they are practical and that what they want is "brass tacks." Often they have the brass tacks, but they do not know where and how to place them. The Taylor Society does know, because it has the philosophic outlook.

Belonging as I do to the much criticized—not to say despised—class of managing capitalists, I feel that I can express some frank opinions about this class. We are inclined to appropriate rather egotistically any development of art, of science, of techniques, whether in methods or in materials. Not only in the United States but on our side of the water, we want to get the best out of it, and we are not always wise as to what is the best. Often short-sightedly we act in a way which is not even to our own advantage, let alone the advantage of others.

This interest in others, this concern for the human beings involved, is a side of industry and management which always had the attention of Taylor (though he was and is misunderstood by many in this respect) and of the Taylor Society. No sentimentality is involved in this. Taylor and the Taylor Society have wanted rational methods, a

planned management, insight into the why and how of an enterprise, which result as a matter of course in less waste of energies and materials and therefore better financial results; but along with that they have consciously aimed to establish proper conditions for the human beings who help to bring about these results.

This latter point has been my interest for a long time, resulting in the founding—together with many others thinking along similar lines—of the I.R.L., known, I suppose, to many of you. For those who are not acquainted with it, I might betray that these letters stand for the International Industrial Relations Association "for the study and promotion of satisfactory human relations and conditions in industry." The full title explains our work. We approached these problems from a somewhat different angle than that of the older, more sentimental movements; we found rational methods and scientific management contributing largely to proper human relations and conditions. But, as was said in the report of the triennial congress in Flushing, Holland: The human being ought to be the pivot around which turns the wheel of industry.

Here it is that the Taylor Society and the I.R.L. meet and supplement and help each other. And both alike—as many movements and persons in these days—are realizing that all our good ideas and intentions, our methods and systems, will not carry us very far as long as there is this constant danger of economic crises such as we are passing through today. I know that we have had other crises, and I know that some view them as necessary or rather as unavoidable, like a recurrent epidemic. There may be some truth in this view, but then in olden times epidemics also were differently regarded; people made offerings to the gods, or rather the devils, who they imagined caused them. Now, prophylactic methods have eliminated much of the danger.

It may be true that economic epidemics are unavoidable. But should we not at least make the effort to find prophylactic measures to prevent or to lessen them? Just as in epidemics science does not treat symptoms, but seeks to get at causes by observing conditions, so in business and industry we must stop talking about merely partial measures and try to get the facts, then the insight into the facts, and after that the philosophy of the dy-