

necessary to give to all workmen a chance to develop their own individuality and thereby to work from *within out*, instead of merely reacting to externally applied force. This premise being accepted, it is obviously necessary for a *thoroughly scientific* management to consciously put more responsibility into the hands of the individuals throughout the organization and to cease its efforts to control *all the minute details of manufacturing*, by orders issued from a central planning department.

There can be no intelligent control of details unless this is done, for it is through the individual that the universal invariably manifests in dealing with a particular situation, and this universal principle of unity, which represents the third field, is reflected in our organization by the central governing body.

We must put more responsibility into the hands of the individual men throughout the organization. It is only in this way that *normal men* can be developed.

I do not mean to abandon the idea of functionalization, but that it should not be carried to its extreme. It is an old axiom that anything carried to its extreme becomes its opposite.

A man who is a specialist in only one line, and who does not realize the relationship of his work to his whole environment, is *not* a normal individual and lacks judgment and creative ability. The medical profession is a typical example of the absurd results obtained by over-specialization and it is rare to find a doctor today who knows a normal individual when he sees one. I am not advocating a return to the old order of things, where each man turned out a complete finished article. It is not necessary to do this in order to develop men. It is, however, necessary to satisfy this inherent longing to create, and I maintain that this fundamental instinct can be satisfied and still allow the benefits of specialization to be retained in a large measure. We should, however, educate our men to a greater realization of their place in the organization and the universal scheme of life and this can be done only by increasing their knowledge of the laws of the natural, or generic field, and at the same time by giving them a chance to specialize these laws through the free exercise of "the will."

The difference between what is frequently done and what I am advocating is largely a matter of emphasis. In one case the proceeding is to determine "the one best method" and then give detailed instructions for following same. In the other it is a question of determining, through the aid of science and in cooperation with the workman himself, the *best procedure under the circumstances* and then creating an environment which will produce a desire on the part of the workman to do the work in the manner

determined upon. In the first instance we have a controlling system compelling discipline from the top down,—a sort of benevolent despotism radiating from the centre to the circumference,—which requires a very decided expenditure of creative energy from the executive branch merely to keep the organization in operation. This necessarily ties up a good deal of energy which could be used to create better conditions for the advancement of the plant. In the latter case, where the desire to do good work is manifesting in all parts of the plant, it is more a question of leadership and those at the head of the organization find themselves constantly guiding and directing the creative activity which is manifesting itself in thousands of ways, because the men entrusted to their charge are being given opportunity to enjoy their work by having it made interesting for them.

I am not going to attempt to describe to you our method of building up plant individuality, as my paper before the Society in May, 1915, published in the August BULLETIN of that year, describes this thoroughly.

I simply want to say in conclusion that I believe it to be absolutely essential for the development of the human race that the men who are in control of our industries obtain a real conception of the reason for man's existence.

This cannot be brought about by a purely analytical process, which will at best only accumulate more facts which add more or less to the confusion, but by a synthetic process which will enable us to obtain a philosophical conception of what life really means.

If this is done, man (considered generically) will be recognized as a connecting link between the great field of nature, which was prepared for him in order that he might realize himself by mastering its laws, and the great cosmic unifying creative principle which brought the universe into existence. Let us recall again the fact that man never creates matter nor force but he does create conditions for the expansion of these primary universal energies. The universal invariably manifests itself through the individual and it is this originating, choosing, adapting power, which Professor Drury speaks of, which must be developed and co-operated with if we are really to make our organizations thoroughly scientific.

Viewed from this standpoint, we can see why the power to create is absolutely essential to man's development and that any organization which denies to its men this opportunity to express themselves in creative work, cannot be considered scientific; for it is not intelligently enlisting into the service that great intermediate power "The Will of Man."

MR. GEO. D. BABCOCK:¹ It is most regrettable that through the illness from which Mr. Cooke is suffering it is impossible for him to be with us to-night, because the issue which was presented by Mr. Valentine's paper a year ago is the issue that still remains in the scale, and it is still going to remain in the scale and swing about the pivot for a long time. I do not believe that there is any solution for that issue except through scientific study leading to deductions based on facts.

Let us consider briefly how most organization relations develop. Some man of broad perceptions, or having special knowledge, interests his friends in a projected business development. They provide as capital surplus earnings acquired by thrift and economy, probably a pension for later years. Buildings, machinery, and fixed equipment, materials, and markets are acquired. The public is notified that new opportunities for employment are offered. The first workmen are usually such as see a greater degree of opportunity for advancement with the new manager, whoever he be, than with their employer; their knowledge of the new product or its probable usefulness must be so limited as to remove it as an incentive to change.

Production starts and is carried on for a time with perfect satisfaction to capital, management, and men. The business expands until large amounts of money are involved in fixed equipment, and if unfinished, in unsalable materials. Largely increasing responsibilities in selling, buying, product development, and financing so occupy the manager's time that his personal relation to his working force, which is much more self-maintaining than these inanimate things, all but ceases and a substituted, delegated, and practically unlimited, authority takes its place. Rapidly increasing demands for workmen precludes a selection of those most fitted by environment and training for the particular tasks, so the "unemployed" are admitted. Production problems fill time and mind of supervisors. The public is cordial to the prosperous industry.

With the addition of untrained men costs rise and markets shrink. Spoiled work, careless attendance, and indifference sour the supervisors, already overburdened with seemingly endless duties. The keen wedge of discontent enters to disrupt the human relations of managers and men. Men are "fired" and new ones who find a chance to work are "hired." They enter employment not to satisfy ideals, but to get a "job." They are employed for what they know, not for what they can learn to do. Knowing little they are soon "fired." No such organization is stable regardless of its valuable product, finance, or selling

¹Production Manager, Franklin Automobile Co., Syracuse, N. Y.

power. Workmen will naturally restrict output, do as poor work as will squeeze through inspection, and if strength comes by might, will group for offense and defense. Emboldened by the first successful results of concerted action, fully appreciating the manager's handicap of immobile fixed investment, limited equitable demands for fair treatment and wages expand to those unreasonable, impossible requirements which succeed to destructive violence.

Suspension of work, mis-payment on bonds—dissolution—fixed equipment and materials—a very limited asset—bankruptcy and ruin to the dependents on capital—loss of employment to the workers—loss of useful, economical, product to the public and their provisioners.

For the want of a nail a shoe was lost,
For the want of a shoe a horse was lost,
For the want of a horse a rider was lost,
And all for the loss of a horseshoe nail.

Unfortunately this is not in this day a fairy tale. I agree that the boss must be from within and not from without the shop. He must, however, assume his inherent responsibilities, not alone for the inanimate things but for the animate as well.

Dr. Taylor found that nail which was lost.

It is our fault alone if we, as managers, do not drive it into the afflicted foot and clinch it well.

MR. A. J. PORTENAR:² I do not know whether the story I am going to start with is new or not. No stories are new. There are only six jokes in the world. All the rest are variations. A gentleman came out on the street of a big city and saw a darky standing in front of a store window. He went to him and he said, "Sam, can you change a five dollar bill for me?" The darky answered "No, sir, I can't but I sure do thank you for the compliment." The point is this: That in the Taylor Society I am welcomed as one who can take a point of view which is regarded as frank and honest and that I am not considered as one who must necessarily be *persona non grata*, because I am sympathetic with labor; in fact, a member of a labor union.

My acquaintance with Mr. Taylor began through an approach made by him to me because of a book I had written and which he had read. That book was written by me as a union man speaking to other union men, and the title I intended it to bear was "What shall we do?" It was shortly after the McNamara exposures. I felt it was up to someone to say something and that I was that someone. The publishers in their wisdom changed the title from "What shall we do?" to the very trite one "Organized Labor; Its Problems and How to Meet Them."

²Superintendent, Bureau of Employment, New York State Industrial Commission.