

those united efforts which makes for close-knit cooperative effort because it is based on complete knowledge among the players of what the team is trying to do.

In this very general statement, I have endeavored to give an outline of some of the principles and methods which we have employed. In executive work especially, it is important to keep the proper perspective. You are dealing with human beings with a variety of talents. These must be brought together in a team which will work together, day after day. It is a mistake to regard the organization of the team according to an ideal as the chief aim. We are not after organization for organization's sake, but we are after results. Oftentimes the personnel changes, one man is not fitted to do just the work of his predecessor, and the load must be adjusted to his capacity. At other times, the importance of the work changes so that jobs must be divided or combined. These considerations make it necessary to modify our ideal organization, but under such stress and strain we try never to lose sight of our ideal, which to our minds, is a highly developed functional organization with an adequate central control.

MR. RICHARD A. FEISS:<sup>1</sup> I had hoped to get away without being called on. I had a contract with myself to keep quiet at this meeting, but this subject is so very interesting that a few thoughts have come to me, especially as to what Mr. Kendall and Mr. Cooke have said. It does not seem to me that they have been on the opposite sides of the same question at all. To my mind it seems to me they have talked about the same question from two different points of view. Neither do I think when the question has all been analyzed it will be as complicated and as intricate as it seems.

Those who have been here in Washington, as most of you have been, and have become a part of the developing machine, and those who like Mr. Cooke and Mr. Kendall have given so admirably and freely and disinterestedly of service, are likely to see the thing from the point of view of the particular problem that is uppermost in their minds. Mr. Cooke has fully stated the things that are true, that are practical in the actual stage of organization that exists right now, in a better way than anyone else could possibly do.

Mr. Kendall, who like many of those present, is in and out all of the time, is looking a little farther ahead, perhaps a little more from the top down rather than from the bottom up as compared with Mr. Cooke. But it seems to me that there are several

<sup>1</sup>Joseph & Feiss Co.—"Clothcraft Shops," Cleveland, Ohio.

things that are beclouding these apparent differences, because there are no real differences at all. The first thing that beclouds the issue is the fact that this conference is on the "Centralization of Administrative Authority," and I do not believe that either of the gentlemen who spoke are sure of what is meant. I know I don't. Personally what I think we are getting at is somewhat unfortunately stated in "centralization of administrative authority." I think the thing we are getting at is control in the division of responsibility. These responsibilities and the questions involved in the present emergency are on a scale that has never been faced before anywhere in the world, except, possibly, in the other warring nations. When we look at it from this point of view, and if we forget the word "authority," we will probably see this question a little more clearly. It is a question of the proper organization for action and of the responsibility for action.

Now, as Mr. Cooke has clearly stated, the responsibility at the outset must be left where it already is, as far as possibly can be. In other words, perhaps the present functions, the present divisions of organizations are not the most efficient ultimately. But there they are. They are the only ones capable of functioning and there is undoubtedly some good in them. What Mr. Kendall stated is also true; we must have coordination. In this connection I want to call to your attention that these two gentlemen have not been disagreeing but speaking of two different things. Coordination is a big, vague word, but it is a very specific thing when you consider coordination as a function in itself. Now, there are more than two kinds of organization. There is line organization and staff organization. There is another and generally speaking more effective organization known as functional organization. This is neither staff nor line organization. It is something far more flexible. It is based on the theory that an organization is not an end unto itself, but is a means for the continued accomplishment of definite things. We must clearly set before us the definite things to be established, and we must decide by what means they are to be accomplished and who is to be responsible for the accomplishment of the various activities or functions necessary. Crudely, that is the gist of functional organization. The idea is so simple that most people overlook it. Many, who read the works of Mr. Taylor as their first means of contact with the idea of functionalized organization, are entirely oblivious of this principle of scientific management.

Now, Mr. Cooke is absolutely right and Mr. Kendall will agree with him, that in order to function we need action somewhere down the line. In order to obtain action, there must be definite functionalization.

This very apparently means decentralization as to action. Just in so far as functionalization brings the necessary and effective decentralization for action, so does functionalization of itself make essential another function. Where there are separate entities of an organization, each responsible for action and results in its own line and all aiming at the same ultimate object, it is necessary in order to obtain harmonious and effective, ultimate action to recognize the necessity of coordination and to treat it as a distinct and basic function of the organization.

This question of coordination is a problem in every industry and in every organization that is large enough to be functionalized. It seems to me that while the problem of conducting the activities of carrying on this war is different in some respects from problems of other organizations, this difference is chiefly one of size. Consequently there must be more organization within the organization. But, from the point of view above, it seems clear to me that the same principles apply, as in the organization of any other activity or set of activities. The fact, however, that the present problems are of such a large scale and that the making of mistakes involves interests of such great magnitude, forces us to be more careful and to make haste but slowly.

In conclusion I wish again to call attention to the fact that this appears to me to lie at the bottom of this discussion. There must be at all times the decentralization implied in the proper functionalizing of any organization. This decentralization is that which Mr. Cooke speaks of and is necessary for responsibility for action so that the organization can function. Control, or the centralization of control, which Mr. Kendall speaks of, is also necessary so as to avoid the duplication of work and to obtain cooperative and efficient results. Both are necessary so that each one in his own sphere shall work for the thing for which he is responsible, and the work shall be coordinated from above so that the work of all shall have accumulative effect necessary to obtain its object in victory.

MR. J. FRANKLIN McELWAIN:<sup>1</sup> Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to be called upon and I am a little at sea as the problem is so tremendous. Mr. Kendall has endeavored to paint a composite picture and I think it is extremely difficult at this time to see that complete, ideal picture. On the other hand Mr. Cooke, it seems to me, views the problem from the standpoint of detail. His plan is to perfect the detail in so far as we can, and out of the perfection of that detail evolve the composite ideal picture. I believe that it is the natural procedure. Most of you who are here

<sup>1</sup>W. H. McElwain Co., Boston, Mass.

have probably been concentrating on concrete problems and possibly have not viewed the final picture in the way in which it should be viewed. I personally am very glad that some minds are concentrating on the problem as a whole, and that other minds are concentrating on the problem of detail. I believe that if we who are in contact with the various departments, and undoubtedly most of us are, concentrate on and assist in perfecting the organization and methods of those departments in a common sense way as described by Mr. Feiss, and as described in that paper on ideal organization which we have just heard, the problem will finally solve itself; but we must get quick, forceful, and thorough action in each department.

Coordination or central control has been evolved to some extent and I believe the tendency in this direction is growing greater each day, because it is perfectly obvious that this action is wise and, in fact necessary. Practically all successful businesses administering or conducting various units agree that it is wise and essential to have a strong central control body. That body does not in any sense take away from the efficiency of the unit, or the efficiency of the department, at least an ideal body with its functions properly outlined does not. We must have in those departments that initiative, that incentive to progress, that power and authority necessary to conduct the work properly and efficiently, but we must also have behind that a guiding body. That body does not interfere; it advises. It does not supplant the work of the various units; it simply suggests; it guides, and it helps to solve the problems, when those various units or departments run up against what seem like insoluble problems.

Now, if in each unit we can get that central control, a larger control embodying all will naturally develop. Take for instance the Quartermaster's Department. At one time there was decentralization in this department. By degrees centralization, proper control, is evolving, without in any sense taking away from the efficiency of the department. In fact it is helping to increase efficiency. But there is a great deal yet to be done, a tremendous amount, and it can be done if we all concentrate our minds on the solution of that problem. In the Quartermaster's Department at one time the purchasing was being done by the various depots; by degrees it was controlled in one depot; that was no place for it. Finally the purchasing was taken over by the Department at Washington and to-day the purchasing department is fast being perfected. At one place, and that place the Quartermaster's Department, under the general supervision of the Quartermaster General, this purchasing can be and will be imbued with the broad gauged principles that are actuating the entire Quartermaster's Department.