

Two points of view have been expressed; one may be termed mechanistic and the other organic. Mr. Kendall speaks of a machine winning the war, but I tell you no machine will ever win the war. Germany gives us the finest example of the mechanistic idea, fully worked out; a machine going to war only by reason of the Junker juice poured in from the top. Is not America's mission to take the measure of that machine, and prove its weakness?

Mr. Kendall says we must win this war, if at all, in six months. He does not trust the organic idea in what he calls Mr. Cook's method of gradual evolution, because it is too slow; yet he defines evolution as "the survival of the fittest." He obviously believes we are the fittest to survive in this contest, yet seems not quite to trust the law of the survival of those fittest.

I fully agree with Mr. Gregg when he says he does not worry about Germany beating us, because I do not think that Germany could, in forty years, beat the living, growing, powerful organism of the United States. It seems to me that the democratic peoples in this war must trust democratic methods, pure and simple, to get results; and personally I would rather go down to defeat working for an effective democratic organization than win the war on an autocratic basis. We are fighting for democracy, against autocracy, and a victory over that autocracy, secured by a final resort to autocratic methods, would be no victory for democracy.

Why is it practical to think of our point of view? Because point of view determines action and action determines results. May I suggest the difference between the mechanistic and the organic point of view? A machine is neither self-acting nor self-correcting. An organism, such as your own body, is both self-acting and self-correcting. An organism must be self-correcting because it constantly meets new conditions which it could not foresee, and it must be able to meet them successfully. Now, if an organism is to be self-correcting it has to be freely self-acting; therefore, if you try to dominate too completely from a central control, no matter how wise—and we all want wise leadership—you destroy this necessary free self-action and self-correction.

This whole question seems to me one between control and leadership. The issue between the two points of view is clear cut. One wants a top control over a perfect machine; the other wants leadership of a free, self-acting, adaptable organism. The authority of the one is autocratic; it wishes to dominate the situation. As we have had it described to us tonight, we need the selection by some one of a group of men (or supermen) so wise that they can dominate the situation and

win the war in six months. I believe no individual is wise enough to make such a selection. The authority of the other is democratic; it wishes similarly wise and competent men to be found and supported as leaders by the crowd because of their proven fitness for leadership. I believe the crowd can and will find and support such men.

Authority from the mechanistic point of view is imposed from the top; authority from the organic point of view is built up from the bottom. The authority of the mechanistic point of view is dogmatic; the authority of the other is scientific, based on facts; and the reason we have to be self-correcting organisms is because we always keep on learning new facts which we must be able to seize and make the most of at the moment. The authority of the mechanistic point of view says, "Do this my way because I say so." The other point of view says: "Successful action must be according to natural law. Let us find and do the right way."

The authority of the mechanistic point of view is comparatively inflexible, because of fear that any change will be for the worse. The authority of the other is progressive, because of eagerness to gain new knowledge. The authority of forcing "my way" makes for disloyalty and disintegration. The authority of revealing the right way makes for loyalty and confidence.

You can be specific on those points and go as far as you like. I have known many executives who believe in the mechanistic point of view and most of them dislike criticism, whether right or wrong. I have also known those with the organic point of view, and they get help and suggestions all the time, from all along the line. The first grow gradually weaker, the second grow constantly stronger.

Take our own make-up; we have our mind, directing our conscious actions, and getting certain conscious results "from the top down"; but a greater and more vital part of our lives is the working, not of our conscious intellect, but of our sub-conscious creative powers through our sympathetic nervous system "from the bottom up." The creative urge, which ultimately wins the victory, can work only that way.

Let us then, in these critical hours, look well into ourselves, that we be not deceived. We must decide whether we are mechanistic in our point of view, believing after all in autocracy, the divine right of self-selected bosses to "dominate the situation"; or whether we are organic in our point of view, believing in democracy, and the ability of the crowd to find its wise and fitting leaders and clothe them with the irresistible power of its united support.

MAJOR H. DIEMER:¹ (contributed) The fact that industrial engineers who have been students of the Taylor philosophy of management have agreed that this philosophy is capable of evolution has been evidenced by their hearty endorsement of the development of the so-called "shop disciplinarian" into the modern personnel and employment division. A further evidence of the acknowledgment of the principle of evolution is the concession that we must preserve the idea of centralization of administrative authority in our development of the principle of functional control. An example from current military practice will, no doubt, enable many industrialists to get a clearer comprehension of this subject.

At a large manufacturing plant there may be stationed a senior officer to whom all officers at that plant or station are responsible. So far as methods and forms of reports are concerned, we may have functional control from central staff officials, reaching directly from staff headquarters to minor functional officers. For instance, there might be under the senior officer in question, an officer in charge of stores, an officer in charge of production, an officer in charge of shipping, an officer in charge of property records, and officers in charge of various kinds of inspection and testing.

Under a philosophy of purely functional control, the senior officer would be without any definite authority. Under existing military practice, however, he is in fact the individual in whom is centralized administrative authority over all of the officers in question. All communications and reports are signed in his name, and pass over his desk. To be sure, this burdens the administrator with considerable routine. With competent help in the way of secretarial and filing assistants, however, this is not so burdensome as might at first appear. The centralization of admin-

¹Ordnance Department, U. S. R.

istrative authority does result in a greater feeling of mutual obligation, confidence and responsibility, and results in greater cooperation than would be possible under purely functional control.

Now let us take the industrial analogy. If the superintendent of a certain division of a large plant is gradually relieved of the traditional duties which he used to administer himself, under old types of organization, and functional heads are introduced, who take over, one by one, such matters as dispatching, or order of work, time studies, and instruction cards, demonstration, or speeds and feeds of machines, employment problems, including safety, welfare and social activities, each of the local functional heads being responsible only to the general head of his function, there cannot be anything like the cooperation or effective results that can be brought about if the local line officer, whether he be a superintendent or foreman, is the acknowledged administrative head of all activities in this territory or field of action.

In order to realize the benefit of such centralized authority, the industrial senior officer must be a man appreciative of the philosophy of functional control, and in sympathy with it. I do not wish to contend that the minor executive, designated by Dr. Taylor as the "gang boss," should be a senior officer over the local planning division heads. I do contend, however, that the superintendent over a group of departments, involving a dozen or more gang bosses, should also be the senior officer over all planning department employees who carry on work exclusively within his field of activity. A survey of plants that have adopted, in principle, Dr. Taylor's philosophy of management, will reveal the fact that there is an increasing appreciation of this need for the centralization of authority.