

One of the reasons for Taylor's great success was that he dealt in facts. Nowhere in any of his writings will you find long discussions on useless theories. His theories were constructive and brought results. He did not envelop his work in a veil of mystery. If he was called upon to do "stunts", he did them simply to prove the soundness of his work.

Mr. Taylor was primarily an engineer, and being an engineer worked along engineering lines. His principles and mechanisms of management are the direct results of the facts obtained from his investigations. He had a problem to solve. Like any engineer, he made a thorough investigation of all facts pertaining to it. He took up all contingencies and worked out various methods to meet the situation as it presented itself. He formed his organization for doing the work, and for seeing that it was done properly.

His work was identically that of an engineer with a problem to solve. Take the case of an engineer building a dam. He gathers information as to the least and greatest amount of water which has run in the river over a period of years; tests the speed of the current; makes soundings of the bottom and examinations of the banks for holding the foundation and the sides of the dam; in fact, makes innumerable investigations before the dam can be designed formally. These questions decided, plans are drawn up and specifications made; then men are delegated to do the work and to inspect it.

Mr. Taylor followed the same method in his work. The difference, however, is that Mr. Taylor was working in an industrial field. We had a much more complex problem to meet as he was dealing to a larger degree with the human element; besides he was entering an entirely new field. The result was, that as his work progressed in gathering facts, he discovered that it was necessary to change business methods very radically if he was to bring about success. He had to make his investigations, draw up his plans and specifications, not alone for a single department of the business, but for the whole business itself, if that one department was to function properly.

I am bringing out these points simply because of the necessity for people to get the idea that there is nothing mysterious about Taylor's work, or the type of management which he taught. It is nothing more than real engineering applied to business.

The work Taylor did for industry is almost incalculable. However, this work will not bear the fruit it should until cant is dropped, and the men who carry on his work are in reality what they claim to be.

The question is how can the Taylor Society bring this about and advance the teachings of Taylor.

I would suggest that they change their classifications and qualifications for membership.

First—Members: They should be men whom the Society is willing to stand behind as being qualified to either teach or install scientific management or to operate a plant in accordance with its principles. To start with, members could be selected from the present membership by a committee. They should not be called engineers unless they have such a degree from some institution of learning, or are so recognized by one of the National Engineering Societies.

Second—Junior Members: They should be managers, superintendents, apprentices, etc., who are doing or learning the work. The Society would not back them for installing scientific management. On the contrary; they would protest against encroachments of this sort.

Third—Associate Members: They should be those interested in scientific management, who desire to support the work and receive the benefits of the Society.

The Society should take up with the universities the question of establishing courses in scientific management, for which the degree of engineer would be given. It should see that the philosophy, principles and mechanisms of Taylor be adopted as the foundation of the science. This would kill the idea of "system."

The Society should also make it known to the public in general, and to business men in particular, the work it is doing for industry, especially with regard to its work with the universities, and its qualifications for membership.

This would be constructive work. It would lead to that for which members of this Society should be working—the betterment of industrial conditions through principles and a philosophy which they feel to be the foundation of proper management and which will not be changed although they may be developed. It would teach the public to understand the work of Taylor in a way that would appeal to the man of affairs.

Very truly yours,

HENRY P. WHERRY¹.

¹Manager the Rosendale-Reddaway Belting and Hose Company, Newark, N. J.

BULLETIN OF THE

TAYLOR SOCIETY

A SOCIETY TO PROMOTE THE SCIENCE AND THE ART OF ADMINISTRATION AND OF MANAGEMENT

ABSTRACTS OF PRELIMINARY REPORTS

OF

THE COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE,

THE COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND THE FUNCTIONS OF THE SALES ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

AND

THE COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND THE FUNCTIONS OF THE SALES OPERATING DEPARTMENT

PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

TAYLOR SOCIETY

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 3, 1920

Engineering Societies Building
29 W. Thirty-Ninth St.,
New York

DECEMBER, 1920

VOL. V, No. 6