

FOLLOWING are the appointments to committees called for by the conference. These committees are to pursue investigations and make reports—preliminary at least—at a Fall meeting. It is hoped such reports can be prepared in time to send out abstracts in advance of the meeting.

I. COMMITTEE TO PREPARE QUESTIONNAIRE; also to act as a planning and directing committee:

Willard E. Freeland, Chairman of Committee on Organization and Functions of the Sales Planning Department.

(Mr. Freeland will be in the West until November, 1920. In his absence Mr. A. B. Rich will act in his place on all committees.)

Charles J. Crockett, Chairman of Committee on Organization and Functions of Sales Operating Department.

Charles P. Staubach, Chairman of Committee on Sales Quotas.

E. St. Elmo Lewis, Campbell Ewald Co., 18 W. 34th St., New York.

Henry Wood Shelton, Industrial Engineer, 804 Pennsylvania Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa., Secretary of the Committee.

II. COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SALES PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

Willard E. Freeland, Winchester Repeating Arms Co., New Haven, Conn., Chairman.

Henry T. Noyes, Art in Buttons, Inc., Rochester, N. Y.

Charles E. Percy, Joseph & Feiss Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

G. H. Kerr, E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., Wilmington, Del.

A. B. Rich, Dennison Mfg. Co., Framingham, Mass., Chairman pro tem in absence of Mr. Freeland.

Sanford E. Thompson, 136 Federal St., Boston, Mass.

John A. Urquhart, W. H. McElwain Co., 354 Congress St., Boston, Mass.

F. R. Wallace, Street & Finney, 171 Madison Ave., New York City.

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

Charles J. Crockett, Printz-Biederman Co., Cleveland, Chairman.

H. A. Burns, New Home Sewing Machine Co., Orange, Mass.

G. V. Carroll, Dennison Mfg. Co., 220 Fifth Ave., New York.

George W. Dickerman, Remington Typewriter Co., 374 Broadway, New York.

Richmond Mayo-Smith, The Plimpton Press, Norwood, Mass.

Harry Vincent, Sales Manager, McElwain, Morse and Rogers, Duane and Hudson Sts., New York.

Henry P. Wherry, Rossendale-Reddaway Belting & Hose Co., Newark, N. J.

IV. COMMITTEE ON THE SELECTION AND TRAINING OF SALESMEN.

J. Passmore Elkington, Philadelphia Quartz Co., 1215 Third St., Philadelphia.

Boyd Fisher, Lockwood, Greene & Co., 60 Federal St., Boston, Mass.

C. R. Cary, Leeds and Northrup Co., 4901 Stanton Ave., Philadelphia.

Fowler Manning, Diamond Match Co., New York.

Charles R. Sturdevant, American Steel & Wire Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

N. S. Robson, Rochester Button Co., Rochester, N. Y.

V. COMMITTEE ON SALES QUOTAS.

Charles P. Staubach, Burroughs Adding Machine Co., 31 Clinton St., Newark, N. J., Chairman.

W. C. Dunlap, American Multigraph Sales Co., New York.

M. S. Eylar, Elliott-Fisher Co., Harrisburg, Pa.

R. N. Fellows, Addressograph Co., Chicago.

C. E. Steffey, Sales Manager, National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio.

J. R. Worden, Frederick Stearns and Co., Detroit, Mich.

THE EARLY STEPS OF TAYLOR'S TECHNICAL ADVANCE

By

H. S. PERSON¹

I. INTRODUCTION

THERE have been—and still are—several misunderstandings of the Taylor philosophy and system of management current among plant managers which have profoundly influenced their attitude towards it and restricted that open-mindedness and receptivity of new ideas and things commonly believed to be characteristic of the American business man. These misunderstandings first appeared about 1911, when scientific management was brought to public attention by the Eastern Rate Case hearings. The first incorrect inference was that scientific management was at that time something new, something recently conceived and suddenly promulgated, a *theory* which had no background of thorough trial; the second was the inference that scientific management had been first conceived as a theory and that the system was simply a body of mechanisms hastily worked out to support the theory; the third was the inference that scientific management, the Taylor System, was a mechanistic thing which could be contracted for—transported, so to speak, through the medium of an engineer—and installed as a fixed mechanical contrivance; and the fourth was the inference that scientific management, during whatever vague past it had enjoyed, had induced labor opposition in many of the plants in which it had been “installed.” All of these misunderstandings, inferences made about 1911 when the public first heard of scientific management, have had an astonishing survival in an industrial community of apparently open-minded, boldly experimental and hard-headed executives.

Denials of everyone of these misconceptions have been made by those informed concerning the early history of scientific management, but these denials have been general and unsupported by systematic evidence, and have on the whole been discounted by the misinformed as partisan statements. The purpose of this article is to tell enough of the story—high lights only—of the beginnings and growth of scientific man-

¹Managing Director, Taylor Society, New York.

agement to relieve those who are laboring under misapprehension.

To correct the first inference—that scientific management was a new and untried philosophy and system of management at the time it first received public attention, in 1911,—it may be said that it had been worked out in its fundamentals by Taylor during the period 1880—1889, and further developed in most of its details during the decade 1890—1899; and that nearly all the story subsequent to that time is a story of refinement which resulted in no fundamental modifications.

With respect to the second incorrect inference,—that scientific management originated as a theory, in support of which mechanisms were subsequently devised,—the fact is that the mechanisms resulted from a series of attempts by a shop foreman to solve practical shop problems, as they appeared one after another, with no thought of a “system;” and that the coordinating of the mechanisms into a system, the philosophizing about them and the formulation of principles were later inspirations.

Of the third incorrect inference,—that scientific management is a transportable mechanism, subject to reproduction in detail in different places with the rapidity involved in mechanical installation,—it should be observed; that in its origin scientific management was a *development* and not an *installation*, that every genuine instance of its appearance in a plant has been a development, and that dependable engineers today undertake to give plants the benefit of it only as a matter of development; and further, that such development is on the whole a problem of *adapting* proven principles and well-tested mechanisms to local conditions, physical and psychological.

Concerning the fourth incorrect inference,—that scientific management has experienced the opposition of workers in the plants in which it has been developed,—it should be said, first, that distinction should be made between plants in which there has been an honest undertaking to *develop* it patiently, as