Notes: Naumkeag. What brought about the experiment?
What brought about the experiment?

As I gather from Goodell's confidential papers, the competitors doing so well took to making wide sheeting. Prosperity was not doing so well took to making wide sheeting. Prosperity was not so continuous, began to feel the competition, but the management having been so long successful thought it had learned the secret and went on its own way. Goodell hints that neither the agent nor the treasurer were what is called "mill men." They had their subordinates upon whom they depended and G. seems to think they kept things from their heads. They probably slid over difficulties or charged them to some unknown scapegoat. At least his idea is that Smith was not getting reliable information and that there was more or less a political struggle going on among them.

The mention in the case of this political management was that the workers themselves took at it, played politics - got easier jobs - more jobs for their friends. This went on for about ten years then something had to be done because of the increased competition. It was here that they attempted to stretch out which has to be explained. Smith worked out a whole series of economies when he saw that they had got to make economies or else cut dividends.

There were such relations between the management and the union that they were called upon to vote upon the proposal as a whole. It was here that O'Connell came in. Of course for
him to have considered for a moment any form of scientific management was contrary to the union's position, position of open antagonism, that it had always had to the Taylor system. He went to Cooke.

Goodell has in this paper a paragraph on Cooke which is interesting but must be regarded as confidential.

"As Mr. Cooke personifies another and not inconspicuous force in this study I must stop long enough to characterize him and his interest and an approximation of his motives. Mr. Cooke had been a close student, admirer and disciple of Mr. F. W. Taylor - beginning in 1903. He has devoted his rare capacities and practical knowledge of men and affairs to the advancement of science in management. I do not believe that this was due so much to his profound love of science as to the love of his fellow men. I think he saw in the scientific attitude toward business and manufacturing problems a very much broader liberalizing tendency than did the other early students of that group - though Mr. Gantt may be an exception. (I did not know Mr. Gantt except through his books.) And I credit Mr. Cooke with the keenest sort of appreciation of the social forces. It was perhaps characteristic of most of the growing group that beginning with a careful and systematic study of processes (bringing larger earnings as well as lower labor costs) they soon saw (1) that they were furnishing an object lesson in factual reasoning for the determination of a square deal - a decided step ahead of bluff and
pretense traditional at that time; (2) that the careful
delineation of duties, the establishment of policies (in place
of snap judgment and opportunism) fashioned a more coordinated
plant, a better feeling between the men involved and a sounder
organization; (3) that the same sort of approach of research to
all provinces of administration - though less tangible in many
ways - would supply the foundation for enduring prosperity,
including regularization of employment.

"I am not competent to go into the details of the shift
which has taken place in the relationship between the exponents
of scientific management and the leaders of organized labor.
I believe that Mr. Cooke saw not only that employees, whether
organized or not, would benefit greatly from the results of these
techniques but, also, that they would in some instances
greatly aid these techniques if they were kept in touch with the
objects sought and encouraged to contribute in the studies which
dealt so intimately with their work. Among the first and
certainly with the most telling effect he "set out to sell
science to labor." He is a master at picking opportunities to
suggest to labor leaders that they must get acquainted with the
new techniques - that they cannot afford to ignore them, that
science should belong to all and not alone to employers."
In using this paragraph or paraphrasing it make the point that his effort was to sell scientific management to labor. I may perhaps be able to use my experiences with Gompers. When I laughed at him for cutting off the worker from science. Was not the laboring man to have the use of science as well as the employer? And if I had anywhere the account of that meeting in Washington it might be used. One thing that they did not include in the results of the application is the education to the worker, the point which has always been the strongest with me in scientific management.

At all events according to this article of Goodell's Mr. Cooke seems to have told the science and Goodell was asked to go up and see whether they were trying to get along or if either party was trying to kill the other, that is, to find out if it was a really sincere effort on one side or the other. Goodell seems to have been able within a very short time to sell both sides a plan for joint research. While the labor union went to scientific management it is interesting to note that it was the management that paid Goodell.

He thinks of all sorts of things. One reflection is that an organization exists in industry when individuals working in it find they can further their own interests better by working against the company's interest, that is when there is a shortage of work, little or no recognition of promising work, this reproduces soldiering. For men from top to bottom were what they believe block with company's interest to further to be their own.
He put down as a maxim that the amount of co-operation in an organization is in direct proportion to the knowledge of the company's objectives.

He points out that you cannot go into a plant where there is disorganization and expect that a large force of men will tumble into organic order. He speaks of the suspicion with which any new influence is greeted when it presents itself in a disorganized plan. He says this is because the supervisors are afraid that the new comer will make the work harder, they are afraid of losing prestige and having petty deceits uncovered, of losing prepossessions that long and bitter years have won for them. An industrial engineer, Goodell says, especially one unaided by some sort of joint machinery, is under a great handicap before he starts.

He speaks of the way the industrial engineer is understood. It is a new profession. Its code not crystallized. An engineer tries out quick working, bright ideas, instead of taking time to find out what the various forces which are at work in the organization, which probably are long standing, traditional, psychological, political. He doesn't take time to unravel these, to see what he up against on both sides. The man that succeeds takes patience, depends upon educational work to put his program through. He must convince both sides. That takes time.

He thinks that when they began work at Naumkeag the morale of the supervision was bad. He says they were all more versed in pretense than he was. He seems to have gone to the agent
and the treasurer and explained what he was up to. He notes the
fact that there were many subterfuges in the plant personnel,
but as soon as they began to have joint discussions they cleared
away misunderstandings and deceit which could not have been
touched without just such a board. They had to show their hand.
His point was to let the facts show and as they were settling on
a basis of fact no one's nose was put out of joint.

An excellent point is this scientific attitude, that
is the attitude which he is building up, slowly forces out all
serious effort to get something for nothing.

"This sort of pressure leads naturally to what I
consider one of the very important features of scientific
management. This scientific attitude slowly forces out all
serious effort to get something for nothing. From the president
down each person is expected to learn to fill his own niche in
the integrated web of duties which make up the company effort.
The establishment of standards, the careful apportioning of
duties and the follow up of performance tends to bring the slacker
into an unfavorable light:"

"As soon as those we come in contact with understand this
plan to have everyone get his fair share of the work – neither
more nor less and as long as we show that we are trying to do
this impartially, it seems to be that there is another and a
higher set of motives also brought into use, motives which tend
to build the participants into constructive leaders among their own constituents. For example, an employee newly brought into our circle and studied on a test, or time study is very likely to pretend that the work is especially difficult by various devices which a century of practical management has brought to a high degree of perfection. Our union members (not our management ones) insist upon letting this pretender know that such pretense is contrary to the spirit of the work and that the best good of unionism means that its leaders stand four square for what they are entitled to - no more and no less.

"One union representative who it happened was also president of the union lost his presidency because of a stand of this general nature; and, in my opinion, he now stands higher than before with his constituents.

"It seems just as well not to have much to say about higher motives in business circles, but unless industry supplies scope for them a certain apathy seems to settle upon us for some reason. If a higher motive can be brought into play in the name of some motive more material, a more practical arrangement is obtained. Faces can be saved and people can suit themselves as to motives."