

ideals and methods with respect to which it has been a pioneer, are now accepted by the van-guard of American executives; and it receives an inspiration to further endeavor from the profound conviction that the ideals with respect to which it is today a pioneer, will before long be axioms of American industrial thinking.

To be more specific, we take the liberty of pointing out the logic of the program of the Syracuse meeting, presented in detail on another page. In the scouting of the Taylor Society on behalf of the army of industrial executives, a primary and ever-present duty is to get the lay of the land, map the field of operation, define the major conditions under which the battle for industrial progress must be fought. One of the major forces to be met, and to be annihilated or adequately provided for, is the existence of cyclic changes in industry. The swing from a period of prosperity to a period of depression, and vice versa, is one of the most powerful forces conditioning the nature of industrial management; recent experience has put us in a state of mind to give attention to this major problem; therefore the opening session of the Syracuse meeting is concerned with the strategy of meeting cyclic changes. A second great problem of current interest—at a time when the industrial army is emerging from the winter quarters of depression and is disposing itself for a season's campaign—is one which combines strategy and tactics: to determine what immediate objectives may be set up, and what movements should be made to make secure the positions to accomplish those objectives; therefore the second session of the meeting is concerned with markets and selling. A third big problem—practically of strategy but chiefly of tactics—is how in detail to win the coveted ground with economy of the resources available; therefore the remaining sessions are concerned with the direction of detail technical operations—the organization and methods of the factory planning room. And the lesson of this part of the program is presented in two ways: by an analytical discussion and by the opportunity for the observation in action of two units of the industrial army which have won the reputation of having most advanced methods in technical operations.

We have not left ourselves the space for comment on the various excellent articles in this issue. But we cannot refrain from comment on Mr. Brown's paper on "Labor Classification and Pay-Roll Analysis." When we poured ourselves out in the editorial "Pro-

ducers and Non-Producers," in the October, 1922, issue—Vol. VII, No. 5—we expected a come-back from somewhere. We got it at the next meeting of the Central New York Section, where Mr. Brown presented his paper. It is a most interesting presentation of a point of view—a forward-looking point of view. But we are not persuaded that it looks forward far enough. We had presented the view in our editorial that there should be no recognition, in a standard terminology, of non-productive labor in a well-managed enterprise; that the only reason for the performance of a function is its productivity; that functions which are in the long run non-productive should be eliminated; that therefore the terms *productive* and *non-productive* should be discarded as conducive to the retention of a wrong point of view and consequently of wasteful functions. Mr. Brown presents an interesting argument for the terminology *direct productive*, *direct non-productive*, *indirect productive*, *indirect non-productive*, and *general*, in the classification of labor. But we adhere to the view presented in our editorial; we cannot see anything but harm in the use of the word *non-productive*, except as a term in reserve to label something which we had believed to be productive but have discovered is not, and should therefore be eliminated. We do not believe it should be retained as a part of the standard terminology for those functions which are desirable. Mr. Brown makes an apparently strong point when he says:

If I may apply the test of productiveness on the basis of profits to an individual or to a department, I may also apply it to a complete organization, and if I so apply it, I find that a given organization in one year was productive because it made \$1 of profits, and I find that in the next year the same organization with the same amount of sales is non-productive because it lost \$1.

Now this is a good criticism of our use without qualification of profits as a measure of productivity. We admit that the measure must be something more fundamental than that; but we used it for purpose of illustration as the convenient first, rough measure of productivity and not as the ultimate measure. It is a good criticism also of the convenient assumption in the editorial that the productivity of an action (whether of an individual, a gang, a department, an entire enterprise or an industrial society) can be determined once and for all, or is always productive or non-productive. In a fluctuating environment a specific action may be now productive and now non-productive. The justification for an action's retention, however, is that it is in the long run productive. The purpose of the editorial was to emphasize the fact that we should recognize, by

dropping the terms *productive* and *non-productive* from our standard operating terminology, that only the productive has a reason for existence; and to establish the mental attitude that any action, which calls for the use of the term *non-productive* should be at once under suspicion—should be able to prove itself in the long run as productive or be cast into the junk pile of discarded elements of the productive process.

PROGRAM OF THE SPRING MEETING  
OF THE TAYLOR SOCIETY  
SYRACUSE, N. Y., JUNE 7-9, 1923

Headquarters: Hotel Onondaga

The next meeting of the Taylor Society is a joint meeting of the National Society with the Central New York and Southern New York Sections. The program follows:

**Thursday, June 7, 2.30 P.M.**—Paper: Business Cycles and Unemployment; by Wilford I. King, Bureau of Economic Research, New York. Discussion.

Acting upon a suggestion of the President's Conference on Unemployment (September, 1921), Secretary Hoover appointed a special committee to investigate business cycles and unemployment; that committee arranged with the Bureau of Economic Research to make the detail study; the full report has just been made available through the McGraw-Hill Book Company. Mr. King will sum up those results of the investigation which should influence every firm's administrative policy.

**Thursday, June 7, 8 P.M.**—Paper: The Sales Machine: 1923 Model; by Harry R. Wellman, Consultant on Sales Problems, Professor of Marketing at the Amos Tuck School, formerly Sales Manager of J. Walter Lowney Company. Discussion.

Good factory management requires continuous operations and employment; these require the highest quality of sales management; the period of intense competition which is immediately ahead will put a heavy responsibility on sales organizations; how are they going to meet the responsibility?

**Friday, June 8, 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.**—Inspection of Planning Department of the Corona Typewriter Company; including a motor trip to Groton, N. Y.

Recent articles in the *Bulletin of the Taylor Society* have interested members in the progressive methods of management at the Corona works, and this visit—a courtesy of the Corona Typewriter Company—will afford members the opportunity to observe the methods and mechanisms in detail.

**Friday, June 8, 8 P.M.**—Paper: The Planning Department as an Instrument of Executive Control, by Keppele Hall, Supervisor of Planning, The Joseph & Feiss Company, Cleveland. Discussion.

"Let me see the planning department and I will tell you what kind of management the firm has," said a prominent executive. "Some planning departments are planning departments in name only; others are the real thing." What are the functions of the planning department? What are the ear-marks of a good planning department? Mr. Hall will bring to the discussion of this subject long experience as an engineer and as the executive in charge of one of the most efficient planning departments in American industry.

**Saturday, June 9, 9 A.M.**—Inspection of the Planning Department of the H. H. Franklin Company.

The courtesy of the Franklin Company will permit guests to observe some interesting mechanisms of a most progressive management. The general description of these in Babcock's "The Taylor System in Franklin Management" has aroused the interest and curiosity of all executives.

MAKE YOUR PLANS

You personally cannot afford to miss this meeting. Your firm should send a delegation of younger executives and foremen. It is time to restore and direct into profitable channels the esprit and pep lost during the depression. Your organization will need both, to meet the increasing competition of an increasing prosperity. You do not need to be a member of the Taylor Society to be cordially welcomed.

MAKE YOUR PREPARATION

Reserve the dates—June 7-9—now. Write at once for reservations at the Hotel Onondaga, Syracuse. Make a tickler memorandum to secure railroad reservations by June 1. Note: Syracuse is the focal point of a number of fine automobile trunk lines—let your imagination complete the suggestion.

WASHINGTON, NEWS LETTER

Washington, D. C., April, 1923.

In marked contrast to the doubtful attitude of Government officials toward scientific management when Mr. Taylor testified before the Senate investigating committee in 1911 are the developments of the past eighteen months. Beginning with the survey of waste in industry initiated by Mr. Hoover, and completed shortly after he became Secretary of Commerce, right down to the passage of the Employees Reclassification Bill during the closing hours of the 67th Congress, several events have occurred which reflect not only an increasing interest in scientific management principles, but also actual application of those principles to current problems, and to some extent, direct participation in that application by members of the Taylor Society now in Government service.