

of the Central New York Section of the Society, has won this responsibility at a comparatively early age. Two of the newly elected members of the Board of Directors are even younger. The Board of Directors is happily balanced as to age and experience—energy and wisdom in counsel and energy and skill in administration. There is in the situation a challenge to all the younger members of the Society to give evidence of realization of their age-group responsibility by intensive activity in Society national and sectional affairs. Evidence of their interest and willingness is already apparent. The experiment, at the recent meeting, of a session planned and conducted by and for the younger members proved to be highly successful. In excellence of planning, importance of the papers and discussion, competence of the presiding officer—in every respect—this younger members' session ranks with the best which has been offered by the Society. It proved its right to become a permanent element of every meeting.

FORTY-TWO educators concerned in the teaching of management were registered at the annual meeting. In addition to these a number of other persons less directly concerned in the same matter attended the session—the first of its kind—organized especially for that professional group. The papers and discussions were substantial in content, and the teachers who were in attendance decided that a similar special session should be a feature of each annual meeting. The distinguishing characteristic of the session organized by the Taylor Society was the bringing together of teachers of management from engineering schools and schools of commerce respectively. The two groups have a common problem—the teaching of management—but each has also a special problem in the solution of which the other can help; engineering school teachers are giving thought to the problem of introducing certain commerce courses into their curricula and commerce school teachers are giving thought to the problem of introducing certain engineering courses into their curricula. In an institution of the university type in which there are both an engineering school and a school of commerce, the problem is especially important. An adequate solution should be found if both groups of teachers consider the problem *together*. In another issue we shall have something to say about the teaching of management which was suggested by the discussions at this session.

ASIDE from the content-value of the papers and discussions there were many interesting features of the meeting. The discussions of the first day were focused upon the Taylor philosophy, principles and system of management. The matter-of-factness with which scientific management and the Taylor System were mentioned in discussion was evidence of a new comprehension and of a consequent new attitude of mind. As Mrs. Gilbreth remarked, the day of controversy has passed and the day of comprehension, adaptation and utilization has arrived. The evidence is accumulating that the Taylor philosophy is the accepted basis of progressive management thinking, and the Taylor mechanisms the accepted basis of progressive management systems. (It matters little whether the thinker or doer appreciates the historic origins!) And as Mr. Kent observed in the course of his remarks at the annual dinner, there is in this a reason for gratification on the part of that thin line of students of management in the Taylor Society who during the past fifteen years, and especially during the first five of these, have stood fast for those ideas and practices which were bound ultimately to be accepted as basic in American management.

IN THE course of the meetings the scientific management attitude towards the problem of industrial relations stood out in new perspective and was consequently better comprehended by casual guests. During the joint session George Babcock and others answered effectively the criticisms of scientific management in respect to relations with workers. Scientific management believes that good industrial relations arise out of a manner of conduct, not out of everlasting talking. Good industrial relations result from a management that knows what it is doing; a management that makes plans, gets orders, regularizes employment, operates precisely and economically—in other words, does the things which maintain it as a going concern; that brings all the resources of the scientific method to bear on its problems; that establishes contractual relations on the basis of all the facts that are ascertainable; that takes operatives into its confidence and secures approval with respect to details of standard method, time and rate; that enhances individuality in team work instead of minimizing it in mob effort; and that—not least—increases social income. In the course of her remarks at the annual dinner, Miss Mary Van Kleck made the

observation that her early interests were in social problems rather than in management problems, but that she had been attracted to and become vitally interested in scientific management and the Taylor Society because her early observations in social work had convinced her that better technical management is the solution of many of the social problems. And in his remarks at the annual dinner, Professor Irving Fisher observed that one thing in scientific management—genuine scientific management, not mere efficiency management—which impresses him profoundly is the possibility of marked increase of real wages through the greater productivity of such management.

MANAGEMENT'S interest in psychology is a by-product of its interest in human relations. Scientific management and the Taylor Society have taken up the challenge of this, interest, and in two sessions (one in April, one in December, 1924) have made a contribution to the literature of industrial psychology, have brought psychologists and managers into closer contact, and have stimulated inquiry, exposition and thinking along fundamental lines. Statistics and frequency tables of conduct in the industrial environment constitute a line of inquiry of which the value cannot be overestimated, but that is not sufficient. It is essential to inquire into the nature and range of the stimuli which cause the conduct which is counted. What are the stimuli to conduct in industrial relations? To what extent can those stimuli be modified? That is a fundamental question, for if the environment can be modified so as to substitute stimuli to conduct expressive of greater happiness and good will, it is management's task to bring its influence to bear towards favorable modification of the stimuli. Even if management cannot effect great changes in the stimulating environment, just to know what the stimuli are will enable it to manage more wisely and effectively. Mr. Mayo's paper, one of the papers printed in this issue, is an inquiry along these lines. It focuses our attention for the time being on the "psychology of the total situation." It was received with marked interest, for his audience realized that his point of view had a strong basis in observation and experiment under actual plant conditions which checked with their experience as managers. We know of one works manager who went back to his plant and re-hired a discharged worker because at the time of his discharge elements of the total situation had not been taken adequately into consideration.

Samuel Gompers

IN THE passing of Samuel Gompers American industry loses a leader who has made history. An immigrant youth of humble parentage and without educational advantages, he developed into a man of genuine culture, a speaker and writer of clear and vigorous style, the creator of a powerful institution to protect and promote the interest of workers as a group, and eventually the advisor of statesmen in matters pertaining to industrial welfare. And like a statesman he was buried, government and industry rendering honor to the great leader of labor.

He was a great leader of labor. His efforts of leadership met the pragmatic test—they were successful because they matched the industrial circumstances of his day. The American Federation of Labor is a powerful institution today because it was at the beginning well organized to meet the conditions which determined its purpose. It could not have grown so steadily, could not have acquired and retained its power over a period of forty years, had its organizers not at the beginning sensed a need of American workers and as time passed taken cognizance of the development of that need. From the point of view of one decade it may have seemed too radical in its ideals, and from the point of view of another decade, too conservative—but steadily it grew more powerful. This could not have been the fact had there not been somewhere in the background the steady force of a genius in analyzing industrial conditions and tendencies in their relation to the aspirations of labor, and genius of leadership in directing labor towards organized self-realization and self-expression.

He was an industrial statesman. His ideal was human welfare—construction, not destruction. But because he was a man of affairs who sought the ultimate ideal by solution of problems as they came to him one by one, his reactions had to be such as to meet the actual situations present in the environment of his day. His methods of solving these incidental problems were determined by the nature of the obstacles and the methods of opponents. In the earlier days of the Federation circumstances compelled militancy, and circumstances are not yet such as to assure the Federation that it can now safely discard militancy; but of late years there has been more of an attitude of "speak softly and carry a big stick"; more and more an attitude of cooperation with other group interests. Just a year ago we called attention to this