

formerly. Science is making it increasingly easy to ignore them. In "strongly" organized centers and even in some strongly organized industries the techniques by which the union-will is circumvented have been highly developed. Employers who have created reasonable conditions as to hours, wages and working conditions, and as to status for the individual worker, have discovered that it is practically impossible for union organizers effectively to approach their employes. My query is whether this seemingly enlightened policy in the treatment of labor is necessarily well advised when viewed in relation to the total national industrial situation. Of course only a very small number of employers go this far. The temptation is rather to have a company union. For most people it is a great deal easier to run a business with a company union than without one. And it is equally true that for the average run of employers it is harder to operate a business with a standard union than without one. But human experience suggests that in great matters "the easiest way" is not a safe guide, and further that a great industry can only grow out of great experimentation and probably out of great sacrifice.

Not being a manufacturer I am permitted the utmost freedom in speculating as to such controls in industry as will ultimately prove most beneficial to society. There are in my mind three major tenets which must be had in view:

1. We must preserve to the worker group in industry, as contrasted with the more direct representatives of the property interests, a fair bargaining position so that they can safeguard themselves, and society on occasion, in the proper distribution of the rewards of productive enterprise and, of increasing importance, against the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of those who control through their property rights, and in the maintenance of that right to an individuality, creativeness and that freedom of thought and opinion essential to racial progress. May it not be that with the advance of science even the safeguarding of individual rights and human freedom itself may have become largely a technical problem, no longer wholly the task of untutored minute men or of labor leaders, no matter how deep their devotion? No other considerations can weigh against these primary objectives, for in the long run if I am not reasonably free, what does it count if I am efficient? Of course

I am not arguing against property rights or even against the wisdom of a centralized leadership in the conduct of the enterprise. For it is quite as much in the interests of an effective utilization of property as it is essential to human freedom and progress that the weaker side in this discussion shall maintain an organization which can check the stronger, if and when the necessity therefor arises.

2. There must be a general acceptance of the validity of the scientific method from the top to the bottom. This carries with it the implication that decisions are to be made by those who find the facts and therefore by those who presumably know. Here there must be a word of caution against the dicta of that class of experts who see their problems too narrowly and who place too great dependence upon mathematics in a field where the heart is as much entitled to recognition as is the head. Many decisions—most of them perhaps—may properly be reached pretty far down in the organization scale. Society will gain in effectiveness and stability largely as we learn the technique of making wise decisions without the necessity for constantly consulting the top controls, which are apt to have the property interest too vividly and constantly in mind even for property's own long-run benefit. This means we must take the emphasis off the veto, and more and more stress the development of techniques and personalities capable of reaching right decisions without the deadening regimentation which necessarily grows out of the veto and the policy of "*es ist verboten*." Perhaps working in this direction the institution of property may lose some facets which have made it exceedingly unpopular in certain quarters and which as I see it are not at all essential to its functioning as a master tool in social development.

3. The organization of the workers must be sufficiently broad geographically and by varieties of work to enable the workers to have access to the best that is known of and thought on any matter under their scrutiny. When I consider how much discussion I solicit and from how many different quarters—geographical and otherwise—on relatively simple questions, it becomes apparent that even a numerous group of workers, engaged in a given plant or for a given enterprise, is at an increasingly fatal disadvantage when, dependent upon a company union confined to a single plant, as contrasted with an organization with broader affiliations, it is un-

able adequately to present its side of any given case. The fact that the labor unions at the present time render such service to their members meagerly, if at all, does not prevent one from looking forward to the time when they, or their successors, may be more effectively equipped for this service.¹³

The European labor unions have in the main been compelled to go into politics in order to find an adequate outlet for their creative self-expression, and this with some results that would be highly distasteful to most American constituencies. In England particularly an *impasse* appears to have been reached in which neither the community nor the unions can make further progress along the traditional lines of combat. And yet in the atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust engendered through generations of an embittered collective bargaining, it is not easy to find a constructive outlet for the labor movement, much as forward looking men in all classes desire it. Attention should also be called to the fact that in several European countries the labor unions have been given a functional status by governmental intervention and statute—notably in Italy under a dictator, in Germany under a republic, and in Russia under the rule of the proletariat.¹⁴

Assuming, then, that with us in America an enlightened social policy toward industry and labor suggests, *first*, the safeguarding in every proper way of the group cohesion of the workers, and *second*, the gradual narrowing of the area of conflicting interest; and further assuming that these ends can only be accomplished through giving the organized workers *functional* status, we are then confronted with the question as to how this can be accomplished.

¹³An interesting experiment which may or may not have a bearing on the problem of giving the grouped workers a functional place in the industrial process is an arrangement recently entered into between Hart, Schaffner & Marx, clothing manufacturers of Chicago and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, by which H. S. & M. sell the output of a clothing factory in Milwaukee owned and operated by the Union.

¹⁴In Great Britain the Liberal Party now accepts "not only as a necessity but as an advantage, the full development of labor unionism, and proposes that on a national scale it should be co-ordinated with the organization of employers." See "Britain's Industrial Future," the Report of the Liberal Industrial Inquiry, Ernst & Benn, London.
In Sweden "it has been found impossible to establish by law compulsory arbitration." Sven Lubeck, Minister of Social Welfare in the new Conservative Cabinet, "has in mind more labor representation in the management of industry." (See New York Tribune, Nov. 11, 1928.)

There is no royal road to the ultimate goal. Any worthwhile result will be reached only through trial and error, extended experience and infinite pains.

Perhaps one of the most obvious first steps would be to introduce as much light and science as possible into the discussion of wages—monetary compensations of one kind or another—now constituting as it does the major subject for collective bargaining. Some experience as an arbiter in the field of wage negotiations suggests that the acrimony developed varies inversely with the amount and reliability of the statistics and other data offered in support of any suggested scale. If this has been the situation in the determination of "living" wages, how much more provocative are the possibilities in the determination of "social" wages and in the establishment of profit sharing schemes. Add the complication of "incentive" wages and the various kinds of insurance—unemployment, old age, accident and death—and the grouped workers are seen to have problems which can profitably engage the attention of a numerous body of high grade and socially minded economists, statisticians and accountants.

Of course there should be the same policy of extracting everything which is not *essentially* controversial or debatable in character from the other standard topics of collective bargaining, such as from the discussion of hours, including rest periods; and from status, including the standards covering employment, promotion and discharge; and from working conditions, including sanitation, rest rooms, lunch rooms, and so on. There is really very little in the content of classic collective bargaining which, when once adequately studied, should afford much basis for controversy as between right-minded employers and equally right-minded employes. But it must be recalled that in the past employers have claimed and retained the prerogatives of management *in toto*, and the unions and other organizations of the workers have usually been almost equally insistent that they be freed from any responsibility for the management because wholly without authority. I am assuming that the entire situation in industry has so changed that in the very near future enlightened employers will be as willing and anxious to relinquish to their grouped employes some part in the management, with its corresponding authority and responsibility,