

the male operatives, knit the fabric, which is then made into a finished garment in a series of operations performed largely by female workers. The toppers, almost invariably women, are a connecting link in the process as they assist in transferring the leg portion of the hose to the machines on which the foot portion is knitted. Each worker in this chain of operations is highly skilled and almost all are paid by the piece. This tends to increase production and the sense of responsibility of the worker toward his or her job.

The question of eliminating waste in the full fashioned hosiery industry is of the highest practical importance because the cost of the silk is the largest single item in the cost of manufacture, an item greater than labor cost. By increasing the quality of workmanship the operatives can make savings which represent large sums of money over a period of a few months. The Taylor Society has published extracts from a speech I delivered describing our campaign to have the workers eliminate waste wherever possible. Our union has never sought to limit production or to hamper efficiency systems by insisting on obsolete trade customs. We have worked unceasingly, and with much success in those plants where management has co-operated, to improve the conduct of our members in the mills. We have worked, for instance, on the matters of regularity, care of machines, and others of greater or less importance. Through our shop committees we seek to adjust all minor shop troubles relating to personnel, in the speediest manner possible and with little formality or friction.

We have made every effort to study our industry, both from the employers' point of view and our own, and have striven to educate the rank and file of the union to the conditions which our industry faces in the present complicated business and industrial system. During the past two years we have attempted to establish some sort of a permanent conference board of the union and the employers in our industry and to set up some permanent machinery for the arbitration of questions under dispute.

I can refer to statements by the employers in the Philadelphia district regarding the attitude of the organization on the wage matter. In an effort to encourage the employer who uses union help to expand his plant in non-unionized districts we re-

vised our price schedule to enable the manufacturer paying the union scale to compete successfully with the employer who is in the anti-union or low wage class.

Some here may wonder why it is that a union as reasonable as ours should be conducting strikes which have become nationally prominent. In every case where trouble has arisen in our industry, we have been forced to fight either because our workers were locked out or because questionable methods were used to force men to drop their union membership. Take for example the Allen-A situation in Kenosha, Wisconsin. It is a disgrace to American society that the group of well educated young, native born workers employed by that wealthy corporation have been forced to walk the streets of Kenosha for almost a year. In Kenosha the employer had enjoyed substantial competitive advantages over other employers in the matter of wages, and because he had men running double shifts without extra compensation. Nevertheless, the Allen-A Company insisted upon forcing a fight with the union, using the so-called "two-machine system" as an issue. We contend the two machine system produces a greater number of workers than the industry can absorb. No two full fashioned machines can be operated by one mechanic. The plan used, therefore, is to have one artisan run the two machines with the assistance of one or more apprentices. The result of this system is a surplus of men wanting jobs as knitters. The Allen-A Company locked out its workers in an effort to scare them into resigning their membership in our organization. Court action against the workers followed, and fine and respectable citizens have been charged with violations of a federal injunction and sent to jail. Is this an atmosphere in which to develop an industry to higher standards of efficiency and orderly operation?

In Buffalo, New York, a group of young workers in the Duffy full fashioned plant were forced to strike because they refused to sign individual (commonly known as yellow dog) contracts.

In conclusion let me refer briefly to a fact previously mentioned, regarding the assistance my union has sought from technical experts who happen to be prominently connected with your Society. One substantial full fashioned concern which has been run on the so-called "open shop" basis, with union and non-union help working together, claims

to be unable to pay the union scale of wages generally prevailing in the organized industry. We contend that, if this is the case, it is largely, if not entirely, due to the mistakes of management. This employer has consented to open his books and we are having a study made by impartial experts to see if we cannot adjust our differences on the basis of reason and fact. We believe that if we are given an opportunity to assist management in the plant under discussion, it will be possible to raise standards of efficiency materially, simply by improving the morale of the workers and by having them follow out certain simple and practical policies in handling their jobs.

Labor unions have progressed in an advancing age, but they have only given an indication of what they can accomplish for industry and a better society. The trade unions of the past, in spite of all their mistakes, have made an enormous contribution to the development of the industrial system. It is our hope that in the future owners, managers and those with scientific training will co-operate with the labor unions to find a practical and common sense way of working together for the best interests of each and for society as a whole.

William M. Leiserson.* I do not think that when we are considering social movements like trade unions and employe representation, it makes very much difference whether you can prove on some theoretical basis that one or the other is better calculated to promote the interests of employers, employes or the community. Most economists agree that in the abstract the union shop policy of the labor organizations (collective bargaining) is a sounder industrial policy than the so-called open shop policy, or the "American plan." Nevertheless, no person who is alive to the actualities of American industrial life will doubt that the open shop policy has made greater headway in this country than has the union shop or collective bargaining. When we recognize this fact, it does not at all mean that we approve of the open shop policy. Neither do we approve of everything that labor organizations try to include under their union shop policy.

It does not seem to me that a scientific person can contribute much to industrial progress by

*Professor of Economics, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

damning the general movements that contending parties attempt to promote under such titles as open shop or union shop. It seems to me that scientific people need to point out to all parties, to the community as well as to employers and to employes, the actual results to which the policies they are pursuing are leading. Our attention should be given to studying the specific things that each of the parties does or wants to do, regardless of whether these things are classified for partisan purposes under such titles as open shop, union shop, or any other slogan.

If employers have been able to whip the trade unions in most of the large industries by their open shop policy, how can anyone think that by merely proving in the abstract that company unions are not as good as trade unions, the employers will not be able to whip the unions still more effectively with their new device of employe representation? What I am driving at is the futility of proving in the abstract that company unions are not as good as trade unions! Whether they are or not makes very little difference. The real point is, are the employers with this new device that seems to concede the principle of collective bargaining and democratic representation in industry—are they able more effectively to prevent the spread of trade unionism among their employes?

I do not think that anyone who investigates the facts as they actually are can have the least doubt that trade unionism in this country is at a standstill, if not actually declining, in the face of the company union movement. I certainly will agree with you or with anyone else that this ought not to be. I should like to see something else happen; but what we think ought to be and what actually is, are two very different things. And as scientists we must clearly point out what actually is happening.

Now as I see it, what is happening with respect to company unions and trade unions is that the employers have discovered a method of making the open shop policy still more effective than it has been, by adding to it the device of employe representation. They are successful in this largely by dictatorial methods; that is, by the same methods that have forced and maintained the open shop policies in their industries. But this is not all of the story. Where they have found dictation and economic power not effective enough in accom-