

ion activities is apparent in the nature of the drive for union security. Why does a labor union, or any other organization for that matter, need security? Security from what, or against what? And who is to provide the security?

Before examining those questions, it might be well to recognize the distinction between "union security" and "job security." The former has to do with protection of the union organization through means such as the closed shop or the union shop. The term *job security* is more commonly used in the sense of "personal security," the implication being that a job ought to secure an individual against the hazards of life, and that every human being has a right to such security as though he has a property right to a given job. This is the theory behind the provision for "seniority rights" which is to be found in many union contracts. Some persons go so far as to say that an employer who offers any opportunity for employment is under obligation to see that the wage he pays is sufficient to insure the employee, and his family, against every hazard of life. This seems to say that the so-called employer class is under obligation to supply a job to any union member who wants to be employed, and at whatever wage the job-seeker might ask.

In a competitive market each employee and each employer—as a consumer—takes the responsibility for satisfying his own needs

from the returns the market affords for the job he performs. The market which reflects the judgment and tolerance of consumers, does not deny an employer the right to help an employee beyond the terms of their contractual agreement. But the market does not confer upon the employer either a responsibility to totally satisfy, or a right to determine, the "needs" of the employee. Such a transfer of rights and responsibilities from an employee would amount to his virtual enslavement—"job security" stripped of all its false wrappings.

"Union security" deals with something other than the personal security of union members. If there is any implication of personal security in the term, it has to do with the security of the union officers in their positions of power. When they ask for a union shop or a closed shop, with a check-off system for collecting dues, like taxes, they are asking for the preservation of their union organization and their own positions of control. What they really seem to want is security from a fear that their union couldn't last as a strictly voluntary organization. There would seem to be a lack of good faith between union leadership and union membership—a fear that a majority of members might quit the union if given a chance. When a man asks for the power to collect dues from everyone, just as the government collects taxes, when he complains bitterly about "free riders," he is