for the foreman, no good for the company, no good for the union."

A sociologist, David Riesman, noting this human problem, urges that society set up "some social fund [for] easing the blow to the casualties of progress." In the past, he says, society has "not paid the cost of readjustment," but it should do so in the future.

Automation not only will result in technological unemployment, but in a reshaping of our cities, our factory system, our human beings, and our politics. Factories that require only a few dozen or a few hundred employees will find it more expedient to move out of the big urban centers to the small cities and even rural areas. The shift in population will tend to make one unending suburbia between big cities like Chicago and Milwaukee, changing political alignments and political structures. It will decisively affect the big city machines and affect adversely the farm-block vote. It will punctuate such problems as civil rights, with Negroes attempting to move into what are now usually all-white suburbs. It will bring with it a host of new social and behavior patterns.

Automation eventually must change the measurement of wages itself. On what basis shall an employee be paid? Today he is paid for his "time," because time is directly related to his productivity. If he produces one piece a minute, he produces sixty in an hour and 480 in a day. This is the measure of his value to the corporation and the basis for payment. But what is the measure when the worker merely watches lights all day? How is the value of his work determined then? By the number of mistakes he catches? By his mere presence? In estimating costs, the employer no longer has to pay primary concern to the productivity of the worker, but to the productivity of the machine. Under automation, just as under mass production generally, the amount of invested capital

will grow, while the share of wages in total costs declines. Presumably, therefore, management should be able to pay what is called a "living wage" without feeling too much economic pressure, since wages will be only a small component of costs. In the long run this may mean a more bountiful living standard; in the short run labor's problem is to get management to shorten hours and raise wages as productivity improves.

Tomorrow's human beings, in an automated world, will also be of a different breed. They will need more education to be sure, but there is some danger that they will become more conformist. History indicates that the machine all too often remakes man in its own image; that man, far from being the master of the machine, is usually its servant. Automation robs the average worker of still more of the satisfaction that work should give him. In the present mechanical system he loses the sense of creativity, but he does maintain some sense of judgment. He must measure to see if an item is the right size or "off" a thousandth of an inch. He must test it for many desired qualities. There is still some "art" to his labor. But in an automated factory the judgment is left to the electronic machine. The electronic machine now judges size, quality, weight, and other factors far better than any human can. It expels faulty tools or products and automatically reworks them. The first industrial revolution made man mechanically minded, money minded. Will the second industrial revolution make him more conformist, less capable of independent judgment?

This deficiency in modern man is already acute, and of considerable concern to many thinkers.

Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, claims that industrialism is producing men "who are not free in any real