union membership on a purely voluntary basis. This purpose was eloquently expressed by Governor Gordon Persons of Alabama in 1953 in his message approving that state's right-to-work law.

Pointing out that churches are the greatest organizations in the world and have done much for mankind, yet no one is compelled to join; that veterans', farmers' and businessmen's organizations further the interests of all individuals in their respective categories and yet no one is required to become a member; that all Alabama teachers had benefited from the work of the Alabama Education Association without being forced to join and have dues deducted from their pay checks; and that even labor unions could affiliate with the big national labor organizations or stay out as they saw fit, the Governor said:

"Those who first settled in our great country did so because they wanted to. It has always been a tradition in America that any man could do as he pleased as long as he did not violate the laws of our land.

"In my opinion, all our labor unions will be far stronger and the members in them will have a far greater interest and respect in the organizations if membership can be shown to be desirable and they are not forced to join."

To move now from the area of abstract argument and get down to cases, the real objection of labor leaders to right-to-work laws is that they detract from "union security," make organization work more difficult, lessen their bargaining power and weaken their ability to discipline the workers they represent.

These objections undoubtedly are well-founded from the labor leaders' viewpoint. If workers are made to join unions in order to get or hold their jobs, the unions will be "secure" indeed. Their incomes will be assured through the "check-off" and their degree of control over individual workers will be absolute. Not everyone thinks this is good, including more than a few stanch union members.

THUS, Warren E. Stone, for many years Grand Chief Engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, is on record as follows: "I do not believe in forcing a man to join a union. If he wants to join, all right; but it is contrary to the principles of free government and the Constitution of the United States to try to make him join. We of the engineers work willingly side by side with other engineers every day who do not belong to our union, though they enjoy without any objection on our part the advantages we have obtained. Some

of them we would not have in the union; others we cannot get." [W. G. Merritt, *The Open Shop and Industrial Liberty*. New York: The League for Industrial Rights, 1922. pp. 6-7.]

That same viewpoint was stated quite recently by Mr. Charles Geddes, president of the British Trade Union Congress: "I do not believe the trade union movement of Great Britain can live for very much longer on the basis of compulsion," he said. "Must people belong to us or starve, whether they like our policies or not? Is that to be the future of the movement? No. I believe the trade union card is an honor to be conferred, not a badge which signifies that you have got to do something whether you like it or not. We want the right to exclude people from our union if necessary and we cannot do that on a basis of 'belong or starve.' "

Opponents of compulsory unionism assert that it gives union leaders the power of economic life and death over individual workers and business organizations; that it enables energetic and often ruthless labor bosses to control the labor supply of an industry, not always in the interests of union members; that it enables them to perpetuate themselves in power and stifle all opposition within their ranks; and that it puts them into a position to exploit the rest of society for the benefit of themselves and their members.

ARTHUR KROCK, the respected political analyst of *The New York Times* and assuredly no "lackey" of industrial management, points out that "Organized labor has legal privileges and immunities denied to all other groups in national production. These are the potentials of an industrial monopoly and a political pressure mass that could dominate the American system.

"Through protective statutes, friendly judicial decisions and the favoritism of political administrators organized labor has been granted special rights in the United States. And the Taft-Hartley Act has left uncurbed the two principal ones. The first is general immunity from the antitrust laws for actions which would be illegal if performed by employers. The second, specifically, is freedom to bargain on a nation-wide basis and to strike, if desired, a nation-wide industry vital to the general welfare."

When, in addition, the way is clear — as it still is in 30 of the 48 states, including most of the highly industrialized ones — to blanket thousands of individuals under the union banner and union control by the mere flick of a pen in bargaining with employers who have no choice but to accept the