

To blame union organizers for usurping power and for exercising the authority which has been granted to them by law, is to miss the important point. The fact is that the power of compulsion cannot be thus exercised until it has first been delegated by our individual selves to the agency of government.

As the government increases its power over the individual citizens, this means a corresponding decrease in the personal freedom to compete and to bargain. If the government, either directly or through its authorized agencies of compulsion, achieves control of food, banking, transportation, steel, coal—the basic industries—it is then able to force individuals to its own terms. Those who depend upon the government for the necessities of life have lost all means of regulating that government. Such a government is a real monopoly, one to which an individual must pay tribute—or else. If the right to compete is lost, bargaining is out of the question. The noose is drawn upon freedom when “collective bargaining” comes to mean monopoly and tyranny.

A Labor Government

IT MAY SEEM unnecessarily harsh and unrealistic to compare the practices of “big labor” with the practices of dictatorial government, but no other comparison is possible. There are only two basic methods of organization.

One way is illustrated by the voluntary cooperation seen within a local church group, or by the satisfaction of consumers who patronize a successfully competitive business man. This is the way of personal choice as manifested in a free market. The other way calls for the power of coercion—the force of government. And in such a struggle for power, whatever group succeeds is the government. Those who lend their support to the struggle for compulsory unionism ought to realize that they are asking for a “labor” government in America. Donald Richberg has aptly described the situation:

“The present and future intentions and desires of the unions have been plainly stated. Their authorized spokesmen argued recently in the Supreme Court of the United States that labor monopolies through a union shop were ‘indispensable.’ They said that ‘workers can not thrive but can only die under competition between themselves,’ and that therefore union membership must be ‘a condition of employment.’

“They said that ‘the worker becomes a member of an economic society when he takes employment,’ and that ‘*the union is the organization or government of this society,*’ with the ‘*powers and responsibilities of a government,*’ and that union membership must be ‘*compulsory upon individuals.*’

“Thus it has been made plain beyond all argument that the goal of the union closed shop advocates is a complete monopoly control of all jobs and the compulsory submission of all workers to government by the unions.”⁹

In theory, a “labor” government would be supposed to promote the interests of laborers, but no “labor” government has ever worked out that way in practice. Every move to destroy the foundations of the private