to public controls that will protect public interests and the general welfare.

The socialist doctrines of Karl Marx were put forth as a program to free the submerged masses of the people from anticipated slavery to economic masters. But today the propagation of socialistic doctrines provides the means whereby the criminal masters of millions of people, who are actually living in poverty-ridden slavery, are trying to force the whole world to submit to their despotism. These dictators are threatening by wicked and reckless uses of brute force to destroy all the wealth and the advances in material welfare gained by several hundred million people who for over a century exercised the wisdom and courage to experiment with free enterprise and with democratic forms of government. Thus they freed themselves and their energies from the stifling oppression of political monopolies and tyrannies that the Marxian Socialists are once more trying to impose upon the world. The regimentation of all workers into compulsory unions is essential to the seizure and holding of political power by either labor Communists or labor Fascists. Without the union closed shop they can not win. But with the union closed shop they may.

Purpose and Value of Unions

Good purposes and present good deeds of well-meaning rulers should not blind a free people to the everlasting truth that the *voluntary* cooperation of self-reliant men and women is the way to freedom, peace and progress in a human society, and that the *compulsory* "cooperation" of a fear-ridden, subservient people is the way to slavery, war and degradation. Let us review briefly the original purposes and reasons for organizing labor unions, so that we can see again clearly why they must remain *voluntary* organizations, or else they will do more harm than good.

The wage earners of modern industry felt themselves individually helpless to resist oppression and exploitation by the selfish, inhumane type of employer. They organized themselves so that by collective action they could force such employers to pay just wages and maintain fair conditions of employment. They chose labor managers whom they could trust to protect their interests in making agreements with property managers, because they could control those labor managers whom they chose and could remove, and they could not control the property managers whom they did not choose and could not remove.

The entire value of labor organization to the workers lies in this power of the workers to control their representatives. The basis of that control, and the only assurance that it will continue, is found in the right and freedom of the individual worker to refuse to support an organization or a representative whose judgment or good will he does not trust. But how can a man trust his servant who assumes to be his master and says: "You must obey me, or I will cut your throat!"

In a small union a worker can insist that his ideas shall be considered and that officers whom he trusts shall be elected. If he is in the minority he may wisely accept majority rule. But if he feels that the majority is utterly wrong, or is doing him more harm than good, he as a free man should be able to withdraw from the union without having his ability to earn a living destroyed.

Even small unions have been sometimes controlled by criminals or Communists or self-seeking men whom no sensible, self-respecting man could support. In such unions gangsters and professional sluggers have often made any opposition hopeless and dangerous. What relief from such brutal tyranny is open to a single worker, unless he has freedom to withdraw without loss of his ability to support himself and his family?

Hundreds of electrical workers in Chicago were once forced to live and work under the rule of their lodge by a gang of thieving gunmen and sluggers, until the national IBEW officers finally had the courage to intervene and abolish that lodge. If the national leadership had been completely terrorized, or had been as bad as the local gangsters, none of those workers would have had any way under the union closed shop to earn a living except by supporting and paying tribute (thousands of dollars a week) to this gang of hardened criminals led by a notorious murderer. (As the lawyer who advised the national union and fought their battle against the criminals in the courts, I know exactly how evil the situation was and how helpless the individual workers were made by the union closed shop.)

What Is Democracy?

In any one of the large industry-wide unions the individual worker is as helpless as a single Democrat or Republican to control his party or its program, or to select its ruling politicians. But a citizen, although compelled to pay taxes and in general support his government, is entirely free to refuse to support a political party or to pay dues to it. Our government is largely a party government; but a citizen can change his party and vote for whom he pleases, without losing his ability to earn a living. There is democracy in "majority rule" so long as a minority or a single person is not compelled to remain an unwilling but contributing supporter of the majority—so long as he is free to support or to organize a minority opposition that may eventually become a majority.

There is no democracy in a labor organization which every one is compelled to join and support, which no one can oppose, and from which no one can withdraw except by sacrificing his livelihood. There is no "freedom of labor" in transferring the control of all opportunities of employment from a ruling class of property managers to a ruling class of labor managers. Indeed, no combination of property managers ever dared to assert a *right* to monopolize. The government has always demanded that businessmen compete; and the prevailing demand of American businessmen themselves has been for "free enterprise"—that is, for free competition.

Few business monopolies have ever had the hardihood even to try to use force to end all competition. Therefore job seekers have always had a vast number of big and little employers from whom employment could be obtained. But the union closed shop closes the open doors of all these competing employers and leaves open only one door to continuous employment, which is the union door. The advocates of the union closed shop plainly demand that there shall be no competition with the labor monopoly—no choice of wages and working conditions. For example, if an employer wants to establish an incentive wage and to pay more for better work, and many ambitious workers want that arrangement, no worker can obtain such employment so long as the union is determined and able to insist on rigid standard wages. The worker must seek employment either in the exceptional union shop where the local union is permitted and willing to agree to incentive wages, or in a non-union shop which all the unions will blacklist and seek to destroy.

Union-Employer Monopolies

Thus, instead of the recognized, but only occasional and temporary, evil of a limited management monopoly, the union closed shop promises the much greater permanent evil of an unlimited labor monopoly. It is, in addition, evident from the practices of many union closed shop monopolies which have been erected in a business area (such as New York City) that the union closed shop offers to employers an opportunity to join with a union in establishing a complete business monopoly within a labor-monopoly wall built around an entire city. Recently a liberal-minded Supreme Court found it necessary to point out that, if this practice were permitted to continue under a legal immunity from the anti-trust laws, the result must be "to shift our society from a competitive to a monopolistic economy." (Opinion by Mr. Justice Black in Allen Bradley Co. v. Local Union No. 3, IBEW, 325 U. S. 797)

Perhaps the reasons why a union closed shop is a bad labor organization for the worker, in subjecting him to the uncontrolled tyranny of labor Fascists, have been sufficiently revealed so that we may turn at this point to the next question:

2. *Is a union closed shop good or bad for employers?*

In view of the dominant power of labor managers under universal union closed shop conditions, it may seem that there are no arguments to persuade employers to welcome such conditions. But, on the contrary, there are a good many fancy arguments which persuade many employers that they are better off (at least temporarily) with a union closed shop than without one.

Some of these are:

a. It is a protection against union rivalries (as between the AFL and the CIO) and against factionalism in the union. In other words, if every employee must become and remain subject to the discipline of one set of labor managers, then all that is necessary for peaceful cooperation is to satisfy these labor bosses. According to the same philosophy it would be better to establish one despotic government in the United States than to be subject to the uncertainties and dissensions of democratic self-government. To those who prefer the security of a well-run jail to the insecurity of a free world, this argument has a strong appeal. It should have no appeal whatever to anyone who knows that the independence of self-support and self-control is the strongest guardian of individual liberty.

b. There are real advantages in standardized wages and working conditions, because an employer, able and willing to pay good wages and to maintain good conditions, will not be compelled to meet the competition of sweatshoppers, chiselers and half-bankrupt concerns that will cut prices by unfair cutting of labor costs. Also unions can impose, as they often do, standards of quality and craftsmanship that will effectively prevent the competition of shoddy or ill-made goods or inferior services which the conscientious manufacturer wishes to avoid.

There is sound reasoning in these contentions so far as they show the desirability of encouraging the maintenance of strong, responsible unions and the establishment of good working conditions everywhere. But they disregard the fact that all these advantages can be and have been gained without compelling all employees to join whatever union holds the contract. An ever-increasing volume of reliable and effective information is flowing to both workers and customers. This makes it less and less possible for an employer to find in substandard wages and working conditions any elements of success. They are more likely to be portents of failure. Furthermore, the employer who lags behind in the improvement of labor conditions will probably fall behind also as his competitors advance in the research, the operating efficiency, and the service to customers, which are the main components of success.

The employer himself should be deeply concerned with the ability of the men to control their union, and fearful of labor bosses who control their constituents. The freedom of men to get out of a badly run union is the only way to protect an employer from forced cooperation with bad labor managers. The freedom of local workers to deal with local employers in mutual adjustments to local conditions can only be preserved by preserving the individual and minority rights of workers to dissent from a remotely determined policy that may be harmful alike to local employers and their employees.

Living conditions vary, and wages and working conditions should vary greatly according to climate, population density, access to natural resources and other conditions surrounding local enterprises. In-