

reasoning and analysis. It would follow from his investigations, which seem to have been thorough and which have certainly covered a wide range and a long period of time, that any discussion of the real comparative value of the two kinds of ability is moonshine. He also believes that neither he nor any other human being knows at this moment whether the greater emotionality of woman is the result of education and racial experience or their cause. Dr. Heymans guesses that sexual differences influenced culture rather than that culture created sexual differences. Other equally worthy persons guess the other way. Mr. Havelock Ellis, a model in this respect both to feminists and to hominists, especially on political platforms, does not guess at all. May be—we hardly dare hope it—but may be this is a sign that some time, before many years are over, the appeal to “science” will be abandoned. May be in the good time coming, the most impulsive biologist will no more dream of deciding whether society gets along further on father-wit than on mother-wit, than of deciding for which of his two legs the sphere is the home.

Unionism vs. Anti-Unionism

THE majority of contemporary controversies between wage-earners and their employers involve directly or indirectly one issue of overwhelming importance. They involve the issue of labor organization itself, of the extent to which it deserves to be encouraged or discouraged and of its function in the industrial system of a democratic nation. No other questions connected with the industrial situation provoke such harsh and stubborn differences of opinion. Many well meaning people who may favor some legislative program of “social justice” are opposed to or suspicious of unionism—that is, to the attempt of the wage-earners to secure justice for themselves. The lack of any effective consensus of opinion about the merits and dangers of unionism has passed comparatively unnoticed hitherto, because it has not brought with it any immediately inconvenient consequences. The “public” had assumed an attitude of neutrality, based on ignorance and irresponsibility, and knew no sufficient reason for reaching a decision on such a perplexing controversy. But recently the resulting immunity from serious inconvenience has ceased. Strikes are becoming the order of the day. They interfere with service or supplies necessary to the public comfort; they compromise vital public interests; they are calling for increasing intervention by the government. Yet if the government is to intervene in-

telligently and effectively, it must act upon some consistent policy with respect to the merits and the function of labor organization, which has the support of public opinion. What is that policy to be?

It is a formidable question, which demands a many-sided and carefully balanced answer, but one phase of this answer can, in our opinion, be made short, sharp and decisive. It should be the policy of the American nation to discriminate in favor of unionism, to recognize its merits, to define its functions, and to make it an essential part of the national industrial system. A policy of this kind does not demand the unionizing of non-union labor as the result of coercion or intimidation; but it does imply popular and official discouragement of any attempt by employers to outlaw unionism. As long as the unions are required, as is so frequently the case at present, to fight not for an improvement in the economic conditions of their members, but for their very lives, no progressive social adjustment of the conflict between the wage-earners and their employers is possible. The conflict is degraded to a level in which fear and suspicion are the dominant emotions and some kind of violence the inevitable, if reprehensible, weapon.

A very rudimentary analysis of the sources of unionism will indicate the danger to the national integrity of allowing the issue of unionism itself to be raised. Wage-earners form unions because their individual ability to bargain with their employers is feeble and cannot be strengthened except by their acting together. If the individual wage-earner is dissatisfied with the conditions under which he is working he is incapable of making an effective protest; but if all the wage-earners in a shop or a trade are capable of acting together they can often compel their employers to grant them better terms. Unionism is consequently an indispensable condition of the economic independence of the wage-earners as a class. It is as important to them as the vote is to the citizen or as some protection against the abuse of political authority is to the property-owner. By no other method can they safeguard themselves from being victimized by economic forces which may, indeed, occasionally operate beneficially to them, but which always operate irrespective of their inclinations and wills. The law has declared that labor is not a commodity, but despite the law it must remain a commodity unless wage-earners possess the power to participate effectively in the negotiations whereby their work is bought and sold. The thrifty wage-earner, acting as an individual, can, of course, change his employment and sometimes better his condition, but acting as an individual his only choice lies between opportunities of employment over whose terms he himself can exercise no control. When

employers refuse to negotiate with the unions, they are denying to their employees the very substance of citizenship in an economic community. They are trying to condemn their wage-earning fellow-countrymen who as a class cannot be paid salaries or become property-owners, to the humiliation of having little or nothing to say about the major business of a wage-earner's life.

Hence the bitterness and intensity of the industrial conflicts which involve the question of union recognition. It is one of those ultimate issues which both sides refuse to arbitrate. The unionists compare arbitration about the recognition of their unions to the arbitration by a nation whether it is entitled to exist. The employers are equally reluctant either to recognize the unions until they are forced to do so, or to arbitrate the question of recognition, because they do not want to abandon any share of their economic power to independent and, from their point of view, irresponsible organizations. As soon, consequently, as this issue is raised, something like civil war sets in, and both parties have a tendency to fall back upon violent methods. The employers spend large sums in collecting social derelicts from all over the country with whom to keep their business going and to break the power of the unions. These unfortunates are assaulted by the unionists and in the absence of an efficient police force have to be protected by gunmen. The laws, the institutions and the authority of the state are perverted by both sides, each in its own interest. The social atmosphere is poisoned by recriminations, fear, and hatred, and the beaten party retires sullenly to obscurity, fully determined to renew the conflict at the first favorable opportunity.

The fight for and against union recognition is embittered and irreconcilable, because it necessarily degenerates into an unscrupulous and desperate struggle to win or to keep power. The unionists are fighting for the possession of sufficient economic strength to enable them to become self-respecting citizens in an industrial democracy. The employers know that when the unions get the power it is frequently used in ways inimical to industrial efficiency, and they make this knowledge the excuse for refusing, wherever possible, to part with any share of their autocratic control. Officially the American nation has tried to evade the issue by admitting a "right" on the part of wage-earners to organize and an equally valid "right" on the part of employers to refuse to recognize organization. But when rights conflict and are asserted by large classes possessed of a considerable ability to enforce them, the national unity is compromised. Neither can it be restored by pious exhortations in favor of mutual good feeling and

peace. The war between unionism and anti-unionism is one about which neutrality is ceasing to be honorable or decent. If the American nation continues to be neutral, it will merely become the victim of both of the belligerents. Mr. Quackenbush, the chief of the legal department of the New York Interborough Company, has given emphatic expression to this opinion. During a recent public hearing, as quoted by the *New York Tribune*, he declared that the country could no more exist half-union and half-non-union than it could exist half-slave and half-free. We agree with him. The political party which first stands upon this truth, as the Republican party first stood upon the truth about slavery, will during the next generation enjoy, like the Republican party, a stormy but triumphant and fruitful career.

If it has come, as Mr. Quackenbush declares, to an exclusive choice between unionism and non-unionism, can any intelligent democrat doubt on which side the preference must fall? Should the American nation consent to the destruction of unionism, it would officially abet a policy of degrading the labor of its own citizens to the status of a commodity. Such an action would be just as suicidal as would have been the elevation of Negro slavery, as the South wished, from a legal right into an aggressive national policy. The United States would present the extraordinary spectacle of the denial by the largest political democracy in the world of the essentials of industrial self-government to the class of wage-earners. The idea is preposterous, but is it any more preposterous than the present neutrality between unionism and anti-unionism, than the sinister connivance at the frequent attempts made by large employers to eradicate unionism among their own employees? In so far as these attempts exist and succeed they create the same condition within a limited area as the adoption of a policy of discouraging unionism by the national government would over the whole country. They introduce irreconcilable antagonisms into the industrial system which are intermittently effervescing into violence and must inevitably continue to do so. Precisely because the warfare between unionism and anti-unionism in our industrial system compromises the public safety, and because anti-unionism is an impossible national policy, the nation must come to the deliberate and official discouragement of anti-unionism and the promotion of unionism.

Those employers who fear that the adoption of such a course would surrender them, tied hand and foot, to a grasping labor oligarchy should ponder one salutary consideration. Up to date the unions have been struggling for the opportunity to survive and grow, and their policy has been deter-

mined by their position as semi-outlaws. They had to seek power in order to protect themselves from being exterminated; and when they seized it, with the threat hanging over them of being deprived of it, they could hardly be expected to exercise it considerably. But after they obtain the security of recognition their attitude will change. A frank and loyal attempt to incorporate unions into the national industrial system will in itself tend to socialize the policy of the unions and make them more responsible. Unionism will then become one of the most powerfully and helpfully educative influences in the community. It will train a class of citizens whose political activities must remain for the present circumscribed in the purposive use of economic power. Industrial controversies will persist, but they will turn, not on the possession or the denial of power, but on the conflicting or varying purposes on behalf of which the two belligerents each propose to use their share of it. And the nation will not be indifferent to the outcome. The state will intervene partly to prevent the power of either party from being abused, but chiefly to discover and devise methods of adjustment between their conflicting purposes. Permanent boards of investigation will be needed, which will scrutinize specific labor problems and processes and after a survey of all the available facts suggest tentative methods of overcoming immediate difficulties. Industrial controversies will thus become capable of something resembling a rational treatment. The labor costs and rewards which prevail in important industries will be audited by industrial experts just as the cost of managing a particular plant and of manufacturing and selling its products is now audited by expert accountants. The scientific management which is converting business into a profession would have its counterpart in a scientific analysis of labor problems and the gradual acquisition of a scientific method of dealing with them. In no other way can they be taken out of the dubious region of class conflict.

The Republican Reunion

WHETHER or not Maine can be considered indicative of the way the whole country will vote in November, one fact stands out clearly: the Progressives of Maine have returned to Republican ranks. The total vote cast was so much larger than the vote in either 1912 or 1914 that it is difficult to estimate how many Progressives voted the Democratic ticket, but apparently they were not more than ten per cent of the number who voted for Mr. Roosevelt in 1912. On this

showing the Republican leaders and press have claimed not only the assured election of Mr. Hughes, but the complete reunion of the two parties for which they have been working since the close of the two conventions. "I come to you as the spokesman of a reunited Republican party," Mr. Hughes told a Plattsburg audience. "We have said it was reunited; we have believed it was reunited; we have devoutly hoped it was reunited. Now Maine proves it was reunited. Whoever was skeptical before must hide his cynicism now."

What sharers of this opinion do not perceive is that there is a wide distinction between what happened in Maine and what constitutes a reunion. Clearly the Maine Progressives voted for the party from which they had cut loose. But the ten per cent of them who may have voted for a Democratic governor might be added to the Republican majority without proving that the breach in the party's ranks had been closed. For that matter, the four million Progressive votes of 1912 might go to Mr. Hughes, and still leave reasons for doubting whether the two divisions were again in concord. Voting for a Republican governor this year, or even for a Republican President, may not be reaffirming faith in the Republican party. It may simply be casting a ballot against Mr. Wilson.

THE NEW REPUBLIC has believed that a Republican campaign, based on anti-Wilsonism, was an unsound campaign politically. It has been of the opinion that such an issue would fail to attract united Progressive support to Mr. Hughes. The Middle West may yet prove that this is the case, and that many Progressive voters will turn to Mr. Wilson as the logical substitute for their own non-existent party. But whether or not anti-Wilsonism succeeds as a campaign issue, it is surely an unreal basis upon which to work for the reunion of Republicans and Progressives.

While the Progressive party had its origin in the insurgency of one man, its influence did not cease to exist when its leader regained complacency. Conceived in personal loyalty it was nevertheless a rebellion, and as such it attracted thinking radicals as well as hero-worshippers. These latter faded with the days, but the radicals had come to stay. For the moment they might consolidate with the old reactionaries in opposition to a common enemy they deemed still more dangerous; but their interest in politics extended beyond a controversy over the presidential chair. They protested against invisible, irresponsible government. They demanded a cessation of the cowardice and corruption of party organization. They brought ideals and programs of reform that the older party termed "socialistic and paternalistic"—aspirations that could be temporarily shelved, but never