

the

FREEMAN

Extra Edition

Free Men

vs.

The Union Closed Shop

By DONALD R. RICHBERG

the FREEMAN MAGAZINE

240 Madison Ave., New York 16

Free Men vs. the Union Closed Shop

By DONALD R. RICHBERG

Donald R. Richberg is one of the country's outstanding authorities on labor legislation. He was co-author of the Railway Labor Act passed by Congress in 1926 and of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. In the first Roosevelt Administration he served as General Counsel of NRA from 1933 to 1935 and as Chairman of the NRA Board in 1935. In the following article he weighs the pros and cons of the union closed shop, and concludes that such a shop is an attempt "to deprive men of an essential of 'life' (the earning of a livelihood), an essential of 'liberty' (freedom to work at one's trade), and an essential of 'property' (the ability to sell one's own labor)."

IN A "closed shop" no one can become and remain employed unless he is *already* a union member. In a "union shop" no one can *hold* a job unless he *becomes* a union member.

In either case this is a "union closed shop," because the door of continuous employment is open only to union members.

Would the establishment everywhere of union closed shops be good or bad for 1) the workers, 2) the employers, or 3) all the people?

1. *Is the union closed shop good or bad for the workers?*

Let us have no quarrel over the *right* of workers to organize, and no question about the benefits that workers *can* gain through a *good* labor organization.

The only question we propose to discuss is: What is a "good" organization—one that is good for the workers? Is it a union composed entirely of voluntary members who join willingly and continue to support it because they believe that it protects and promotes their interests? Or is it a union composed partly of unwilling members who are compelled to join and support it, in order to be able to get or hold a job and thus earn a living? Which is the stronger, more reliable union to advance the best interests of its members?

These are not easy questions; and despite the natural objection of free men and women to any avoidable compulsion, we all recognize that in a democratic, self-governing society we must establish many rules of good conduct and enforce them against people who will not voluntarily obey them.

Those who advocate the union closed shop argue very earnestly and sincerely that the "rule of the majority" is the "American Way"—and the "democratic way"—which makes it possible for men to live and work together effectively and peaceably.

That is partly true. But let us not forget that in

our democratic American way of life there are also rights of minorities and of individuals which must be maintained and which a majority is not permitted to deny or destroy. Is the "right to work," without being compelled to join a union, one of these "democratic" rights?

The founders of our Republic were so fearful that the "tyranny of a majority" would eventually destroy our liberties that they prohibited the government itself from making any laws that would limit free speech, a free press, freedom of religion or freedom of association, or would deny anyone time-honored protections, such as trial by jury, or would deprive anyone of the essential enjoyments of "life, liberty or property."

When unions were small only a limited number of wage earners were affected by their insistence that employers, with whom they made a contract, should employ only union members. So long as there were many "open shop" employers and there was no nation-wide organization of workers, the "closed shop" in one plant did not mean that a worker *must* join the union in order to earn a living.

But today, when a nation-wide, or industry-wide, or city-wide, union demands that all employers make a union closed shop contract, the union is trying to do precisely what the government of the United States is forbidden to do. The union is trying to deprive men of an essential of "life" (the earning of a livelihood), an essential of "liberty" (freedom to work at one's trade), and an essential of "property" (the ability to sell one's own labor).

The Union Argument

If a man can no longer earn a living except by paying dues to a private organization and becoming practically, if not legally, subject to its laws and discipline, he is forced to become the subject of a private government in order to live.

If he voluntarily joins and remains in a union, this is "government by the consent of the governed." But if he is forced to join, and forced to stay in, this is government without consent, which the Declaration of Independence denounces as tyranny.

The Freeman is published fortnightly. Publication Office, Milford Turnpike, Orange, Conn.; Editorial and General Offices, 240 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. Copyrighted in the United States, 1951, by The Freeman Magazine, Inc. John Chamberlain, President; Henry Haslitt, Vice President; Susanne La Follette, Secretary; Alfred Kohlberg, Treasurer. Application pending for second class entry at the Post Office at Orange, Conn. Rates: Twenty-five cents the copy; five dollars a year in the United States, nine dollars for two years; six dollars a year elsewhere.

But advocates of the union closed shop will say that this criticism is unfair and exaggerated because, first, the unions have no nation-wide monopoly of jobs, and secondly, the union "government" is controlled by the workers themselves, and also by the government of the nation. However, the test of what is right and what is good for the workers is found not only in what the unions are doing today, but also in what they are trying to do and will do if, as they intend, they organize all workers and establish the monopoly of the union closed shop in all important industries. Then they will control all the opportunities of employment for practically all workers. Today they already control most of the opportunities for employment of a very large percentage of the workers.

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. Of course such a control over all employment of labor would carry with it control of all industries and, eventually, dominion over the public government through the voting power of unionists and union control of the economic power upon which political power depends.

Socialism and Fascism

In a word, the inevitable result of establishing nationally a union closed shop monopoly must be to accept national socialism under labor domination—the triumph of what can be most accurately described as "labor fascism." This description is not emotional but coldly realistic. The word "fascism" is ordinarily used to describe the rule of industry and government by a monopolistic combination of property managers of industry. But the rule of industry and government by a monopolistic combination of labor managers of industry would provide the same sort of tyranny. In one case the tyrants would be elected by politically organized stockholders, and in the other case by politically organized workers. But in both cases the individual citizen would become a dependent servant of his political-economic masters.

It is the common complaint that small stockholders and bondholders of corporations (of whom

there are millions) are unable directly to control their managers. But they do have an indirect control that is quite effective. They can sell their stocks and bonds in a free market, withdraw from an enterprise, and refuse to provide additional capital. So business managers are under strong pressure to maintain the support of bond and stockholders. It is equally well known that the millions of members of a big union are unable directly to control *their* managers. Individual refusals to obey powerful union officers are very dangerous, and campaigns to change them are both dangerous and expensive. It has been proved repeatedly that an American coal miner is nearly as helpless to oppose John L. Lewis as a Russian is to oppose Joseph Stalin.

Under compulsory unionism, workers are unable to withdraw from or to cease to support their unions. They can not, like stockholders, simply take a loss, if necessary, and get out of their association, and invest their property (their labor) in another enterprise. Under a union closed shop monopoly they are like prisoners in a vast jail which they have built for themselves. Only by trying a desperate revolt can they set themselves free—and if the revolt fails they stand to lose their opportunity to earn a living.

"Security" for Whom?

That is why the "security" of workers, as well as the freedom of all our people, depends on whether the workers themselves can and will prevent the establishment of a labor union monopoly of all work opportunities—and the resulting control of industry and public government by a private government of labor Fascists. The very term "union security" which is given to a union shop agreement shows that it is the *union* and not the individual that gets the "security." Monopoly power may give to labor managers a feeling of "union security," but it should give no feeling of "job security" to the workers. Whoever before claimed that a monopoly gave "security" to those forced to let monopolists rule their lives? Those dependent upon the arbitrary power of someone else to bless or curse them are always most insecure.

There is probably not an outstanding leader of American labor who is willing to believe that the triumph of the union closed shop policy would establish a labor tyranny such as has been described. Like all zealous, ambitious men who gain popular followings, honest labor leaders undoubtedly believe in the sincerity of their purposes to advance the interests of those who follow them. But when good men develop powerful machines for good purposes they can be sure that eventually bad men will operate them for bad purposes, if they are given the chance. Great power to do good carries with it great power to do evil.

Where great power is created for good ends, the resulting great power to do evil either must be denied to vicious or reckless users, or, if that is impractical, all uses of such power must be subject

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 sub-standard 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-

dustry-wide standards are often undesirable, yet almost inevitable with national labor organization, unless the power of local self-government is left with local units. The union closed shop doctrine of non-competitive labor is destructive of a large part of that healthy competition between enterprises in different localities which, again, must be desired by anyone who really believes in "free enterprise."

c. Cooperation with union labor is much easier if the discipline of the union compels employees to accept the union settlement of grievances and if the union is fully supported in its expenses by dues from all employees. Employers are often persuaded that non-union employees—"free riders," who do not pay dues and are not subject to union laws—are troublemakers for them. Union men will not support the grievances of non-union men, and these discontented employees make sore spots in what might be a healthy morale. But this argument overlooks the fact that union officers possessing the arbitrary power of a union closed shop may go to either one of two extremes. They may become negligent and dilatory in ironing out complaints of their own members, who can not prosecute their own grievances. The management is blamed and employees are disgruntled. Or the labor bosses may become so arrogant and anxious to assert their power that they will use excessive force to win trivial victories. Then both employers and employees suffer the losses of repeated strikes or slow-downs or long-drawn-out, expensive negotiations in order to demonstrate that the demands of union officers must be complied with, even when most unreasonable.

The employer who agrees to a union closed shop not only makes himself a tool of labor managers to help them do their work and to force employees to support them, but also makes himself their accomplice in any wrongs they inflict upon their members—and upon himself!

It is an old story. If we will not learn from history, we will be taught by bitter experience. A wise, benevolent autocrat may promote justice, efficiency and security. But if we are to avoid the menace of injustice, inefficiency and insecurity from the rule of a foolish, malevolent autocrat (and the certainty that arbitrary power will be abused), we should not consent to establishing autocratic power anywhere. The only sure safeguard against the abuses of too much power is to retain in individuals the freedom to refuse to support any longer an authority over their lives which they feel is doing them more harm than good. Employers as well as employees have a lasting interest in preserving democratic, competitive controls of industry and in preventing the establishment of any monopolistic controls of their enterprises.

3). *Is a union closed shop good or bad for all the people?* It must be plain that if monopolistic controls of industry by a union closed shop monopoly, or by a combined union-employer monopoly, are bad for both workers and employers, they are even worse for all the rest of the people. Farmers, small

businessmen, independent professionals, government employees, consumers as a class (which includes all workers, business managers, investors and holders of insurance policies)—all must depend for security from oppression and exploitation upon a free competitive system to regulate prices, quality and production. The only real alternatives to such automatic regulation are imposition of temporary government controls to meet the demands of such a national emergency as the threat or existence of international war, or submission to the permanent political tyrannies of national socialism.

A private monopoly control of any vital industry is utterly intolerable. Inevitably the people will demand in the future as they have in the past that their government destroy or at least take control of such a monopoly.

Thus it follows that if a monopoly of all employment were ever obtained by labor managers through a universal union closed shop program, this private government monopoly would be destroyed or taken over by the public government. If the unions continue to use their political power to prevent the government from outlawing the union closed shop, they will present two alternatives to the workers and business managers. Either they will themselves stop the spread of the union closed shop, by the workers refusing to join and the managers refusing to support compulsory unions, or free workers and managers will organize and support a movement for government control of the union.

Warning Voices

If a monopolistic rule of industry becomes inevitable, the people will certainly insist that at least the rulers be selected by all the people as public servants and not chosen by one class to serve its special interests. The growth of a private labor government within industry will either be stopped or in time a public government—a national socialistic government—over industry will be imposed. Indeed, the transformation of a private labor government to a public labor government—which occurred in England—would be inevitable here because, in achieving its complete monopoly control, the unions must achieve at the same time a political control to protect their monopoly which will become more and more oppressive, even to those whom it assumes to favor. When men seek to rule by force they must control the ultimate force which resides in the public government, because it has the power to enact and enforce laws that all must obey.

Justifications of the union closed shop, which appealed to many friends of labor in the early days when unions were small and fighting a bitter battle for the simple right of the workers to organize themselves, can no longer be offered. The unions are no longer small organizations struggling for the right to exist and to have a voice in the councils of industry and government. They are the largest, most militantly organized, and most influential organizations of class-conscious citizens in the na-

tion. Their power is enormous and often terrifying in its destructive use. Their continued existence is assured. The right of workers to organize, for which the early labor leaders had to fight, is today recognized not only in the United States but almost universally, although in such socialistic governments as those of Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany, labor organizations have always been made completely subject to government control. A similar socialistic policy is becoming evident in England.

The rise to power of organized labor in the United States has come so rapidly that the dangers and inevitable consequences of compulsory unionism have become apparent only recently. Liberal opinion in our country has generally and persistently supported the efforts of labor unions to expand their memberships and to increase their powers, on the blind assumption that these were democratic organizations which aimed at advancing the welfare and freedom of their members and of society.

Long ago, however, some of the outstanding champions of labor organization had the foresight to see that, as in all organizations of human beings, labor unions might be controlled by evil or misguided men as well as by good and wise men. Such farsighted liberals warned the workers and the public that the laws of human behavior should not be disregarded and that the only way to make sure that human beings would not abuse powers given to them was to limit and to provide restraints upon all powers which are capable of serious abuse.

Among these early warning voices none spoke more clearly, perhaps, than the long-outstanding champion of labor interests, the late Justice Brandeis. His notable disciple, the present Justice Frankfurter, quoted Brandeis at some length in a recent opinion which he delivered in the Supreme Court, and these quotations are worthy of earnest study by all those who today either advocate or tolerate the union closed shop doctrine.

In 1910 Brandeis wrote:

The objections, legal, economic and social, against the closed shop are so strong, and the idea of the closed shop so antagonistic to the American spirit, that the insistence upon it has been a serious obstacle to union progress.

In 1912 Brandeis wrote:

But the American people should not, and will not accept unionism if it involves the closed shop. They will not consent to the exchange of the tyranny of the employer for the tyranny of the employees.

Even earlier, in 1905, Brandeis said:

It is not true that the "success of a labor union" necessarily means "a perfect monopoly." The union, in order to attain and to preserve for its members industrial liberty, must be strong and stable. It need not include every member of the trade. Indeed, it is desirable for both the employer and the union that it should not. Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness. Neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condi-

tion for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are non-unionist. In any free community the diversity of character, of beliefs, of taste — indeed mere selfishness — will insure such a supply, if the enjoyment of this privilege of individualism is protected by law. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer.

Other liberal-minded students of industrial relations have over and over again uttered similar warnings. In recent years the menace of labor monopolies and the wrong of compulsory unionism have been clearly shown in the frightening abuses of power by union leaders that have sapped the industrial strength of America even when we were fighting for national existence against foreign enemies.

It is time for all Americans to realize that the union closed shop creates a monopoly power too great to be entrusted to any person or organization — a monopoly power that will inevitably so weaken and disorganize our industrial energies and be so abused by power-intoxicated, privately chosen dictators that there will be no way left to rescue our industries from demoralized inefficiency — no way left to oppose successfully foreign aggression and to preserve some remnants of our liberties — except to subject all our industries and all our people to the dictatorial rule of a socialized national government. This is not a tolerable prospect for a free people.

When we find ourselves rushing to destruction because we are losing control of our motive power it is time to put on the brakes while we can check our momentum. It is not "progressive," "courageous" or "liberal" to step on the gas when our car is hurtling down hill past red flags that warn us of imminent disaster. Certainly there are enough red flags along the industrial road now so that, if the union drivers themselves will not put on the brakes, their fellow-passengers should do it for them.

Conclusion

Liberal-minded men and women in America have been slow to recognize the illiberal character of the policies and programs of all the major labor organizations of today. Their demands for, and their abusive exercise of monopoly power are still defended as necessary to protect "exploited" workers from continuing "oppression" by employers. Yet these "oppressive" employers have been proved, again and again, to be practically helpless to resist demands which were plainly unreasonable and injurious to the general welfare.

It was logical for Communists to try to develop and to dominate revolutionary labor unions. But to gain their ends the capture of official positions would have to follow, and not precede, the conversion of the rank and file. That is being accomplished by the conversion of labor leaders to what they complacently regard as "democratic socialism,"

which is nothing but communism watered down for popular consumption. In this form it can be advocated by those who sincerely detest the cruelty, terror and tyranny of an orthodox Communist seizure and exercise of power.

The menace of communism today is as great in its efforts to corrupt the minds and to control the organizations of American labor as in its plan for military conquest from abroad. Those labor leaders who today join in supporting every project for socializing the industries of the United States can hardly be trusted to exercise wisely a monopoly power over industry. Even if they could be relied upon today to use such power to advance the general welfare and to preserve the freedom of all people, they might be led further astray tomorrow, or be supplanted by more extreme labor Fascists, or by the Communists who are now plotting to overthrow them.

The concentration of power in a few places and in a few hands always holds the menace that such a key position may be captured, and a vast organization of men and machines may be demoralized or misdirected by a few enemies. The only sure defense against such catastrophe is to avoid and to prevent any such dangerous concentration of power. The union closed shop now provides the means of centralizing a power of life and death over the industries of America. This power has already been so abused that, by the action of a few men, our vital industries several times have been temporarily paralyzed in a time of national peril. There is no way to prevent the recurrence and extension of such intolerable abuses of union monopoly power except by stopping its further growth: by making it unlawful to compel any worker to join a union in order to earn a living; by outlawing compulsory unionism and the union closed shop.

WHO'S NOT CONCERNED?



LEADERS OF LABOR . . . EMPLOYERS AND WORKERS . . . EVERYONE is concerned with this vital subject of individual rights. The very roots of American freedom are involved in the problem so capably analyzed in this extra edition of the *Freeman*.



YOU WILL WANT COPIES...

to send to friends and associates immediately in order that they may better understand the dangers whenever an overbalance of power is vested in the hands of any labor leader. This edition is a textbook on freedom. Order your copies NOW!

the FREEMAN

Dept. R

240 Madison Avenue

New York 16, New York

PRICE LIST

Single copy	.10 cents
12 copies	1.00
100 copies	8.00
Larger quantities	.07 per copy

WE SHALL BE PLEASED TO SEND A SAMPLE COPY OF THE FREEMAN ON REQUEST