

dread of the "company union." But note that I am not proposing the abolition of the national union or the multi-union federation—simply a restoration of powers of choice lost to the operational groups through the growth of union hierarchies. The national union will still have a centralized role of general policy making, promotion, and enterprise leadership—including legitimate lobbying. It may formulate general policies as to work rules (as it now does) and propose wage levels and differentials, but with these tailored by the local to its own peculiar (environmental) conditions, and state of the employing company (as textile workers have done). The main point is that any strike vote shall be taken independently for itself by each union without constraint by others. This would not be a departure from practices which now obtain sporadically within the union movement, but would regularize and generalize the principle and would allow "the show to go on," recognize difference in operational requirements, assure self-determined values, and raise the dignity of local leadership. It would not have to rubber stamp central policy or seek promotion to the national hierarchy via such subservience. Union members who have felt they had to support the national leaders even in an "unpopular" strike might ponder whether their own interests would not be served better by contributing to the making of differentiated adjustments than by accepting authoritarian decisions.

Note, too, that my proposal includes a similar restitution of powers of decision making by the centralized corporation to its component operating units.

This diagnosis is not based on the negative proposition that bigness must always suffer from bureaucratization, but on the positive concept of economic statesmanship and promotion of the common good, about which there is such ambiguity. Much as officials of the national government should and, to a not always recognized extent, do have a national or statesmanlike outlook even amidst the practical necessities of reflecting local and interest-group pressures, so top executives of national corporations and top officers of national unions have a similar opportunity (and duty) to learn of the national process within which their management must function and of practicing two-way statesmanship: backward for the enlightenment of their constituent parts and forward to the enlightenment of government agencies as to the needs and response of their "factor" group and its underlying parts.

A second impediment in the path of fundamentally workable adjustments is the refusal of management almost universally to admit that the price of product (in its relation to volume of sales, number of jobs, and rate of profits) should be considered as an integral part of the wage problem. If management were to admit the functional inseparability of these issues, it should expect labor similarly to treat wages in their relation to volume of employment, productivity, and actual rather than formulated living costs. This issue goes to the very heart of the proposals currently being made in various forms for dealing with labor-management deadlocks by means of "fact-finding" committees, compulsory arbitration, Presidential pressure for some "recommended" terms of settlement, or legislation providing for "a third chair [the public's] at the bargaining table." The simple fact is that corporation orthodoxy clings to the huckstering philosophy of early proprietary capitalism even in our new day of trustee capitalism. The progress of science and engineering has, in the area of technology, eroded the province of "trade secrets" almost to the vanishing point, and industrial executives have found that patent licensing is a practicable way of competitive life. We now need a counterpart development under which rational determination of critical cases within the price-income process could be approached by arraying the pertinent factual material and applying to it the best of professional expertise (with such fruitful variants of interpretation as economists would offer—even as scientists and engineers do). In a word, our society is now laboring under a serious cultural lag, and will continue to do so until we can bring ourselves to substitute scientific method for "muscle" in the conduct of big-unit industrialism.

In the fourteen years since the war we have demonstrated only a very precarious kind of control over the built-in or institutionalized inflation that has evolved and only dubious and adventitious capability for full and sustained use of our national resources for production. We are now, very properly, probing into a variety of local and more or less discrete manifestations of this unsatisfactory performance, in the hope of improving economic structures and elevating economic practice. Along with these activities, and as a guide to them, we should also ponder deeply what are the over-all impli-