

has neglected to seek to understand management's technical problems. This has created the present impasse. Research departments—now more than 60 operated by unions—have asked union leaders to visualize more clearly the problems of management; but any drive for better relations between labor and management should be accompanied by an educational campaign to acquaint labor with management's problems, and management with labor's standards, goals, and aspirations. For either to be indifferent to the other's aims creates continuing warfare. Technical committees under sound labor-management relation have gone a long way in acquainting labor with managerial problems. These committees are joint committees, which

consider only technical problems, in the plant or shop. They do not deal with questions of human welfare.

Better labor-management relations are impossible. The impasse is not so complex or so stubborn as not to admit of analysis. The stakes of sound labor-management relations are great. It is unlikely that democracy can continue to exist with a deep cleft down through its vitals—the cleft made by a disordered industry. It is not likely that human society can solve international relations, if it cannot close the gaps at home, and solve labor management relation. Then, too, the financial return for good relations is enormous. It is estimated the recent automobile strike cost the industry more than a billion dollars.

## Credo for Labour

By KERMIT EBY

WHAT is organized labor? Why affiliate with it? Why give your life to fighting its battles, defending its positions, when you might teach? Or preach? Or work at some less strenuous calling? These are questions which my friends often ask and which I have many times tried to answer.

Perhaps no one can completely answer such questions. The following is an attempt to summarize some of the answers articulated and others subconsciously felt.

In the first place, let me tell you what the labor movement is not! It is not a few personalities, however important, played up by press and radio; not letter-heads bearing the names of Philip Murray, William Green, David Dubinsky, and Walter Reuther! The labor movement instead is a base, foundation of 14,000,000 American workers on which social, economic, and political democracy

can be built under the guidance of sound leadership. And without such a base, those who speak for economic reforms and social legislation would be literally "a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

Therefore, those who live in the American labor movement, who understand its historical mission, who know it was in the vanguard in lifting the worker out of economic serfdom, in protecting the rights of women and children, in insisting in season and out of season on free public education, are proud to be a part of it. Labor's ideals are consistent with our American idealism which has its roots in concepts of brotherhood, respect for human values, and equality of opportunity.

We Americans once were an inspiration of the world. Our revolution inspired other lands. The persecuted looked to America as a haven. For every DAR whose ancestors came on the Mayflower, seven debtors from the prisons of Europe found security on our shores. In 1716, one-third of America's citizens

EDITOR'S NOTE: Kermit Eby is Director of Research of the C. I. O. in Washington, D. C. A theologian by training he played a leading part in the Teachers Union before assuming his present position.

were descendants of German religious refugees who fled to Penn's state of brotherly love. In 1848, those who sought to escape military tyranny followed in their footsteps. Finally, in 1890, they were followed by the poor and oppressed of Central Europe. This was the amalgam which made America. Their children are to-day citizens and also union members, who must understand this heritage and its fruition in Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln and Roosevelt.

We believe, furthermore, that labor's ideals are consistent with the best in our Judaic Christian heritage. In this religious heritage are certain deep concepts. Human personality is sacred. Men are not means to ends. They were created in the image of God, a little lower than the angels. To me there is dignity in such a concept of creation. A denial of such a concept, seems to me to be the essence of sin. So is all that which denies man the fullest opportunity for development.

The labor movement, because it is of, by, and for the people, understands these things, hence its fight against poverty and all its blighting effects. We understand intuitively what Jesus stressed when he fed the hungry and clothed the naked! To-day, we go even farther, for we are convinced that ours is an economy of abundance, and that hunger and nakedness are a judgment not on individual men but on a system which places profits above people.

In this quest for economic security, the labor movement does not wish to give up its liberty. We do not desire to be slaves, no matter how tolerant our keeper, how high our living standards; we want to be free to worship as we please, express our ideas without fear, assemble where we choose. These rights, it seems to me, are basic. They are basic not only in our history but in that of civilization. They are fundamental rights, not to be granted by kings or dictators or taken away by them.

The labor movement is on record in the affirmation of this creed. Because

of our firm belief in the essential truths of which our culture and our labor movement are the inheritors and protagonists, we resent the intrusion of philosophies and loyalties which demand allegiance to other values. We fought fascism because we believed it a threat to civilization itself. And we are equally opposed to those that stress that other elites should rule us in the name of the proletariat they exploit. We take this position because we believe good ends cannot be accomplished by evil means. We, with Emerson, believe, "The end pre-exists in the means."

We insist on the right to criticize, evaluate, and arrive at independent judgments. We refuse to accept the Stalinist thesis that all who criticize communism are *ipso facto* fascists, and we go even further to say that their posing of the dilemma stimulates the very fascism they would avoid. Perhaps we are so adamant on our insistence on this right to criticize because we do not believe truth is the monopoly of a monolithic in-group. On the contrary, we are inclined to agree with Lincoln that resistance comes out of the experience of peoples. So, we of the labor movement believe ours is the task of persuasion, not coercion; that absolute power concentrated in the hands of any group moves to its own destruction. Perhaps our feeling can best be expressed in the concept that Abraham Lincoln is a truer symbol of democratic aspiration than Joseph Stalin. Didn't Lincoln write to his son, "Keep close to the people; they will not lead you far astray."

Failure to understand these most profound truths has bred a deep sickness in our civilization. Our civilization is confused. And in our confusion we assent to forced labor, enslavement of prisoners of war, transfers of peoples from their homes, liquidation of millions. It is this sickness which may mean the end of our Western civilization. To me the real tragedy was not the death of 6,000,000 Jews, but the lack of a moral climate to prevent it. We share the guilt of

Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering.

The labor movement, to its everlasting credit, realized the danger in such moral collapse, but it was not strong enough to prevent the tragedy. So, to-day it is labor's task to sharpen our sensitivity to evil. We must learn to speak out in the presence of wrong. We must understand that the civilized man can never be above the battle. We become, because of our convictions, like the Jesuits, the "Hounds of God." Like Wesley and Whitefield, we must be uncompromising in our opposition to wrong and injustice. Herman Rauschnig, in *The Triumph of Nihilism*, expressed this concept clearly, when he said, "We must make the democratic values of justice, liberty, equality and brotherhood more dynamic than the negative ones of hatred, exploitation, and war, if democracy is to triumph."

Furthermore, we in labor must never fail to distinguish between the big and little sins. We do not ask why workers drink in taverns and waste their "pitiful wages." We say that until society creates an environment in which opportunity for creative jobs and creative leisure are taken for granted, various escape mechanisms will continue to operate.

We hold the same attitude toward Negro and other exploited groups—justice does not rest in protestations. It is only accomplished as we move toward absolute equality in job opportunity, pay, and social privilege. We take seriously the claim of all minorities to equality of status. There is to us no Negro problem distinct from that of other workers. In the international field, we hold discrimination in immigration laws based on racial criteria as inconsistent with our highest ideals of democracy. Now, of course, certain of these ideals are not yet fully achieved; nevertheless, there can be no compromise in their assertion.

In other words, we in labor are not involved in abstract concepts of justice. Brotherhood to us in labor is a very pragmatic thing. It is the "cup of cold

water", the visit to the sick, not the long prayer and the hypocritical testimony. We want specific determinants, specific wages, specific living conditions, homes, playgrounds. Minimum wages to us means to-day a 65c-75c minimum; social security means just that, a protection against the threat of unemployment, old age, and sickness. Full employment means jobs at a living wage for all those willing and able to work. Ours is the task of creating an economy where charity and other palliatives are minimized. The right to work belongs to all people—not merely a chance to survive because of someone else's sympathy or gratuity. Our balance sheet is not measured by financial profits revealed or hidden; our balance sheet is determined in human terms: the happy man, the healthy child, the serene home.

If one wished, one could go on forever defining these specifics. We might point out that we who heed the cry of the children do so by assuring them of free schools and playgrounds, hot meals, adequate houses, and preventive medicine; for their fathers, jobs; and for their mothers, budgets providing the essentials of life.

Naturally, if we believe the attainment of such ends is desirable for ourselves, it must in time become the heritage of all peoples. We believe that our values to triumph must be understood and acted upon. This means understanding the effect of an unstable American economy on that of the world; it means using our resources to help the nations of the world industrialize and move upward in their living standards.

Trade to us means balance in imports and exports; it means the organization of the world to take advantage of diversity and specialization instead of monopoly and exploitation. Because labor believes these are achievable goals, we support the Reciprocal Trade Agreements, Bretton Woods, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the World Bank.

To-day the economies of the world are geared to war. Thirteen billion

dollars, perhaps eighteen billion, of our budget is spent for national defense against weapons for which there is no defense. This is tragedy. No nation can continue to exhaust its resources in war and spend 60 per cent of its budget on armaments in peace-time without ultimately impoverishing its people.

We in the labor movement believe in the ideals of the Atlantic Charter and in the creation of a world order operating on law. Stated succinctly, we insist that the enforcement of law must be taken from the hand of the litigant and placed in the hands of the court.

Ours is a program of transfer of sovereignty. We are convinced that a balance-of-power approach to history can only lead to war. Perhaps our position

can best be illustrated by the development of the British commonwealth, in contrast with the autonomy of other empire systems. In the British system, force was abandoned for cooperation based on mutual advantage.

Peace is very precious to us in the unions. We know that the "little people" bear the brunt of war. We understand the community of interest among those who toil everywhere; therefore a warless world is among our paramount goals.

In conclusion then, labor to me is the guardian of the values of our civilization. True, it is not without its faults, but yet it is the greatest driving force for good now extant. Believing this, it is my responsibility to work from within, not criticize from without!

---

## The Measurements of the Canadian Labour Force

By R. W. JAMES and NATHAN KEYFITZ

### I

THE planning of the war in Canada required statistical information of almost every conceivable kind. It was essential to know the output of aluminum and copper and other raw material as well as the needs of the civilian population for shoes, butter, and meat, among other things. Everybody became accustomed to filling out forms and applications, almost all of which were eventually used in compiling statistical information. As a result, many people became more conscious of the value of good statistics. Certainly this is true of government administrators. New methods of collecting statistics have been developed by the government in response to new demands for information. This paper is concerned with the introduction of large-scale sampling methods in the collection of labour force statistics, and with the circumstances which prompted this new development.

### II

In the early 1930's, the professional economists were unable to offer any satisfactory account of the depression which was sweeping over the world. There was large-scale unemployment in most industrial countries, but no one seemed to be able to suggest any convincing or practical remedies. The public was bewildered, and took refuge in wild monetary schemes or in complete disillusionment. Even in the depths of the depression, public understanding and opinion had not crystallized sufficiently to force governments to adopt useful countermeasures. By about 1935, Lord Keynes' brilliant analysis of the problem of underemployment had begun to spread and within a few years had taken the academic world by storm. The essential novelty of the Keynesian system was that it abandoned the traditional assumption of full employment and demonstrated quite clearly that the manpower and resources of a country could remain underemployed for a long period. Lord Keynes showed that a declining birth

---

EDITOR'S NOTE: R. W. James is Chief of the Sampling Unit of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa; N. Keyfitz is Statistician with the same unit.