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Over the last two centuries, wherever the industrial revolution has taken root and developed, there has arisen alongside it the popular demand for democracy. Similarly, in response to the growth of industry and to its social consequences, modern socialism has arisen as a political movement of global significance. It is not surprising then, with recent histories so closely linked, that both democracy and socialism have much in common. Indeed, where there is no democracy there can be no true socialism; and where there is no socialism, democracy is but a hollow rhetoric.

At present, and in the coming decades, man faces a new stage in the process of industrialization. He stands on the brink of a period which holds but precarious promise — both for his just recently won material affluence and for the still unattained higher quality of human life.

Canadian Labour today must meet the new challenges of industrialization in a vigorous and courageous fashion. Its commitments toward social justice and social equality must be re-affirmed and pressed forward.

We believe that our present task is to extend the struggle for democracy, human rights and human welfare to the shop-level itself. Only through a program aimed at the full democratization of the workplace can the working man’s economic and democratic rights be fully secured and protected. Only a movement for Industrial Democracy in all of Canada’s plants, mines, and offices, carried out by a progressive trade union movement, can face up to and deal with the variety of challenges that lie ahead and thereby insur the attainment of a socialist and truly democratic society for all Canadians.
The conference on Industrial Democracy held recently in Toronto was called in order to bring together trade unionists and others interested in the future of Industrial Democracy in Canada. An entire spectrum of views and opinions on this subject was presented in the hope of stimulating further discussion. The organizers of the conference have now decided to publish the proceedings so that workers across the country will have an opportunity to consider the issue for themselves. The speeches presented in the following pages do not by any means cover the entire field, nor do they constitute a coherent strategy for achieving Industrial Democracy. Such a strategy would be premature at the present time. It is a task necessarily reserved for the Canadian Labour movement itself. But we hope that the publication of these speeches will initiate a fruitful dialogue among Canadian workers on the subject of Industrial Democracy and its meaning for the future of the Canadian labour movement.

Gerry Hunnius
For: The Workers Control
Task Force,
Praxis: Research
Institute for Social Change
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INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY:

Definitions, Questions and Problems.

by Leo Roback

During this important Conference we shall be discussing several aspects of Industrial Democracy. Before we do, there are a number of basic issues and questions to be examined as closely and critically as possible. Some of these involve, inevitably but necessarily, definitions of terms. Others require the posing of arguments for and against in order that our conclusions be based on as objective an analysis as can be made.

Some of these questions and issues may be listed briefly.

1. WHAT IS Industrial Democracy in theory and practice?
2. What are its origins?
3. WHO is involved and why?
4. Who wants Industrial Democracy?
5. What is the relationship between Industrial and Political Democracy?
6. Is Industrial Democracy (as defined) possible, feasible and desirable?
7. Is Industrial Democracy necessary, and if so, why?
8. Does Industrial Democracy require basic changes in the structure of the economy from the point of view of
   (a) ownership
   (b) autonomy of individual enterprises or other units?
9. What is the relationship between Industrial Democracy and Collective Bargaining and Trade Unionism as we know them?
10. How relevant to Canada are the various experiments in Industrial Democracy?

I should like to comment briefly on the questions posed above, not so much to propose answers as in the hope of clarifying the issues and pointing to some of the dimensions I think are involved.

1. WHAT IS INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY?

Since “Democracy” is an old Greek concept dealing with political institutions, it is natural that the term “industrial democracy” has been interpreted quite often in a “political science” way, applied to a specific type of community, namely that of WORK, involving as it does not only economic
activity, but *authority relationships*, in short, a system of "government". Thus Clegg bases his definition of Industrial Democracy on that of Political Democracy which he considers is "a form of government in which all the GOVERNED have or can have an effective share" (emphasis added)\(^1\).

Applying this to the context of work relationships, Clegg concludes that Industrial Democracy cannot be "self-government" ("government by the governed") but rather "democracy by consent" or "pressure-group democracy" in which an independent group (union, workers' council) acts as a countervailing force on management to promote the interests and protect the rights of workers in the enterprise against management. In the final analysis, says Clegg, this means collective bargaining in essence, whatever its concrete form may be.\(^2\) This means, too, that the UNION must be the key instrument or vehicle of industrial democracy. This implies, first, that the "share in government by the governed" is limited to those aspects that bear more or less directly and immediately on the work done in the enterprise, while the major decisions affecting the enterprise and its operations — including notably, the existence and goals of the firm — are left to management.

In most contemporary discussion, the term "Industrial Democracy" is increasingly replaced by "Worker Participation in Management" as it appears to be more precise, less tinged with moral judgment, and more easily related to concrete experiences in various parts of the world. It has the advantage as well of referring directly to the enterprise or unit of economic activity in its other dimension — that of a community. In this light, a broad but useful definition is that proposed by Jacques Grand'Maison for "Community Development" but which might be applied to Worker Participation in Management:

"A social process wherein the citizens take into their hands the collective fate of their community and become capable of tackling the principal problem of the community..."\(^3\)

While Grand'Maison's definition (which we are applying to the basic concept of this Conference) leaves many elements still to be defined, it does set out the basic goal, thereby providing us with an important criterion for judging various means of reaching that goal. In other words, "Workers' Participation in Management", if it is to approach a "taking into their hands the collective fate of their community" by those involved, must go beyond the specific conditions of work, beyond "indirect impact or influence" on decisions which are crucial to the community (enterprise) and produce a degree of mass involvement in the process.

This raises an immediate question: does workers' participation in management necessarily involve acceptance of the existing goals of the enterprise? Or does it presuppose contesting and changing those goals? To be specific, if the basic objective and raison-d'etre of the enterprise is to maximize profit or rate of profit, or control of the market, is workers' participation in management possible and/or desirable? Turning the question about, if the answer to the first one is negative, does workers' participation in management have to wait until the goals of the enterprise have been changed, presumably by a transformation of the basic political, social and economic system? This is really the question posed many years ago by the Syndicalists in Europe and the I.W.W. in the U.S. who proposed the take-over of the
factories by the workers as the means of overthrowing the capitalist system and state power.

While the issue may appear academic, it is real and essential. Is workers’ participation in management an end in itself — for its psychological, economic and humanitarian benefits to workers and enterprise — or is it an integral, necessary aspect of a broad strategy toward an all-going transformation of society? This is the approach taken by Charles Taylor in his “Socialism in the 1970’s in Canada”. Taylor’s view is that socialist planning of the economy is a pre-condition for democratization of Canadian society, but cannot guarantee democracy unless responsibility for important decisions is placed in the hands of the people who are most affected by these decisions. This general approach also appears to be adopted by the leadership of the Yugoslav government and Communist League, though observers outside that country are far from unanimous on the subject.

2. WHO IS INVOLVED AND WHY?

It seems odd to ask “who is involved” in workers’ participation in management, since the two words “workers” and “management” appear self-explanatory. But does “workers” include only wage workers (blue and white collar eligible for union membership under present rules) or does it take in professional employees, supervisors, middle management and so on up to the immediate level below “top management”? Again, the question is of substantial practical as well as theoretic importance, since studies in Yugoslavia have shown a much higher level of interest and activity in “worker self-management” by technical-professional employees than by blue-collar workers. It might be asked as well whether major decisions affecting the enterprise, and therefore the whole of society if it is a large enterprise, should be left in the hands of those working in the enterprise? Is a decision on the phosphate content of detergents to be left to Local 27 of the International Chemical Workers, and a decision on the quality of General Motors cars to UAW Local 222?

What is “participation” and what is “management”? To some, “participation” means having influence, a say in decisions in certain areas affecting those who are managed”. But what areas, what degree of influence, at what levels? Participation can range from “self-management”, meaning FULL POWER on all matters affecting the whole enterprise to “consultation”, representation on decision-making boards and executive bodies, through indirect participation via collective bargaining, grievance procedure and arbitration.

Who does the participating? Is it “direct”, involving all workers, at whatever level and on whatever area, or are we talking of “delegated” participation, by elected representatives (chosen directly by the workers in the enterprise or plant or by the union)? And is there a realistic option between the two forms, or is representative or delegated participation the only mode really practicable?

Various answers can be given as to the reason for worker participation in management (however this is defined). We have already mentioned the historical source, in the Syndicalist movement, of “self-management” of enterprises by the workers (occupation of the plants, “the mines to the miners”) as the road or means of achieving the overthrow of capitalism and
the establishment of an "associationist" society. A contemporary social-democratic (or democratic socialist) rationale is that socialist economic planning for a rational, egalitarian society requires decentralization of power, hence radical extension of participation in decision-making by the people affected by decisions.

A second type of argument for worker participation in management is based on an ethical-sociological line of reasoning. This holds that worker participation is an expression of human rights, of the moral dignity of work, hence of the right of the worker to be master of his own labor power and to dispose of the product of his work. This approach has been developed by the French sociologist, Alain Touraine, among others. Touraine argues that work must be considered a social action (praxis) in which man is transformed at the same time as nature. Therefore work must have meaning for the worker, a meaning expressed in the two-fold need and desire for creativity (freedom to create) and control over the product of his work, the product being defined as "works" not "objects". The two goals are described by Touraine as "freedom and democracy", the struggle against the system of authority in work communities and the economic system which separates the worker both from himself and his product.7

This is not too different from the approach which sees worker participation in management as the supreme means for de-alienating much of present-day industrial work even without changing the nature of processes and tasks. Research on "job satisfaction" shows that when the worker's decision making power on the job increases, there is, independent of the level of skill and type of work situation, a significant rise in satisfaction and meaningfulness of work.8

Blumberg's argument is that worker decision-making on the job is not only necessary to counter alienation, but feasible. His research shows that industrial workers are oriented and responsive to participation, especially to participation at the level of decisions that are of direct interest to them because of their effect, and that are within their scope of action.

This leads us to yet another line of reasoning which justifies worker participation in decision-making not merely for what it does for the worker, but for its benefits to the enterprise. This is the argument that participation — in the sense of understanding what goes on about him and being able to control events affecting him — leads to more efficiency. This is obtained through various means: obtaining ideas contributed by workers for improvement in operations; increased willingness of workers to accept change; better morale, translated into higher productivity; reduction of conflict; stimulation of management to greater efficiency; providing a communications circuit which enables management decisions to be checked and corrected.9 This is fairly close to the increasingly popular ideas of Douglas McGregor and R. Likert on "participative management,"10 stressing social motivation and the capability of workers to exercise self-direction, self-discipline and self-control as against individual incentive and the "stick-and-carrot" type of coercive and manipulative management and supervision.11 McGregor's idea is that management in modern, technologically-advanced enterprises requires not only the maximum degree of teamwork (running across formal frontiers based on hierarchical position and job functions) but also the utmost in delegation and decentralization of decision-making. It is quite clear, however, that McGregor is thinking mainly
of lower and mid-management and staff specialists, and that he is not thinking of his “democratization” procedures going so far as to question the objectives of the enterprises. In short, as one critic points out, McGregor's theory is itself manipulative, designed to assure greater integration and loyalty to the enterprise and social system by those in it.12

3. WHO WANTS WORKER PARTICIPATION?

Back in the '30's, a Hollywood film showed a left-wing agitator haranguing a group of unemployed workers from a soap-box. "Under this system, only the capitalists can eat strawberries and cream. But comes the revolution, everyone will eat strawberries and cream!" At this point, a mild-looking little man spoke up. "I don't like strawberries and cream". The agitator glared at him furiously and screamed: "Comrade, comes the revolution, you'll eat strawberries and cream whether you like it or not!"

Research in various countries shows that the desire or interest of workers in participation is affected by a host of variables. These include educational level, the level of responsibility in the operations of the enterprise, the pay or income level, the type of technology, the cultural background, the ideological context or value system in the society, and so on. Interest also varies according to the aspect or area of participation, and the kind of participation — direct or by delegated representatives. Most research results seem to show that those with higher education, greater responsibility and status (and pay) are more interested in some form of participation in management than workers with little education, little responsibility and low pay and status.13 A French observer notes that there are two major aspects of participation in management — (a) that involving "policy decisions"; (b) that bearing on matters of internal organization. It is the latter which arouses the greatest interest among the broadest strata of workers.

"When workers speak of 'the management of the enterprise', they really mean the management of their own work, independent of the aims and purposes of the work".14

What Mallet is saying resembles a point stressed by some other authors, namely that participation in management or even "self-management" is perceived in some situations as autonomy of the group in relation to its own work, as against sharing in decision-making and therefore responsibility for the work of other groups, and the operations, the objectives and success of the enterprise.15

Some tentative conclusions can be drawn:

(a) Formal procedures or mechanisms for worker participation in management are unlikely to be meaningful unless there is a real change in the relation of worker to his immediate work situation and in the manner that decisions directly affecting his work are made;

(b) Participation at the level of the immediate work situation does not preclude participation at higher levels of decision-making and on broader areas of decision. Indeed, it can be argued that involvement at the "primary group" level is a pre-condition to effective participation in management.

(c) Since each enterprise and work community has a host of peculiarities and variables affecting the interest of workers in participation, the "results" will inevitably vary from one situation to another, as will the precise forms and structures. This suggests also that there must be conflicts and tensions if worker participation in management is considered as an on-going social process and not merely as a formula.
(d) Unless each and every separate enterprise and work community is seen as a little world of its own, some unifying, guiding thread is presupposed to provide a general purpose and meaning to the various and very different situations. This, I would suggest, is provided by what might be called (for lack of a better word) ideology. This ideology could be named "democracy", "freedom", "egalitarianism", "brotherhood" or what you will. It signifies a more or less coherent set of ideas and values centered around the notion of quality of life, of the autonomy of individuals combined with mutual responsibility, the assertion that human intelligence and sensibility and responsibility are not the monopoly of an elite but within the purview of all, at various levels in varying degrees. This ideology, as I see it, is expressed (in odd and sometimes awkward and incoherent forms) by the various "student power" movements. It comes close to what Jacques Grand'Maison calls "contestation as the other side of participation".\footnote{16} Worker participation in management does not arise in a vacuum. It is born and grows in a situation strongly marked by authoritarian relationships. It seems obvious that meaningful participation in decision-making must involve a good deal of questioning of decisions already advanced, in short, of contestation. Some of this will be uninformed, ill-informed, even erroneous. It cannot be otherwise, since it involves an educational process leading to a great transformation of relationships and mental habits and attitudes.

4. IS WORKER PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT FEASIBLE?

Since modern, advanced economies are incredibly complex affairs, and since modern technology requires tremendous amounts of specialized, technical knowledge, how can an industrial or administrative complex be directed, managed, planned or even "controlled" (in the French sense of the word, subjected to verification, surveillance and use of veto) by non-specialists? Secondly, would close involvement of the workers in the management of "their" enterprise not lead to a kind of "enterprise egotism"? Would this not lead to an unhealthy competitiveness with each group of "worker-management" seeking to make "its" enterprise the biggest, the most profitable, the most productive, and the one with the highest wages, even at the expense of other units in the society?

To the first objection, it is a well-known fact that increased specialization of a technical kind is not necessarily the optimum condition for decision-making on broad policy matters. Douglas McGregor emphasized in his classic book that the very fact of the "knowledge explosion" places a premium on flexibility and adaptability. People change jobs, fields, careers. The two top posts in the CBC are held by men with no background whatever in radio or T.V. Robert MacNamara was a professor of mathematics before becoming successively President of Ford Motor, Secretary of Defense and President of the World Bank. The formal training of Air Canada's President was in Modern History, and so on. The greatest and gravest decisions in the world are daily made by laymen, often on, but sometimes against, the advice of "experts". There are policy decisions, which can and are made by informed laymen, while the execution of the decisions are and must be left to technically competent people. However, the execution can also be broken down into elements which are within the competence of non-experts for some areas of decision-making. The experience of large enterprises in France, among the most advanced and technically complex, indicates that
Experienced workers in the skilled and technician categories are able and anxious to correct management decisions which they consider wrong and harmful to the operation.17

In this connection it is important to remember the remarkable increase in the general level of formal education in Canada in recent years and the rapid rise in the number and variety of post-secondary and adult education programmes. For example, in 1960-1961 in Canada as a whole only about 50% of those starting elementary school continued on through Grade XI and only 27% of French-speaking young people in Quebec completed high school, whereas the proportion at the present time is 70%.18 It is true that these figures do not tell the whole story. However, it is legitimate to assume that the great majority of younger workers in Canada have the basic educational equipment to be able to understand and appreciate information and propositions dealing with such matters as investment decisions, quality control, marketing, price policy, cost accounting and productivity. Clearly in a technology based on knowledge and information, the accessibility to both becomes crucial. This means, for example, an enormous effort designed to educate and inform the broadest groups of workers on both micro and macro aspects of economic and social problems. It means, specifically, the projection of situations and systems based on complete and open information at all levels. This undoubtedly sounds utopian in the light of the present situation where information that is communicated by management to union representatives is normally done under the seal of “confidentiality”. What does this produce? It brings about a double separation of workers from decision-making: from decisions within the enterprise and from those affecting Union policy. In a discussion a few years ago, a Quebec trade union leader stressed this point to the writer, namely that there can be no real equality of power between union leaders and rank and file simply because the former possess, exclusively, information (much of it obtained in meetings with the employer) which enable the leader to make decisions beyond the effective “control” of the members. The problem is aggravated at the macro level, where advisory and other governmental agencies having union representatives normally operate under rules of secrecy.

The second objection mentioned earlier, that of “enterprise particularism” or “local egotism” is a serious one. The problem has been noted in Yugoslavia by sympathetic observers and freely admitted by political leaders in that country.19 Where material benefits of the workers are directly dependent on and proportional to the economic “success” (measured by productivity or profitability) of the economic unit, it is easy to imagine that “particularism” can develop to a “devil take the hindmost” behavior and lead to conflicts between units as well as between the interests of a particular unit and those of the community or society as a whole. If we accept the idea that worker participation in management is a great social process involving the transformation of men and their behavior as well as that of structures we shall admit that these contradictions, tensions, dysfunctions and conflicts are inherent to the process. It will also be apparent that the full development of worker management can be envisioned only in the context of a highly socialized society, with general consensus on basic, overall purposes and centralized but democratic mechanisms. Decisions are made through processes involving “circulation” from bottom to top and back again of information, needs, directives, techniques, proposals as well as the recognition
that conflicts of interests may occur and need to be brought out into the open. This, it will be recognized, is the opposite of “administrative-type” or “technocratic” planning. In fact, the co-existence of highly autonomous self-managed enterprises at the micro-level, and centralized planning at the macro level, requires maximum circulation and conflictual participation if the planning is to work, because of the inevitable and generally foreseeable unforeseen factors and circumstances. In other words, it supposes a process combining centralization of purpose and macro-goals — a basic, underlying ideological consensus — and highly decentralized decision-making as to micro-goals and means of realizing them. The whole, therefore, is suffused with a clash of views and seen in a context of continuing change.

SOME EXPERIMENTS IN THE FIELD OF WORKER PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT

1. WEST GERMANY

The “Co-Determination” (Mitbestimmung) system in West Germany is well known, but a brief recall of its main features will be useful, especially since it is a subject of debate in that country at the present time.

It should be pointed out at the outset that there are two major types of “co-determination” (“co-decision” is probably a better translation of the German term, while the French rendering, “co-gestion” or co-management seems quite far off the mark).

(a) Coal and Steel

It is in this sector that the system exists in its most developed form. The current debate in the Federal Republic is over the Unions’ demand that the Coal and Steel system become the general one, extended to all enterprises (limited companies) employing 2,000 workers or more, of which there are some 600 at present.

A Works Council is elected every two years, by secret ballot, by the employees (blue collar and white collar) of the enterprise. The employees are represented on two of the three governing bodies of the firm. These two governing bodies are the “Board of Supervision” (corresponding roughly to our Board of Directors) and the three-man “Board of Management” — the body which executes the decisions made by the Board of Supervision. The Board of Supervision is a bipartite board of 11 members composed of an equal number named by the employees (by the Works Council, by the Union and by both together) and by the shareholders’ meeting (the third governing body). These two groups name the additional, “odd man” to the Board, the so called “neutral member”. Although the Board of Management is appointed by the Board of Supervision, one of the three members of the Board of Management, the “Personnel Director” (Arbeitsdirektor — the other two being responsible for production and marketing and finance) named by the Supervisory Board must command a majority of votes by the worker members of the Board. In principle, then, the Personnel Director is the “nominee” of the workers’ representatives and is supposed to represent their interests and viewpoints on the Management Board.

(b) Other industries in the private sector

In these, the Works Council in a limited company employing over 500 employees is entitled to name one-third of the members of the Board of
Supervision. There is no provision for naming the personnel director or any other member of the Board of Management.

Public sector enterprises (railways, etc.) are covered by provisions similar to those in the private sector. Public agencies (unemployment insurance boards, social security agencies and so on) have members on their boards named directly by the “most representative” trade union concerned.

While the Works Council’s functions are largely concerned with issues relating directly to conditions of employment (grievance, piece work rates, hiring and dismissal of large groups, work rules, social welfare, technological or other changes affecting working conditions) within the general framework of the collective agreement covering the industry or trade of the enterprise, the Council’s participation in management (besides the representation on boards described earlier) is provided by the “Economic Committee”. This body consists of an equal number of members named by the Works Council and the Company. The Economic Committee is to be informed by management on all matters relating to the economic situation and prospects and plans of the firm, and is to advise the management on all economic matters. The Committee’s proceedings are governed by strict rules of secrecy (Works Council members are not to divulge anything they learn to their Union) including the right of management to withhold information considered “dangerous” if leaked out to competitors.

The conditions under which the crucial Economic Committee operates are considered among the major reasons for the limited degree to which Works Councils and workers in general participate in important economic decision-making. As a recent study puts it:

“In Germany . . . opinion would appear to be virtually unanimous in the groups concerned that . . . Co-Determination exerts no influence whatever in the economic field.”

It is probably impossible to make a general judgment on the German “Co-Determination” experience, especially if it is abstracted from the historical context in which it was introduced. On this point, one observer notes that the German Trade Unions had to start from scratch after 1945, they had neither power nor independence. Consequently, the unions sought to use Co-Determination as a means of obtaining power. The judgment to date appears to be that the experiment may well be working against the unions. Sturmthal, for example, considers that the general tendency is for the Works Council to become a sort of “junior partner” of management, with the result that conflict takes place increasingly between Works Council and Union, on the one hand, and between workers and their Works Councillors, on the other.

2. Yugoslavia

If the hypothesis advanced by Blumberg is valid, ideologies of worker-management develop most strongly in historical situations where the legitimacy of an established economic elite is called into question and the status and prestige of that elite goes into eclipse. Thus a parallel can be established between the situations in West Germany and Yugoslavia after the last war. However, in the case of Yugoslavia, there was a double process within a short space of time. The pre-War elite (largely foreign entrepreneurs) and the German Occupation authorities and their Yugoslav collaborators had both been dislodged and rejected by the Liberation. Three years later, the Soviet Union’s managerial-political-ideological elite and its centralized
administrative planning system was discredited in turn. "Workers' Self-Management" was not only seen as a functional system for harnessing initiative and self-interest toward rapid industrial development, but became a powerful ideological weapon, both within and outside the country, against the isolation and offensive launched by the USSR. In other words, the new system was a means of showing that the Yugoslav Communist Party was the "true heir" of Marx. In contrast to the Soviet Union, where the Party-State bureaucracy interposed itself between the workers and the means of production, the Yugoslav working-class (in an all-inclusive sense) would be "re-united with the means of production" and would become sole masters of the means of production. In concrete terms, this meant that the workers would: (a) manage those means; (b) make the decisions concerning the distribution of the national income.²⁵

Unlike Germany, worker-management was seen as a means, not of strengthening the power of the unions in a context of collective bargaining with reconstituted industrial corporations, but as an instrument for transforming the society itself. In a sense, the underlying theory of Yugoslav worker management resembles that of the Syndicalists in Europe and their precursors, the "Associationists" of the mid 19th century and their heirs, the Guild Socialists in Britain of 50 years ago. However, where the Syndicalists projected an egalitarian, self-managed economy without a coercive State apparatus, the worker self-management experiment in Yugoslavia was established by a strong, centralized state, controlled by an equally centralized political-ideological organization.

The general trend of development since the institution of worker self-management in 1950 has been in the direction of decentralization of decision-making in all fields. The Communist Party (League of Yugoslav Communists), according to one of its top leaders and theoretical spokesmen, renounces the responsibility for the immediate direction of the economy, for deciding on policy for the enterprises, or even for intervening directly to correct errors related to the goals and social responsibility of particular enterprises. "The . . . League must try to be the organized social consciousness, closely tied to the historic and immediate interests of the working class, the individual worker and modern science."²⁶ As far as the state itself is concerned, the worker self-management system is seen as a basic element in a long process developing ultimately into a "completely self-directed society, one in which constraint by the state will no longer be necessary."²⁷ This is the Marx-Lenin theory of the "withering away of the state", but stated in a context which apparently seeks to bring it about in practice through a deliberate system of decentralizing powers, massive involvement of people in decision-making (or at least decision-controlling) at a variety of levels, a high degree of autonomy for economic units (enterprises) and political ones (communes), the latter two being closely integrated. The enterprises operate according to market forces (profitability is the key criterion of "success"), workers are paid according to both the "ability to pay" of the enterprise and their own output (largely group incentives) but the whole operates within a general framework established by:

(a) socialist property of the means of production (except for family-type agriculture, small service establishments, etc.).

(b) state power "oriented" by the Communist Party which exercises considerable influence and direction in all fields, notably the economic;
(c) a general plan oriented to producing rapid industrialization in a seriously under-developed and industrially-backward country, that is, a country characterized by an economy of scarcity. The plan (or rather plans) dealing with economic and social development, set out guidelines and general dimensions and relative proportions and priorities. The plans, determined or sanctioned by the legislative bodies, are the basic instruments for “coordinating fundamental relationships in the fields of production and distribution”. The individual enterprise is the basic economic unit — the “economic organization of labor” and is an integral element in the basic unit of Yugoslav society, the commune, described as an “autonomous social, economic and political collectivity”.

The enterprise itself is considered an “independent economic subject”, whose technical and economic activities are not subjected to political authority. It can enter freely into market relationships (including import-export) and develops according to its production and market situation, always within the general framework of the social-economic plans.

The enterprise is “governed” or directed (more realistic than “managed”) by its employees (all categories) who constitute the “collective.” The basic and supreme organ of authority is the general assembly of the workers which determines rules, the enterprise’s plans (production and market), the distribution of the enterprise’s “disposable income” (about 65% of the total, since the 1965 Reform), receives reports from the Management Committee, and approves financial statements.

The Assembly delegates its operational decision-making powers to the Workers’ Council, elected for a 2-year term (renewable for only one term) which exercises authority on all matters of policy and elects the Management Committee (the body which executes the Council’s decisions) and the Director. The latter, defined as an “individual organ of workers’ self-management” is normally appointed for a 4-year term (renewable) and is directly responsible to the Council. Senior staff employees are appointed by the Management Committee of which the Director is automatically a member. The Council also has special sub-committees dealing with such problems as recruitment, discipline, grievances, and also names a Supervisory Board which has no executive function, but has the task of verifying decisions to ensure that they are in accord with legal requirements and obligations.

The decentralization process, which is the hallmark of the entire system, is carried through as well, within the enterprise, through more or less autonomous “work units”. These constitute, it would appear, a deliberate effort to develop “direct participation” within the larger framework and in certain types of activity.

It would be of little significance to hazard an over-all judgment in this paper as to the validity and viability of the Yugoslav worker self-management experiment. The system itself has undergone periodic changes, some quite drastic in nature, and the political leaders themselves stress the gravity of the problems and the complexity of the dilemmas and contradictions in the system. The operative word seems to be “process”. Thus Kardelj: “Socialist worker self-management is only in its infancy ... Many generations will have to work on this experiment to perfect the system.” A second basic element is the “absolute faith in worker self-management by the Government and the Communist Party, in spite of errors committed by Workers’ Councils; these
errors are the price the working class must pay to learn how to manage directly.”

The crucial dilemmas and problems noted by serious observers are attributed by Yugoslav leaders to the economic, educational and cultural under-development of the country and its peoples (particularly in the most backward, pre-industrial republics, like Bosnia, Macedonia and some areas of Serbia) in addition to the fact that the “process” is still at an early stage. Thus the problem of “enterprise particularism” — expressed in the effort to realize immediate, maximum profits for the enterprise, and thus a pay-off in the form of higher wages and social benefits — appears to be a natural result of a market-regulated economy based on highly autonomous units. Is this not in contradiction to the realization of social goals based on a value system and ideology fundamentally opposed to a market-regulated economic society? Does this imperative not call for coordination and regulation, on the national level, by central state regulation? However, the prevailing idea is that the self-management system will and must replace state administrative regulation, must and will establish a complex network of interrelationships among the myriad self-management organs, which will eventually develop into a complex and constantly changing system able to bring about the balanced development and harmonization of competitive-conflicting interests. In this way the market economy of to-day will give way to a democratically planned economy which will be truly socialist in content.

One other aspect of interest is the emphasis laid on education and information designed to enable workers at all levels to participate meaningfully in decision-making. This means, concretely, not necessarily coming up with solutions to technical problems, but being able to appreciate alternative proposals for solutions, their implications and their criteria for evaluation.

WORKER PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

It would be one of the great masterpieces of understatement of all time to say that worker participation in management and worker self-management arouses little support and less enthusiasm in North American Labor circles. We refer to the European models, of course, because a good many writers and unionists would claim that there is more real influence on management decision-making through collective bargaining in the U.S. and Canada than in Europe with its sophisticated and “radical” mechanisms. The basic approach or “philosophy” which is predominant in Canadian Labor (excluding the Confederation of National Trade Unions for the moment) can be summarized briefly, (at the risk of over-simplifying) as follows:

(a) Unions have as their basic responsibility, duty and function an “adversary” role of protecting the rights and defending the interests of their members (and other workers) in their capacity as workers or employees. Since the “adversary” is the employer — “management” — it follows that unions must be jealous of their independence vis-a-vis management. Since management’s basic duty is to maximize the economic success of the enterprise, it cannot at the same time be a “legitimate” government (“legitimate” in the sense of acting in the interests of the “governed”). Hence the industrial relations system, if it is to function, requires a counter-vailing power to represent the
governed – a “loyal opposition”, in Peter Drucker’s phrase, which “keeps the government on its toes”, gives voice to the governed, but does not and cannot aspire to supplant the government of the enterprise.33

(b) The “adversary” or “loyal opposition” role is played through the collective bargaining system. The very foundation of collective bargaining is the independence of unions from management, the clear demarcation of functions as between the two agents, and a system of rules and procedures for rule-making. These rules and procedures and machinery for interpretation, and adjudication and accommodation of disputes are incorporated mainly in the collective agreement (often referred to as the “law of the parties”) but also in unwritten, informal understandings, custom, practice and the like.

(c) Labour-management relations under our system are based on, and reflect power relationships, expressed in their most common form by overt conflict (strike or lockout), that is to say, the balance of injury which one party can impose (or threaten to impose) on the other.

(d) The basic criterion by which a union evaluates a management decision is the effect of that decision on the matters forming the primary duty and function of the Union; in other words, the rights and interest of the members (and/or workers covered by the agreement) in their character as workers-employees – “governed”. From this point of view, collective bargaining can be said to fix the conditions under which management manages and “governs”.34 In this sense, then, collective bargaining can be, and is, described as “effective participation in management”, or “impact on management”. In principle, it is participation “at arms’ length”, from the outside, so to speak. It is “you-tell-us-your-decision-and-we’ll-tell-you-whether-it-is-acceptable-or-not”.

(e) Implicit in the system is the notion that any problem bearing on rights and interests of employees as employees can be dealt with through the collective bargaining system. This notion extends beyond the limits of the collective agreement, to apply to legislation obtained, indirectly, via collective bargaining. Walter Reuther, not so many years ago, insisted that the most effective way to win improvements in the U.S. Social Security system was by extracting large gains in negotiated pension plans from the “big 3” automobile companies. These, in turn, would pressure the Government to improve the legislation so as to reduce the net cost of the bargained pension scheme, – a variant of the “dominoes” theory!

It is true, of course, that some collective agreements and procedures run up against the “management rights” problem, a situation in which the agreed conditions under which management could manage were broken by management. One party decided to change the rules of the game in the middle of the game! If the union is sufficiently strong, it will “blow the whistle” on such unsportsmanlike conduct as the railway operating brotherhoods did to the CN in October, 1964 over the “run-through” issue. This led to the Freedman Report which proposed new rules designed to reestablish the essence of the old rules.

An important aspect of this type of “indirect” participation in, or influence on decisions of management is, as a consequence of the criterion for evaluation mentioned earlier, that it normally bears on specific, limited areas
of decision-making. In other words, it is not a total evaluation of the decision based on its intrinsic content or broad implications, founded on an ideological option or determination to be an integral, equal (or even preponderant) part of the decision-making process, but one based on effects on the employees' rights and interests in the enterprise. As one observer notes, the increased "participation" in decisions of management by unions is not based on a well-established policy or an ideological position in favor of greater participation. It is a "by-product" of the union's concern over matters directly in its field of responsibility. A good example of this is the increasing demand for a voice in the administration of negotiated pension plans and in decisions on the investment of pension funds.\textsuperscript{35}

The same writer sums up his thesis that collective bargaining leads to and represents a form of participation in management, and that this is accomplished most effectively through the union in the North American system by the following points:

(a) The union is "present" in the enterprise, everywhere and at all times (unlike the European system where the workers' representatives in the enterprise — works councils, plant committees, shop stewards — are separate and more or less independent of or even in conflict with the union). Thus the union is in constant contact with the workers at the level of the work situation.

(b) The grievance procedure, while a "reactive" mechanism to management decisions, produces an impact on management which tends to anticipate worker and union reactions. In short, the grievance procedure tends to become a "servo-mechanism" which effectively "regulates" management decision-making in certain areas.

(c) Following from (a) and (b), prior consultation tends to develop, even if not provided for in the Agreement. In some sectors, such as the pulp and paper industry, prior consultation on major changes was established practice long before it was written into agreements.

(d) Since collective bargaining in the U.S. and Canada deals with a host of "work-related" situations and problems, and is normally based on a single enterprise or establishment, problems arising and unresolved during the agreement can be dealt with in contract negotiations at the end of the agreement.\textsuperscript{36}

Without entering into a detailed discussion on the above points, it should be noted that the trend toward larger bargaining units, industrywide or even "sector bargaining" tends to reduce the closeness of the tie between the union, as a collective bargaining instrument, and the workers on the job. In addition, the impact or influence on management decision-making is limited in its effect. As Sturmthal remarks, referring to collective bargaining on technological change, "In all these and many other instances (Armour, Pacific Coast Longshore, Kaiser) the union exerted direct or indirect influence on the rate of technological change... by increasing the cost of the change to the employer but not by so much as to make change impossible."\textsuperscript{37}

A good example of the collective bargaining, contractual approach to union participation in management decision is found in the current agreement between the United Transportation Union and CNR and CPR. A clause, inspired largely by the Freedman Report, deals with the contentious issue of "Material Changes in Working Conditions".
The Company will not initiate any material changes which will have materially adverse effects without as much advance notice as possible. No material change will be made until agreement is reached or a decision rendered in accordance with . . . Sec. 1 . . . (the procedure for final settlement of disputes on this issue.)

**Procedure**

(3) *Arbitration* (after unsuccessful attempts to negotiate and mediate) *The decision of the arbitrator shall be confined to issues before him, . . . measures for minimizing the adverse effects of material change upon employees . . . affected . . ."*

The Scanlon Plan, on the other hand, is an interesting attempt to combine elements of both direct union participation and worker participation on a relatively broad range of decisions affecting the operation and economic results of the enterprise. This is all within the North American collective bargaining context of union-management negotiation and delimitation of functions between management and union (management has absolute right to decide). The Scanlon Plan in a unionized plant actually separates the two areas—"production" and "union-management relations" in the traditional sense. The Joint Production Committee, for example, does not deal with grievances, but restricts itself to discussing suggestions, criticisms and calculations of the "bonus" for improving productivity and lowering unit labor costs. As Scanlon's closest collaborator describes them, the basic elements of the Plan are:

(a) Enabling the worker to know and understand why he is doing what he does;
(b) consensus by management, union and the workers on the common goal (improving efficiency and reducing costs);
(c) an opportunity for people in adult society to say how they think the job should be done, while leaving the final decision to management since the union does not want responsibility for management;
(d) real participation, not merely a "sense of participation";
(e) full information on all matters relating to the enterprise's operations as it affects the ultimate result (the "bonus").

The Scanlon Plan represents, as described by its boosters and observers, a highly-developed system of limited participation, limited both as to degree (final decision by management) and area (improvement of enterprise economic efficiency), and of "enterprise particularism" and "integration" of workers with the enterprise. Many other examples could be cited of more or less direct union participation in areas of management decision based on the primary function of the union in our industrial relations system. One thinks at once of John L. Lewis' policy, in conjunction with the management of the U.S. coal industry, to carry through a drastic rationalization of the industry some years ago. The policy aimed at ensuring 80,000 fairly secure, relatively high-paid jobs, as against having 400,000 insecure, less well-paid workers. The U.S. Government was called on to "pick up the tab".

In Quebec, the CNTU and some sections of the Quebec Federation of Labour have seriously questioned the validity and effectiveness of the North American "indirect participation" system via collective bargaining.

In his 1966 presidential report to the CNTU Convention ("A society made for man"), Marcel Pepin detailed his bill of particulars against the present decision-making system. This is based on two basic elements:
(a) In a profit-oriented society, economic decisions are the exclusive domain of “non-responsible” (to the community at large) enterprises. These decisions, based on private interests, lead to an anarchic development of the economy.

(b) Union power can only have an indirect effect, the effect of a pressure group. The workers have no direct power of decision in the enterprise, not even on matters that vitally affect them. They are, in effect, “strangers in the enterprise”, and are obliged to bear the consequences of privately-motivated, privately-made decisions.

The CNTU president proposed a programme based on the principle that the power of economic decision-making in the enterprise and in society as a whole, cannot, must not remain the exclusive prerogative of a small elite. This principle calls for a “counter-vailing democratic force” at the level of the economy and in the enterprise. This democratic force should be expressed by:

(a) representative bodies of the working class with the power and the right to intervene and participate in major economic decisions, rather than merely exercise the power to contest and react defensively;

(b) at the macro-level of the economy, the state should have pre-eminent power, with the participation of representative bodies;

(c) intervention by state and unions in decisions concerning the pace and rate of technological change, especially of automation;

(d) economic councils with worker representation to have the legally-established right to obtain full information on all aspects of the enterprise (financial, future plans, etc.);

(e) special programmes and facilities (such as paid leave of absence) designed to train workers in the knowledge and understanding of economic and technical matters related to the enterprise’s operations and the economy as a whole.

A more recent statement by Fernand Daoust, General Secretary of the QFL expressed the frustrations experienced by workers at their forced separation from centres of decision-making, both in the enterprise and at the macro-level in their society. To Daoust, the key element is the lack of access to information, the prerequisite and pre-condition for meaningful participation. His solution is

“Participation, if it is not to be merely a farce and a hoax, supposes a profound transformation of our trade union movement and of our whole society. If workers are to realize their aspirations of real power (in decision-making) they will first have to exercise political power . . .”

Mr. Daoust stated the dilemma of the trade unions, as he sees it. It is that unionists are wondering what is the true role of the union movement. They are torn between the desire to represent all the workers in collective bargaining action, on the one hand, and serious and growing doubts as to the possibility of solving problems of workers through collective bargaining, without the massive intervention of the state: Hence the necessity for the unions to develop decisive political power towards radical transformation of society.

My own view is close to those of Pepin and Daoust. While the two approaches are not mutually exclusive, the “strict” collective bargaining approach, in my view, must give way to much greater emphasis on
social-political action. This action must be based on much greater involvement of the rank and file, if we are to approach decisive gains on the road to real participation of workers in decision-making.

by Leo Roback,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Industrial Relations
University of Montreal
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I will try to place my comments in a theoretical framework. In a discussion about industrial democracy and workers’ control it seems to me that, in Europe as well as in Quebec, one of the major points to discuss is the position of the unions. I will try to clarify the concept I want to use in this discussion. I would like to go from the concept of a pressure group to that of a social movement, and its meaning in the discussion of industrial democracy. Social movement in this context means that unions would act mainly on the level of the economy. By addressing themselves to economic problems, they get to a point where there is an overlap of the economic and political spheres. If a union wants to enforce a decision at the level of the economy, it is ipso facto engaged in politics. From then on it also becomes, to a certain extent, a value-oriented movement, even if in its principal reason of existence and its daily activities, it remains mainly a social movement, oriented towards specific goals at the economic level. Trade union action comes close to the definition of a pressure group. What is specific to this means of action is that it tends to obtain favourable decisions in debates and in policy where the interests of the organization are involved. The definition could be that of de Grazia: “The pressure group is simply any organized social group which seeks to influence the conduct of politicians without seeking any formal control of the government. This unwillingness to exert power is implicitly contained in the definition that Touraine gives of the same concept. If an individual or collective actor has only a principle of identity, that is to say, a defense of the actor’s own interest without relating it to any adversary and without bringing up the question of the social legitimacy of the action, then the actor constitutes nothing more than a pressure group and the action is limited”. Such pressure groups can go as far as transforming themselves into lobbies with regard to parliamentary decisions.

These two concepts having been stated, we can try to specify the nature of each one in relation to the other. At the two extremes of the continuum, we have the pressure group which seeks immediate advantages without criticizing either the economic or political system. One result of its pressures
and negotiations is precisely to make the system legitimate. The social
movement, at the other end, ultimately seeks to set up another system,
feeling that it can no longer realize its goals within the present system. The
labour movement in its concrete action stops short of these lines of
demarcation. As a pressure group it might want to back up its daily claims
with the threat of bringing into power a party that will represent it
specifically and will thus progressively take on the forms of a social
movement. In the same way a general social movement founded on the
dissatisfaction of workers will end up by acting just like a specific social
movement, even perhaps like a simple pressure group, if it agrees to put an
end to its protest when it has obtained satisfaction in just one particular
point.

To explain these changes in the type of action engaged in by trade
unions, we must consider the concept of organization. Indeed the pressure
group runs a greater risk of being drawn into action of the social movement
type if the size of its membership and its organizational power leads it to
abandon small isolated claims in order to lay out more general and better
coordinated reform programs. The fact that trade unions are organizations
accounts for tensions within them, between the social movement and the
pressure group. In labour movement theories it is well known that the great
critical currents described by Michels even before the first World War,
presented exactly this problem: why does the organization in a social
movement manage to extend its action, its objectives and its means in such a
way that the organizational aspects — that is to say means and tactics —
predominate over the movement aspect; that is objectives and strategy, and
then culminates in a bureaucratized system. Touraine sees bureaucratization
as a set of processes by which an organization (the means) is placed at the
service of rationality, identifies itself with the latter and thus becomes an
obstacle between the producer and the rational production to which the
producer is working. In other words, means predominate over the end. In the
case of a single leader, the organization of tendencies often supercedes the
tendencies of the leadership toward original objectives. The organization as a
whole is thus torn by internal tension whose extreme poles and ideas are the
pressure group and the social movement, although the image of a social group
torn between two opposing poles has no reality except when it comes to a
long-term analysis or in periods of crisis when indeed tensions express
themselves in extreme terms. A short term analysis shows much more limited
movement along this continuum from pressure group to social movement. It
is not enough to understand the possibility that the unions may take steps
towards a real industrial democracy or workers’ control. It is not enough to
distinguish between the position of the union as a pressure group or the union
as a social movement. If we want to understand that even in a union the two
types of action co-exist; if we want to understand the movement from one to
the other, we have to introduce another type of definition and to cut this
continuum from pressure group to social movement by another line, that of
short time action and long time action. It is a matter of tension between the
desire felt by the social movement, as well as by the pressure group, to accept
sacrifices immediately with a view to a general and more distant objective,
and, on the other hand, the desire to obtain immediate benefits from their
action. This is the crux of the dilemma between benefit and progress,
between saving and consuming.
If we want to have a deep transformation such as industrial democracy or workers’ control, we have to make a choice between immediate benefits and long term benefits. For the purposes of a demonstration we can consider certain motives for union action as relatively stable and cite them as an example to try the analysis. Pressure group unionism can act on a short term basis, and this is Gomperism — or on a long term basis and this is trade unionism of the British type. In the latter case we come to the position held by people like the Webb’s trying to achieve permanent relationships between the whole trade union movement and a specific working class party. With regard to the social movement, they, in the long run, want to create an entirely new economic and political system through revolution, subordinating union-type action to political action. The other type of unionism, which took roots in France, are the anarchist unions which, it seems to me, have been resurrected by the students now. The anarchist unionist advocates short term action through the repetition of direct action but for long term objectives.

It seems to me that workers’ control and its more developed form, that is auto-gestion, is that type of radical reform that cannot be achieved without radical change in the unions. Auto-gestion may be a means or an end. It is a means if we consider that this is the way by which workers and citizens will gain control and transformation of production while at the same time learning the skills required for their new role as self-managers. It seems to me, however, that there is very little chance that they will reach this goal or even choose that goal, if at the same time auto-gestion or workers’ control is not chosen as a means to another end: the liberation of man from his alienation, from the type of bureaucratic society in which we are all involved. I repeat what I said at the beginning, I have many doubts that this object will be chosen if it is not preceded by a radical change in the organization and politics of the unions.

by Jacques Dofny,
Chairman, Department of Sociology
University of Montreal

*This text has been extracted from a forthcoming publication on trade union organization in Quebec, by J. Dofny and P. Bernard.
Leo Roback has dealt with some of the questions and issues that must be considered in any discussion of industrial democracy. But he has dealt with them in the light of things as they are now in this and other countries. And he has considered the alternatives in the light of approaches that have been tried or are in the process of development in this and other countries.

Consequently, he has implied a definition of industrial democracy that can be more precisely described as workers' participation in management.

To twist a favourite quotation of the late Bobby Kennedy, Leo Roback has looked at things as they are now and asked: Why?

For my part, I would prefer to dream of things as they never were and ask this conference. Why not?

I believe that the basic underlying issue is Freedom!

I believe that man must some day develop a kind of society from which the subjugation of man by man has been forever eradicated.

Marx and Lenin saw this kind of ultimate development in a society in which the state has withered away. But most people including self-professed Marxists and especially those in countries in which a nominally Marxist government is in power seem to have forgotten this aspect of Marxism.

But philosophers of many different stripes have dreamed of the possibility of a similar kind of society. It is the unstructured society in which full freedom is the undisputed right of all men and women. A society in which brotherhood is the driving motivation, and peace and happiness is the result. As such it is dismissed as an idle dream of philosophers, poets and other impractical people like myself.

I suggest that it cannot be dismissed! History shows that things that were impossible can very quickly become practical, then commonplace, and finally, outdated.

In education, for example, the elimination of structure is in progress throughout most of the system. We are eliminating grading and moving towards the elimination of curriculum, tests, degrees, diplomas and even teachers. The president of a Western Canada university has, for instance,
recently urged the development of a nation-wide system of residential colleges with no courses, no degrees, and no entrance requirements. Some aspects of the elimination of structuring can be found in most educational systems especially in the Province of Ontario.

It is in this context that I wish to consider industrial democracy. That is to say, I accept full freedom as a goal which may some day be possible of attainment. I believe that all of society must be moved towards that goal. Society in all its aspects; economic, industrial, social, educational, political and so forth. As one aspect of society, industry must be democratized — as must all other aspects — as part of a process that will ultimately eliminate the subjugation of man by man.

With these goals in mind, I view industrial democracy as a term describing an on-going process which cannot be exactly defined. To attempt a definition, one must stop the process while it is in forward motion and describe it in that arrested state, and consequently, arrive at a distorted view.

If you accept the concept that industrial democracy is a process rather than a system, it then follows that any set of changes which tend to democratize industry and move us along the road to a free society can be characterized as part of the process of industrial democracy.

With this concept in mind, I believe that every aspect of our society must be changed, but not necessarily at one and the same time. It is possible to make very radical changes in certain areas, as we are continuing to do in education, while we leave other areas unchanged.

At some point, however, these other areas, industry for example, must make similar changes or further progress will be impossible and the changes already made may become irrelevant.

In Canadian industry, it is possible and practical to make some very basic changes in isolation from the rest of our socio-economic system, but only up to a point. When that indefinable point is reached, it would then become necessary to make complementary changes — for example, the change from private to social ownership — before further progress would be possible.

At this time, I propose not to deal with the problems posed by the making of such further changes.

Let me deal instead with those changes which fall within the present capacity of our labour movement. I suggest that there are three areas in which we can take immediate action to begin the democratization of industry.

THE FIRST AREA IS JOINT-CONSULTATION

The federal government has a joint-consultation branch of its Department of Labour that has seen little use by unions. Unions have tended to be suspicious of this kind of approach and Leo Roback has dealt with some of the reasons why.

I do not believe any of these reasons are sufficiently valid to justify our failure to make use of what seems to me to be an opportunity to further the cause of the working people.

I sat on a joint-consultation committee as a rank-and-file member fourteen years ago in Kitimat. Our local union found that committee to be extremely useful at that time. Why? Because it gave us the opportunity to gather facts for fighting grievances and for use in negotiations; it gave us the opportunity to argue with management about company policy and it gave us
an insight into the way in which those policy decisions were being made. Several locals of our union in Toronto have similar committees and in every case there are similar advantages to the union. In no case has there been any degree of co-optation, or any lessening of union militancy.

But this is only a very limited use of the potential of such committees. If we were to make full use of this potential, I believe we could force access to company records on production matters, productivity and general financial information, and to profoundly affect the making of company policy in these areas. At the very least, such committees can serve as both a training ground for our people and a platform from which we can publicly demand a share in corporate decision-making.

THE SECOND AREA OF POSSIBLE ACTION INVOLVES THE USE OF UNION REPRESENTATION ON THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF VARIOUS PUBLIC ENTERPRISES

As most of you probably know, there are a number of trade unionists who sit as members of such boards; to give a few examples, the Toronto Transit Commission, the Harbour Commission, each of the new community colleges in Ontario, various hospitals, York University and so on.

There should be no doubt in anyone’s mind as to why these people sit on such boards. Like the well-known token negro or token woman in other situations, these are token trade-unionists placed on these boards as someone’s idea for creating a liberal facade.

I am the token trade-unionist on the Board of Governors of Seneca College, and I can assure you that my appointment had nothing whatever to do with any other qualification I might have had at the time of appointment.

But whatever these appointments represent to those who appointed us, to the labour movement they present an opportunity. And it is an opportunity which we have failed to exploit in any way whatsoever.

I suggest that we contact each one of these labour board members and demand that they render themselves accountable to the labour movement; that labour develop a program for them to attempt to implement; that they give regular, written reports to the appropriate labour organization, for example, the Ontario Federation of Labour; and that they agree to resign if called upon by the labour movement to do so.

If any one of these members refuses to be accountable to labour in this way, he should be publicly repudiated by the labour movement. Whenever there is a union representative on one of these boards, we must develop some regular means of liaison between the board member and that union. Finally, we should press, wherever such pressure might be effective, to extend this principle of board representation on an expanded basis, at least, throughout the public sector.

In any discussion of industrial democracy someone always asks what could we take as a first step which could be done immediately. Well, as a labour nominee on a governing board who is willing to be accountable and is anxious to work to a program, I suggest that this is one step we could begin to take tomorrow.
THE THIRD AND BY FAR THE MOST IMPORTANT AREA IN WHICH WE COULD TAKE IMMEDIATE ACTION IS COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

At this point, I wish to state that I reject the "adversary" role of the labour movement, as Leo Roback has described it and as I know it to be myself, as the only role the labour movement can play for all time to come. I hope to see us build a different kind of society and there are many roles we could play. But for the moment, as an adversary, there are a number of things we can do now.

Just bring to mind the management rights clause from any Collective Agreement. There you will find set out point-by-point all the decision-making areas which are now exclusive management prerogatives. These are, therefore, the very areas that we must re-negotiate. One such point which appears in some form in any such clause is "... the direction of the working forces..." and all which that implies.

Why should that be an exclusive management prerogative? Why shouldn't we have some say in this area? Why shouldn't we turn it upside down and make it an exclusive union prerogative?

But whatever we might ultimately do, there is no reason why we could not immediately take over such functions as the scheduling of shifts and vacations. And on the job posting - why limit it to vacancies within the bargaining unit? In any plant with a long established union, most of the supervisors from foreman up to superintendent are former union members, usually former officers or stewards. So why not post those jobs and deal with the applications, like any other job posting applications, on the basis of the existing seniority clause?

I could deal with an almost inexhaustable list of specific minor changes that one might make, but the point I really wish to make is this:

Our collective agreements seem to draw an artificial line around that which is a proper subject for collective bargaining and that which is sacrosanct management ground.

I suggest that the line be blasted away and that we use our bargaining power to thrust as far into those areas as the circumstances in each situation seem to dictate.

Then there is a second range of subjects that are usually referred to in the management rights clause in such vague terms as "... the right to generally manage the enterprise".

Those general rights include, of course, the right to shut down the plant, re-locate it, automate it, or otherwise change the nature of the operation in a way that can rob a life-long employee of his job, his dignity and his whole life style.

We cannot afford to leave such power in the hands of the socially-irresponsible management!

Progress in our society demands that we move quickly and decisively to curb that power, to wrest it from those hands, and to exercise it, not for the advantage of the few, but for the good of all.

I believe that some of the moves to do so can be made by the trade union movement through collective bargaining.

You will see from what I have said that in the terminology of industrial democracy as Leo Roback has introduced the subject, I have outlined a kind of industrial democracy that would involve a mixture of consultation,
co-determination and direct control of certain functions to be spelled out in our collective agreements and complementary legislative changes.

The point I would underline is that this is not intended to be the definition of a form of industrial democracy, or a blueprint to follow, or a set sequence of necessary steps. It is instead a description of the process by which we can develop social democracy. It is a process defined by both the forms and traditions of the Canadian labour movement. It is a process that will begin to function once we accept the challenge to fight for freedom. Once that goal is accepted and the process set in motion, it will move of its own momentum to fulfillment.

All of human history is a record of man’s struggle against his environment, against his oppressors, against all the things that bind him, control him or limit his ability to set his own course and fulfill himself on his own terms. According to this record, man has been pursuing an elusive goal. Only certain individuals or groups of individuals have ever won any degree of real freedom, and then, only at the expense of others.

Yet the pursuit of this goal not just for ourselves, but for all mankind, is the only cause worth fighting for. It is in the belief that we are joined in that historic cause, that we must work to build an industrial democracy in Canada.

by Chris Trower,
United Steelworkers of America, Toronto
INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY:

Some Reflections.

by Charles Millard

When I first heard the subject material for this conference, it reminded me of an incident that happened way back in the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee days. The locale was the National Steel Car Company in Hamilton. We were marching around in the old orthodox picketline when one of the men was approached by an irate new Canadian woman who asked, “What are you on strike for anyway?” I suppose she was sore because her husband couldn’t go to work that morning. Well, I couldn’t see the look on the man’s face but I could see his picket sign lift a little bit. He squared his shoulders as he walked past and I heard him distinctly say, “We’re on strike for collective bargaining — whatever in hell that is.”

The question “What is Industrial Democracy?” is being increasingly raised among trade unionists. For me industrial democracy is little better than a sort of disembodied slogan. It is in the same category with participatory democracy and the just society — surely modern myths of some sort. But don’t forget that those myths were good enough for a certain man to ride into power as prime minister of Canada — so there’s some substance to them, even if they’re just myths, even if they’re just slogans. For me, industrial democracy is also a myth. Perhaps it is our definition of industrial democracy that lies at the heart of the problem. For example — what is our concept of democracy itself? Perhaps most people don’t go further than our school days’ definition: government of the people, by the people, for the people. It is now many years since I came across a much better definition of democracy, by the late Harry Emerson Fosdick who said, “Democracy is a conviction.” It is a faith in your fellow man. Democracy is a conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people, that if only the doors of opportunity are opened wide enough, surprising consequences will flow from unlikely sources. I want to underline this because based on my own experience I believe that we are wasting one of the most valuable resources that Canada or any other country has, we’re not developing the untapped resources that lie in the ordinary man. If one were to accept this definition, one might properly proceed by asking, “Have we any practical examples of
this concept in action?" I suggest that domestically, at least, we came closest
to a breakthrough during the last world war. At that time, urged by
government on so-called patriotic grounds, management offered prizes to the
workers — all day suckers — for ideas that would speed production, cut waste
and eliminate inequalities. It was a sort of partnership of convenience for the
time being.

Someone has suggested that a shining example for industrial democracy
is to be found in the post-war co-determination program in West German. My
experience in representing the International Confederation of Free Trade
Unions suggests that we should shrug off that illusion. In spite of appearances
there was or is no real co-determination. A veteran German mine workers'
union official was asked: "Do you think that management does all its
business in your presence?" The answer came without hesitation: "We are
positive they do not. And they can be just as sure neither do we." Now that
was co-determination.

With the rapid rise of management control over holding companies,
corporations and conglomerates, the trend has been away from industrial
democracy, whatever that is, rather than towards such an objective. That’s
the state we are in right now. Even shareholder control is no longer a practical
reality, through the proxy system and so on. The ordinary shareholder is just
told to get lost, if he disagrees with tough management recommendations and
policies. So he has no real control. Even parliamentary democracy is now
threatened. People used to believe in the divine right of kings. Then we had
an era when peole talked about the master-servant concept. Now we believe
apparently in the divine right of management.

Through a strong trade union movement backed by socialist-labour
political parties some progress towards what may be called industrial
democracy has been made in Britain, Sweden, Yugoslavia and so on. But even
there progress has been very, very limited. In the United Kingdom the
movement toward industrial democracy is generally called worker control.
Again it stems primarily from World War II and the early post-war years when
labour achieved a consultative role, and a consultative role only. Even in
public enterprise undertakings, when the mines were nationalized, workers
achieved only a consultative role. Management maintained a dominant,
decision-making status even under those highly favourable conditions.
Elsewhere, management’s position has been aided by the merger-
conglomerate-corporate control process.

Industrial unionism wasn’t imported into Canada from the United
States, but rather into North America from Britain. They are much older and
experienced and mature in industrialism. As I said above, the British workers
have not achieved even a modicum of industrial democracy and therefore,
don’t be too disappointed or discouraged that we haven’t achieved much in
Canada. When we talk about collective bargaining and industrial democracy
we must remember that labour’s primary struggle is still for recognition and
acceptance.

One of the advantages held by the opponents of industrial democracy
and perhaps the most effective advantage, has been the lack of full public
disclosure. Behind this most effective shield, according to John Kenneth
Galbraith, markets, people and even governments may be and often are
manipulated to serve management corporate interests. And the funny part of
it is we pay for it and don’t complain. The trade unionists are certainly
manipulated. They get an increase today and somebody else takes it away from them tomorrow. You can't tell me that Bell Telephone didn't know what the outcome would be when they made applications for some free capital by raising the rates in Canada. They could pay dividends, good dividends. I happen to know because I had ten or fifteen shares. But they wanted free capital. After all, everybody else was doing it (the Steel Company of Canada, for example).

Shareholders, like workers in a factory, are citizens as well. They are both beneficiaries and victims of this manipulation. With the increasing lack of control by a dispossessed management and by the technical personnel (they're being dispossessed sometimes by computers) the labour movement may well find new allies in the struggle for effective forms of industrial democracy. It will have to look outside its present ranks. There are more and more people that need a union. Maybe they haven't realized it yet, but they will come to that point soon. We're a dispossessed people. Control of our companies and of top management is often located in some other country. Certainly it is not located at the scene of the industrial undertaking. So the labour movement may well find new allies and that means political allies as well, in the struggle for some effective form of industrial democracy.

by Charles Millard,
Director of Organization
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (I.C.F.T.U.)
1958-1963
WORKERS' CONTROL:

Toward an Offensive Strategy for Canadian Labour.

by Andre Bekerman

I. INTRODUCTION

In nearly every nation of Western Europe at present the subject of Industrial Democracy is an immediate and vocal issue. The development has been particularly impressive in Britain, where conferences such as the one convened here today have been held for a number of years and have given impetus to a widespread campaign for Workers' Control of British industry. In view of these facts it is my belief that the conference today presents a valuable opportunity to clarify the meaning of Industrial Democracy for Canada and to discuss what course of action Canadian unionists should take in relation to the subject.

Presently in Canada, Industrial Democracy is being advocated by various prominent New Democrats and unionists. Several major unions have recently announced plans to take up aspects of Industrial Democracy through the collective bargaining process. To cite only a few examples:
- The UAW is raising the subject in relation to the car pricing policies of the Big 3 Auto companies in the next round of bargaining.
- The Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers Union is placing control of pollution on its bargaining agenda.
- The Teachers Federation in Toronto is demanding control of classroom size in its current negotiations.
- The Canadian Union of Public Employees has recently begun an organizing campaign demanding effective workers' representation on decision-making bodies for University of Toronto employees.

Other examples could be given, but the significant fact behind such developments is that both unions and political activists are recognizing the necessity for extending and going beyond traditional collective bargaining goals and methods. Since Industrial Democracy is still a new direction for unions, these various initiatives have not yet been linked to a general drive for Industrial Democracy in all plants and offices. I might also add that the inevitable strategy for winning Industrial Democracy must enlist the active support and release the creative energies of the rank and file workers in order
to be successful. Industrial Democracy, and issues directly related to it such as pollution control and other initiatives to protect consumers and the public, must be backed up by active membership support, and this support will be difficult to achieve unless the immediate issues within the workplace itself are taken up in relation to the subject.

II. THE IMMEDIATE IMPORTANCE OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN CANADA

The idea of Industrial Democracy is not new to Canada, nor is it a foreign import unrelated to Canadian realities. It was advocated in the Regina Manifesto of the CCF and even earlier. It now needs re-introduction, however, because for several decades the unions have avoided challenging the fundamental issue of ownership and management’s rights to exercise authoritarian control over workers and production.

Industrial Democracy is becoming of immediate concern for various reasons: one such important reason is the increasing alienation of workers on the job which is rapidly reaching crisis proportions; another is that with the increased education of the majority of people, particularly through the exposure to television and other mass media, people’s horizons have widened and they have become more aware of the possibilities for self-expression and for creativity at work; and finally, the growing complexity of technology itself and the greater proportion of skilled and technical work is affecting people on the job in ways that only direct control over the workplace can solve. All these factors heighten that old contradiction where management expects greater and greater competence of workers in dealing with increasingly more complex work and processes, but at the same time refuses to grant any corresponding increase in initiative, creativity, and control to workers. In fact the reverse is true: the computer operator who replaced dozens of clerical employees is just as powerless as the typist and the clerk. He has to show technical know-how in dealing with the machine but he has no control over the purpose of the work, over the work methods or the conditions under which the work is done. In many cases this is aggravated by the fact that automation, in both plants and offices, has replaced group work with a single operator who tends a largely self-contained process. In short: fewer workers have jobs, and those who do have become mere servants of the machine.

The alienation and powerlessness of the individual in the work process has been recognized for some time, as well as the fact that technology is making it worse, but what is now making alienation an even more explosive problem is the new generation of young workers now joining the labor force. This generation is challenging traditions and institutions which have not been examined for several decades. They are questioning previous attitudes toward the accepted relationships between workers and management, as well as the structure of capitalist society itself. In the unions, the young workers are the spearhead of contract rejections; they don’t attend union meetings; and they are unimpressed with the present condition of collective bargaining and grievance procedures. They angrily sense that the unions have accepted the basis of the relationship which frustrates them, offends their sense of justice, and makes them just one more cog in the machine of ‘industrial relations’.

Most of these feelings are well-founded. Collective bargaining is becoming increasingly less effective in really altering the worker’s position as
wage gains are purposefully and systematically offset by price increases, tax increases, and other methods of economic and legal manipulation by the corporations and their governments. The unions are granted less and less knowledge about profit rates, expansion plans, and other information of direct importance to workers as the process of consolidation of ownership and control into conglomerates continues. Management decisions are getting harder to offset or even to influence on such immediate issues like speed-ups, lay-offs, and plant closures as American takeovers escalate and decisions are increasingly made outside of Canada.

Grievance procedure has never been more than a defensive weapon to force management to carry out the terms of the collective agreement. But that agreement itself is based on the continued power of management to make most significant decisions unilaterally. Authoritarian industrial discipline is what in fact determines the day to day relationship. It is based on ownership, property rights, and results in a dictatorship in which 'orders' are to be obeyed much as in the military. And that is the underlying doctrine that the unions have failed to challenge, the same doctrine that is a primary focus of concern for Industrial Democracy.

One could add that yet another fact that lends urgency to this discussion is that management itself is taking steps to deal with this situation: they are concerned with the alienation of workers, since, from their point of view an alienated worker won’t produce as well and is more difficult to manage. The conference held in Montreal at the McGill Industrial Relations Centre earlier this month and attended by representatives of the most powerful corporations in Canada, was mainly concerned with this problem. We can easily guess what their ‘solution’ to this problem will mean for workers!

III. CO-OPTATION OR CONTROL?

If we are to progress toward real Industrial Democracy the main problem is to understand the difference between management’s approach and that of the workers. Management’s objective is to increase productivity and efficiency while preserving its domination and power. Our aim should be toward workers’ self-determination in the work-place, our objective to win real freedom, both of which mean necessarily encroaching upon and superseding management dictatorship and replacing it with Industrial Democracy. Within the context of capitalist society and private ownership this approach is usually called Workers Control: an offensive strategy to win effective decision-making power in industry by the workers themselves by taking control from below. An opposite approach is sometimes called ‘Participation’, which is usually a scheme to induce workers to share responsibility for decisions made by management after the union has been consulted. Such consultation involves no real power to significantly alter the decision.

Participation and Workers’ Control are contradictory strategies since participation integrates the union and workers into management rule, and even lessens their ability to resist management’s dictates. On the other hand, Workers’ Control depends on the exercise of independent power by the workers who act on their own behalf and in their own real interests. Participation should be rejected because it solves none of the fundamental problems and ties us to the existing situation.
An essential part of the strategy for Workers' Control is the demand to "open the books" and access to the financial affairs of the corporations. A complete knowledge of profit rates, export of capital and investment policies will enable us to find out the true mechanisms of inflation, poverty, and regional disparity.

Workers' control will also expose planned obsolescence and other practices that defraud and victimize the consumer since the workers will gain a complete understanding of the operation of the corporations and it will be to their interest both as producers and consumers to make the corporations socially responsible. This ties in with the general drive for social change from below and is an essential part of the struggle to achieve a socialist society.

IV. HOW CAN WE BEGIN THE CAMPAIGN FOR WORKERS' CONTROL?

It is of crucial importance to realize that what has been said thus far is not a proposal that we stop pushing for wage increases in order to ask for something abstract called Industrial Democracy. In fact, Industrial Democracy directly implies the extension and intensification of present union activities. The campaign for Workers' Control will enable us to fight more effectively for major gains in wages and working conditions since management control of every aspect of industrial life, supported by government manipulation of the economy and the legal restriction of unions, has seriously hampered the effectiveness of our present activities. Workers Control is an offensive strategy for labour that can call on the enthusiasm and dedication of rank and file workers and challenge the base of authoritarian corporate power.

Collective bargaining is well-established in Canada and is likely to remain the most effective way to proceed towards Industrial Democracy. Little can be achieved by unorganized workers who lack the focus for their collective strength that a union provides. For these reasons the unions will be the main vehicle for winning Workers Control.

There is also a logical progression from inplant issues like the right to refuse overtime, freedom of speech, dress and thought, toward that of direct control over production. The fight for 'civil liberties' in the workplace is important in building up the confidence and self-respect of the individual worker in his relationship to the boss. Unions have tried for years to protect individual dignity but have been hamstrung by accepting the right of management to define what is acceptable. We should challenge management's right to dictate at all on these and similar matters, and defend the right of workers to exercise personal freedom on the job.

To assert meaningful Workers' Control, it is necessary to obtain direct control by workers over the scheduling of work, the speed of production, work methods, and the selection of supervision. It is also essential to establish veto rights over lay-offs, discipline and other management prerogatives.

Collective bargaining can be extended as well to introduce control over all significant decisions such as pricing, technological change, expansion plans, plant shutdowns, and relocation and investment policies.

There is, of course, also a close relationship between gains in the area of Workers' Control in industry by union action and political action through the NDP to make legislative change to consolidate those gains. The two should be closely interrelated or both will be weakened.
V. PROBLEMS AND OBSTACLES

Some unionists oppose Industrial Democracy and are suspicious of Workers' Control as a strategy for labour. They believe that this approach will blur the line between the union and management and thus they prefer the adversary approach in the hope that it will preserve our purity. But this seems to me a totally unrealistic objection since we are already neck-deep in various types of involvement with management, ranging from Joint Consultation and token representation, to joint ventures to promote sales such as, for example, much of the Union Label promotion. The problem lies in our failure to distinguish correctly between Participation and Control. If we participate entirely on management's terms and act as adversaries only within their definition of what is negotiable, then there can be no meaningful and effective control. Undisguised efforts of corporations and governments to restrict and suppress unions are more easily met by open resistance; what is often more difficult is to know how to cope with attempts at co-optation, especially when they occur in the form of participation schemes on management's terms.

Governments are playing an increasingly active role in this, posing as an honest broker between the unions and management but in reality trying to maneuver us into accepting joint responsibility without control. Their efforts have often occurred in the form of Joint Consultation (Labour-Management Consultation Committees) and through various schemes of minority representation. Representation in such schemes extends from the Economic Council of Canada to local Hospital and United Appeal Boards, Boards of Governors of Universities and Community Colleges. At the same time, corporations are reviving the old company union, now dressed up with verbiage about participation. Many organized companies are relying on the 'big happy family' approach, complete with glossy employee-oriented magazines aimed to undercut the union's prestige and credibility with the workers. All these schemes are attempts to divert the deep-rooted desire of the workers to feel involved and to be considered as something more than a commodity, into channels which will not threaten management's control and will, at the same time, increase its profits.

It would be wrong and unworkable to hope to counter management's attempts of co-optation by refusing to take part. For one thing most unions are already involved, and hundreds of union officials sit as token representatives on all kinds of Boards and Commissions. We should rather try to use this situation to our advantage, provided we do so only on the basis of accountability from below. At present, a union representative on the Board of Governors of a hospital is an official of some other union rather than a person from the immediate bargaining unit for that hospital. He is accountable to no one and is easily pressured into accepting the existing consensus of managers and businessmen who run the hospital. Why couldn't we replace him with a rank and file worker elected by the bargaining unit and responsible to his fellow-workers there? The position could then be used to oppose all proposals detrimental to the employees, to gather information to be reported back, and to propose the workers point of view as alternative to management policy.

This is only an illustration to show that we can and must be creative and flexible in applying a strategy of Industrial Democracy without at any time conceding or weakening on the principles of accountability from below,
direct election and recall by the workers as a group, and refusal of responsibility for those decisions and policies that we do not effectively control. In this manner, we could also prevent representatives from becoming more loyal to the position they occupy than to their constituents, the workers themselves. In short, we can turn what is now a liability to our advantage and make it a useful part of our campaign for control and true Industrial Democracy.

The same approach can be used in regard to joint consultation committees that now exist. Why should we, as is the present practice, accept financial secrecy and limit ourselves to discussions about washrooms and lunchrooms when we know that the really important decisions relate to financial considerations and profitability?

Yet another problem is the fact that only a minority of workers are organised into unions at all. If people are not yet union-conscious how can we expect them to favour Industrial Democracy and Workers’ Control? I would suggest that besides legislative and structural obstacles to organizing, alienation has prevented union consciousness. Working people who find their working lives meaningless and regimented are not quick to get involved in yet another structure. However, a campaign for Industrial Democracy that complements the traditional and still valid union objectives with a new emphasis on job-control and personal freedom will find unorganized workers more responsive and unionized workers far less apathetic.

VI. CONCLUSION

In closing, I would suggest that the desire for democratization of the workplace will intensify as the demand for a people-oriented and democratic society clashes more and more sharply with all authoritarian structures in capitalist society. Through their industrial relations specialists, the corporate elite and their allies are trying to find ways to accommodate and co-opt this desire for more meaningful democracy at all levels of social life, so as not to concede any aspect of their control or to alter the authoritarian character of the corporation. In their view, the corporation exists only to produce profit, and not to fulfill the needs of the population or to provide a meaningful occupation for workers.

What I have tried here is to present a rough outline for a strategy of Industrial Democracy which would avoid the trap of co-optation and would provide meaningful and effective workers’ control. Hopefully, it is a strategy that can enable the workers to win personal freedom at work and the beginning of true Industrial Democracy at the workplace and in the economy in general. I believe such a proposal ties in our present action based on our immediate needs to the more general process of social change towards a Socialist Canada.

A conference such as today’s can’t make policy for the unions. But what we can and should accomplish is to clarify to some degree what is involved in the concept of Industrial Democracy. More specific demands and tactics can only be determined by the people involved and I would suggest that discussion should be continued throughout the union movement, especially at the local union level where the rank and file workers can become involved. That is after all where Industrial Democracy must begin.

by Andre Bekerman,
Education and Publicity Officer,
Canadian Union of Public Employees,
Local 1000, (Toronto)
Workers' Self-Management.
by Gerry Hunnius

Limitation of space permits at best a few provisional remarks about a subject which is very complex. What I will aim at are elaborations of some factors which, in my judgment, are strategic. Essentially I shall talk about workers' self-management and some of the obstacles and problems connected with its achievement.

First a few words to define three concepts which are frequently confused: participation, control and self-management. "Workers' participation in management implies a situation where workers' representatives are to some extent involved in the process of management decision-making, but where ultimate power is in the hands of management."\(^1\) Workers' control is a strategic demand made by workers for actual control over the means and processes of production. Workers' self-management describes a situation where the workers themselves manage and control their own enterprises and industry in cooperation with the wider community. Workers' control can thus be seen as a transitional demand in the move from participation to complete self-management.\(^2\)

The term *industrial democracy* as I use it here, describes both the transitional period of workers' control as well as full self-management. It is not a substitute for overall economic control and public ownership of the commanding heights of the economy, and it is not a substitute for strong and effective trade unions.

Hugh Scanlon, President of the Amalgamated Engineering and Foundry Workers Union (A.E.U.) in Britain and Bill Jones, Vice-President of the Transport and General Workers' Union, have said that, "We have to make it clear that we believe that we, the workers who produce the wealth, have the undeniable right to say how that wealth should be distributed."\(^3\) "What we are considering," says the Assistant General Secretary of the A.E.U., "is the development of the workers' struggle for industrial and political power."\(^4\) It is not only radicals who raise their voices in protest. The right Hon. Douglas Jay, a senior minister in both the Attlee and Wilson governments, asks: "How can the election of 100% of our boards of directors, to control the greater
part of industry, by passive absentee shareholders possibly be defended in the 1960's?"^5

WORKERS' SELF-MANAGEMENT

Self-management emphasizes qualities of self-actualization, self-expression and interdependence. It encourages collaborative relations and de-emphasizes the "I win – you lose" philosophy of competition. Our economic culture rewards some of the basest of human characteristics and penalizes some of the best. Self-management would operate from a different theory and produce a different practice.

One of the characteristics of our industrial system is the fact that it produces alienation of the workers from their jobs. A recent study of Detroit factory workers shows that they are aware of the alienation produced by their work.^6 While no one claims that increased participation or self-management will provide a total cure, the democratic assumption has always been that self-government can create conditions in which mental and moral health are most likely to flourish. Stendenbach, of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, argues that "work alienation, to the extent that it results from lack of creativity, meaninglessness and powerlessness, can be most effectively reduced by man's participation in the decisions that affect his work."^7

It is fundamental to capitalism that the owners and their appointed management have absolute control over industry. They have always vigorously resisted any weakening of their authority. Control and power are inevitably centralized and any delegation of authority emanates from the top.

In contrast, the self-management system starts with absolute decentralization where all workers participate in decision-making. Then it questions which decisions should be delegated "upwards", what rights are the workers willing to place in the hands of their elected representatives and how can they control the outcome. To put it differently, the horizontal structure with its division between legislative and administrative power can be contrasted to the North American vertical model where both powers are united in management.^8

To meet the needs of the wider society, workers' self-management is advocated only under conditions where there is popular control over the economy whose units are managed by the workers. A socialist democracy will have to combine public ownership with workers' self-management if it is to be both socialist and democratic.

Yugoslavia is one country which operates on the principle of workers' self-management. What we see there is an attempt at industrial democracy based on the workers' collective and its elected organs in the plant while leaving the trade union movement to represent the workers' interest at higher administrative and political levels.^9 The basis of the Yugoslav system of industrial democracy is the clear division between two types of power – the power to govern and the power to administer. "The general membership governs while the nominated or elected administrators administer."^10

The typical features of this system are the following: they are based on legislation applicable to undertakings in the "socially owned" sector of the economy, which means that management rights – but not ownership – has been transferred to the workers. All workers and employees are entitled to
participate. Self-management can be direct, where all the workers of a small enterprise — or a section within a larger enterprise — make the decisions jointly and directly. Representative management takes place where the workers elect their own organs of management. The largest governing body and the source of all ultimate power within the enterprise is the total membership, usually called the collective. It governs through referendums and meetings of the various departments or shops. The general membership elects the Workers’ Councils which in turn, elect the Managing Board which functions as its executive body. The Workers’ Council nominates the director and all the top executives of the company. Further decentralization and democratization has been achieved by giving increased decision-making powers to the so-called Economic Units, which are separate departments within an enterprise based on technological and economic independence from other units.

Industrial democracy of this kind involves a very large sector of the working force in a continuous process of decision-making. Prof. Adizes has studied a large factory in Yugoslavia and states that about 40% of its membership was engaged in decision-making. The system of rotation prevents re-election of officials twice in succession and thus virtually guarantees the participation of the vast majority of workers in the decision-making process.

Further guarantees against the creation of cliques and bureaucracies are provided by the system of recall of all elected members, the referendum (which is compulsory in certain very important issues such as mergers), and the activities of the socio-political organizations on the plant level, particularly the Trade Unions, the League of Communists and the Youth Brigades which contribute their judgment to the decision-making process. The enterprise is linked through innumerable autonomous, non-governmental organizations to the wider economy and society.

No existing system of self-management can serve as a blueprint to Canadian workers, but we can learn from the experience and errors of others in seeking our own structures and policies.

WORKERS’ CONTROL AND SELF-MANAGEMENT: OBSTACLES, ENEMIES, AND PROBLEMS

(a) Resistance by Management:
It should be obvious that a fully operational system of workers’ self-management cannot operate within the capitalist system. The struggle for workers’ control and self-management will not be easy. Consider the following quotation from Fortune Magazine: “The hard financial core of capitalism is composed of not more than 60 firms, partnerships or corporations, owned or controlled by 1000 men... In fact recent forecasts claim that in 25 years, 200 multi-national firms will completely dominate production and trade and account for over 75% of the total corporate assets of the capitalist world.”

We should, however, also be concerned with some of the more specific obstacles to genuine participation and control. We may briefly note the following:

Resistance of management to demands of workers’ control are so obvious that they need no elaboration. What is less obvious and less
understandable is the resistance exhibited by management to the various participative schemes which have grown out of the human relations approach of management which leave ultimate decision-making power in the hands of management. A recent study of three plants operated under the Scanlon Plan in the U.S. shows clearly that efficiency has increased, labour turnover has decreased and labour-management relations have improved. Why then is management in North America still reluctant to adopt such plans?

One important factor is undoubtedly the fear on the part of management to experiment with anything which might lead to a gradual erosion of management’s prerogatives and power. These powers are considerable as anyone familiar with collective bargaining well knows. Take the following section (article XV) from the agreement between the Beech Aircraft Corporation and the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 70: “It is mutually agreed that the Company has and will retain the unquestionable and executive rights and power to manage the plant and direct the working forces, including, and not limited to, the right to hire, classify, grade, suspend, discharge, promote, demote or transfer its employees, provided it does not conflict with the provisions of this agreement. All matters which are not specifically covered by this agreement are solely functions and responsibilities of Management.” Under self-management such an article might read: workers have the right to control industry and management has the duty to serve the workers and the community. Management is very touchy regarding the likely encroachments on their rights by unions. As Prof. Roberts has pointed out, the suggestion by Walter Reuther a few years ago that the U.A.W. should be allowed to look at the books practically “made American employers go purple in the face and speechless with rage at his impudence.”

(b) Efficiency:

The argument that workers’ control or self-management would decrease the efficiency of industry is one of the key arguments used by North American management. This argument can, and should, be answered on two levels:

1. The continuous increase of efficiency, as defined by management, linked directly to increasing profits, must be challenged as a priority of our economic system. People pour themselves into the productive process and out comes a shiny product. What this process leaves behind is exhausted human beings. It is intolerable that the priorities of our economic system are determined by a handful of people disregarding the needs and wishes of the workers and the community at large.

2. The efficiency argument can even be challenged in a more narrow sense on its own grounds. The cooperatively run and controlled industries within the Kibbutzim illustrate that self-management, in fact, increases efficiency even as defined by North American management. No one has advocated the removal of managers and experts. The question is: Who are they to be responsible to – the shareholders or the worker?

(c) Workers are not Interested in Participation and Control:

Studies about the attitude of workers and employees can, of course, be interpreted at will. It is, nevertheless, true that some recent surveys have
shown a high degree of interest among factory workers in increasing their control and power within the plant. In a recent study of Detroit factory workers 60% agreed with the following question: "Working people should have more say about how things are run in factories than they have now." More telling perhaps is the recent upsurge in interest among organized workers in industrial democracy. To quote the Secretary-General of the International Federation of Chemical and General Workers' Union (Geneva) at a recent conference: "History will record, I believe, that 1968 was the year that industrial democracy advanced to the centre of the industrial relations stage. It was the Year that the issue ceased being merely an interesting experiment in Yugoslavia and the Federal Republic of Germany." 

As Andre Bekerman has stated, there are indications that Canadian unions are also beginning to press in this direction.

(d) The Position of Unions:

Union indifference or hostility to most participative schemes presently under discussion has been strongest in North America. In Europe, in fact, this is no longer the case and an increasing number of large unions are beginning to take a new look at workers’ participation and control in management. Unions in the U.S. and in Canada almost always reject in practice all forms of workers’ participation in official management bodies. The unions wish to be critics rather than partners in management and union influence is exerted largely in negotiations and grievance handling. Unions do not, in other words, want to sit at both sides of the bargaining table.

Some clarification is necessary at this point. Union suspicion and opposition to management introduced participation schemes is, in fact, healthy and well founded. Such schemes give no real power to the representatives of the workers and are used not infrequently to draw workers away from their unions.

Union opposition to shared responsibility in management, as for instance in the co-determination model in West Germany’s coal and steel industry, is, I would argue, also well founded. Co-responsibility on whose terms and for what ends? As long as the power to make all fundamental decisions rests with management alone, unions are perfectly right in refusing a share in the responsibility.

But what we are now discussing is not participation but workers’ control. There is no contradiction, argues Hugh Scanlon, “between a vigorous attitude toward collective bargaining being maintained and the attempts for greater industrial democracy.” Workers’ control does not mean sitting on both sides of the bargaining table. Independent and strong trade unions are essential to any successful campaign for workers’ control.

Demands for workers’ control by unions would also bring about a greater involvement of the rank and file in the activities of the unions. Support from the rank and file would be indispensable in any confrontation with management. Charles Levinson, Secretary General of the International Federation of Chemical and General Workers’ Union (Geneva) has pointed out recently that, "It is normal that demands for greater voice, direct participation and decentralization of power, which is the basis of the 'youth rebellion' today and which unions are demanding within industry, will occur within the trade union structure itself. It is not really a revolt against leadership or the unions. It is more a demand for decentralization and efficacy in the exercise of trade union power."
The Work/Leisure Argument:

It has been argued, by trade union officials as well as by management, that we should concentrate on increasing satisfaction of leisure time rather than attempting to make work more satisfying. Management just loves this idea. We all know about the social facilities provided by large corporations. IBM's country clubs, Du Pont's psychiatrists, Reynolds Tobacco's chaplains and Richfield Oil's model houses. All of these are symptomatic of an effort to create a feeling of community for the middle class employee who has no alternative community in which he can find a sense of belonging. Much less is done for the blue collar workers. Recent studies have established a direct relationship between job satisfaction and leisure time satisfaction. "Men satisfied with one aspect of their lives tend to be satisfied with other aspects." The interpretation usually given is that favorable or unfavorable job feelings carry over to produce corresponding feelings in other sectors of life. What is vital is that there is no indication, "which would support the idea that men who are more dissatisfied in work find extra enjoyment away from work or, conversely that those dissatisfied at home and in leisure manage especially to find satisfaction in work." The importance of increasing job satisfaction is thus evident.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In conclusion, we should emphasize that when we speak of workers' control we do not limit ourselves to factory workers only. The demand for democracy within the work place includes by definition everyone who works for a living. One recent development in this field has been a move to introduce a process of democratization in mass-circulation newspapers and magazines.

The staff of two of the world's leading publications have led a successful struggle to achieve a greater voice in the content, personnel selection and general policies of their publications. An editorial association of the staff has now substantial editorial and administrative control over the conservative Figaro, one of the prestige newspapers in France.

Even more significant was the rebellion of the staff of Stern, generally described as West Germany's Life. The rebellion was sparked over an attempt by one of the partners of Stern to sell his share. The sale was called off and a new agreement was signed giving the staff substantial editorial powers. The staff now elects an editorial council. No staff dismissal can be effective without the approval of two-thirds of the editorial council which is to be elected each year.

In Canada, Prof. Beattie of the University of Western Ontario has advocated the democratization of newspapers by introducing a separation between ownership and operational functions.

A move for workers' control and community control over our mass media may have additional significance insofar as it would likely lead to less biased reporting. The Canadian Labour Congress has stated in a submission to the Senate Committee on the Mass Media that, "In terms of news content and editorial opinion, Canada's daily newspapers tend to treat organized labour at best as some kind of necessary evil".

Workers' control of the mass media and other institutions of special public concern raises the important issue as to how the interest of the wider community can be safeguarded. In Yugoslavia, this has resulted in community
representation on the decision-making organs of newspapers, radio, television, hospitals, insurance companies, banks and many other similar institutions.

The protest movement, begun years ago by students, has now been joined by significant sectors of the Canadian population, all challenging the legitimacy of the establishment, which, to use the words of Laurier Lapierre, has created in Canada a "benevolent autocracy". 27

The response of the establishment has been the traditional mixture of the carrot and the stick, the carrot being symbolized by offers of token participation and representation in decision-making organs. Participative democracy is today about as controversial as motherhood. Demands for effective workers’ and community control, however, are resisted by those in positions of power.

What this revolt is all about, it seems to me, is an attempt to establish, by struggle from below, the autonomous power of organized workers and citizens. Subordinate and delegated responsibility must be replaced by this autonomous power of citizens if political and economic liberty is to mean the power to choose one’s own options.

The answer is obviously not to sit back and hope for emancipation from above. This kind of deliverance “is the permanent promise held out by every ruling power to keep the people looking upward for protection, instead of to themselves for liberation from the need for protection”. 28

by Gerry Hunnius,
Workers’ Control Task Force,
PRAXIS: Research Institute for Social Change,
Toronto
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Before getting to the substance of what I have to say, I would report to you that after receiving the invitation to address you, I obtained as much literature as I could find on the subject of workers' control — and I read it, ad nauseam. I now report to you that no subject has attracted more second class intellects, nor so thoroughly exhausted them. An article by Ed Finn in Canadian Transport and Chris Trower's paper were the only documents that I would recommend to anyone. For the rest — forget it! My argument is: "industrial democracy", in quotation marks, — is a snare and a delusion and that our concern with it is phony, enabling us to evade certain larger and more urgent questions.

In more detail, I would argue three things: first, that where we have a strong union we have at least the potential if not the substance for whatever degree of industrial democracy we may desire; secondly, that those who clamour most for industrial democracy are in industries where the workers' organizations have abrogated their responsibilities; and finally, that we will only obtain industrial democracy in those areas where it is not now present, not by talking about it, but by helping the workers build strong unions.

I take it, by the words "industrial democracy" or "workers' control", we mean effective participation in those decisions which in any way affect the worker on the job. If this is what we mean, then I contend that in most of the organized industry in North America we already have it. Let's take a specific case. One of the largest local unions in Canada is Local 6500 of the United Steelworkers of America in Sudbury. It represents some 17,000 employees of the International Nickel Company. It regularly bargains in such areas as wages, seniority, work loads, health and safety, severance pay, welfare plans, pensions, transfers, job opportunity, plant closure, etc. It can bargain, and bargain fairly effectively, in all of these areas and in any other areas it chooses. The simple fact is that this local union is strong enough to compel the company to negotiate on any matter which is of concern to the employees. What it obtains as a result of that bargaining may not be sufficient, in the eyes of the employees — but the union can bargain, and if its
members feel strongly enough, it can come very close to compelling the company to do what the employees wish.

For some years now the International Nickel Company, as a matter of a deliberate and uncaring course, has been systemically poisoning its employees and the natural environment in the Sudbury area. It has done this with the passive complicity of the Government of Ontario. These are facts which are beyond argument.

Now as a result of some pressure and some public outcry, the company is taking a few hesitant steps to rectify the situation. The union was at the root of the outcry, and it is now accomplishing something on behalf of its members and the people of Sudbury. My point is that the local union could, if its members so desired, rectify the matter completely within a year. There is nothing to prevent that local union from advising the company that unless the situation is totally rectified within a certain period of time, its members will no longer report for work. If you advise me that such procedure is illegal, I can only reply in the words of Sidney Smith, former president of the University of Toronto. Shortly after taking office, he was advised that some of the engineering students had been “found-ins” at a particularly inventive bawdy party. In words that all posterity would note, President Smith said, “My, my”.

Some years ago, the Steelworkers’ union was finally successful in organizing an Alcan smelter in British Columbia, displacing another, rather ineffective, union in the course of its efforts. The first grievance processed by the Steelworkers after they obtained certification had to do with an employee by the name of Haecky and a foreman by the name of Spracklin. In short, the foreman swore at the employee. The employee filed a grievance and the settlement demanded was that the foreman apologize to the employee before the entire assembled department. The grievance didn’t proceed that far — it was withdrawn by the employee when the plant manager tendered an apology on behalf of the company, and disciplined the foreman. That may not have been the last time a foreman swore at an Alcan employee — but it sure was the last time the union ever heard about it.

So I make my first point — that employees, when represented by a strong union, can enjoy whatever measure of industrial democracy they are willing to fight for. In the final analysis, that’s what unions are all about.

My second point is that those who cry most for industrial democracy do least about getting it. I refer now in particular to the Institute for Workers’ Control, an English organization which has published some of the most pedestrian prose I have yet read on the subject of industrial democracy. It appears, upon close reading, that the roots of all the workers’ troubles are 1. Harold Wilson and 2. the bloody Yanks. Now I happen to think that Wilson is a bit of a bastard, and that he has debased the currency of socialism. I would also love to confine the Yanks to their own country, that is, if anyone could show me how to do it. But I don’t think setting up a works council in the Midlands takes us measurably closer to either goal.

I think also, from what I have read, that British unions and indeed most European unions have abrogated their responsibilities as unions, in that they tend to bargain only for wages, leaving all other matters that concern workers to be settled by work stoppages, agitation or petition. In short, I don’t think that they are doing their job. As a consequence, I can quite understand how a European worker can argue convincingly that he should have a voice in
determining work standards, production rates, retirement policy and plant closure. I agree entirely. Of course he should have a major say in all these things. My view is that in North America, organized workers do have a say in these matters, and exercise that say frequently. Organized workers are not necessarily strong enough in every instance to have their own way — quite the contrary. But workers will only achieve that strength in one of two ways — by either building still stronger unions, or by achieving political power to enable them to change the rules of the game. But in no case will they get power by talking about industrial democracy. They will have to fight for it.

The President of the International Nickel Company is a Mr. Henry Wingate. Mr. Wingate responds with considerable alacrity to any suggestion that production, and therefore profits, be interrupted. But if you think that Mr. Wingate is going to stop polluting the Sudbury atmosphere because we here in this room endorse industrial democracy, then, my friends, you haven’t met many of the Henry Wingates of this world.

Surely the real point of all this discussion is this: there can be no industrial democracy whatsoever where there is no union, and that those of us who believe in industrial democracy should make every effort to bring the benefits of trade-union organization to every single worker. If we don’t understand that, we’re just talking words.

For some years now the experts have been telling us that the two hour week is just around the corner. I think that’s a lot of crap. I seem to be a lot busier than my father was, and the same observation applies to most of my friends. It is quite true that productivity in agriculture has increased spectacularly, and that massive capital infusion has produced spectacular productivity increases in manufacturing. But when I look at our unfinished business — a quarter of our population living in poverty, a shortage of half a million housing units — and when I look beyond our own relatively prosperous borders at the rest of the world, I believe that our most serious future shortage will be manpower. I think, contrary to the experts, we are going to have an economy of want for a long time to come, and the serious job of the government will continue to be the determining of priorities. Finally, I think that as productivity increases in the production of goods, there will be a corresponding increase in the demand for services. By 1980, two-thirds of our work force will be in the service sector of the economy. Yet there has been no apparent gain in productivity whatever in that area and it is precisely in this sector — in government, trade, finance and personal services — that unions will find the going toughest. In North America I would also add agriculture — but I will return to that later.

Put very simply my argument is this: if we wish to promote the cause of industrial democracy, we must do everything possible to promote the growth of unions in those sectors of the economy where workers are not presently organized. We have a real opportunity to put our money where our mouth is. I refer especially to the grape workers' strike in California. Governor Reagan has branded the strike as “immoral” and I don’t suppose, therefore, that any better endorsement could be found. The facts surrounding the strike are pretty well known, but they are so appalling they must be repeated.

I don’t know how many of you have ever visited Calexico, on the California–Mexico border. Calexico is the principal point of entry for Mexican field labourers. There you will see one man feeling another man’s muscles before hiring him for a day’s work. There you will also see workers
who have travelled thirty miles or more for the opportunity of twelve hours
work under the blazing sun at a dollar fifty an hour, less deductions, on
Southern California's ranches and farms.

These are the people that Caesar Chavez set out to organize ten years
ago. He started with the grape workers centered around Delano in Tulare
County. These are the dispossessed of this earth — underpaid, underfed,
undereducated labourers, living in miserable hovels, working ten and twelve
hours a day for a dollar and a half an hour, poisoned by DDT, old before
their time at forty.

Talk to these people about industrial democracy. The single, simple,
appalling fact is that in the United States, as in Canada, agricultural workers
have no legal right to organize — the employer is free to do anything he
wishes to break attempts at organization. Workers have been murdered in
Delano — and more will be murdered before the strike is over. An organizer
for the Farmworkers Union was run over by a grower, and crippled for life.
The organizer was prosecuted for obstructing traffic — the grower has not yet
been tried. If we want to do something constructive about industrial
democracy we can do no better, to start with, than to picket and boycott
every store which sells table grapes.

Industrial democracy is not just a phrase — it's something that workers
have to fight to obtain, and have to fight to maintain. The battle for
industrial democracy is joined every time the union deals with management.
It will be broadened and extended only as the unions grow in jurisdiction and
in strength. If we wish to promote the cause of workers' control, we can do
no better than to promote the growth of unions everywhere, and particularly,
in those areas of our economy where unions have yet to make any significant
penetration.

by Wally Ross,
Secretary,
British Columbia New Democratic Party
Industrial Democracy in the Public Sector of Canada.

by Gilbert Levine

Let me first state my personal position on the issue of industrial democracy and workers' control.

I support the concept of workers' control in industry as a tactical goal, not only for the transformation of the workers-employer relationship, but as a means of transforming society itself. I foresee workers in Canada using their experience in the fight for control of the workplace to gain control of the society and government. The lessons gained in controlling industry will be valuable to workers who, in the future, will have to control society, if it is to be a democratic society.

However, I do not support the type of labour-management cooperation whereby workers have been co-opted into the System and have, in the process, lost any control of the workplace.

My topic is “The prospects and possibilities of industrial democracy in the public sector in Canada”. No one should entertain any illusions that establishing industrial democracy in the public sector will be an easy task. Anyone proposing such a plan faces formidable obstacles.

Employers have always asserted, with great vigor, the right to manage and the principle of authority. This principle of authority used to be asserted simply on the basis of ownership of property. The mere owning of property automatically gave the owner the authority to manage.

Although the demand for complete authority by management has remained the same, the rationalization for retaining it has undergone some changes in recent years. Instead of claiming its right to manage merely on the basis of ownership and responsibility to the shareholders, management now tends to advance the notion that it must have the responsibility and authority to manage on the basis of some vague responsibility to the whole community to improve productivity. Complete authority is said to be a prerequisite of maximum efficiency.

This so-called change of emphasis by business from making a profit for the shareholder to providing an efficient service to the community is, of course, a false image. The business community spends millions of public relations dollars each year attempting to create this image.
Nevertheless, on the theory of providing an efficient community service, the views of managers in the public sector are very likely to coincide with the views of managers in the private sector. Although one might hope and expect those responsible for the management of public enterprises to have different motives and to have less objection to the democratic sharing of power and authority, the facts do not bear this out. There exists in Canada today a close similarity in attitudes between the managers in both the public and private sector.

The similarity in outlook between the two groups of managers appears to be founded on the following factors:

1) the similarity of problems to be solved, particularly where the public sector is in competition with the private sector, as in broadcasting, railways, airlines.

2) the structure of management control in the publicly owned industries which follows the same pattern that has been established in the large enterprises of the private sector;

3) the common social background and training of the management group. The young managers moving into private industry and the young managers moving into public industry have likely received their training at the same school of business administration, with its emphasis on authority and efficiency.

4) the numerous links between individuals in the public and private sector and the frequent moves from one sector to another. Recent appointments of managers from private enterprise to Air Canada, C.B.C., etc. are examples of this.

5) and the common social and political environment in which public and private enterprise operate. Within the capitalist system a "socialist" enterprise tends to operate as a capitalist enterprise. The public sector simply cannot be isolated from its private surroundings.

These similar approaches to management have resulted in some Crown Corporations and Government Departments aping some of the worst features of industrial relations in the private sector. The Post Office Department, particularly in recent days, has demonstrated that it is capable of assuming all of the worst industrial relations practices of the worst free enterpriser.

Given this approach, it might be readily concluded that there is as little hope of democratizing the public enterprise as there is in democratizing the private enterprise. The same type of resistance to an increase in workers' control and a decrease in management prerogatives could be expected from both types of enterprises.

However, the ethos and purpose of public industry should be different than those of private industry. The purpose of private industry is to make a profit. The purpose of public industry is to provide a service.

For these reasons, workers in the public sector should be fighting for the introduction of new and democratic management practices instead of allowing management to continue playing "follow the leader" with the established practices of private industry.

Instead of allowing them to follow some of the worst practices of the private sector, Crown Corporations should be forced by their employees, to become a testing ground for new approaches to democratic control of the enterprise. Crown Corporations should become models for joint consultation and management.
The backward industrial relations records and anti-labour policies of some publicly owned enterprises make them obvious candidates for immediate and far reaching changes. This will require organization like the Post Office and the CNR to abandon their fixation of emulating free enterprise and to revert to their stated role as public services.

One immediate step which must be taken is the appointment of worker representatives to the boards of directors of public agencies on the clear understanding that they are selected by, and responsible to, the workers in the enterprise. At the present time no public enterprise in Canada has direct worker representation on its governing board. Only a few have indirect token labour representation, such as the local parking, housing, transit, and harbour authorities in Toronto.

However, it should be made abundantly clear that mere worker representation on the governing body of a public enterprise will, in itself, not democratize the operation or provide any significant degree of workers control. Worker representatives sitting on the Boards of management will not give the man on the job any more control over his direct environment. For example, a Union representative sitting on the Board of the CNR in Montreal will not be able to affect the unwarranted actions of a supervisor towards an employee in the CNR freight sheds in Vancouver.

The American Sociologist, Blumberg, confirms this on the basis of British experience:

"The manifest failure of the public corporation to arouse the British workers' enthusiasm on the job stands as apt testimony that any kind of administration in the public sector which does not involve the worker directly in management, but only via remote representatives at the top, cannot hope to affect significantly the the workers' attitudes towards their work or their company."

Public ownership without democratization on the job fails to change the existing work alienation. Therefore, the democratization must not only take place at the top level of management, but must permeate all levels of the operation.

This statement coincides with the conclusions reached on this matter by the British TUC as stated in its submission to the Donovan Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers:

"There is now a growing recognition that, at least in industries under public ownership, provision should be made at each level in the management structure for trade union representatives of the working people employed in these industries to participate in the formulation of policy and in the day to day operation of these industries."

The appointment of worker representatives on governing boards, therefore, must be viewed as only one of many steps which must be taken to democratize the public enterprise.

In its attempts to emulate the goals of efficiency, the public sector has adopted some of the worst autocratic features of business, instead of experimenting with new democratic systems which could yield far greater results. There are now impressive research findings showing that, where the worker has meaningful decision making power on the job, his job satisfaction increases, as does his productivity and efficiency.

It is interesting to note that when the Government and the ruling class were really interested in maximum production and efficiency — during World
War II — they were prepared to extend certain democratic practices into areas which were previously restricted. In Canada, during the war years, many of the barriers to unionization of the work force were lowered. In Britain, mandatory consultative machinery between employers and employees was established. These changes were made to improve production. With the war over and the urgency for maximum production diminished, employers again reverted to authoritarian forms of management. In post war Canada employer hostility towards unions increased once more. In post war Britain the mandatory consultative system of the war years became voluntary and largely ineffectual.

Therefore, on the basis of the experience of the war years and other experiences, the public sector, if it is truly interested in efficiency, should experiment with the principles of industrial democracy instead of merely adapting the worst features of the business system.

What are the chances today of employees in the public sector of Canada pushing for industrial democracy or workers' control? In reviewing the positions of civil servants at all three levels of government or the employees of Crown Corporations, the prospects look pretty gloomy for the following reasons:

1) At the federal and provincial level, civil service associations are new and they have gained collective bargaining rights only within the last few years. Even these bargaining rights are much more limited in scope than those in the private sector. For example, federal civil servants do not have the right to bargain on promotions, layoffs, health and welfare benefits etc., as is the case in the private sector. These associations feel that they have a lot of catching up to do to bring their position more in line with what has been established over a great many years by the industrial unions. In addition, paternalism is still very rampant and many of the actions of the civil service associations are similar to the actions of company unions. I would suspect, therefore, that in the immediate future, these associations will emphasize the extension of bargaining rights and the raising of conditions of employment up to the level of private industry. The more remote issue of industrial democracy may well have to wait until civil servants feel their more basic economic problems resolved.

2) Even at the municipal level and in the Crown Corporations, where fairly broad-scale collective bargaining has been carried out for quite a few years and where the unions have had a fairly close association with the industrial unions, there does not appear to be any membership push for industrial democracy. The problem here may well be that the municipal and Crown Agency Unions have traditionally looked to the industrial unions to provide the leadership in breaking new ground in industrial relations. The industrial unions, for a great variety of reasons, have simply not shown any real interest in the issue of industrial democracy. They are not providing any leadership on this matter.

3) The Labour Movement in Canada and the United States has laid much greater stress on business unionism as opposed to social unionism. North American business unionism has emphasized short term economic goals. Social unionism, which is more prevalent in Europe, has stressed social and political goals, including questions of workers' control. Civil service unions and associations in Canada are even more
inclined towards business unionism than are industrial unions. An examination of convention resolutions of most civil service associations shows a heavy emphasis on benefits and privileges and little concern with even mildly political questions. The matter of workers’ control, which is a highly political matter, is just not on the agenda for civil servants at the present time.

If there is little prospect of civil servants and public employees making any strides on the issue of industrial democracy, is there any area of the public sector where we can hope for a breakthrough? If any breakthrough will be made, I suggest it will occur at the universities.

It is worthwhile to examine first, what is happening with the universities as employers:

1) It is well known that education is now big business and that the number of students and staff at universities has grown enormously in recent years. Canadian universities, with an approximate total of 100,000 employees, have become major employers in Canada. The University of Toronto, for example, has 8,000 employees — about 4,000 in various teaching positions and a further 4,000 in other staff positions.

2) An increasing number of university employees are turning to various forms of collective bargaining to assist them in resolving problems of their employment. My Union, the Canadian Union of Public Employees, now represents about 3,500 non-academic staffs on twelve campuses across Canada. Another 4,000 are represented by other unions on other campuses. And most recently, we have witnessed the faculties at certain universities in Quebec and Alberta seeking collective bargaining rights. This growing unionization of university staffs will become an important factor in developing industrial democracy at the universities.

However, a more compelling factor which may bring industrial democracy to the universities is, of course, the whole fight being waged, particularly by students, and to a lesser degree by faculty, for the democratization of the universities. Practically every university in Canada has had to face up to demands of both faculty and students for a voice in administration, for a voice in course content, for a voice in the selection of staff, for a voice in carrying out discipline etc. Translated into the industrial context, these are all matters of “workers control”.

Based on the example of the students I suspect that, if a breakthrough will take place on the issue of industrial democracy, it will take place at the universities. However, even here, it will not come about without a great many problems.

The Canadian Union of Public Employees recently had its first encounter with the question of industrial democracy at the University of Toronto. It proved disastrous. A review of the events of this incident will illustrate some of the pitfalls and problems of attempting to advance the concept of workers’ control in the public sector, as well as elsewhere.

During the latter part of the 1960’s both faculty and students at the University of Toronto were highly critical of their limited role in decision making, of the authoritarian structure of the University, of the role of Boards of Governors which was top heavy with big business representation. Both groups, particularly the students, were demanding decision making participation in the running of the University. In short, they wanted
industrial democracy or workers' control. The workers in this case were "the community of scholars".

Under pressure, the U. of T. President, in late 1968, established a Commission on University Government (CUG) whose purpose was to examine and make recommendations regarding the entire structure and government of the University. Hearings were held, presentations were made by student, faculty and other organizations and a report was to be published in the late summer of 1969.

It was at this point, after long drawn-out opposition by the University, that CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees) was certified as the bargaining agent for a group of some 350 non-professional library workers at the University of Toronto. Since all groups at the University, except for the non-teaching staff, had made representations to the Commission, it was felt that CUPE should prepare a brief outlining the position of the non-teaching staff on University Government. A CUPE request to make such a presentation to CUG was refused on the grounds that the hearings were completed and a draft report was in preparation.

A brief was prepared and submitted to CUG by CUPE. Since the deadline for presentations had passed, the brief was not formally presented to the Commission. However, it did receive wide distribution at the University and through the Press.

In its brief, CUPE stated that staff and students were both fighting the same battle for democratic control of the University. The brief made a number of recommendations which may be summarized as follows:

1) There is a class system at the University with a sharp division between the academic and non-academic staff. A whole series of rules and practices have been established to place the non-academics, or support staff, in an inferior position. CUPE called for an end to present barriers by involving all of the staff in the government of the University.

2) CUPE called for 50% representation by the support staff on all University committees dealing with conditions of employment.

3) A request was made for effective, and not token, representation on the governing council, as chosen by the bargaining agents of the employees.

4) In order that the support staff become more identified with the educational program at the University, CUPE called for orientation programs for new employees, free tuition, with time off if necessary for employees to take special or regular academic courses.

5) We recommended that all university facilities – housing, health, physical education, library, dining facilities etc. be made available to all staff. For example, the maid and the plumber should have access to the faculty club, Hart House etc.

6) CUPE called on the University to cease its anti-labour attitude and instead develop a model form of labour-management relations. Even these very mild recommendations towards industrial democracy were ridiculed in the daily press:

1) To the idea that a university janitor sit on the Board of Governors, the Globe and Mail said editorially "This lies beyond the pail."

2) Democracy is fine BUT, said the Saskatoon Star Phoenix: "Labour Unions have a right co-equal with professional and other groups to similar representation on university Boards. But the wisdom of exercising such a right appears to be questionable."
3) *The Vancouver Sun* ridiculed the idea of a university janitor sitting on the University Board of Governors. It is just a bargaining ploy said the Sun for janitors who really want "such pittances as tenure, sabbaticals, Canada Council grants, and a seat on the 50-yard line".

The idea of industrial democracy did not fare well with the Press. How did the idea fare with the University employees? Very badly. An examination of the reasons for this failure could provide valuable lessons for those who want to promote industrial democracy in the future, in the public sector as well as elsewhere. There are some suggestions as to why the idea failed:

1) The Union staff representatives were not entirely convinced of the idea of industrial democracy and, accordingly, found it difficult to convince the University staff of the idea. Therefore, before the workers seize this idea, there will have to be a massive educational program for both rank and file members and union leaders on the concept of industrial democracy.

2) Due to time limitations and priorities, little time was available to win rank and file support for the principles of industrial democracy. Admittedly, it was an idea imposed from the top. But industrial democracy, if it is to work, must come up from the bottom and not down from the top.

3) In the negotiation of a collective agreement and particularly a tough first agreement – when Canadian workers have to make a choice between bread and butter economic issues and issues of workers’ control – they will quickly abandon workers’ control. What is needed, therefore, is a whole new change in ideology in the labour movement if the concept of industrial democracy is to catch on.

In the discussion I hope the audience will raise two important points on which I did not have time to comment:

1) What are the possibilities of workers’ control preventing plant shut-downs? For example, if we had a high degree of workers’ control in the Dunlop plant, which was recently closed down, could the workers have stopped the shut down and taken over the plant as a public enterprise? In other words, can workers’ control extend the area of public enterprise in Canada?

2) Can workers’ control be one of the weapons in the fight to prevent the economic take-over of Canada by the United States? When Steven Roman decided to sell out Denison Mines to the Americans, could the workers, through their Union, have taken over control of the mine and run it as a *Canadian* public enterprise?

I hope I have raised enough issues and problems to provide a good discussion on the prospects of industrial democracy in the public sector of Canada.

by Gilbert Levine, Research Director, Canadian Union of Public Employees


I'm sure that some of you at this conference have detected a peculiar hesitancy among those who have been active in the trade union movement. Trade Unionists don't seem to be quite as enthusiastic about "Industrial Democracy" as some other people.

Well, we are a bit suspicious of slogans. Your chairman has repeated that "there is no power greater than an idea which has come into its own", and, for proof of the power of ideas, he then talks about Mr. Trudeau getting elected on the slogan of "participatory democracy". I have just made up a new quotation of my own. "An idea which has come into its own is not the same thing as a slogan which has just been grabbed by somebody else."

I am afraid I am not one of those people who, like St. John, can start off a gospel with "In the beginning was the Word." The truth is that, in the beginning, there weren't any words at all. The only people who have ever really believed that words meant something specific were medieval magicians. They were certain that, if you could describe a blonde in bed in the right words and in the right circumstances, you would get one.

Therefore, whenever I see terms like "worker control" and "industrial democracy", I instinctively remind myself of Chase's semantics test. Chase says that, if you want to carry on an intelligent conversation, you should get five people in a circle, take each word and, unless the five people agree on what that word means, replace the word with "Blah" and then read it all over again. I'm sure we would all hate to apply that test to the subject matter of this conference.

Getting back to my remark about other people stealing slogans, I've just been reading another book called "Sweden Now", which must be sacred at such an affair as this because the book is, after all, Swedish. In the current edition, there is an article by David Jenkins. Jenkins says that one sign of the keen interest in "industrial democracy" was a recent executives' seminar on the subject designed for 35 participants. Jenkins reports that all the places were sold out and there were more than one hundred names on the waiting
list. My experience as a unionist tells me that any conference called by an employers' federation which turns out to be so popular among junior executives that they line up for seats isn't going to do the workers a bit of good.

I would like to point out that a lot of these "industrial democracy" ideas have been tried and discarded already — right here in Canada. I know that this isn't common knowledge. Even our most ardent Canadian nationalists have seldom studied anything about our own Canadian labour history.

"Worker Control?"

Let me tell you about Dacks Shoes. Before it was bought over some years ago and while it was still making its reputation, Dacks operated without a foreman. The owner sat in his office, took orders, pushed the orders through a slot in the wall to the chief steward. That was the last thing management had to do. They made good shoes and made them without any foremen or managers. Unfortunately, the shoes were so good that another company bought them out.

Another example involved Charlie Millard and myself many years ago. One day a gentleman from Gananoque showed up in our office and told us he was going to die in a year or two. He seemed appalled at the idea of leaving his plant to his children or those they had married. He wanted to know if the union would be interested in buying the plant because he would love to die with an interesting experiment in progress.

We didn't agree to buy the plant. But we did co-operate in getting the employees to buy the plant. For a number of years Parmenter & Bulloch was 100% employee-owned. It was also a 100% union shop. We used to watch the spectacle of the same people gathering to elect a Board of Directors and, a few months later, gathering to elect a union bargaining committee to bargain with their Board of Directors.

They fought just as if they didn't own the place. One year the guys on the Board of Directors were arguing against increasing the benefits because priority should be given to buying a new machine. The Bargaining Committee was saying "Benefits now — new machine later." The next year, the same man might be on the other committee saying the exact opposite of what had been said the year before. All this was done with perfect sincerity. In the collective bargaining system there is sincerity on both sides. It's just that both sides disagree on priorities.

The plant finally became so good that some smart operator offered all of the employees many times as much as they had paid for their shares, bought the place and, in my opinion, ran it into the ground. For all I know he just wanted to lose money for income tax purposes.

"Co-Determination" ... with workers on the Board of Directors?

For years, the late J. S. MacLean of Canada Packers insisted that his workers elect two members to the Board of Directors and insisted upon a form of profit-sharing. One of the first union demands, after recognition, was to get rid of those members on the Board of Directors.

In the papers and in some of the remarks on this subject, there has been some pretty obvious depreciation of the collective bargaining process. Andre Bekerman, for example, says that young people are alienated from the unions. But I can take you up to Thompson, Manitoba, where the average age of the bargaining unit is only 23. I can assure you that there is no
"alienation" from the collective bargaining process or the union in Thompson. There is, instead, very great participation by the young people.

I suggest to you that, where you have the collective bargaining system as we know it, we have the answer to more "industrial democracy" and more "workers' control" right in our hands right now and that the rest of these devices may be a bit of a waste of time.

In most of Europe — and, indeed, the world — unions do not practice collective bargaining. The Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, British Commonwealth countries and the United States are the only countries where you have direct bargaining as we know it ... direct bargaining between plants or industries and unions. There are "works councils" in France and other countries where everyone belongs to a different union depending on their religious or political prejudice. But these divided unions do not have bargaining power. All they can do is bargain minimum wages with the state and take up grievances through their works' council.

The story of the development of the collective bargaining process is the story of the way in which workers have, reluctantly, insisted upon taking power away from management in order to protect themselves.

The trouble is that the average working man, and this is the problem you are really up against ... frequently, doesn't want power. Most of the time, he frankly wishes that various authorities ... including his union authorities ... would just go away and leave him alone. He will accept power if he absolutely has to have that power to effectively protect himself and his family. But he will still accept such power reluctantly.

We tend to forget that collective bargaining is, essentially, a greater and greater invasion of management rights because, during the last fifteen years or so, inflation has forced unionists to emphasize pay increases first, last and always. As the practical people here know, if you asked people facing present increases in prices to go on strike for "industrial democracy" instead of 15c more an hour, they would, quite understandably, walk all over you in the process of getting the extra 15c an hour.

I have just been going over a scrap book recording a union organization campaign which went on in Kingston twenty five years ago. In the entire scrap book there is not one promise that, if people formed a union, they would get a wage increase. Unions were organized in those earlier days on the argument that a collective agreement providing for seniority and a grievance procedure was essential for employee security. Anyone who had come through the depression into wartime full employment realized that what he needed the most was security. But, to get that security, he had to invade the existing area of management rights.

If what you mean by "industrial democracy" is more freedom for the individual in the work place, you can get that automatically by getting full employment. During wartime, for example, there is such a shortage of labor that the boss can't afford to fire you. You can do your own thing — catch a few winks behind the machine or flirt with the girl at the next machine — you won't be fired. If "freedom on the job" is what you're after, go after full employment. With full employment there's a lot of "industrial democracy". With a lot of unemployment there is no democracy and a lot of fear.

I suggest that we stop confusing "democracy" with the mere election of governments. Let's also stop confusing it with some sort of Plato's Republic where all the intellectuals are automatically elevated from the bottom to the
top because of the force of their ideas coming into their own. A democratic society, in practice, is really a society where all the pressure groups will gang up to make sure that no one pressure group ever wins all the power.

Within that kind of democracy, I would like to suggest three practical areas where we should concentrate, using the present collective bargaining system as an instrument and realizing that collective bargaining is, in its essence, an invasion of total management power.

1. Let us strive to extend collective bargaining to a larger area of Canadian workers. At present, collective bargaining is confined, in practice, to large bargaining units where, because of skills or numbers, employers cannot easily replace employees. That means that, no matter what the politicians tell you, employees in our small bargaining units cannot hope to get a collective bargaining agreement of any kind.

2. Let us attack the concept of financial secrecy. A typical example of this sort of thing was the recent report of the Prices and Incomes Commission on steel prices in which the Commission took evidence from the union in public but insisted upon evidence from the industry being given in private. Or look at the refusal of Dunlop Tire or the government of Ontario to take part in a feasibility study designed to keep the plant operating.

I assure you that the companies will fight any suggestion of providing workers with financial information to the bitter end.

3. Let us question the whole concept of "management rights." A most practical suggestion along this line came from our Auto Workers' chairman this morning. He said that the Auto Workers were going to grapple with the traditional grievance procedure. He argues that the present process which assumes that management can do anything except what they agree not to do in a union contract is unfair when it is applied to employee grievances. Should an employee be punished, before an arbitration board finds him guilty or innocent, or unpunished until it is proved by management that he did something wrong?

Specific objectives such as these may sound awfully dull and unimaginative. But they are practical objectives that workers can get excited about now. I seriously suggest that, by using the collective bargaining system to win greater and greater rights for employees by invading more and more areas of management's present total power, we will do far more to build industrial democracy than by repeating slogans about theoretical "workers control, and "co-determination," etc.

by

Murray Cotterill
Public Relations Director (Canada)
United Steelworkers of America.
INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY:

Where do we go from Here?

by Edward Broadbent, MP

It is clear from what other speakers have said earlier in this conference that there is no one "essential" form of industrial democracy. Variants are possible.

However, there is one characteristic which I maintain is essential to the organization of an enterprise or economy for it to be appropriately listed among the variants. The essential element is power. As in our parliamentary institutions there is no democracy unless power is effectively possessed by the majority. There is no democracy where those participating in a system have simply the right either to advise or to oppose or to protect. To be democratic there must also be the right to participate effectively in the actual making of decisions.

Given this fact, it is unlikely that industrial democracy exists anywhere in the world, although certain countries are beginning to approximate the required conditions.

Western liberal democracies like Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom are excluded because our trade unions in the main have only "oppositionist" power. Unions or workers do not make the decisions, nor even share in the making of them. Within the Soviet Block the absence of industrial democracy is even more evident: there is no governmental democracy and trade unions are powerless.

WHY INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IS A RELEVANT, PERSISTENT AND GROWING ISSUE

At present, supporters of industrial democracy are to be found among four groups: (1) Western socialists, like the Prime Minister of Sweden, who want to build upon the foundations of the welfare state; (2) Western & Eastern trade unionists who see that democratising power is essential to their needs; (3) Marxists in the East and West who are breaking out the ossified intellectual and moral moulds of their countries' Communist Parties; and (4) Youth in prosperous industrialized nations with a liberal tradition: Western democracies plus Poland, East Germany and Czechoslovakia — but not the USSR.
The non-Communists are now seeing that the welfare state, although a major improvement over classical capitalism, cannot meet the moral and practical requirements of a full democracy so long as decisions about investment and work are controlled in an autocratic manner. The new liberal Communists see equally clearly that state ownership per se can merely serve as an instrument for more effective suppression.

It is important to note that these four categories of people did not simply "spontaneously" emerge. They are products of certain social and intellectual conditions which persist and fortunately give no indication of slowing down. Indeed, insofar as any historical predictions can be rationally grounded, the only reasonable one would be to anticipate significant growth in their numbers and in the intensity of their efforts. Within both the trade unions and political parties of the left, industrial democracy will probably develop as the question for the 1970's. For example, I understand it is to be the central issue at the next convention of Sweden's Social Democratic Party.

THE CANADIAN SITUATION

Although much remains to be done in completing the Canadian welfare state, it is my view that at this time in our history the old parties will now compete for power on the basis of which of them will do it and at what speed. The point is that they now accept the principle.

If we New Democrats stay within the welfare state in terms of our policies and vocabulary, we will deserve the dismissal by Canadians which will inevitably follow.

I want to stress that the substance and vocabulary of freedom and democracy are very important aspects of Canadian history: Canadians cherish them. It is now our responsibility as Canadian socialists to show in concrete detail how these ideals are to be fully realized in our industrial system. If we make the effort I am convinced Canadians at this time will listen.

We must show that we want economic independence not because Americans are evil but because our aim is to create a better society, one in which democratic control over capital will enable us for example to build more houses instead of more office buildings, to do medical research instead of military research, and to remove economic disparities instead of allowing the "free" market to increase them.

We want to take away the exclusive right of the owners of Duplate of Canada, Ltd., to open and close factories in Oshawa not because it may be more efficient to do so, but because all such decisions should as a matter of justice involve the effective participation of the workers and communities affected.

Finally, we propose finding means of effective participation in decision-making at the job level by working people, whether they be unskilled, technicians, or professionals — not because of a commitment to an abstract principle, but because both common sense and the vast majority of empirical studies inform us that under such conditions people are happier, more creative, more co-operative.

TRADE UNIONS ARE CENTRAL

The fate of industrial democracy will be determined by those who work in Canada's offices and factories. Politicians and intellectuals can help but unless those directly affected by our authoritarian economy make the issue
their concern, nothing will avail. Ideals without actors is the essence of romanticism.

Of importance at this stage is the attitude of the trade union movement. Directly or indirectly trade unions in Canada have been the major source of rights and benefits enjoyed by working people in Canada. Whether in unionized plants or offices or not, benefits possessed by all employees have been the result of vigorous and determined union men. It is shallow nonsense to think otherwise.

There is no need to list the past achievements of our unions for people attending a Woodsworth Foundation Conference. The question we have before us is “Where do we go from here?”

I think the following are the relevant and over-lapping questions trade unionists should consider:

1) Is the trade union to remain essentially a defensive institution, one which restricts its activites to protecting the worker after action is taken by others?

2) Is the trade union’s function mainly to get more for its members; more money, more leisure, more pensions?

Finally,

3) Is the trade union going to accept the adversary function as its sole and permanent one, refusing to take any responsibility for what are called “management” decisions?

Although I understand the practical and historical reasons for these traditional positions, I think that they must now be seen as far too restrictive. This is particularly true for our larger and more powerful unions, e.g., steel, auto, and packinghouse workers, who are now in a position to make qualitatively different demands. The United Automobile Workers have already moved in this direction. In their present contract proposals are demands concerning automobile price levels, pollution control, and the removal of barbaric plant level conditions (clocking in and out, high protective fences, and armed guards.)

Earlier speakers, notably Chris Trower and Andre Bekerman have made sound, practical proposals for immediate action. Like them I believe we should use and build upon our collective bargaining tradition, particularly in breaking down the barbarous “management rights” clauses in contracts.

One by one each of these “rights” must come within the legitimate power of the trade union. Each union will be the best judge on which of the rights can be best attacked at a particular time. The ultimate objective however is clear: traditional authoritarian control of profits, investment, pricing, discipline, and product innovation must be broken.

CONCLUSION

The central idea of industrial democracy is that all power — productive, community and parliamentary — should be subject to direct or indirect democratic control; and such power should be used to develop a civilized society whose benefits and possibilities will be equally available to all.

Together with the trade unions, the New Democratic Party should make the creation of a democratic industrial Canada its guiding ideological principle. This is what the “new” in New Democratic Party should be all about.

Edward Broadbent,
M.P. (Oshawa-Whitby)
The Case for Political Action.

by Stephen Lewis, MPP

As might be expected, this conference has etched again the persistent dilemma in discussing Industrial Democracy. Let me say that although it is not something about which one storms the battlements, the subject does present a very real problem. It is a problem which, incidentally, applies to similar social movements in society at large.

Those who are skeptical about the formula of Industrial Democracy can make, it seems to me, a pretty compelling case. They say that there are so many elemental, primary concerns of the trade union movement to be defended and extended, that they just have not the time to explore the "joys" of workers' control. Nor are they willing to jeopardize the gut struggles for wages, hours and conditions of employment by experimentation — by a calculated assault on all areas of residual managerial rights.

And in some real sense, they are right. Contract negotiations are not easy. The smallest extensions — even those which involve a clause providing for consultation about technological change — involve bitter battles. What has been accepted in European practice for decades is here often beyond the pale. What is more, at this very moment in time; when a phobic obsession has developed about austerity; when society is on the road to a self-induced recession; when governments have become pathological about the war against inflation; the preservation of basic economic gains is as much as most unions can handle.

Let me take it a step further. The antagonists of Industrial Democracy point out, again with some justice, that such a modest percentage of the work force is actually organized in this society that there are worlds to conquer in the simple process of forming a union, without worrying about sharing in decisions, be it by way of consultation, co-option, or co-determination over profits, productivity, technology, etc. And again that argument in many ways has merit. It is reinforced right across Canada, but especially in provinces like British Columbia, Newfoundland and Ontario, by labour legislation which frustrates, violates and impedes the collective bargaining process at every turn. Organizing the unorganized in Ontario is a piece of social heroism: you have to develop a martyr's neurosis in order to achieve occasional success.
The government, the Ontario Labour Relations Act, the courts, the companies, the branch-plant economy, all conspire to resist, often savagely, most attempts at forming a viable bargaining unit. Recall, for a moment, the litany in Ontario alone: Proctor-Silex, Tiico Plastics, Wallaceburg, Hanes Hosiery, Allanson Manufacturing, Pure Spring Canada Limited, Weiner Electric, Alpine Meat Products, Peterborough Examiner, Broadview Poultry. Most of them catastrophically lost, or walk a tight-rope between victory and defeat.

Now think for a moment of the enormous expenditure of energy and man-hours. What time is left for Industrial Democracy?

But that is only the half of it. In many ways, this society is becoming more and more primitive. A week ago yesterday morning, at 9:00 a.m., 600 workers at Dunlop Canada Ltd. were unilaterally thrown out-of-work — with that arbitrary despotism which only the corporate world can impose. There was no notice, no consultation, no concern and certainly no compassion.

Yesterday afternoon, Cliff Pilkey, Ed Broadbent, and I spoke at a meeting of 1,000 laid-off auto workers, most of whom are now permanently unemployed: General Motors currently pursuing the profit motive in a way as reckless as anything since corporate Darwinism — junking jobs purposefully, frivolously, maniacally.

Now what do you do when your society is so uncivilized? How do the various trade unions cope, especially weaker and smaller unions, where they are confronted by absolute power exercised absolutely? How can one expect them to engage in the refinements of radical Industrial Democracy in the face of such urgent, simple reality? It’s as though we were back to Year One. Job security, incredibly enough, has become the battle-ground. It’s easy enough to say that the workers at Dunlop (or Duplate) should have been in the position to prevent or to control the move, or to assume ownership of the company; but I trust that everyone recognizes what a revolutionary extension of the collective bargaining process that would constitute. In this country, we need direct legislative action. Dunlop is a perfect example of where collective bargaining leaves off, and politics begins.

For, to top it all, we live in the most belligerently capitalist society in the world. The forms and structures are so rigid and oppressive that to challenge the system fundamentally often seems an exercise in impotence. There is a natural human instinct to preserve the gains, however frail, in the face of such an industrial monolith.

But for that very reason perhaps, the advocates of Industrial Democracy fight hard, and their arguments, too, strike home. Using exactly the same analysis, they arrive at a rather different conclusion. They assert that precisely because there is such a sense of personal and collective futility; precisely because there is such a desperate sense of alienation; precisely because the basic collective bargaining process occupies so much of our time; precisely because the capitalist system closes in evermore inflexibly and the getting at control of capital is crucial, it’s absolutely imperative that we storm the barricades of worker participation and/or control. Not only because it is philosophically right, not only because it reasserts some vestige of self-worth, not only because it provides a rationale for the trade union movement which might otherwise be enmeshed in its own day-to-day concerns; but most important because the only way you can cope with North American capitalism is by challenging it on every front simultaneously, — industrial as well as political — if need be to extremes.
It may be that that's where the two supposedly differing views converge. Perhaps it becomes solely a matter of how far you will press the collective bargaining system. Some of us turn to political action sooner than others. And surely that's how you resolve the basic dilemma. Otherwise, as the conference shows, it is difficult to arrive at any sort of consensus on means or ends. The same is entirely true of analogous social movements.

I can remember many years ago arguing bitterly with friends about what the devil one did with one's life. Even then, they were inclined to repudiate the political process as an irrelevant mockery, an exercise in ego and self-indulgence, a piece of obvious futility where men and women toyed with words and tip-toed about at the fringes of social change. For them it was an offensive charade: life was too short to play such games.

And so they began systematically to devote themselves to little—not lesser—causes: civil liberties, settlement houses, work with disturbed children, work with Indians, work with agricultural communities—always confined, always limited, but extremely satisfying in the sense that it gave of concrete accomplishment. They might win only one case; they might help only one person; they might effect only one change; but it seemed a great deal more real than a whimper or words in parliament, and at least, however parochial, there were no illusions.

Well, that basic approach has of course become a fetish. Everyone talks of participatory democracy and direct action. Everyone extolls the virtues of extra-parliamentary activities as being complementary to, perhaps far more relevant than, parliamentary activity. Certainly, say some, it is more useful.

And of course, with the fetish comes the dialectic, a dialectic of three kinds. First, the argument that the last 25 years have shown a dangerous erosion of minority rights in favour of unthinking, insensitive majority rule. Second, that the human condition is so deprived of self-respect, of any sense of autonomy, that the decision-making process must somehow be recaptured. Third, that since the capitalist system is unlikely to be altered by the political status quo, it must somehow be transformed by direct social protest and/or the exercise of power by various social movements, working out there in the "real world". In other words, those who articulate a full measure of Industrial Democracy in labour-management relations are often the counterparts of direct action in all these other areas.

Now let me add immediately and decisively that those who advocate a much greater measure of workers' control by no means necessarily eschew the political process. Ed Broadbent, Andre Bekerman, Gil Levine, Chris Trower, attest to that conclusively.

However, I do think they might agree that a certain rift is increasingly evident between contemporary politics and other social movements. There is a ritual rejection of politics and the politician. It matters not whether that rejection is fashionable, cynical or ideological—it exists! More often than not, it stems from this sudden plethora of activist pressure groups. Everywhere we turn, new groups spring to the fore asserting rights, proclaiming injustice, ridiculing the political process. There is no question but that these causes are just, but the limitations are so severe that surely it is not possible to believe that the alternative of participatory democracy is, of itself, sufficient.

Look at the tenants associations: a classic struggle in the confrontation between private property and political freedom. But when the chips are down, where is the power of the tenant's association? What, in the final
analysis, can they assert against the landlord, be he an individual or a company. Sure, a few out-raged protests and you may win a standard lease-form, or remove security deposits to be replaced by the last month's rent in advance, or give the bailiff a good whack in the plexis. But which tenant's association has achieved collective bargaining rights and how will they ever do so? And however much in theory there may be dreams of withholding rent, denying tenancy, or picketing a building, will it, or can it come about in this generation?

And what of the students and their tempestuous reform of universities? The battles are fought, the battles are won, and nothing changes. In the vast majority of universities in the Province of Ontario, boards of governors are still corporate and absolute. The tokenism of one student, or two students, or five academics at the so-called decision-making level is ludicrous.

In the case of the University of Toronto, for example, a sense of social change is achieved by a ‘Commission of University Government’ which is simply a masquerade for the President to rule the campus through an intricate system of self-perpetuating bureaucratic committees. The dominant institutional form has won the day in most instances. Beyond Clarke Kerr there lies Claude Bissell. Those who think that the power has been transferred, live, with respect, in a fantasy world. Dow Chemical no longer recruits on campus; it’s been replaced by Honeywell Industries, makers of fragmentation bombs. And every year, half a million dollars or more comes directly from the Pentagon to finance research projects, some open, some, I am certain, secret, in Ontario universities. And Dr. Solandt calls the shots for the board of governors while defending ERCO against those of us paranoid enough to believe that phosphates are undesirable.

And what of demonstrations against Vietnam outside the U.S. Consulate; against OHSIP outside the Legislature; against farm costs on tractors on the highways; against authoritarianism at the Ontario College of Art; against the Spadina Expressway? These demonstrations are tremendously important and never to be underestimated. Indeed they are always to be encouraged. But make no mistake about it, what we are witnessing in these so-called contemporary social movements is institutionalized dissent (often middle-class), achieving a head-line on page 5 of today’s Globe and Mail. With all the will in the world they cannot be otherwise described.


And what of the Indians, and what of the poor, and what of the working poor, and what of the ghettos of urban renewal? The same pattern: intense organization and direct action. But in every instance, the limits of social change are, in the great scheme of things, minimal.

Along the way many peculiar forms occur, some encouraging, some bewildering. An alderman, representing an oppressed working-class proletariat, wins election to the City Council of Toronto and acts with
absolute candor as the voice of the people. He reflects their every whim; if they do not speak, he does not speak, whatever their stance, it becomes his stance. Truly admirable — a tidal breath of fresh air. But social forces do not operate in a vacuum, they operate within a given system with particular values and socio-economic structures. If you come at that system with dissent alone, without an alternative social philosophy, idealism turns sour. In France, it went Poujadist. At the Chicago trial of 7, one is faced with the reductio ad absurdem. The state goes berserk, and the voice of protest, ever noble, becomes a parody of social change.

This then is the dilemma. We all agree that social change there must be. What I am saying, however, is that all of these contemporary social movements must, I repeat, must be linked to legitimate political action. Otherwise, if you want my frank opinion, it's a complete cop-out.

If it's thought that we, as politicians, are playing at the periphery of the capitalist system, then let me say that individual direct action groups which denigrate politics are willing pawns of the status quo. They will never achieve, by themselves, fundamental changes in this society. And as an aside, if it's the rhetoric of revolution that I am supposed to believe, then it will have to be taken somewhere else. There is about as much chance of creating a mass movement to seize power in this country, as there is for the Africans in the shanty-towns outside Johannesburg, by themselves, to overthrow apartheid. What is surely far more exciting is the possibility of using participatory democracy as a catalyst for the political process. That is the way it works best. Politicians are never more bestirred than in response to some relentless and acid pressure. And that, I suppose, is what makes every similar social movement, from tenants associations to those who argue Industrial Democracy, potentially so effective.

Nonsense say the cynics. Potentially effective? How? Through contemporary politics where all you politicians have been seduced by your own role-playing? Well, that may be. But if it's true, then the answer is not to deny politics. The answer is to re-enforce a given political party. It could be that well truly have to democratize the NDP, and I, for one, have always looked upon our entry into municipal politics as a major step in that direction.

But willy-nilly, let me put an absolute conviction on the record. There is only one way for a profound and fundamental alteration of contemporary capitalism. A socialist party has to take power using the old-fashioned electoral process. And that's worth as much commitment, devotion, and energy, as any other cause one cares to name.

When we have taken power, it may conceivably be too late — though I doubt it. When we have taken power, there may be some who are disappointed. But if we do take power in the next very few years, as I believe we will in the Province of Ontario, then it will still be possible to reconstruct the economic order in ways so dramatic as to qualitatively change the quality of life.

Therefore, when people say to me: 'Industrial Democracy', 'tenants associations', 'student protests', 'anti-Vietnam marches', 'demonstrations against the Rand Report', 'submissions to the Senate Committee on Poverty'; I say to them: Bravo — by all means, but remember where the decisive war must ultimately be fought.
Many people feel a twinge of guilt when they’re cynical about politics, or they gently depreciate politics. I’m less charitable — I look upon it as folly. I remember with Lord Acton that “there is another world for the expiation of guilt, but the wages of folly are payable here below.”

by Stephen Lewis,
MPP Scarborough West
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