

co-operation, unity of aim and purpose, feeling of partnership in industry, can arise only from a clear-headed understanding of the deep, underlying, economic realities of the situation and a sympathetic determination to act on the square. When this economic understanding and this ethical determination are reasonably developed on each side, there will be no insuperable difficulty arising from creating machinery, organisation, means, for getting together. But, if these mental conditions do not pre-exist, the most perfect machinery that can be devised for the purpose will be of no avail. There will be no intelligence to guide it and no motive power to actuate it. Hence, those who have this problem at heart and have any real understanding of the essence of it, will make use of every available educational influence to this end. Clear understanding, essential cordiality, and downright good-will may succeed even with imperfect machinery. But without these, the whole arrangement becomes a sham, a makeshift, a temporary bulwark that only increases the disaster when it finally gives way.

Nevertheless, proper organisation for getting together is not to be despised. Suitable and efficient arrangements for this purpose will go far towards maintaining a proper and sympathetic atmosphere and will assist in keeping up and in increasing good-will. They will also furnish the best opportunity for continuing that democratic education whose groundwork we are pre-supposing as prepared during school life. Bungling organisation, like badly designed machinery, causes much loss in friction and may lead to an early breakdown.

In this creation of democratic organisation for unifying the aims of Capital and Labour, Great Britain is once more the pioneer. We instinctively turn to her for industrial experience, as a child turns to a wise parent. Her experience in industry is many centuries older than ours. Her labour is much more highly unionized. Her Trade Unions have passed through two centuries of struggle. Her differences between Labour and Capital are more clearly defined. Her class distinctions, for other (historical) reasons, are more marked—a fact that has added to the bitterness between Capital and Labour. These