recognition and representation in the affairs of government, so in the industrial realm there are constituent elements entitled to a degree of recognition and representation not hitherto conceded in the government of industry. Too often problems arising in the field of industrial relations are regarded as problems of only two dimensions—Capital on the one side, and Labor on the other. To my mind, they are problems of four dimensions, embracing rights and duties on the part of Management distinct from those of Capital, and rights and duties on the part of the Community equally as entitled to recognition as any on the part of Labor, Capital or Management.

Here and there to-day large-visioned employers—lesser or greater De Montforts in their way—are calling to their industrial councils representatives of Labor and of the Community, as well as of Capital and Management. They are seeking to work a wise system of joint control. In the field of industry, they have conceded the principle of representation, not to privileged classes only, but to all who participate in production.

III.

How vast has been the transformation in the relative powers of kings, lords, and commons since the days of Edward the First! Control in political government has widened from absolutism to executive authority broad-based upon a people's will. We have here suggested the third point of resemblance in the parallel of the industrial unrest of our day with the political agitation of bygone years.

The effort to work out a political constitution which would recognize all constituent elements and prevent, in the affairs of government, a monoply of control by any one, finds its parallel to-day in the field of industrial agitation in the effort to prevent any one of the four parties to industry exercising a monopoly of control. The revolutionary or extreme movements of our day are mostly in the nature of inevitable reactions against monopoly of control by one of the parties to industry.

As a guide to government in industry, we shall not err