I've enjoyed this little episode reported by Douglas McGregor in The Human Side of Enterprise:

"An agent of the Textile Workers Union of America likes to tell the story of the occasion when a new manager appeared in the mill where he was working. The manager came into the weave room the day he arrived. He walked directly over to the agent and said, 'Are you Belloc?' The agent acknowledged that he was. The manager said, 'I am the new manager here. When I manage a mill, I run it. Do you understand?'

"The agent nodded, and then waved his hand. The workers, who had been intently watching this encounter, immediately shut down every loom in the room. The agent then turned to the manager and said, 'All right, go ahead and run it.'"

Had I ever been required to "take sides" in the episode, I probably would have supported the agent. More revealing, perhaps, is the observation that until recently I tended to see such conflict as happening to other people. Today I can see it happening to myself. "The times," cries the folk singer, "they are a changin'."

While each of us lives in a unique and partly private world, we all are affected by changes in our mutual conditions of life. It seems to me that one of these changes, brought about by a number of forces within and without academia, is a growing cleavage between university faculties and their administrative hierarchies. It seems to be happening in Oregon and indeed within our own institution.

I find this a matter for deep personal regret. But the hard fact is that the warm colleague relationships I once knew and loved are almost gone. In their place I find formalism, polarization and a growing trend toward adversary relationships. The rate of change has quickened in very recent years.

It is useless to point a finger of blame. We all are responsible; we all are victims, faculty and administration alike. We are caught up in growth, in financial crises, in civil rights, war, in the times. We are imperfect mortals moving along together on this ball of earth, striving for what we individually believe to be right and just, and in the scuffle we are changing our relationships with each other.

Beneath the footwork lies a basic issue: a shift of power from faculty to administration. It is a shift - part actual, part potential - which many faculty members consider unwarranted, or threatening, or both. Some feel that firm, organized effort is needed to protect their rights and interests.

I think it would be a mistake for anyone to assume that the tenure controversy constitutes the entire problem. While tenure is a factor, the problem involves the total fabric of rights and rules. Traditional faculty "rights," "prerogatives," "inputs," - call them what you will - seem to be eroding rapidly in many important areas, such as work loads, scheduling, control of curricula, performance appraisals, promotions, salaries and perhaps others. The erosion has followed a change in administrative attitude and style, which in turn has its own causative factors.

It seems unlikely that we can go back. We are locked into our times. We must go on. We might, however, look to history for guidance. Cleavages similar to those now developing in the university occurred long ago in other
segments of society. McGregor’s little episode reveals a fairly typical result in the industrial sector. Some professional groups recently have reacted in similar ways.

I am not at all sure that many of us would wish for that kind of solution, but hard-nosed unionism certainly is among the possible ways of dealing with oppressive management wherever it occurs. People respond to their environments. Those who feel abused, ignored and threatened band together. Unions arise in response to needs; managements generally get the kind of employee relations they deserve.

Unfortunately for us all, managements in the public sector often are faced with severe external pressures and constraints. As these and other pressures build, employee groups must meet them or pay the consequences. There is evidence to suggest that academic people in Oregon have begun to pay some of the same consequences that have driven their counterparts in other states to collective bargaining.

Perhaps I am too pessimistic. I hope so. But in all honesty I see no signs indicating a reversal of the trend. The loss of faculty power in Oregon and at OSU, which has resulted from external pressures, administrators who yield too readily to those pressures, a thirst for power by some administrators, unfortunate administrative appointments, student unrest, and a fragmented too-passive faculty, seems likely to continue. The forces are in motion and our divided faculty presently appears to be in no position to fend them off.

While I have no ready-made solution for the problem, it seems to me that our faculty almost inevitably will be driven to some form of collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining is not a dirty word. It is a response to reality,
an honorable and workable system for protecting rights and balancing power carried out under law by many kinds of employee "associations" and "unions" and their employers. It means that rules are established bilaterally, rather than unilaterally. It means that the rules are followed. When disputes arise, it provides a fair and dependable system of appeal and resolution. In short, it means the settlement of differences through negotiation by parties of roughly equal, rather than unequal, power.

Collective bargaining is not without its human and financial costs, but competently handled it can foster understanding, peace and productivity. It even can be creative. It will come to OSU when enough of us believe that its benefits outweigh its costs. Its ultimate form will depend upon pooled judgments, but its arrival in some form may come sooner than we think.

Some of us, as members of an AAUP/CSEA committee on tenure and collective bargaining, are trying to develop and weigh alternative approaches in anticipation of the need. At this point we are simply a study group with no commitment to any particular approach or organization. We are analyzing the situation and talking to a variety of people from on and off the campus. We know there is much to learn.

If you have an input for us, we (Fred Harris, Lafe Harter, John Keltner, Helen McHugh and I) would be happy to receive it. At appropriate times we will try to communicate what we have learned. Meanwhile, every member of the faculty would be wise, at the very least, to let the idea of collective bargaining percolate through his mind.

Jack L. Rettig
Professor, Business Admin.

November 22, 1971
A WORD OF WARNING

The moral fortitude required of Les Strickler and Paul Weswig in publicly recommending consideration of collective bargaining as a means of united faculty action must be recognized and applauded. I take this opportunity to add my support to the recommendation to consider unionization, although I see little probability that we can maintain our rights to provisions for academic freedom and tenure if we abandon our claim to professional status.

I wish to propose a way in which the faculty may receive professional advice in seeking the proper means and in avoiding pitfalls while attempting to organize for collective bargaining. I recommend that each faculty member donate 0.1 of 1% of his annual salary to provide a fund to bring to the campus professionals with expert knowledge and experience in the problems of unorganized workers. I suggest that Harry Bridges, Cesar Chavez, Leonard Woodcock and the presidents of other unions not notorious for adherence to sweetheart contracts be requested to send their top organizers to the campus at our expense. These speakers would be assigned the topic 'How May Unorganized Workers Obtain Protection?' The speakers would be instructed that they are not being asked to organize the faculty but that they are requested to inform the faculty of the best ways to approach the problems of organization. The students must be invited to participate in these discussions which, ideally, would be arranged under the aegis of the Faculty Forum.

The reason that the management of the State System currently views the development of the adversary relationship inherent in the bargaining process with such great equanimity is their belief that apathetic faculties will opt to have a company union as their agent. The line of least resistance for the faculty (and greatest comfort for management) would be to allow either OSEA or AAUP to handle the duty. I've been a member of both these organizations for 24 years. At times I have been active in both organizations. Experience has led me to the same opinion of them that I have of the Faculty Senate. They more nearly serve the purposes of management than those of the faculty. These organizations require much time and energy of concerned faculty members in return for a mostly unfulfilled promise of eventual benefit to the institution.

The faculty's needs probably will be served best by a new agency erected specifically for the purpose of bargaining with management. Whether this agency should be local, statewide or national in its scope has yet to be determined. As of now, I am sure of one thing. The faculty as yet is in no position to make an intelligent and informed decision. However, I firmly believe that the procedure I have proposed is workable and will be effective. As evidence of this belief I pledge $20 to initiate a fund to bring informed professional organizers to the campus so that we may be instructed in how we may protect ourselves from management.

The word of warning mentioned in my title has already been sounded in my first paragraph. I see little probability that we can maintain our prerogatives of academic freedom and tenure if we abandon our professional status for the untested protection of collective bargaining.
In spite of the fact that some members of the legislature and of the State Board, the Chancellor, some institutional executives, some deans and even some department chairmen have made obvious attacks upon the security of our professional prerogatives of tenure and academic freedom, these same people continue to express a preternatural concern that their attacks will result in unionization and an adversary relationship between the faculty and management. The repetetive insistence with which these members of the managerial establishment parrot this common refrain has made a great impression on me and forces me to conclude that management views such an eventuality as desirable and that their doleful dirge is as phony as plastic grass. In fact, the managerial establishment at Oregon State University has already discussed the probable success of moves to replace notices of appointment by limited term contracts.

If management considers unionization and collective bargaining more desirable than tenure and academic freedom should the faculty accede passively to this desire? What alternative does the faculty have? I recommend that a grass roots, do-or-die resistance be organized by the faculty and students at all of the institutions of the State System. The public should be informed that the struggle to retain tenure and academic freedom is a fight to preserve the intellectual stature of the institutions. I further recommend that the faculty senates, the interinstitutional faculty senate, OSEA and AAUP not be involved as these are "officially recognized" organizations and are subject to control by management. Individual members of these bodies may use them as platforms from which to obtain public recognition and understanding of the fight being waged by students and faculty against the anti-intellectual stance of management.

A concerted effort to involve the students must be made. Ever since the war there have been increasing protests by students that they are being treated as mass produced, inanimate objects. I am certain a majority of them will appreciate the further decline in their rights to a true education if the classroom becomes a union shop.

There will certainly be a few of my colleagues so bemused by the claims of the ultimate superiority of the methods of American Business Management that they will want to argue that Higher Education can surely benefit by similar methods. I can only remind such individuals that the managers are the same wonderful people that have given this country the Edsel, the FTX, the Atomic/Vessel Savannah, the SST, the Pentagon Papers, Lockheed, Anitchka Island, the Corps of Engineers, the U-2 incident, the 1950 version of the University of Massachusetts, the Kent State and Jackson State massacres et cetera ad nauseum. We cannot afford to servilely permit the managers to inflict similar disasters on the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Harry K. Phinney
Professor, Botany & Pl. Pathology
November 19, 1971
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND THE DECISION PROCESS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY
by John H. Keltner

The remarks of my colleagues on collective bargaining in this and previous issues of the Faculty Forum concern all of us. We are facing important changes in the structure and organization of higher education. According to Robert Theobald these changes could bring the destruction of institutionalized education in this country and a return to highly individualized systems. The increasing numbers of able and qualified students dropping out or just not entering higher education should be recognized as something more than the usual erosion process.

The pressures upon the institution of higher education are growing rapidly and are felt by all of us. Public insistence upon greater accountability of the administration of educational systems must not be scorned nor ignored. Students' insistence on work that has greater relevance to their real world cannot be avoided.

Eventually the complaints and the attacks fall upon the faculties. The pointed and critical questions now being raised about our systems of tenure, promotion, hiring, salary determination, purposes and methods of instruction, scope of courses, freedom within the classroom, etc. are only preliminaries to the big attack. These challenges are not mere continuations of discontents from other generations and other times. They may have their roots in other eras but they now represent substantive and insistent questions about the continued existence of faculties with any degree of autonomy and freedom. To take flight from the arena where these matters are being fought out is to engage in truly fatal "headinsandism."

As this struggle for our very existence becomes clearer we are becoming more and more aware of collective bargaining as a reality of public life. Since President Kennedy's Order 10988 made it possible for federal employees to bargain with their employers, the expansion and sophistication of public sector bargaining has moved rapidly. Public employees at every level of government are organizing and bargaining. Teachers in the public schools in Oregon, for example, have been involved in the process (called "consultation" to avoid the onus of the word "bargaining") for about five years. In the last legislature, substantive changes were made in the law to make bargaining processes more functional and viable.

In the Eastern part of the United States, some colleges and faculties are now moving into bargaining postures in the face of real threats to their welfare and professional freedom. These threats are no less here than they are in the East. We are simply less aware of their significance and reality.
There is no way in which we can avoid involvement in bargaining processes. We must confront this reality with a concert of effort quite uncommon to the academic community. Failure to achieve this concert will simply hasten our professional demise.

Many of us have viewed with disdain what we considered a "process of the crass marketplace." Too many of us feel that we are above such involvement in the determination of our personal welfare. This kind of olympian seclusion from reality will bring us nothing but hemlock in our wine.

There is truly nothing unprofessional about the bargaining process. It has a long and distinguished history. Labor vs. management bargaining is hardly the exclusive area of its application. Agriculture has used the process for a number of years in the coops and in the struggles between the growers and the processors. International affairs have, almost since the beginning of the nation states, relied on various forms of bargaining out the conditions of the relationships between nations. The statesmanship of men like Ralph Bunche, Dag Hammarskold, Trigrye Lie, and others came into being as they became bargaining agents and later mediators in the realm of international bargaining (called diplomacy). The church has long depended on forms of collective bargaining to conduct its affairs. Ecumenical efforts throughout the centuries have involved occasional massive bargaining events as well as almost daily negotiations for the favor of deity.

In our own University, we have engaged in considerable collective bargaining as we struggle to develop curricula and courses. We regularly become embroiled with each other about our respective rights to offer certain courses or our relationship to the academic community itself. While many of these are individual confrontations there are many which are part of a process of working out decisions suitable to the university community. In these instances, representatives of various groups negotiate with each other to accomplish curriculum adjustments. While we have called this process by many other names, it is frequently one of the purest forms of collective bargaining. There is, thus, no reason for us to turn away from collective bargaining about our personal and professional welfare on the grounds that it is below our dignity. We, ourselves, have dignified it in our own deliberations. It is reasonable to do so.

Intense bargaining between the faculty and the administration of higher education is inevitable now. Thus, it is necessary for us to organize in a fashion unfamiliar to the academic profession. Provincial differences of academic genre must be set aside. As a total faculty we must address ourselves to the task of getting into condition for the events to come.

As we do this several questions arise. Must we adopt the same game rules now used by the private sector in the labor vs management
bargaining? Are there unique dimensions which can be developed to fit our particular conditions and personalities? Where does collective bargaining fit into the University scheme of decision-making?

I'll tackle the last question first. As I see it, bargaining is only a part of the process whereby individuals and groups make decisions. It is neither the best nor the worst way in which to arrive at a mutual commitment which can guarantee action. If we should set the various processes into a continuum I think we would all agree that the most desirable decision-making process would be joint deliberation which results in a voluntary commitment of all persons involved in the problem. At the other end of the continuum are those processes which involve unilateral decision-making by individuals or small power groups and the enforcement of these decisions on all others regardless of position. Sometimes, at this level, the decisions are imposed by force of one kind or another.

Ranging between the extremes of full open joint decision-making and closed unilateral decisions are the processes involving bargaining. When the joint deliberation processes fail to achieve results which can be translated into necessary action, we quite naturally begin to choose up sides. At this point the bargaining process can begin to work. Rather than declare war, we gather our force and power from our constituencies, select representatives or agents and send them to bargain out the conditions of our relationship with each other. Factors of persuasion, argument, power, influence, and strategy become involved. The representatives and/or agents at the bargaining table must be experts in the processes of bargaining. There is no substitute for this skill at the bargaining table.

Arising out of the bargaining relationship are two third-party processes which are receiving greater attention in the public sector bargaining than ever before. Mediation is a process whereby a disinterested third party assists the parties in working out a decision. Mediators do not make any decisions, they have no power to enforce any decisions, and they cannot force the parties to any decision which mediators might believe is justified. The mediator is, essentially, a catalyst to the decision-making through bargaining. He is there because both parties have recognized that there are conditions which make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to work their problems out alone. Mediators are called in to provide privileged communication channels, to assist in making suggestions for settlements which the parties may have overlooked, to encourage the parties to work the problem through and to help one or both parties "save face" when they are overextended.

When the parties are unable to find agreement, even with the help of a mediator, they may then seek the help of another kind of third party, an arbitrator. At this point the parties to a dispute agree to give away their right to make a decision themselves. The
arbitrator hears the arguments from both sides and makes a decision which both parties have agreed to follow prior to the appointment of the arbitrator.

It is important to all of us to recognize the quite different functions of the two kinds of third party intervention. Mediation does not abridge the function of both parties to make their own decisions. Arbitration, by mutual agreement of the parties, takes away the right of the parties to make their own decision. Obviously, if the parties wish to protect their right to make decisions, they should attempt mediation first. Arbitration should be used only after all other possible peaceful processes of reaching decisions are exhausted.

It won't take X-ray vision for you to recognize, immediately, that as the joint processes cease to work, we tend to move to other means of decision-making in the University. These conditions have been present from the beginning.

It is becoming apparent that the present conditions in the University no longer allow for joint deliberation and decision-making on many matters in the University of direct personal concern to us as faculty members. Where once faculties could deliberate on policy and then see it applied, now their policy functions are being abridged by no less than the legislature itself. Where once the Chancellor may have been the voice of the professional faculty, he now is the administrator of the public's universities. As such he is answerable not to the faculty but to the government and the people of the State. It is no shock to me that Chancellor Liebwellen spoke as he did on his visit here last month about his role in relation to the faculty. He is a realist in this respect. He is the resident manager of the people's institutions of higher education in this State. His job is to see that these institutions produce what the people of the state want them to produce.

Likewise, deans and department heads are less and less representative of their faculties and more and more middle-managers of the university enterprise. Their responsibilities to the faculty as such are diminishing and their responsibilities and accountability to the top management of the university is increasing. More and those seeking to fill the administrative positions in the university are looking for professional managers rather than academicans. This makes very good sense in terms of the present condition of the university as a state enterprise.

This condition brings an inevitable scism between faculties and university administrations. The personal and professional welfare of the faculties as such is less a direct concern of the administrators than is the maintaining of the institution and its service to the government and the people of the state. Insofar as the welfare and condition of the faculty is directly related to the output and the responsibility of the university in the eyes of the public the administrator is concerned with the faculty. You and I may feel that the welfare of the faculty is the first priority matter
matter in the maintenance of the institution. This view is not necessarily held by the professional administrator.

Under these circumstances it becomes necessary that the faculties of the universities seek ways of protecting and advancing their own welfare in order that they may perform their tasks as teachers and researchers with maximum effectiveness.

In the face of the growing scism we have several alternatives. Among them is the attempt to increase the amount and broaden the scope of the joint decision-making processes within the university and within the state government in relation to the welfare of the faculties. Attempts at this, while weak at best, have indicated that we are not very effective. Our own decision-making processes are almost grossly inadequate to handle such matters. Some of the evidence for that can be seen at almost every faculty senate meeting.

Another alternative is to abandon any effort to be a part of the essential decision-making concerning our personal professional solves. This choice I reject immediately. I still think that I have a right and a responsibility to be a party to the decisions regarding my own professional future.

The last alternative is some sort of collective bargaining. This is not an unhappy alternative for it provides us with possibilities of an even greater voice in our own welfare than we have had in the past. It seems to be the only responsible alternative which we can handle.

There is no reason why we have to adopt the form and style of bargaining used in private labor-management relations. Ours can become a different type, designed to meet our unique situations. It may be that we will have to experiment with a four-sided bargaining: faculty-students-administration-public. In such manner it may become an advanced form of representative joint decision-making. We can also introduce mediation processes much earlier in the situation than is typical in the private sector and thus bring to bear the talents of the mediator in helping us solve our own problems. It is also possible that we can develop a greater and more effective use of arbitration when our differences become organizational disputes.

Beginning the preparation for bargaining is not easy nor is there a clear path to follow. We must examine the existing organized faculty units to determine their viability as representatives of the faculty. Such units would include the faculty senate, the faculties of the several schools, and the faculties of the departments.

If these units cannot or are not allowed to handle the functions of working out the relationship with the employers, we must then seek other organization forms on which to build our strength. One thing is sure, we must find some form of organization which will give us
maximum power to bargain with the administrators and policy makers. Without a soundly organized faculty constituency which will, if necessary, back up its agents and representatives with action, there is no use even beginning. We have at present several possibilities which must be examined: The AAUP, The OSFA, The AFT, and the possibility of a new faculty unit of statewide nature.

Beginning, also, brings on the problems of selecting, preparing and supporting those representatives who must be our voice at the decision-making table. These people, whether they be representatives chosen from amongst our own people or trained agents whom we employ, must be expert in the skills of negotiation and bargaining. The state employers are learning through their negotiations with the classified personnel that the unskilled negotiator is a serious handicap. With that knowledge they are bringing in more skilled people to represent them at the table. We must be prepared to do the same.

So, I think we are on our way whether we want to go or not. The inevitable is here. We simply delayed too long in refining our own joint decision-making processes so that they would provide ample protection for us (the faculty). Now we must take the necessary steps to provide protection within the system now emerging in the state university complex. Each of us must assume responsibility and share in the effort and sacrifices or all of us will suffer immeasurably!

John W. Keltner

November, 1971
Collective Bargaining For Faculty Members

Will the faculty of Oregon State University join the trade union movement? A few years ago such an idea would be unthinkable. Today a small but growing number of professors would eagerly embrace collective bargaining. Others view this prospect with revulsion. Meanwhile the majority are unaware of the events which are changing the world we have known.

At this point it is difficult to determine if Oregon professors will adopt unionism in any significant numbers in the near future. Because it can happen here, we should explore the possibilities and implications.

Men join unions because they feel unable to influence the important decisions which determine their careers. When their employers treat them as groups and not individuals, they discover they have but little influence and almost no bargaining power. The exercise of arbitrary power by their superiors can damage their careers and sometimes even end them. When hope of advancement through individual achievement is replaced by the realization that one is but an unimportant member of an undifferentiated group, one is ready for unionism. Finally when other groups seem to be making gains by organizing, unionism may come quickly.

University communities would seem to provide infertile ground for unionism. Professors have possessed status, influence, and security such as people in few other professions enjoy. Although compensation in terms of the required training has always been modest, most of us have had significant and regular pay increases, at least until the last few years. Professors in comparable universities outside of Oregon have done even better. For most Oregon professors there has been the chance to move elsewhere if conditions here should change for the worse.

Professors have been treated here as professionals and not employees to whom regulations must be applied. Under President Strand who ran his own show, professors felt they had influence. We were smaller then and he was readily accessible. Although the Senate was hardly responsive to the faculty, he seemed to be. At least many felt they had his ear.

As the University grew, President Jensen introduced more administrative machinery and procedures. At the same time he transformed the Senate into a body representing faculty. In numerous other ways faculty responsibility and influence grew.

A University such as ours is highly decentralized. In our departments we determine who our colleagues shall be, our course offerings, our standards for promotion, how to cover for sick colleagues, and in some cases who the chairman shall be. We have some influence in the choice of deans and other administrative officers.

Most matters in a university are decided by contending influences and not by exercise of power. We gain the impression that the logical arguments and skillful negotiations win most of the decisions. We would be shocked if an administrator refused to listen to us and made a decision clearly contrary to our interests.
We call our system of university governance the collegial system. It is also a congenial one. As long as it continues to function and we continue to enjoy security, status, and reasonable gains in our standard of living, unionism is not likely to take hold. Unfortunately, many of us are concerned that these conditions are being eroded away.

As we have grown into a larger University, individual influences become less and less. New layers of administrators insulate the top decision makers from the rest of us. A new high rise office building isolates the higher administrators from the rank and file of professors.

Pressures from the outside force administrators to perform in ways they have not before. When they have fewer funds to dispense, they must make difficult decisions which may harm some person's career. They also foreclose on the dreams of many to build their departments and schools into towers of strength.

Also from the outside comes the demand for accountability. If administrators must be accountable, they cannot afford to share the responsibility for decisions. How can a department be permitted to follow its own hiring practices, if they lead to the loss of millions of dollars of contracts? Can a department choose its own chairman if its choices perpetuate mediocrity for the department or create trouble for the University? In countless ways this trend toward accountability, if continued, may lead to what may appear to faculty members as arbitrary decisions. A feeling of powerlessness could replace the present feeling of being influential and appreciated.

Lack of resources may continue the trend of increasing the student teacher ratio. Small classes may be eliminated and work loads increased. Professors may have less and less classes in which they and students have any meaningful relationships. Not only is the type of loss unfortunate in itself, but it leads to dissatisfaction on the part of students. Often the students blame the faculty members rather than the situation. They charge faculty members as being dull, irrelevant or even incompetent. Then as a reaction to the accountability drive, students' secret reactions are solicited to be used in considerations for promotion, tenure, and retention.

The students with some public backing attack faculty tenure policies. Members of the legislature also believe in some change. At present the Board of Higher Education has a committee studying the situation. Although President MacVicar of O.S.U. and President Clark of the U. of O. have taken stout stands in favor of tenure, the Chancellor declines to say anything except that some sort of change is in order. Furthermore, he asserts that it is not his function to protect the interests of the faculty. This attack on tenure along with the expressed dissatisfaction by students strike at the feelings of security by faculty members.

While the legislature has usually exercised parsimony when deciding on our raises in pay, they were particularly stingy this last time. They showed themselves subject to pressure from groups having more power than we have. It is obvious that as long as our state's fiscal affairs remain in their sorry state we shall suffer. There is no prospect for improvements in the near future. The tactless remarks of our non-faculty friends and neighbors that they shall vote for no tax increases indicate that our prospects are dim.
The feeling of being influential may be decreasing. Decisions in the future may seem arbitrary as administrators follow the collegial system less and less. They may appear as bosses instead of colleagues. If we lose tenure, the relationship of bosses to employees can be quickly established. At the same time the feeling of insecurity can motivate faculty to seek unionism. Frustration over salary matters can initiate demands that we must have organizations strong and tough enough to be effective. If we see other universities making what appear to us as substantial gains under unionism, we may join the parade.

No one can say exactly what unionism will mean. Experience at other universities is only fragmentary. Furthermore, the crisis conditions under which it arose affected it in ways that might not be comparable to our situation.

But unionism would alter many of our relationships. We could no longer be as individualistic as we are. Effective bargaining depends upon solidarity and on preventing members from going off in all directions. It also depends upon developing a clout, either political or economic. The former is difficult without intensive organization and almost universal participation. The latter implies the ability to close institutions. To do so would require a toughness, intolerance, and a willingness to undergo grave risks. The better organized we would be, the less would be the need for the tough approach. We might never need to utter an overt threat in order to receive reasonable treatment. Yet the possibility is distressing.

The administrators would act differently if we were unionized. The trends I have noted would be carried out still further. Instead of dealing with us as individuals, they would bargain with our representatives. Consequently, they could not afford to be as candid or as generous. They would have to hold back considerations which they could use as bargaining counters.

Many of our existing committees and councils might be eliminated, curtailed or made into joint union-employee bodies. The informal give and take relationships would be altered. We would live under a collective bargaining contract instead of day by day accommodations.

We would lose something under collective bargaining. Perhaps we shall lose these things anyway. If the public, the legislature, and our administrators destroy our collegial system, we would have little to lose. Instead we would have the gains which can come from strength.

Regardless whether we eventually turn to collective bargaining, we should in the meantime strengthen our professional organizations: the A.A.U.P. and the O.S.E.A. We should follow events carefully and not interpret every mistake of an administrator as evidence of the collapse of our present system. It is not closed yet. Later if we find collective bargaining is in our interest, let us approach it carefully and thoughtfully. Let us retain as much of our collegial system as we can. It was an ideal which was never completely realized, but our believing in it made us professionals instead of mere employees.

L. G. Harter, Jr.
Department of Economics
November 30, 1971
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS FOR THIS PUBLICATION
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a. Must be authored by a faculty member eligible for election to the Senate according to the provisions of Section 2 of Article IV of the Bylaws.
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