

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1903.

Number 290.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

The National Civic Federation has played in another solemn farce, and retired behind the wings to doff its costume and wash off the paint.

It is with no desire to fling an epithet that we call this performance a farce. We call it a farce because that is what it is. Any scheme for the harmonizing of "labor" and "capital," such as the Civic Federation represents, is bound to be either a fake or a farce, and in the spirit of charity we prefer the latter characterization.

This does not imply that harmony between labor and capital or laborers and capitalists, is impossible. What it does imply is that harmony is impossible between labor and special privilege. That this implication is true may be seen by reflecting upon some simple example of the relation of mere laborers to beneficiaries of a distinct and clearly defined special privilege. Suppose the special privilege to be the ownership of a lake, and the work of the laborers to be the catching of fish in that lake. What possible community of interest could there be between those lake owners and those fishermen? Obviously none whatever. Economically they are enemies, not friends.

Nor would this obvious fact be changed if the lake owners were to become capitalists, making nets and boats and collecting bait for the fishermen. As net and boat makers and bait collectors, their interests would indeed be identical with the interests of the fish-

ermen. In that relationship they would really be laborers, too, and the interests of labor are universally identical. But the interests of these boatmakers and bait collectors, these capitalists, would be unchanged as to their ownership of the lake. In that relationship their interests would still be hostile to the interests of the fishermen. In those circumstances to call them capitalists, and then urge that the interests of capitalists and laborers are identical and ought to be harmonized, would be either a trick or a comedy.

Yet that is what the National Civic Federation is doing. The interest of most of the "capitalists" who compose it is chiefly not as actual producers of boats and accumulators of bait, but as owners of the lake. That is to say, dropping the metaphor, their dominant interest is not as actual producers or collectors of capital; it is as owners of special privileges. And that they may not be required to remove their masks at the Federation conferences, it is provided by the Federation rules that questions having that tendency shall be excluded from discussion.

An instance of the disposition to head off that kind of discussion was afforded at the recent conference, as reported by the local press. We quote from the Chicago Tribune of the 17th:

Labor leaders and representatives of capital gave socialism and its advocates a stinging rebuke yesterday when, without invitation, socialists attempted to promulgate their theories at the second day's sessions of the National Civic Federation convention in Steinway hall. One of their speakers was stopped in the midst of his harangue at a time when he was trying to demonstrate that "the wage system must be abolished before employer and employe can be reconciled."

Now we do not accept the socialist theory. We believe that it will

collapse when it comes into general discussion, with the true individualist spirit instead of the plutocratic animus for its adversary. Neither do we approve the action of any man in forcing his views uninvited upon any conference of which he is not a member. But the socialists do represent a proposed remedy, be it true or false, for the economic troubles about which the National Civic Federation professes to be solicitous. Yet the socialist theory is stringently excluded from the considerations of that body. Nor is this done merely when the theory is advanced by an uninvited auditor, who is perhaps out of order. It is a definite and permanent policy of the Federation, deliberately designed to prevent the unmasking of monopolists who play in the role of capitalists.

The principal subject of discussion at the Chicago conference of the National Civic Federation was the "open" shop. Most of the "capitalists" present were for the "open" shop, while the labor leaders were opposed to it. Those who advocate the "open" shop insist that employers should make no discrimination between union workmen and non-union workmen; those who oppose it insist that employers, if they want to harmonize labor and capital, must "unionize" their establishments and employ none but union men. Over this question the Federation "capitalists" and labor leaders wrangled. The labor leaders had the best of the argument, of course; for if "labor" means organized labor (and it is so treated by the Federation), and if capitalized monopoly is "capital" (which the Federation assumes), then there is no way of harmonizing "labor" and "capital" with the "open" shop. For organized labor to concede the "open" shop, not from necessity but as a prin-

ciple of unionism, is to abandon the whole trade union scheme. Extremely ridiculous, therefore, is the pretense of "capitalists" who approve trade unionism and yet insist upon the "open" shop. To trade unionism it would be fatal to allow organized workmen to work with unorganized workmen in any establishment in which they were sufficiently well organized to prevent it.

"Prof." George Gunton has appeared upon the stump for Senator Hanna in the Ohio campaign. "Prof." Gunton is economist extraordinary and professor plenipotentiary to the plutocratic combines of the country. His appearance upon the Ohio stump is strictly "non-partisan." In fact he does not appear as a stump speaker at all. He appears as a "non-partisan" lecturer. His "bulletins" and leaflets also are "non-partisan." The whole thing was arranged for immediately after Tom L. Johnson's nomination. Senator Hanna arranged for it, quite in a "non-partisan" way.

This may be seen by reference to the following letter from Senator Hanna, if read in the light of the use "Prof." Gunton has made of it.

Cleveland, Ohio,
September, 4, 1903.
Professor George Gunton,
41 Union Square,
New York, N. Y.

My Dear Sir:

I have carefully considered your proposition with reference to educational work along the lines you have planned. I fully appreciate the benefit of such work and heartily endorse your proposition. It will give me pleasure to cooperate with and to assist you in the development of your ideas in this matter. With very best wishes, I remain truly yours,

M. A. Hanna.

With a remarkably good fac simile of that letter "Prof." Gunton is appealing to business men in even the most distant parts of the country for funds to help Senator Hanna's campaign in Ohio. Observe the kind of "educational work" that Mr. Hanna so heartily endorses and offers to assist, and note its deliciously "non-partisan" flavor. "Prof." Gunton ex-

plains it in a letter to selected business men (accompanying Senator Hanna's letter), which appeals to their "personal interest." A copy of his letter has been sent us by a business man, to whom "Prof." Gunton's "managing secretary" had sent it under the mistaken impression that this business man's "personal interest" could be appealed to with the usual effrontery. We quote the pertinent part of "Prof." Gunton's managing secretary's letter:

It is felt that the strong and convincing writings of President Gunton will be of great value in the present campaign in Ohio, and arrangements have been made to send many thousands of bulletins and leaflets into that State—directly into the hands of the voters. This, of course, will necessitate a large and extraordinary expense, and if you do not feel at this time prepared to cooperate with us to the extent of subscribing for a life membership which is fully explained in prospectus [\$100], we ask that you contribute in such an amount as you feel the proposition is worth to you and do so promptly in order that the work for the Ohio campaign may go forward with vigor and in the largest possible proportions. Make checks payable to George Gunton, President, and kindly remember that the greatest good will come from immediate and decisive action.

And so Senator Hanna's good "non-partisan" work in Ohio goes on, under the crafty management of the ingenious "Prof." Gunton; and the ship-subsidy goose hangs excitingly high.

Senator Hanna is a protectionist, yet he is working with might and main for ship subsidies. He says he wants more American ships. But why should a consistent protectionist want any ships?

While Senator Hanna was in Chicago in attendance upon the conference of the National Civic Federation, he learned of the ominous closing down of factories that has already begun in Ohio. One of the closers-down, an Ohio manufacturing friend of his, unfolded the news to him. Naturally enough Mr. Hanna was indignant. Had he not been telling the working people of Ohio that industrial disaster will not come so long as he and his party friends are kept in office? And here were

Ohio captains of industry recklessly bringing on industrial disaster in the very middle of an Ohio campaign, where so much depends upon fooling enough of the people yet a little longer. In his indignation Mr. Hanna turned upon his friend, and not without some bitterness of tone, pungently asked him: "Why couldn't you have waited until after election? Don't you realize that I have some interest in Ohio myself just now?" Mr. Hanna is evidently a good deal of a confidence man in politics. But he was not discreet enough on this occasion to speak easy.

The result of this campaign in Ohio will determine absolutely whether the present condition of prosperity is to continue or not." Did Mark Hanna say that? Are you sure? Will he guarantee that the conditions under which our prosperity labors are to be abolished if he is beaten? For the prosperity was all the trusts said it was, and more. The half was never told. The land wallowed in prosperity. Then the trusts put their conditions on it. Hanna has a condition, for instance, that every one who rides on a street car in Cleveland must pay him toll for use of the streets. Now that is a condition that will be removed if Johnson wins. But the trusts have imposed conditions of the tariff and other devices by which they get a quarter of the prosperity the country makes. Will that be eliminated if Johnson wins? Glory hallelujah! Hanna is like the fellow who proposed to a girl. "I'll buy you a washboard," he said, "and you can have half what you make." Hanna's condition of prosperity is that the people shall have all they make after the trusts have had their rake-off. Boundless, except a limit of two dollars a day. The amount the workers may earn is boundless; the amount they may get is the condition. And if he catches them murmuring he is going to take the washboard away. Thank God, the results of the Ohio campaign, this year or next, this century or next, shall