

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 19, 1902.

Number 224.

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.

Whether were it better, to be a major general in the United States army, who, for ordering wholesale slaughter of all enemies over ten years of age, gets retired on reduced pay, or a department clerk, who, for condemning such revolting slaughter, though after office hours and as a citizen, gets the grand and summary "bounce" without any pay?

The question of the rights of the public when labor strikes are on has been raised again in Chicago, and under exasperating circumstances. Railroad freight handlers having struck against the railroads for better wages and recognition of their union, the organized teamsters came to their support by refusing to haul goods to or from the railroads, and in consequence the public generally was put to irritating inconvenience while ordinary business men were subjected to the possibilities of heavy loss. It is not remarkable, therefore, that those who suffered or feared they might, got "hot under the collar," and condemned strikes and strikers without much regard for anybody's rights or comfort but their own. But strikes and strikers cannot be disposed of in that choleric manner. All occasions of this kind call for coolness and fairness of judgment.

The first consideration is the violence which accompanies strikes. Sometimes it takes the form of riots, though in this form it is usually provoked by "strike breakers" for the purpose of prejudicing public opinion against the strikers. But much of what is called "picketing"

does run into threats and actual instances of violence in derogation of the rights of others. In the strike in question, for illustration, teamsters' "pickets" did not stop with requests to nonunion teamsters to join in the strike; they approached loaded wagons threatening the drivers with violence and sometimes carried out their threats. But for the punishment of acts of this kind there are just criminal laws. These should be rigidly enforced, as rigidly against strikers as against anyone else. There should be no clubbing by policemen, which is unlawful except in cases of resistance to authority. There should be no autocratic writs of injunction, which revolutionize the criminal law. But there should be legitimate and dignified but determined prosecutions for crime.

It is a mistake to suppose, however, that violent strikers are the only lawbreakers in connection with the industrial problems out of which strikes grow; and he who contents himself with denouncing the crimes of strikers, overlooking the greater and more oppressive and dangerous crimes of the monopoly corporations and trusts which foment most of the troublesome strikes, exposes his partisanship. If strikers ought to be punished for their kind of lawlessness, so should trust manipulators be punished for theirs. But it is a significant fact that the same men who most vigorously denounce the lawlessness of strikers most strenuously defend or minimize the lawlessness of trusts. May there not be some excuse for the lawlessness of strikers who find the lawlessness of the corporations they contend against shielded and condoned. When we call down the rigors of the law upon exasperated men who would be glad to get 18 cents an hour for muscular

work and settle for 17 rather than starve, while we wink at evasions of the law by men who get as many dollars a minute for "brain" work, we must expect the 17-cent men to become violent. It is not a workingman's peculiarity to "get hot under the collar" in such circumstances; it is a peculiarity of human nature.

Much has been made of the fact that the freight handlers in the Chicago strike have demanded recognition by the railroads of their union. This demand they in fact soon receded from by way of compromise. But they made it, and it is easy to explain. It is one of the workingman's defenses against blacklisting. When committees of workmen appear before their own employers, the committeemen are at once marked as disturbers and at the first opportunity are discharged. This is an old trick of employers, especially of corporation employers. They profess to be willing to confer freely with representatives of their own men, but their motive is to weed out those of them toward whom the rest look for leadership. Workingmen have consequently learned that the only way to save their leaders from the blacklist, is to demand that negotiations with employers be carried on through regular union representatives, whom the employers cannot victimize, instead of doing it through occasional shop committees, who put their jobs at stake when they accept a call to represent their fellow shopmen in negotiations with the boss.

What real objection could the railroads of Chicago possibly have had to this mode of negotiation? None whatever unless they were seeking evidence upon which to victimize labor leaders in their service. Were not they themselves at that very mo-

ment meeting as a union of railroad managers? Their union of managers comes together regularly and passes upon the rights and privileges of employes, of their customers, and of the public at large in most arbitrary fashion. A more arrogant, oppressive and powerful trade union does not exist than this same board of railroad managers. Yet it had the infinite cheek, while in actual session as a union, to refuse to confer with a committee from the union of its employes, on the ground that they must not be recognized when acting as a union. Sitting in royal session it decided what each road should do and how each should stand by the others so that all might act in unison; but it required the complaining freight handlers to confer separately with their respective managers. We can understand why the railroads should want to act as a unit yet want to force their men to act individually. Their motive is plain enough. But why should anybody else have taken their side in such an arrogant policy?

Some one always defends the corporations and trusts that are involved in strikes by urging that if the men don't like their jobs they ought to quit and go somewhere else. It would probably surprise such people to know that they have hit upon the true solution of the whole labor problem, strikes and all. If workmen with a grievance would refrain from striking, and, instead of organizing unions, throwing out pickets, and threatening and injuring people not concerned in their quarrel, would simply throw up their jobs and take others, as individuals, there would be no labor troubles. And this is no joke, either; for that is precisely what dissatisfied workmen would do if they were not prevented by law.

The law prevents them by authorizing land grabbers to fence in the valuable vacant spaces of the earth, which checks production and so di-

minishes profitable demand for workmen at increasing wages. The law prevents them also by turning the great highways of the country over to the autocratic dominion of trades unions of railroad managers. The law prevents them further by putting protective tariffs upon imports, internal revenue duties on manufactures, and taxes without number on enterprise and thrift in general. All this cooperates with land monopoly to restrict legitimate industry and encourage blighting speculation; and it thereby so far diminishes the demand for workingmen that the man who throws up his job can find no other job to take. To ask a workman, getting 17 cents an hour, why he doesn't give up his job and get another, if he wants 18, is to mock him. Throw down the legal barriers to industrial enterprise—the railway monopoly barriers, the tariff monopoly barriers, the burdensome tax barriers, and the land monopoly barriers—and then the question why workmen don't get another job if they object to the one they have, may be asked with propriety and force. But then there would be no occasion to ask it. The oppression of labor would cease; for labor cannot be oppressed when the demand for it continually exceeds the supply. Strikes would be resorted to no more; for who would need to strike if his services were in urgent demand? Labor unions would dissolve; for every man then would be his own labor union. Meanwhile the irritations and injuries incident to labor strikes must be endured as patiently as possible as part of the price we must pay for allowing a comparatively few people to own the earth.

In an editorial advising the President that "any fight he may undertake against the objectionable trusts will be futile to the point of ludicrousness if it be not directed against the protective tariff duties enacted for the benefit of those trusts," the New York Times mentions two fea-

tures of trusts as objectionable. One, it says, is—

the secret favors shown to them by the railroads, the roads themselves being in some cases controlled by the trusts. The other is the heavy tariff duties imposed on their competitors abroad.

This is true as far as it goes. But is not the monopoly of the natural richness of the Mesaba ore mines and the Connellsville coal deposits an objectionable feature of the steel trust? Isn't the monopoly of the pipe line right of way from the oil regions to the sea an objectionable feature of the Standard Oil trust? Doesn't the monopoly of the Pennsylvania coal fields play an objectionable part in the anthracite coal trust?

What really constitutes the backbone of the arrogant and domineering trusts is graphically shown by Mr. Schwab's recent affidavit in which he schedules the properties of the steel trust. On his own showing less than one-third in value of the property of the steel trust is a product of any sort of human energy, while more than two-thirds in value consists almost exclusively of riches which nature and nature's God have deposited in the earth. Here are Mr. Schwab's figures

Iron and Bessemer ore properties	\$ 700,000,000
Mills, fixtures, machinery, equipment, tools and real estate (400 plants)	300,000,000
Coal and coke fields (87,589 acres)	100,000,000
Transportation properties, including railroads (1,467 miles), terminals, docks, ships (112), equipment (23,185 cars and 428 locomotives, etc)	80,000,000
Blast furnaces (75 plants)	45,000,000
Natural gas fields	20,000,000
Limestone properties	4,000,000
Cash in bank	66,000,000
Material and product on hand	82,291,000
Total	\$1,400,291,000

If we analyze these figures we find that all that can possibly be credited to human energy are the following:

Mills, fixtures, machinery, equipment, tools and real estate	\$300,000,000
Transportation properties	80,000,000
Blast furnaces	45,000,000
Cash	66,000,000
Material and product	82,291,000
	\$576,291,000

But out of that sum something must be deducted for so much of real estate as consists of the unimproved values of land. This would hardly fall below \$100,000,000; and if we deduct that as not due to human en-

ergy, but simply as the security value of a natural opportunity, or site for production, we have as the grand total of steel trust property—produced by human energy—only \$476,291,000. All the remainder, \$924,000,000, is the value of certain natural wealth of the country—as truly common property as money in the public treasury. Thus:

Unimproved values of real estate estimated as above.....	\$100,000,000
Iron and Bessemer ore properties.....	700,000,000
Coal and coke fields.....	100,000,000
Natural gas fields.....	20,000,000
Limestone properties.....	4,000,000
	\$924,000,000

What power would the steel trust have if these gifts of nature, made valuable not by the owners but by general social growth, could not be monopolized by the trust, but were available to all, upon equal terms, for the common good?

At last the public is informed of the result in the court-martial proceedings against Gen. Smith—Gen. Jacob H. Smith, who was accused of ordering his subordinates in Samar to devastate the island with fire and to kill every person over ten years of age. He was found guilty of the charge. Mind that! By a court of his own comrades he was convicted of giving to his subordinates—we quote from the secretary of war's summary of the court-martial proceedings — “the following oral instructions”:

“I want no prisoners. I wish you to kill and burn; the more you kill and burn the better you will please me,” and, further, that he wanted all persons killed who were capable of bearing arms and in actual hostilities against the United States; and did, in reply to a question by Maj. Waller asking for an age limit, designate the age limit as ten years of age.

So it is established that an American general did give the most brutal order of which there is any record in civilized warfare. He did give an order which amply confirms the substance of the charges of American atrocities in the Philippines. But what does that court-martial do with him—that court-martial in which was reposed for the

time the safekeeping of “the honor of the army”? How has it vindicated “the honor of the army,” which by its own verdict appears to have been grossly outraged? It condemns the murderous culprit to be admonished! And what does President Roosevelt do, into whose keeping “the honor of the army” next comes in connection with this case? How does he vindicate that honor which Gen. Smith has outraged? He gravely “admonishes” the convicted defendant and retires him from the army. But not as a criminal does he retire Gen. Smith. Not as a criminal, but as an officer who has served beyond the limit of his age—retires him as he is waiting impatiently to retire Gen. Miles!

Think of it, you worshipers of shoulder straps who would condone all the infamy of American military exploits in the Philippines, in the name of “the honor of the army.” Think of it, if you dare think. Here is a high military officer caught red-handed. He is convicted of one of the infamous crimes with which the army in the Philippines stands charged. A plain case is made out, so plain that his own sympathetic comrades cannot deny the facts. Not only that, but his criminal order was obeyed by Maj. Waller and Lieut. Day to the extent of the murder of 11 men, at least eight of whom were absolutely innocent, says Gen. Chaffee in his endorsement of the Waller and Day verdicts, even of a suspicion of even a military offense, and “continued to the last to carry the arms and ammunition of the men after they were no longer able to bear them, and to render in their impassive way such services as deepens the conviction that, without their assistance, many of the marines who now survive would also have perished.” This general officer, so guilty and so convicted, is “admonished,” “reprimanded,” and honorably “retired.” If, after this, “the honor of the army” does not become a by-word, it will be because the American people have

lost their sense of humor and not yet gained a sense of justice.

The President and Mr. Root have felt it necessary to explain the leniency in Gen. Smith's case. They say that nobody but Waller and Day obeyed the order, and only 11 natives were killed pursuant to it. Why didn't they make the irony of the comment complete by assurances that these injured natives have made no complaint? But their unconscious irony aside, how are the American people to know that only 11 were killed? Reports and rumors of atrocities from various sources are abundant, but the secretary of war has assiduously suppressed all official information that did not actually ooze out. The Smith case itself would never have been heard of through the war office had Waller yielded to the suggestions of his superiors and pleaded mental irresponsibility. But he insisted upon defending himself as having acted under Smith's orders, and so this one bloody cat got out of the bag. How many other bloody cats are there in that bag? With this one horrible instance revealed, with the war department suppressing official information about other cases, with the Senate investigating committee refusing to investigate, is it not a reasonable presumption that the numerous reports of American atrocities are in the main true, and that the Smith case is only one of a multitude more or less like it?

One of the most encouraging things about the army scandals in the Philippines, and at the same time one of the sanest suggestions regarding the “honor of the army,” appeared in City and State, of Philadelphia, in the issue of July 10. It is an editorial which declares:

The work of gathering the essential facts incident to our Philippine conquest will go steadily on. It must be done, so far as we can see, through the energy and patience of a few men—a few citizens who believe that the real honor of the country can never be maintained by base means, by cruelty and suppression of truth, and who be-