The Public

Sixth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1903. Number 271.

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.

Now that labor unions have acquired a power which enables them to harass employers, and tempts them to make irritating demands and to avail themselves of tactical opportunities, they excite a bitterness of hostility which was never before so general. Even among their erstwhile sympathizers may now be heard a warning cry. They are told that they are going too far, and that if they keep on the sympathy that once was theirs will justly be theirs no longer.

All this is sheer nonsense. The man who was indifferent to the condition of workingmen before unions were powerful, can expect no commiseration for himself now that they are strong enough perhaps to ruin him. He had no compunction about ruining when he wasn't himself the under dog. As to the sympathizer who threatens to withdraw his sympathy, did he imagine the labor union movement to be an ethical movement, that he now complains of its breaking bounds? If he did, he was sadly mistaken.

There is nothing ethical about the labor union movement. It is coercive from start to finish. In every aspect it is a driver and not a leader. It is simply a war movement, and must be judged by the analogies of belligerency and not by industrial principles. Whoever speaks of labor unionism as an embodiment of industrial principles talks at random. Labor unions like armies cannot be justified. They can only be excused. And this because and only because they are fighting a defensive war.

War has been made upon labor, and is constantly though subtly waged against labor, by means of monopoly laws. Against this condition labor is striking blindly by means of the labor union movement. It is a weak mode of warfare. Its victories are trifling, its defeats are disasters, its ultimate destruction is almost a certainty. But its activities are to be judged by its character as a fighting force in an irrepressible conflict, and not by the principles of industrial peace. And of all men that have no standing to condemn labor unionism, most notable are those business men who insist upon perpetuating the conditions of capitalistic monopoly. Out of these conditions labor unionism springs as naturally as gangrene out of a neglected wound. Why curse it. The thing to do is to remove its cause. We gravely fear, however, that the privileged classes would rather defend their privileges against the warfare of labor unionism than to dissipate unionism by foregoing their privileges.

The workingman who gets $25 a week in Chicago is extraordinarily well paid as wages go. From that amount the scale of wages runs down to $6 or less, the ordinary rate for men being not far from $12 to $15. Yet Chicago business men are reported as warning the working classes that they must not ask for more or they will put an end to the present "unbounded prosperity." Among the men so quoted are Marshall Field and John V. Farwell, Jr. Now, in all earnestness, what kind of unbounded prosperity can that unbounded prosperity be which allows no higher wages for hard work than from $6 to $12 or $15 a week, or even $25?

In the report of a railroad wreck last week one of the unknown dead was described as "evidently a laborer." His station in life was doubtless determined by the clothes he wore. Had he been well dressed he would not have been described as "evidently a laborer," but more likely as "evidently a man of wealth." Why is it that we so habitually associate labor with poverty, and leisure with wealth? There is nothing in nature to suggest it. Nature couples wealth with labor. For it is to labor and to labor only that nature yields wealth.

The bitter complaint of organized workingmen, long prevalent in the United States but vigorously disputed by the press, that the courts are packed in the interest of capitalists, is now sustained by three out of seven of the judges of one of the most important courts of the country, and by one of these three in pretty distinct terms. We refer to the New York Court of Appeals, the highest court of that State. The National Wholesale Druggists' Association had entered into a combination to coerce manufacturers of proprietory medicines on the one hand, and retailers on the other, into an arrangement for assuring fixed prices on the sale of their goods. In consequence of this combination the drug house of John D. Park & Sons Co. was boycotted by manufacturers and brought suit in New York against the wholesalers' association. The plaintiff charged a conspiracy against trade. Two lower courts and four of the judges of the Court of Appeals held that the facts gave no right of action, although the latter court had held otherwise in an action against a trade union upon substantially the same facts. But three other judges of the Court of Appeals dissented in the druggists' case, and one of them, Judge Martin,

Digitized by Google

was explicit in contrasting the decision in this case with the contrary decision in the labor case.

As reported in the "Official Edition of Law Reports and Session Laws, State of New York," for May 23, 1903, Judge Martin drew that contrast in this restrained but pointed language:

If the decision of the court below shall be affirmed, it obviously results in an unfair and unjust discrimination by this court in favor of capital or business and against labor, by enforcing the law as to one and refusing as to the other. As we have already seen, this court, in Curran vs. Galen, unanimously held that a combination or association of workingmen whose purpose was to hamper or restrict the freedom of the citizen in pursuing his lawful trade or calling, through contracts or arrangements with employes to coerce workingmen to become members of the organization and to come under its rules and conditions under penalty of loss of their positions and of deprivation of employment, was against public policy and unlawful; while in this case it is held that a combination or association of wholesale dealers in useful articles whose purpose is to hamper and destroy the freedom of the plaintiff and others to pursue their lawful business, by contracts or arrangements with manufacturers to cause them to become members of their organization and to come under its rules and conditions under penalty of the destruction of their business, was not against public policy nor unlawful. As these decisions could not be harmonized, they would result in a discrimination in favor of capital or business, which could not be sustained upon any just or legal principle known to or established by statute or common law.

In that quotation there is pretty good judicial authority for the complaint that the courts keep on hand a supply of one kind of law for capital and another for labor. And the quotation is justified by the facts. So far as the New York Court of Appeals is concerned the case of Curran vs. Galen may now be referred to as authority for prosecutions of coercive labor combinations, while the case of Park vs. the Druggists' Association is looked to as a legal shield for coercive business combinations. Here are all the materials for a judicial "Box and Cox" farce, or "Now You See It and Now You Don't."

If the anti-tipping movement could be carried on to success it would be a good thing, not only for the people who give tips but for the working people who take them. Tipping is degrading. It degrades the giver, because it stimulates in him a sentiment of fictitious superiority; it is degrading to the recipient, because it makes him servile. The man-to-man relationship cannot exist where tipping prevails. Nor is it profitable to the recipient. His income is really not bettered by tipping. Wherever tipping is customary wages are correspondingly low. The wages of Pullman car porters, for instance, are $25 a month and less, and they must buy their own meals. It is not the porter who gets the tips; it is the Pullman Co. Tipping is not likely to go out of vogue, however, through the influence of an anti-tipping league. It is one of the characteristic manifestations of that differentiation of the people into social classes which came in with liveries. Not very long ago the waiters in middle class restaurants even in New York would have resented as a snobbish insult the offer of a tip. Waiters then refused to be regarded as members of an inferior class. But no waiter any longer regards a tip as an insult. Both the waiter and his customer have now a pretty well defined feeling that the tip is something which one social class owes to another.

What may be the full effect of the recent decision of the Appellate Court of the District of Columbia in the second class mail matter cases is not quite certain. It is probable, however, that until the question reaches the Supreme Court of the United States the Postmaster General will be more of a press censor than ever. Some idea of the aggravating character of this censorship is given by Benjamin R. Tucker's "Liberty" for June, in an account of its own experience. Here is a paper which, having once possessed the second class mailing right, lost it by suspension, and upon resuming publication was compelled to make a new application. Such an application should have been granted without delay or other annoyance upon proof of the good faith of the publisher. But it was months after application before Mr. Tucker received his second class license. Meantime a red-tape investigation slowly proceeded, which escaped being exasperating only because its details were so absurdly comical. The latest instance of totally unwarranted interference with legitimate second class publications has to do with the Nebraska Independent, of Lincoln. This is an established weekly paper, perhaps the most important and influential of the Populist press. During the Spring its editor conceived the idea of making of one of its regular issues a "Henry George edition," and this idea was carried out in May. The special issue differed from the others only in being devoted to a discussion by many writers, of the Henry George idea. Yet the postoffice department has taken steps which threaten the existence of the paper. As we have heretofore freely discussed this subject of the second class postal censorship of the press (vol. v, pp. 548, 196, 211, 468, 515, 548), which is apparently designed especially to embarrass radical papers, it is not necessary to dwell upon these more recent instances of its operation; but this much at least should now be repeated, that there is an increasing necessity for taking away from the postoffice department, and reposing wholly in the courts, the question of the right, in individual cases, to second class mail accommodations.

From Washington it is announced that Secretary Hay has taken measures to assist the Secretary of Agriculture in preventing the importation of European food stuffs, "in retaliation against the countries which discriminate against American food products." This commercial "retaliation" is a funny thing. For instance, Germans want American food

Digitized by Google