

holiday and keep the American flag out of sight. They must have discovered the difference between deliverance and conquest.

This "unparalleled prosperity" of ours is certainly "a great, bright, beautiful, wonderful" thing. It is everywhere except where you try to interview it. But there it is either resting from fatigue; or it has not yet arrived, but is hourly expected; or it consists in more work without more pay, or an increase of business without an increase of profit; or else it has the pouts because workingmen won't let it stay unless they can have a share in it. One of the peculiarities about it, too, is that it makes opportunities for employment abundant, yet causes no shrinkage in the supply of unemployed workmen ready on a moment's notice to take the place of strikers. In the Chicago waiters' strike, for instance, the local papers have been full of reports like this: "The hotel proprietors scored heavily on the strikers during the day by securing from other cities more than 300 nonunion waiters, cooks, and chambermaids, while news was received that 700 others are on their way to the city." And then the quoted report adds: "The strikers were stunned at the ease with which the places of some of them were filled." Well might they be stunned. Had they not learned from the same papers that our "unparalleled prosperity" has made a demand for labor which leaves nothing to be desired except by the employers who cry piteously but vainly for more help?

What the local papers say, however, of the Chicago waiters' strike must be taken with a good deal of allowance; for it is an open secret in newspaper circles here that the big advertisers and not the editorial corps, are dictating the policy of the local press with reference to labor questions. This appears to be one of the effects of the employers' union which has recently been established in Illinois, and is especially active in Chicago. Its avowed object is

to suppress labor unions, and one of its methods is to coerce the newspapers. That is something it can easily do, for it numbers in its membership some of the largest advertisers of Chicago, who boldly warn advertisement solicitors that if their papers want advertisements their editors must stop flirting with labor unions.

That advertisers have a right to make such exactions cannot be disputed. No one is bound to advertise in a paper that offends him editorially or refuses editorially to serve him. He is at perfect liberty to cease advertising in such papers. It is equally indisputable that newspapers have a right to be governed editorially by these considerations. No newspaper publisher is bound to pursue an editorial policy which may be ruinous financially. Readers, on their part, are at perfect liberty to cease trusting newspapers that sell their editorial policy to advertisers. But it is important that the public should know the fact. No paper has any right to pretend to be independent when it is controlled by advertisers. Knowledge of such an alliance (which is unholy if secret) is necessary to enable readers to determine how much confidence to repose in the reports and editorials of the papers they read. Great caution ought to be observed by readers of papers that thrive upon the advertisements of business combinations which are financially interested in creating impressions that may possibly be false and misleading.

The success of the coercive policy on the part of Chicago advertisers has been manifest during the Chicago labor troubles of the present time. Note, for instance, the avidity with which some of the Chicago papers have picked up the refusal of the striking waiters to deal with organized proprietors or to arbitrate differences. When were those papers ever known to criticize large local employers for refusing to deal with organized workingmen. When were they ever known to criticize large lo-

cal employers for refusing to arbitrate with organized labor? Not until an organization of Chicago workingmen turns the tables upon organized Chicago employers who are affiliated with big Chicago advertisers. Then it is, but not before, that they discover how good and wise a thing it is for Chicago employers and workingmen to negotiate in organized bodies and to submit their differences pleasantly to arbitration. If this were all, it might not be so significant of advertising coercion. But there is more to it. With the exception of the Examiner and the American there has been a tendency in the press to misrepresent the attitude of the waiters' union. That organization has not refused absolutely to arbitrate. It did refuse to arbitrate its own right to exist. While agreeing to arbitrate all other differences it demanded that the question of unionism or nonunionism should not be submitted to arbitration. Similarly on the question of dealing with organized employers. The waiters expressed a willingness to deal with organized business interests in their line of employment, but not with those interests as a sub-organization of the union of employers which had been organized for the avowed purpose of disrupting labor organizations. These distinctions, whether really valid or not, do not appear to be altogether absurd. It is one thing to arbitrate your differences, and quite another to arbitrate your right to exist; it is one thing to deal with a body organized to promote trade, and quite another to deal with one organized to destroy you.

To the average business man there is only one side to the labor question. He asks with the expression of an innocent what it is these workingmen want that they haven't got—utterly ignoring the fact that he himself hasn't a thing he doesn't want, and that their wants are as human as his own,—and then he concludes that they are a bad lot anyway, and ought to be suppressed. The kind of govern-

ment he would like for workingmen is that of the Czar, as described in a local paper's interview with Prof. Paul Milyoukov, of the University of St. Petersburg, one of the summer lecturers at the University of Chicago, who arrived a few days ago and secured apartments in one of the strike ridden hotels. "I can hardly realize it," said Prof. Milyoukov. "This would not be possible in Russia. Such a thing as a trades union would be entirely out of the question there. In my country it is illegal to form a trades union and a criminal offense to start a strike. The strikers are all regarded as criminals and punished as such."

To listen to the average business man's indictment of labor unions—much of which is a "true bill," it must be confessed—you would suppose he was appealing to your sense of justice. But he isn't. He is only appealing to your sympathy for him. If he were a workingman he would be guilty of every unjust thing they are guilty of; being a business man he is solicitous only for the business man's interests, which he calls rights regardless of whether they are rights or not. Leaving the hindmost to the mercy of the devil, he trots along with a placid conscience to the good old business man's song of—

Let him get who has the power,  
Let him keep who can.

When the workingman was a pitiable under dog in this game of getting and keeping, the average business man smiled. But now that the working man "butts" into the same game, the average business man is extremely sensitive to the injustice of it—for workingmen. When the average business man is ready to have justice done all around—to crush out institutions that rob workingmen as well as labor movements that annoy business men—his complaints about the injustice of labor unions will have a truer ring and his rights seem better worth conserving. What he needs to learn now is that he cannot go on preserving and unjustly profiting by

laws and institutions that disinherit a vast majority of the people, and yet enjoy his own rights in peace. Justice is impersonal. No one can appeal to her standards with reference to his own rights, unless he is willing to abide by them with reference to the rights of all; and this is something which would amaze your average business man if he found himself doing it.

Take for example the decision of Judge Holdom<sup>8</sup> in fining Chicago workingmen last week for breach of an injunction. Whether his decision was right or wrong legally, one thing he said in rendering it was profoundly true. We refer to his remark that "all have a right to work." This is a common saying also of your average business man. But he doesn't mean it. All that he means, and probably all that Judge Holdom meant, was that one workingman has no right to prevent another workingman from working for an employer. That is true, too, but if the principle it involves goes no further, it might as well be false.

Suppose the employer had already monopolized all the natural opportunities for work, what right would he have to ask a court of equity to enjoin a laborer from preventing another from working for him. Isn't there a maxim of equity jurisprudence that would apply in such a case—the maxim, namely, that "he who comes into a court of equity must come with clean hands"? Yet that is in principle the very situation. A particular employer may not have monopolized natural opportunities for work, and a particular workman might not be able to utilize them if they were not monopolized; but employers as a class have monopolized them, and laborers as a class could utilize them.

We need not go outside of Chicago, with its vast number of vacant but very desirable and much-desired building lots, for illustrative examples. It is this systematic exclusion

everywhere of laborers as a class from natural opportunities for work that accounts for efforts of individual laborers to prevent other individuals from working for employers. Yet Judge Holdom and the average business man, utterly oblivious to their own wholesale prevention of men from the full enjoyment of their right to work, are stentorian in their indignant ejaculations when a few poor men, struggling to raise the price of a casual job, try to prevent others from taking it away from them. This interference is bad, to be sure; but how petty and narrow and mean and swinish must be the disposition of any man, unless his ignorance may excuse him, who can condemn this interference while approving the other.

One of Mr. Chamberlain's advance couriers for his scheme of imperial protection is an intimation to workingmen that they are to be benefited by the scheme through the old age pensions it will provide. They are to pay—this is Mr. Chamberlain's explanation—75 per cent. of the proposed tariff taxes on food; but that is all to come back in pensions to the worthy among them as they grow old, increased by the other 25 per cent. which the leisure classes will have to pay. Think of that, now! The working people wear themselves out with work, but get so little that there is nothing for them in their old age; and they must be pensioned, three-quarters of their pensions being provided by themselves in taxes extorted from their own meager wages. But the leisure classes make their leisure so profitable that they get no pensions (not out of this deal), but must make up the other 25 per cent. for pensions to their working brethren. What does it all mean? Are we living with Alice in the looking glass, where work consumes and leisure produces?

On the contrary, it is a reasonable suspicion that Mr. Chamberlain's pension proviso for workingmen may prove disastrous to the British landlords whom he is seeking to protect.