

# The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

Volume VIII

Number 370

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1905

## CONTENTS.

### EDITORIAL:

Review of the Chicago strike.....	65
Prof. Starr on inferior races.....	68
Rockefeller and Gladden.....	68
Fraudulent foreign incorporation.....	68
Racial Equilibrium .....	68

### NEWS NARRATIVE:

The teamsters' strike in Chicago.....	70
Military slaughter in Warsaw.....	72
Protection in Great Britain.....	72
British land value taxation .....	72
Municipal questions in the United States .....	72
News Notes .....	73
Press Opinion .....	74

### MISCELLANY:

The Man at the Margin (verse).....	74
Representative Government in Switzerland .....	74
The Carnival and the Missionary.....	75
From Earth to Heaven .....	75
Uncle Sam's Letter to John Bull.....	76
Christian Citizenship .....	76
His Statesmanship (verse).....	78

### BOOKS:

Two Strong Novels (Dillard).....	78
Politics of New Zealand .....	79
Periodicals.....	79

CARTOON—Wake Up, Uncle Sam.....80

For terms and other particulars of publication see cartoon page

## EDITORIAL

The dangers which at this moment directly threaten Chicago, and indirectly menace the whole country, are extremely serious. Disorder has occurred, and rioting, already imminent, may possibly be precipitated before these words reach the reader's eye. To be sure, there is nothing especially serious in the possibilities of a riot, nor in an actual riot, for riots usually come and go in cities with no other effect than a temporary disturbance. But if this riot comes, it will be no outburst of local and ephemeral passion. It will come as a battle carefully planned and deliberately provoked, in an irrepressible war of hostile classes.

And more serious in its sinister possibilities than the rioting, something else will come. The regular army will come. With its recruits drawn from the frayed edges of society and drilled to the

mechanical perfection of unfeeling automata; with its officers selected from the body of the people, but carefully trained like Janissaries to hold in contempt the order of life out of which they are chosen; with the button that controls this deadly mechanism far removed, both geographically and politically, from the community whose humiliation it may decree—every instance of the use of the standing army in local disturbances, paves the way for the coming of "the man on horseback." Yet the country is full of fools, who, for the sake of a temporary advantage to their own interests or to interests with which they sympathize, are echoing the demands and encouraging the efforts of a few imperial-minded or sordid knaves to turn the regular army into a local police force upon the slightest provocation or at the least excuse. If the Chicago riot comes, their insane wishes in this respect, fraught with the gravest dangers, as all history shows, to themselves and their children and their children's children, will assuredly be realized in one more instance.

In the face of such dangers to the principle of home rule, which has always been the touchstone of American liberty, the utmost intelligence and candor is demanded in considering the situation. Class feeling, personal prejudice, pride of organization, love of power, and over-solicitude for business interests, must all be suppressed; and in the fullest and widest sense the spirit of fair play must take their place. No other attitude of mind is tolerable in circumstances like these. Solicitude for the public peace, to be maintained by local self-restraint and fair-minded adjustment and not imposed by external power and reckless slaughter—the peace of good citizenship, not the peace that reigned in Warsaw—this is the primary consideration. Whoever has conspired against peace

of that kind, or obstructs its restoration, be he employer or hired man, rich or poor, black or white, striker or strike-breaker, resident or non-resident, timid preacher or subservient newspaper, complacent merchant or subsidized lawyer, is a public enemy. Then let the undisputed facts speak for themselves.

In the course of the development of labor organization which has spread and strengthened in this country since the Civil War, slowly and with some fluctuations but steadily on the whole, the question of "open shop" or "closed shop" has come to be a burning issue. This is now the nub of the controversy between labor unions and employers' unions. The latter have recently got to be a highly important factor. The labor struggle, no longer between unorganized employers and organized labor with its federated unions, is become a strife between laborers organized and federated and employers organized and federated. These hostile systems of economic organization are each an empire within the Republic, and whether one or the other wins, or the two confederate, the Republic will suffer.

The weapon of organized labor is the strike. Nominally, this is a peaceable refusal to work; actually, of course, it is industrial war. In that war the weapon of organized employers is the floating mass of the unemployed or partly employed, who, living on the ragged edge of things economic, are almost always available to supply the needs of employers well enough and long enough to defeat a strike. To make striking successful, therefore, these workmen must either be got into unions or be otherwise prevented from competing against unionists. The former method is preferred by labor leaders. Consequently the "closed shop" contract has become a prime object of trades unionism. Under this

contract, the employer who can be induced by argument, or coerced by strikes or threats of strikes, into signing it, is obligated to employ only union men. It has been urged that labor leaders use their powers under such contracts to deprive men of work by keeping them out of unions. But it is only fair to say that the few instances of such conduct are instances of personal graft, from which no large organization is wholly free. The general tendency and the evident interest of unionism is to enroll every workman; for its aim is to monopolize the loyalty and thereby to regulate the employment of all hired labor. On the other hand, yet for identical reasons, employers' organizations think it to their interest to oppose the "closed shop." Consequently they insist upon the "open shop." The nominal meaning of this is that employers will not discriminate between union and non-union men in their hirings; its obvious effect would be to arm the employers' union with a ready supply of unorganized labor, and to disarm organized labor of its only defensive weapon.

With the merits of this controversy we have nothing at present to do. We have given the facts and indicated their bearings for another purpose. They are necessary for an understanding of the origin and probable scope of the present dangerous conflict in Chicago between labor unions and employers' unions; for this conflict originated in the breach of a "closed shop" contract by an employers' union. Somewhat more than a year ago, as the result of a labor arbitration between the garment workers of Chicago and their employers, the wholesale tailors, that "closed shop" agreement was made. It provided on the part of the employers for the employment of members of the garment makers' union exclusively, for a definite period, the union agreeing to supply workers for the same period. Long before its expiration,

the employers' union began to violate its terms by locking out union workers and employing non-union workers, pursuant to a formal decision of their national federation, to adopt an "open shop" policy. Against this breach of contract by their employers, the garment workers' union struck. That was in November last. They sought the sympathetic aid of the teamsters' union, but this aid was denied for months and until their strike had been evidently lost, when it was suddenly resolved upon and the teamsters struck in sympathy (pp. 17, 23). But they confined their strike to one house in the congested district; and as this did not serve the garment workers, but did tend to produce disorder, the garment workers asked the teamsters to call off their sympathetic strike, which was done (p. 59). For a reason by no means clear except inferentially, the employers then locked out some of the teamsters, and a new strike, for the teamsters now as well as by them, was declared. This is the strike in progress at present and in connection with which rioting and the use of troops are imminent.

It has been rumored, and the rumor has plausibility, although the fact might not be proved, that the inexplicable strike which the teamsters made in sympathy with the garment workers, was not made in good faith, but had been brought about by collusion between grafters in the teamsters' union and grafters in the employer's union. What the motive of the employers may have been it is not easy to say. Their animosity toward the teamsters' union and that of the team owners (which worked together very exasperatingly to mercantile interests) might sufficiently explain their readiness to facilitate a plan for crushing those cooperating organizations. But the manipulators of this crushing programme are quite freely accused of ulterior designs. They are suspected of intending to involve

Mayor Dunne in such embarrassments, political and official, as to balk his municipal ownership policy. They are thought even to have intended entangling President Roosevelt in the alternative of angering organized labor by calling out Federal troops or of giving the railroad interests a leverage against him for refusing to call troops out. Whatever may have been their motive, if they really did maliciously bring on the teamsters' strike in behalf of the garment workers, some significant facts are certain, and to these we call attention.

The employers' union had prepared elaborately for the strike, although it seemed to come like a bolt out of a clear sky. It refused to consider any adjustment while the strike lasted. It provoked the second strike in cold blood when the first had been abandoned. And it refuses to consider any terms of settlement whatever, even to secure the public peace, declaring that its purpose is to destroy the teamsters' union. All the indications are that this purpose is no afterthought, but was the purpose before any strike began. To throw the matter into the Federal courts, this employers' union has organized a local teaming company under the laws of West Virginia. This gives these Chicago men the legal right to go into the Federal courts in Illinois as citizens of West Virginia. However the law may regard that proceeding, fair men must regard it as a subterfuge for the fraudulent purpose of giving an appearance of national character to local questions, and thereby making color of legal authority for calling upon the Federal army. This device was supplemented by an ex parte injunction of the Federal court,—an injunction so broad as to make it dangerous for a striker to speak to a non-striker lest he might be charged upon affidavit with asking him to quit work against his express desire. Then came overture after overture for reasonable arbitration, which the employers

rejected. Here again they resorted to a subterfuge. They said they would arbitrate the contract which employers had with the teamsters and which the teamsters had broken, but would not arbitrate the contract which employers had with the garment workers and which the employers had broken. The latter they waived aside as a "closed question." Yet it was that employers' breach of contract which afforded the excuse if not the occasion for the teamsters' breach; and any fair-minded man would expect to bring both questions into the arbitration if he arbitrated at all—the provocation as well as the act it provoked. But the employers did not intend to arbitrate at all. They contended, when refusing to arbitrate, that the only issue was the free use of the streets and the right to sell goods freely. If that was the only issue, there is no doubt that such arbitrators as Judge Tuley, whom they rejected, or any other arbitrators who could possibly have been appointed, would have decided in their favor. No arbitrators would have reported against their free use of the streets and their freedom to sell goods. The very fact that the employers refused to arbitrate suggests to any candid mind that they did not really believe that the free use of the streets and freedom to sell their goods was the only issue. They must have been conscious of other issues, and fearful that arbitration would expose them. Since then they have shown that they had that consciousness. In a letter of the 3d to J. M. Taft, of the Taft Teaming company, they specify five other issues: (1) Inviolability of teamsters' contracts; (2) intolerability of sympathetic strikes; (3) assertion that they do not discriminate against organized teamsters; (4) assertion that they are not resisting labor unions; and (5) that members of the teamsters' union are guilty of violence, intimidation and coercion. If these issues do exist, they are arbitrable; and if the employers believed themselves in

the right as to these issues, they would not hesitate to accept the overtures for arbitration — especially if, as they themselves make clear, bloody battling in the public streets is the alternative. The unavoidable inference from all the circumstances is that the employers want no settlement. They want a street fight — as bloody as possible. Some of them have said as much in interviews, and the fact became clear enough when they appeared before the Mayor's commission last Sunday. Forced there by direct questions to explain their platitudes about the "sacred right to work," they acknowledged that their set purpose was to destroy the teamsters' union, and that therefore they would make no settlement and enter upon no arbitration.

The organization which takes that ground confesses itself in the wrong; and if the public peace is endangered thereby, it puts itself morally in a criminal attitude. Every life lost in consequence of refusal to make peace on terms which fair-minded arbitrators would propose, is chargeable to this recklessly domineering organization. While asserting its own right to organize for the purpose of influencing the wages of labor downward, it insists, even at the risk of disturbances to the public peace, upon destroying organizations of workingmen seeking to influence wages upward. All the heavier is its responsibility when, as the fact is, this defiant organization is itself provoking the very breaches of the public peace the possibility of which it refuses by arbitration to avoid. It has brought Negroes by wholesale from the South to arouse race antagonisms which Chicago may be long in recovering from. It has provided these strange men of another race with firearms, and has recklessly sought disturbances by sending them out as teamsters among street crowds in sympathy with the teamsters' strike. It has brought farmers' boys to Chicago

from distant places to destroy the teamsters' union by temporarily taking organized teamsters' places, knowing full well that most of these imported white men, as well as the imported Negroes, will soon become vagrants on the hands of the city authorities, in a city already crowded with workmen. It has hired professional "strike-breakers," a species of thug which private detective agencies herd and supply to order for employers' unions, importing them from distant cities and thrusting them into the public streets, armed with rifles, with the purpose, so slightly veiled as to be unconcealed, of having them provoke or create breaches of the peace sufficient to afford a pretext for policing the city with Federal troops. These acts are not consistent with good citizenship. They are criminal in morals, even if they may be shrewdly made to evade the criminality of the law. It would not be considerate perhaps to blame too severely for such acts the irritated merchants, who have doubtless had much to irritate them, as anyone acquainted with the annoyances of trade unionism will readily appreciate; but they cannot escape serious blame for acts so manifestly designed to provoke crime without incurring its penalties.

The sad thing about all this menacing turmoil is the blindness or indifference to its real nature, of those who engage in it or encourage it or weakly deplore it. The employer thinks it a violent outbreak of the lower classes, which can be put down by superior violence. He ignores the obtrusive fact that there may be an exciting cause of increasing intensity. In that case the superiority of violence will almost certainly shift, in the not distant future, and make of him and his hapless victims to their own selfish pride. Let him remember the arrogance that preceded the French Revolution. On the other side of the picture, the idealistic labor unionist, acting in re-

sponse to an economic pressure which he feels but does not understand, thinks to relieve it by coercively organizing the working classes into a body that shall treat an injury to one as the concern of all. He ignores the fact that the pressure he feels may be one of increasing intensity, and that in such case organization may not be able to keep pace with it without a degree of coercion which means riot, troops, slaughter and the gallows. Labor unionists of the business type view the matter in still another way. They expect to lift their own class of labor above the level of lower labor classes—Ten-penny Jameses above Nine-penny Jims—by safe and sane business methods. They overlook the fact that a lower class of labor is all the time a competitive menace to the class above, and that no isolated unionism can long withstand it. Another type is the ideal non-unionist. He is a sturdy believer in the right of free contract between employer and employe—almost as much so as is the employer who finds him a convenient catapult for battering down the walls of unionism. Then there is the “business” non-unionist, who makes a precarious living by hiring out as a “strike breaker.” Like any other tramp, he is one of the phenomena produced by the general cause of the whole vexed labor problem. Merc flotsam and jetsam, his blindness or indifference to the nature of labor troubles is probably not very significant. As for people who deplore these troubles, but neither think with vigor nor speak out like men, lest they may check an income, or anger a parishioner, or lose a client, or get disliked in a club, or be marked as a crank, or otherwise suffer some petty annoyance—as for them, can they not realize what will happen if there is an intensifying cause for labor troubles? The time must soon come when that cause will bring on irretrievable disaster, in which even they, their own dainty selfish selves, may be engulfed along with the rest of us.

That there is a general exciting cause for these labor troubles we all instinctively feel. And we all really know what it is. We know that it is inadequate opportunities for employment on the lower levels of labor, relatively to the supply of such labor. This is the cause, and it is an intensifying cause. It cannot be dealt with by Federal injunctions or Federal troops, by labor unions, or employers' unions, by weak wishing or strong cursing. Let the cause continue to intensify, and we shall be overrun with hordes of laborless men. They will be of the type of the strike breaker, and their brutality will not always be vented on strikers. But if this cause were removed, if conditions were sought and established in which jobs were hunting for men instead of men hunting for jobs, we should have neither employers' unions nor laborers' unions. Every man would be his own union, and general prosperity and industrial peace would follow. How to effect this change, from a superabundance of workers to a superabundance of opportunities for work, is the crux of the labor problem. How can it be done? There are but two ways. We must either kill off surplus workers, or we must release cornered opportunities for work. Which shall it be?

Prof. Frederick Starr, the distinguished anthropologist, has a wise word for the proud Saxon who thinks himself superior to all other races, partly because he is successful at grand pillage and partly because his skin is bleached. Says Prof. Starr: “We think we are the chosen of God, but it is my belief that the real worth of the different races is one and the same. We are the most meddling race that ever existed. We meddle at home, we meddle abroad, we meddle everywhere; and it is the almighty dollar that is the reason for our meddling. That is the watchword of the Anglo-Saxons. Even our missionary work is simply meddling.”

Mr. Rockefeller's lawyer, who

undertook to show Washington Gladden how ignorant or how wicked he was in accusing Mr. Rockefeller of perjury, has not been so quick to reply to Mr. Gladden's answer as his assumed familiarity with the subject gave reason to expect. Indeed he does not seem to have replied at all, and up to date Mr. Gladden appears to have very much the better of the controversy.

Apropos of the organization in West Virginia of a company of Chicago merchants for doing business in Chicago, with the purpose of enabling them to go into the Federal courts with their litigations, which they could not have done but for their incorporation out of their own State, why is it not in order to ask whether the State of Illinois intends to allow such trifling with its sovereignty, or the Federal courts such frauds upon their jurisdictional authority.

#### RACIAL EQUILIBRATION.

The political dominance of the trusts and the rise of colonialism in this country are coincident with the furious democratic ferment in Russia—a retrograde eddy in the most advanced country at the moment when the least progressive western nation is precipitated into a step forward. The world is smaller than it used to be, and each part of it is in closer touch with every other. No important country can long remain far ahead nor much behind the others without the spirit of the age eating into it wholesale; soon, like the ocean, they will all approximate a common level. Modern science in abolishing isolation has made a unit of the race question in our Southern States, in Asia, and in Africa, as to-day each locality quickly feels anything of importance that occurs elsewhere.

The Anglo-Saxon has been a leading offender against the law of democratic equality between races, and quick to demand special deference to white men as such. Yet a stronger law of nature now has been the undoing of his racial pretensions. As leader of the world's commerce, and to