The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy & A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

Vol. XV. CHICAGO, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1912. No. 736.

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents **Yearly Subscription, One Dollar**

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL

The Labor War in Chicago.

The contradictory statements that make it impossible to pass fair judgment upon the technical merits of the newspaper labor war which began in Chicago last week, are on the one side those of the pressmen theretofore employed by the Hearst papers, and on the other those of Andrew M. Lawrence, Mr. Hearst's factotum. Mr. Lawrence's statements appear to have been received at face value by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, which has accordingly assumed responsibility in behalf of the employing interests. There is, however, no reason why anybody else—Mr. Hearst excepted, of course—should attach presumptions of superior veracity to Mr. Lawrence's declarations. The pressmen, who outnumber Mr. Lawrence if witnesses are to be counted, and whose motives for misrepresentation are not especially obvious if testimony is to be weighed—should at the least have the benefit of any doubt excited by conflicts of statement.

Vastly greater considerations, however, are involved in this labor war than those that concern merely the technical merits of the specific quarrel with which it began. More distinctly than any labor controversy the United States has yet experienced, does this one exhibit the essential character of that actual class war to which certain socialistic groups look for the overthrow of what all socialists call Capitalism. Neither the Lawrence

strike nor the San Diego episode are likely to compare in importance with this affair in that respect.

To enter into details very minutely might be premature, but the larger details are plain. One of these is the perfect organization of newspaper publishers, from coast to coast, with an apparent purpose of destroying the effectiveness of labor organizations throughout the newspaper field. Their form of organization is indeed not at all military; but their adaptation of Napoleonic methods to economic strife is highly significant of military genius in a new sphere of action. Another of the larger facts is the readiness and skill with which similar military genius has formed a battle line on the labor side. Into a commonplace strike or lockout over a petty contractual dispute, syndicalistic socialists have breathed the fighting spirit of class warfare, and thousands upon thousands of the hired-man class outside the particular craft concerned, few of whom are conscious revolutionists, are angered to the heart's core. It is no insignificant thing, at a time of prevailing economic injustice and of widespread human misery in consequence, that organized workers whose opportunities for a livelihood are snatched from them should be re-enforced by organized workers of kindred crafts at peril of their own livelihood. Since for this kind of devotion there are few parallels outside the sphere of national patriotism, is it so very far-fetched for revolutionary agitators to welcome it as a sign of the coming of the labor-class patriotism they long for?

What the immediate results of any such class war would be, requires no gift of prophecy to foretell. It may be summed up in a few sentences: Extensive strikes; splendid loyalty; intense suffering; deadly animosities between individuals and groups whose interests are for the most part identical if they would but take pains enough to readjust them with reference to interests that really are hostile; slugging on both sides; blood spilling; pitchforks and cobblestones against muskets and artillery; defeat; convictions for crime; appeals for sympathy in quarters where sympathy has been crushed out by the bitterness of class warfare; hangings; peace, the peace of the cemetery; reaction; and for climax a more powerful plutocracy on the backs of a worse oppressed working people. If a universal co-operative social state in which all shall serve and none are masters be a dream, it is nevertheless a dream that can be gloriously realized. But realization must come from brotherly feeling through the direct action of straight thinking. Direct action to promote class war involves a species of crooked thinking that can but turn the realizable dream of brotherly co-operation into a realized nightmare as horrible as any that history records.

For this danger, and an imminent danger it is, where shall the blame rest? Shall it rest upon those who work, or upon those who exploit workers? upon those that are shut out by law from equal industrial opportunities, or upon monopolists of industrial opportunities? upon those whom our institutions drive to the extremities of poverty regardless of their productive industry and thrift, or upon those whom those institutions lift to the extremities of wealth regardless of their idleness and waste? There is but one true answer, but one manly answer. The blame for industrial violence, if unhappily this shall seriously disturb our communities, ought to rest—we cannot say it will, but it ought to rest—not upon working masses, exasperated at an injustice they do not understand but do feel, who angrily rise in hopeless rebellion. These will be shot down or gibbetted with no more consideration than the crucified followers of Spartacus got from a Roman plutocracy as sensual and selfish and cruel as our own. But the blame, if not the punishment, ought to rest primarily upon defenders of the indefensible legal privileges by which those uprisings are provoked. To be as specific as the occasion calls for, let the accusing finger of the preacher with his "Thou art the man!" point in this particular instance at the Chicago "local" of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association. If that body has nothing better to propose than coercion of organized hired-men by organized employers, the latter fortified with laws of property that spell privilege and wealth and power for them but exploitation and poverty and weakness for their adversaries, then the blame ought to rest upon that newspaper publishers' association, its members and managers and sympathizers.

In controversies like this, it cannot be that there is nothing better to stand for than coercion of organized labor by organized wealth. Somewhere in the industrial scheme there must be a place and a function for the elementary principles of justice. If not, then indeed will barbarism with its law of might and misery come again. But if there be a place and a function in the industrial scheme for the elementary principles of justice, how can

the chief responsibility for the inevitable horrors of crowding out those principles be saddled upon the victims of the laws that do it? Beneficiaries of perennial injustice should not escape, they must not escape, they ought to rise superior to so much as a wish to escape, that greater responsibility for social disaster which goes with their better opportunities for understanding the social injustice which causes social disasters, and their larger powers of education and influence for bringing that injustice peacefully to an end.

❁ ❁

"Collectivism."

In an admirable address on "The Trend Toward Collectivism," delivered before the Chicago City Club and published in its Bulletin of April 19th, Professor Rauschenbusch makes a distinction which needs to be emphasized. By "collectivism" he means, as in this address he explains, "something larger than Socialism usually means." In its organized form, Socialism seems to him to be "only one section of a far larger movement;" and this larger movement he designates "by the word 'collectivism,' not because that is the ordinary use of the word, but simply in order to have an algebraic symbol for something we want to express." Socialists would probably shrink from regarding "collectivism" as larger than Socialism; and many persons who are not Socialists would be at least surprised to learn that Socialism and collectivism are not identical. It is nevertheless true that the movement or trend which Professor Rauschenbusch symbolizes as "collectivism" is larger than the Socialism which makes class-war its *sine qua non*, be that war considered as peaceable or as violent; it is also true that the idea he indicates with the term "collectivism" is not necessarily technical Socialism either in part or altogether. The trend toward collectivism, while socialistic as all things societary are socialistic more or less, is in some of its aspects not Socialist at all in any of the legitimate senses in which the term "Socialism" is now current.

❁

But it may be that in his definition of what he means by "collectivism" Professor Rauschenbusch has fallen short of a precise definition of what he probably does mean. As it is difficult to believe that he is not as solicitous for private welfare and private rights as for public welfare and public rights, he may fail to guard his terms completely when he speaks favorably of "collectivism" as putting "emphasis on public welfare and public rights rather than private welfare and private rights," and of increasing "the amount of public property as against private property." Of course *emphasis* may be placed upon public welfare and public rights without at all minimizing private welfare and private rights; and a desire to increase *the amount* of public property as against private property may be realized without in the slightest degree impinging upon just rights of private property. Yet criticism, even if only captious, might be made. We do not presume to speak for Professor Rauschenbusch, nor in any wise to substitute our phrases for his in the expression of his thought. For the purpose, however, of expressing our own thought, which we regard as quite in agreement with his, and to express it so as to prevent misapprehension, we offer this slight paraphrase of his explanation, as our statement of our own view: "Our proposition is that we are all moving in the direction of what we may call 'collectivism.' By 'collectivism' we mean the putting of emphasis on public welfare and public rights *for the sake* of private rights, and a desire to extend public ownership as against private ownership of *public* property." By this paraphrase we do not mean that "collectivism" has yet become thus definitely discriminating in its tendency. That would not be true. There is probably as yet no great sensitiveness to the importance, both to individuals in the mass and to the mass itself, of the distinction *between private and public* welfare, rights and property. But that this distinction indicates root differences, and that those differences should be clearly distinguished in promoting the manifest trend toward "collectivism," is of vital importance alike to public interests, to personal freedom, and to permanent progress.

❁ ❁

Good Trusts and Bad.

This is the trust issue in Mr. Roosevelt's mind, as he discloses himself: Good trusts or bad trusts. President Taft interprets his policy as meaning that Mr. Roosevelt would by paternalistic methods determine between trusts, on the question of their goodness or badness, arbitrarily. We surmise not. Judged by the trusts he seems to like and has favored, Mr. Roosevelt's method is not arbitrary. He would seem rather to intend a distinction between the trusts that connive and fight and contract and conspire to choke competition, and those which are fortified by law, through their basic property holdings, against all effective competition. Take the Harvester and the Steel trusts for example. These appear to be in Mr. Roosevelt's category of good trusts. Yet they are the