

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1903.

Number 298.

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.

Some judge in New York has granted an injunction against a trade union's forbidding its members to strike for the purpose of compelling an employer to employ union men only—to adopt the rule of the "closed shop." Thus does "government by injunction" advance another step.

One need not sympathize especially with trade unions over this latest move in the direction of their suppression; for they have used their influence pretty freely at elections in behalf of the party that stands for "government by injunction." Even if they had not, the subject is not one for mere sympathy. It goes far deeper. To enjoin workmen from quitting work, whether singly or unitedly, for any purpose whatever, certainly when they are not under contract, is to invade the personal rights of every man, be he a trade unionist or not.

If the courts can grant injunctions against striking for a "closed shop," they can grant injunctions against striking for shorter hours or against longer hours, for an increase of wages or against a reduction, for sanitary conditions or against unsanitary conditions. And when they have gone thus far, they will have laid a foundation for regulating everybody's life by the ready method of injunction orders and contempt proceedings.

The expanding notion that trade unions monopolize labor and that the "closed shop" deprives outsiders of work is not true. What the unions may yet do in that di-

rection is another question. As yet they deprive no workmen of opportunities to work. They simply say that any workman may belong to their organization if he wishes to, and that they will not work by the side of any man who refuses to join them and contribute his share toward checking the aggressions of employers. This they have a right to do. True, they thereby in a sense coerce men who may not wish to pay union dues. But how do they coerce? Merely by refusing to be shop-mates with men who refuse to be union mates with them. To deny this right of coercion to any man is to deprive him of his individual rights. To deny it to him if others join with him in such refusal, is none the less to deprive him of his individual rights. No one can lose any individual right because others with the same right assert their right when he asserts his.

Yet much is made of the "coercion" by trade unions. It transpires, for instance, that some non-union man in Chicago was found in a state of destitution last week. He explained that the union was responsible for his suffering, because he could not find work outside of "closed shops" and the union would not admit him without his paying dues he could not afford. Thereupon the Chicago papers—bound hand and foot with plutocratic gyves—made a loud outcry against the "coercion" of the unions. But in explaining why this unfortunate did not join a union, they itemized his financial resources and liabilities, thereby letting out the fact that he paid \$8.00 a month for three squalid rooms in a dingy tenement house. These rooms would have been dear, probably, at \$2.00, on a valueless site. But the owner was able to exact \$8.00 because of their location. So at least \$6.00

of the rent the man paid was extorted in a much truer sense than any exaction of union dues would have been. It was an exaction by one man from another, not for permission to work as his companion, but for permission to live at all in a location on the earth's surface convenient to his place of work.

The enslaving nature of land monopoly has been neatly illustrated by Gen. Wood in the Philippines. Here is the dispatch from Manila published in the Chicago Evening Post of the 11th, which tells about it:

Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood has proclaimed in Moroland an anti-slavery law, passed last October by the legislative council of the Moro provinces. On the promise of the sultan and dattos to abide by its provisions Gen. Wood has suggested to Gov. Taft the establishment of the native Moros on lands which will be assigned to them by the sultan and dattos at a rate of valuation sufficient to provide the latter with a moderate income from the rentals.

Now, what is the difference, in economic principle, between the slavery that allows sultans and dattos to exact work without wages, and the "freedom" that allows them to confiscate wages in the name of "rentals"?

At a banquet of contractors and builders at the Chicago Auditorium hotel last week, an eminent advocate of the rights of man, yept William D. O'Brien, refused to toast the American flag. He was indignant at the interferences with natural rights under its folds, by—the army in the Philippines? the navy at Panama? the carpet-baggers in Porto Rico? the secretary of commerce and labor at New York with his "letter de cachet" or "administrative" process? Bless you, no! not any of those aggressions; but by—walking delegates in the building trades! Mr. O'Brien rose loftily when he described the rights of