

Labor Strife during the Development of Industry in America, 1890-1920

Documents

From: *Conflict Resolution and United States History*
(Chambers and Gardner, 2007)

Labor Strife during the development of industry in America, 1890-1920

Table of Contents for Documents

Part One: Pullman Strike, 1894-95

- Document 1: [Testimony of George Pullman, U.S Strike Commission Report, 1895](#)
- Document 2: [Testimony of Thomas W. Heathcoate, U.S Strike Commission Report, 1895](#)
- Document 3: [Eugene V. Debs, excerpt of speech to the ARU Convention, Chicago Times, June 12, 1894](#)
- Document 4: [Statement of the Pullman Strikers to the ARU Convention, June 14, 1894](#)
- Document 5: [The Sherman Anti-Trust Act, 1890](#)
- Document 6: [Testimony of Everett St. John, U.S Strike Commission Report, 1895](#)
- Document 7: [Testimony of Eugene V. Debs, U.S Strike Commission Report, 1895](#)
- Document 8: [Testimony of Samuel Gompers, U.S Strike Commission Report, 1895](#)
- Document 9: [Telegrams between Governor John Altgeld and President Gover Cleveland, July 5, 1894](#)
- Document 10: [Excerpts from *Wealth Against Commonwealth*, 1894](#)
- Document 11: [Jane Addams, Excerpts from "A Modern Lear," *Survey*, Volume 29, November 2, 1912](#)

Part Two: The Paterson Silk Strike, 1913

- Document 1: [Excerpts from the National Labor Relations Act of 1935](#)
- Document 2: ["6,000 Weavers Quit; I.W.W. Leaders Held; Paterson Police break up Mass Meeting and Arrest Elizabeth Flynn and Carlo Tresca," *New York Times*, February 26, 1913](#)
- Document 3: [Testimony of Moses Strauss to the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, 1916](#)
- Document 4: [Article by "Big Bill" Haywood in the *International Socialist Review*, 1913](#)

- Document 5: [Excerpt from the *One Big Union in the Textile Industry* by Evald Koettgen](#)
- Document 6: ["Golden Attacks I.W.W.," *New York Times*, July 3, 1913](#)
- Document 7: [Testimony of Adolf Lessig to the U.S. Commission of Industrial Relations, 1916](#)
- Document 8: [Interview with Carrie Golzio by Historian Steve Golin, 1983](#)
- Document 9: [The Mayor's View, U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, 1916](#)
- Document 10: [Letter from Peter W. Kirschbaum, Secretary of the Relief Committee, to the Brooklyn Defense Conference, 1913](#)
- Document 11: [Article in the *American Silk Journal*, October 1913](#)

Part One: THE PULLMAN STRIKE AND BOYCOTT, 1894

Document 1: Excerpts of Testimony of George Pullman before the U.S. Strike Commission

1895

Pullman: During “the entire month of August [1893] we had not received an invitation to bid for any cars and...during the month of September and October on more than one-half-quite a large proportion-a large majority of the bids that we put in for those months we failed to get the work. It was let to other parties because of lower prices.

I realized that some vigorous effort must be made to secure work for the large number of people we had employed at Pullman, or great suffering would be the consequence...[The managers] undertook, about November, to revise the piecework prices and see how low we could make the cost of cars. Upon that basis I undertook [it] personally to attend the meetings and to contribute money in the way of bidding below the actual cost, for the sake of procuring orders...

Up to the time of the strike, we had lost, I think, more than \$50,000 in the effort to keep our men at work...

I explained it personally to the men in Mr. Wickes' office...[They] said ‘we want the wages of 1893’...I said, ‘It would be the most unfortunate thing for you, and for all the men here-all the men employed-if the wages of 1893 should be restore, because there is not more than six or eight weeks of work in the shops altogether, and it would be utterly impossible to get any more work at the prices measured by the wages of 1893, which were somewhere from 20 to 25 percent higher than the wages of 1894,’ and I though it would be most unfortunate for the men.”

When the commission asked Pullman why he did not keep wages up by using money from the successful divisions of the company, he replied: “I would have no right to take the stockholder’s money to give one set of mechanics a higher rate than the market price, or higher than we were paying other men-that is, to give them a contribution, as I understand you to say that if we had made profits, why, divide them. We can only divide profits in a corporation to its stockholders. The wages had been fixed between the managers at the shops and the men. They were to work on an agreed scale.”

Commissioner Worthington: “Had the men agreed to work at those reduced prices?”

Pullman: “They were working at them, yes sir.”

Commissioner Worthington: “Well, they were forced to?”

Pullman: “No; they were not forced.”

Commissioner Worthington: “They had to take that or quit?”

In explaining why he refused to submit the dispute to arbitration, Pullman stated: "It must be clear to every business man, and to every thinking workman, that no prudent employer could submit to arbitration the question whether he should commit such a piece of business folly [as to give into the workers' demands]. Arbitration always implies acquiescence in the decision of the arbitrator, whether favorable or averse...Can I, as a business man, knowing the truth

Source: U.S. Strike Commission, Report and Testimony on the Chicago Strike of 1894. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895

Document 2:

**Excerpts of the Testimony of Thomas W.
Heathcoate before the U.S. Strike Commission**

1895

(Commissioner Wright) Did any violence or destruction of property take place at Pullman?

(Heathcoate) No, sir.

(Wright) You spoke of the United States militia; you mean the State militia, do you not?

(Heathcoate) I mean the United States troops.

(Wright) Were United States troops at Pullman?

(Heathcoate) Yes, sir.

(Wright) What wages were you receiving at time of and prior to the strike?

(Heathcoate) Now, I was a foreman of a gang, or what they call a gang boss, and I have my time book with me [witness referring to book]. In June, 1893, my pay for two weeks' work was \$43.55 at piecework; in July, 1893, my pay for two weeks' work was \$34.65. The reason of that difference was in the difference in the cars. On some cars we got a little better price than on others, it being finer, nicer work, and an expert mechanic can make better wages on fine work than common work.

(Wright) You worked on palace cars?

(Heathcoate) Yes, sir.

(Commissioner Kernan) If you had kept on at the same kind of work you were on in June would not your earnings have been the same?

(Heathcoate) If I had had that class of work right along and the price for it my wages would have been the same.

(Kernan) Was there any change in the scale of wages in those two months?

(Heathcoate) Not on the same kind of work. For the last two weeks of July, 1893, my pay was \$30.20. I lost some time during that two weeks; I did not work two or three days. In the first two weeks in August there was a reduction in the pay of 20 per cent, that is, the same class of piecework was cut down and a 25 per cent reduction made on the piecework. The day rate remained the same in August. We were rated at so much a day, but we had to do piecework, and a great many of us never got any day work. It was only the friends of the foreman that got the day work. The last two weeks of August, 1893, my pay was \$37.25; I worked some overtime. In the first two weeks of September my pay was \$32.70, and for the last two weeks of September, \$12.25. We were laid off from the 22d to the last of September, that is, the foreman laid all the gang off, so I only earned \$12.25 that two weeks. During the month of October we had no work at all. The first two weeks in November I received \$8.05; the second two weeks \$20.10. There was another cut; there were two cuts came in the first two weeks.

(Kernan) Can you give us here what you would have earned for the same amount of work in June, 1893?

(Heathcoate) I could not tell exactly without figuring it, but instead of earning \$20 I would have earned about \$38.

...

(Kernan) What would you have earned for the same work in June, 1893?

(Heathcoate) About \$43. We were making in June, 1893, from 28 ½ to 32 ½ cents per hour on piecework, and now we are making 19 cents an hour, and 18, 15, and 14 cents.

(Kernan) What do you mean by now?

(Heathcoate) In the months of March, April, and May, 1894. The first two weeks in April I lost two days and made \$16.25; the second two weeks, working full time, I made \$20.95. I worked up to April 4, and we appointed a committee to go and see Mr. Wickes. On the 5th that committee returned to Pullman. We waited two days to have an answer from Mr. Wickes in regard to what should be done, and on the 9th we returned again to Mr. Wickes.

(Kernan) You have not given us what you said to Mr. Wickes?

(Heathcoate) In the first place we went to Mr. Middleton, the manager of the shops, and asked that something be done with reference to the piecework, that the price be raised, that we could not possibly live at the prices we were getting. He said he could not do anything, that he had no authority, that the general manager had utterly refused to do anything with regard to raising prices so we could make more per day. We then appointed a committee of three from each department to go down and see Mr. Wickes, so each department would be represented. We went down and saw him, stated our case to him, and he said he could not do anything, that the company could not pay any more wages, that they were losing money. I asked Mr. Wickes why it was the railroad companies were paying \$2.50 per day for the same work the Pullman company were only paying \$1.90 for. He said he was not aware of anything of that kind. I had gotten that information from the master car builder of the Great Western road and the Northern Pacific. I wrote to him to find out what price they were paying per day and found out that they were paying \$2.50 per day for the same kind of work that was being done in the Pullman shops for \$1.90 per day, only ours was piecework and theirs was day work.

In order to show you the difference in making \$1.90 at piecework and \$1.90 at day work, a man has to do about four times as much work at piecework as he has to do at day work, because the prices are cut down so low it is almost impossible for a man, unless he is an expert, to make \$1.90 per day at the work. For instance, take the desk behind which you sit. I take the making of that desk today for \$20; I go to work on it and, being an expert, make \$4 per day at it; then the foreman says to me "the next time I will not give you but \$18 for making it." Well, I take another desk at that and by hard work still make \$4 per day at it. The next time he cuts the price down to \$16. I still by using more effort, working hard, make \$4 per day at it. He then cuts the price down to \$12 and I can only make \$3 per day at it. Being an expert mechanic, I will not make any more, don't want to. He then gives the desk to some other man who is not as expert in doing the work, and that man can not make \$1.25 per day at it. That is the reason a man has to work so much harder in order to make \$1.90 than the man who works in a railroad shop at \$2.50 or \$2.75. He has to do four times the amount of work.

(Wright) Would the same proportions you have given with reference to your own loss of earnings hold good for the general employees at Pullman during the time you were working there?

(Heathcoate) I think so. There are some men in Pullman that earn good wages, but on the average all the employees of the Pullman shops were in about the same condition.

Source: U.S. Strike Commission, Report and Testimony on the Chicago Strike of 1894. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.

**Document 3: Excerpt of speech by Eugene V. Debs to the ARU
Convention**

June 14, 1894

Under such circumstances it is not only not strange but natural that in the contention for supremacy by the forces of right and the forces of the wrong, deeds of violence should sometimes occur. It is human nature — it is history, and history will repeat itself until the day of darkness comes for our land, when plutocrats are supreme, or think themselves supreme.

Before an amazed country, the preliminary acts of a mighty tragedy are being acted, and it were well to let the curtain fall. The condition of the country is becoming hourly more momentous. The camps are all astir, where drums beat the long roll and the bugles call to arms. The President of the United States, the commander-in-chief of the army and the navy, is concentrating his battalions in various places. When a semi-savage queen had been dethroned in the interest of good government and of civilization, the President became so profoundly stirred that he sent a private commissioner to feel the pulse of the old queen and report to him how matters stood; but when 4,000 Pullman employees were being ground to dust between corporation millstones, the commander-in-chief goes a fishing, and at the call of courts concentrates soldiers of his standing army, *a la* tsar, at various points with the orders to fertilize American soil with the blood of American workingmen. As we write the work of bloodletting has begun and the street gutters of Chicago are running red with blood. The situation is one of terrible significance. The country is alarmed. More than one-half of the continent is involved and the army of the idle is increasing. George M. Pullman's greed, depravity, and despotism aided by the alliance of railroad managers have brought about conditions of peril from the contemplation of which bold men turn away. As I conclude, it must be said that the situation is full of premonitions that the worst has not been reached. There are no encouraging symptoms.

The outlook is in all directions disheartening. Around the horizon and overhead naught but storm clouds meets the vision. The vivid flash of the lightnings of anger accompanied by the sullen, deep-toned mutterings of human voices mingled with the explosions of powder, bode only evil. But, regardless of the outcome, it will be written that George M. Pullman and his confederate despoilers of labor were responsible.

Source: The Eugene V. Debs Foundation, Terre Haute, Indiana

June 14, 1894

Mr. President and Brothers of the American Railway Union: We struck at Pullman because we were without hope. We joined the American Railway Union because it gave us a glimmer of hope. Twenty thousand souls, men, women, and little ones, have their eyes turned toward this convention today, straining eagerly through dark despondency for a glimmer of the heaven-sent message you alone can give us on this earth.

In stating to this body our grievances it is hard to tell where to begin. You all must know that the proximate cause of our strike was the discharge of two members of our grievance committee the day after George M. Pullman, himself, and Thomas H. Wickes, his second vice-president, had guaranteed them absolute immunity. The more remote causes are still imminent. Five reductions in wages, in work, and in conditions of employment swept through the shops at Pullman between May and December, 1893. The last was the most severe, amounting to nearly 30 percent, and our rents had not fallen. We owed Pullman \$70,000 when we struck May 11. We owe him twice as much today. He does not evict us for two reasons: One, the force of popular sentiment and public opinion; the other because he hopes to starve us out, to break through in the back of the American Railway Union, and to deduct from our miserable wages when we are forced to return to him the last dollar we owe him for the occupancy of his houses.

Rents all over the city in every quarter of its vast extent have fallen, in some cases to one-half. Residences, compared with which ours are hovels, can be had a few miles away at the prices we have been contributing to make a millionaire a billionaire. What we pay \$15 for in Pullman is leased for \$8 in Roseland; and remember that just as no man or woman of our 4,000 toilers has ever felt the friendly pressure of George M. Pullman's hand, so no man or woman of us all has ever owned or can ever hope to own one inch of George M. Pullman's land. Why, even the very streets are his. . . . He may debar any man . . . from walking in his highways. And those streets; do you know what he has named them? He says after the four great inventors in methods of transportation. And do you know what their names are? Why, Fulton, Stephenson, Watt, and Pullman. . . .

When we went to tell him our grievances he said we were all his "children." Pullman, both the man and the town, is an ulcer on the body politic. He owns the houses, the schoolhouses, and churches of God in the town he gave his once humble name. The revenue he derives from these, the wages he pays out with one hand—the Pullman Palace Car Company, he takes back with the other—the Pullman Land Association. He is able by this to bid under any contract car shop in this country. His competitors in business, to meet this, must reduce the wages of their men. This gives him the excuse to reduce ours to conform to the market. His business rivals must in turn scale down; so must he. And thus the merry war—the dance of skeletons bathed in human tears—goes on, and it will go on, brothers, forever, unless you, the American Railway Union, stop it; end it; crush it out.

Our town is beautiful. In all these thirteen years no word of scandal has arisen against one of our women, young or old. What city of 20,000 persons can show the like? Since our strike, the arrests, which used to average four or five a day, has dwindled down to less than one a week. We are peaceable; we are orderly, and but for the kindly beneficence of kindly-hearted people in and about Chicago we would be starving. We are not desperate today, because we are not hungry, and our wives and children are not begging for bread. But George M. Pullman, who ran away from the public opinion that has arisen against him, like the genie

from the bottle in the Arabian Nights, is not feeding us. He is patiently seated beside his millions waiting for what? To see us starve. We have grown better acquainted with the American Railway Union these convention days, and as we have heard sentiments of the noblest philanthropy fall from the lips of our general officers—your officers and ours—we have learned that there is a balm for all our troubles, and that the box containing it is in your hands today only awaiting opening to disseminate its sweet savor of hope

George M. Pullman, you know, has cut our wages from 30 to 70 percent. George M. Pullman has caused to be paid in the last year the regular quarterly dividend of 2 percent on his stock and an extra slice of 1 1/2 percent, making 9 1/2 percent on \$30,000,000 of capital. George M. Pullman, you know, took three contracts on which he lost less than \$5,000. Because he loved us? No. Because it was cheaper to lose a little money in his freight car and his coach shops than to let his workingmen go, but that petty loss, more than made up by us from money we needed to clothe our wives and little ones, was his excuse for effecting a gigantic reduction of wages in every department of his great works, of cutting men and boys and girls; with equal zeal, including everyone in the repair shops of the Pullman Palace cars on which such preposterous profits have been made. . . .

We will make you proud of us, brothers, if you will give us the hand we need. Help us make our country better and more wholesome. Pull us out of our slough of despond. Teach arrogant grinders of the faces of the poor that there is still a God in Israel, and if need be a Jehovah—a God of battles. Do this, and on that last great day you will stand, as we hope to stand, before the great white throne "like gentlemen unafraid."

Source: U.S. Strike Commission, Report and Testimony on the Chicago Strike of 1894. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.

The Sherman Anti-Trust Act

1890

15 U.S.C. §1: Trusts, etc., in restraint of trade illegal; penalty

Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$10,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$350,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding three years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

15 U.S.C. §2: Monopolizing trade a felony; penalty

Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$10,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$350,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding three years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

15 U.S.C. §3: Trusts in Territories or District of Columbia illegal; combination a felony

Every contract, combination in form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce in any Territory of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or in restraint of trade or commerce between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, is declared illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$10,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$350,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding three years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

15 U.S.C. §4: Jurisdiction of courts; duty of United States attorneys; procedure

The several district courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of sections 1 to 7 of this title; and it shall be the duty of the several United States attorneys, in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. Such proceedings may be by way of petition setting forth the case and praying that such violation shall be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of shall have been duly notified of such petition the court shall proceed, as soon as may be, to the hearing and determination of the case; and pending such petition and before final decree, the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises.

Source: Our Documents, The National Archives

**Document 6: Testimony of Everett St. John before the U.S.
Strike Commission**

August 1894

Commissioner Wright: One what date was the resolution of your association passed, relating to the boycott that was order?

St. John: I will give you a little account of that. One June, 22 1894, after having read in the press that a boycott was to be established upon all on the lines operating Pullman cars, I sent out this call:

Chicago, June 22, 1894.

Dear Sirs: An emergency meeting of the General Manager's Association is hereby called for Monday, June 25, at 2 p.m., at the Rookery Building, Chicago.

E. St. John, Chairman

The meeting assembled; every line was represented. The statement was made by the chair that the meeting had be called to consider the statement which had been published that at 12 o'clock on the following day a boycott on the various lines would be declared by the American Railway Union, and the meeting is now open for discussion and such action as may be deemed necessary. The matter was freely discussed and upon notion duly seconded. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas we learn through the public press that the American Railway Union will declare a boycott on all Pullman cars; and

Whereas said boycott is in relation to matters over which we have no control and in which we have no interest whatever; and

Whereas it is stated that the object and intent of the said boycott is to discommode the traveling public and embarrass the railroads, in the belief that the public and the railroads affected will influence the settlement of the question as the American Railway Union desires; and

Whereas it is necessary that these companies determine for themselves what cars they shall or shall not handle; and

Whereas it is important that the traveling public understand the position of the railroads in this matter; therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that the proposed boycott, being

Source: U.S. Strike Commission, Report and Testimony on the Chicago Strike of 1894. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.

Document 7: Testimony of Eugene V. Debs before the U.S. Strike Commission

Commissioner Wright: Take up your narrative from the 21st of June.

Debs:

Pursuant to the order of the convention, practically the order of the 150,000 employees composing the union, because it was taken by the delegates by authority of their several unions- and I would like to emphasize this point, for the reason that it has been repeatedly claimed and it has been the source of a great deal of prejudice, I think, to our cause, that the president of the union ordered the strike, that the president of the union was a self-appointed individual and ordered the strike-I would like to have that point understood, that the strike was practically ordered by the rank and file of the membership of the order; that is, the delegates acted by their express authority and instruction. I admit that when the reports came in from these committees, and from what I knew myself, that I was ready, as the president of the union, to sanction such action. I do not wish to shirk any responsibility for my act as the president of the union. I gave my hearty concurrence to the movement. I did not order it, however, nor did I have any voice in ordering; but if I had a voice in ordering it, I should have ordered it.

On the 26th day of June, pursuant to the order of the convention, the employees began to refuse to haul Pullman cars. The officers of the American Railway Union established temporary headquarters at Ulrich's Hall. They were very careful to instruct the men, or to advise the men, rather, in our advisory capacity, not to take this action anywhere unless it was sanctioned by the majority of the employees, and unless it was certain that the employees and they felt strong enough to make it effectual. We said, it is not wise for a few men to create trouble, and not to strike unless it was sanctioned by a majority of the employees, and unless it was certain that the employees of the body will stand by you in doing. The committees came from all yards and from all roads to confer with us, and we would authorize that committee to confer with us. The switchmen, for instance, would send a committee to act for that year or for that road, and that committee would then go to that yard and take charge of the affairs, serve notice upon the men, and keep them in line, and above everything we advised them to do everything in their power to maintain order and prevent violence.

Source: U.S. Strike Commission, Report and Testimony on the Chicago Strike of 1894. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.

Document 8:

**Testimony of Samuel Gompers before the U.S.
Strike Commission**

...

Commissioner Worthington: I understand that neither you as president nor the executive committee or executive council (by whichever name you call it) has authority to declare a general strike. That is correct, is it?

Gompers: That is correct.

Commissioner Worthington: And has no authority to declare a strike of any particular body of workers?

Gompers: It has no such power.

Commissioner Worthington: Has it any power to prohibit strikes?

Gompers: It has not, except when any affiliated body engaged in an industrial dispute desires having the assistance, financial or moral, of the American Federation of Labor, it is within our power to give it our approval or disapproval; and while it is not an order to strike or an order not to strike, it is fair to assume that an approval carries with it considerable prestige for victory, and, on the other hand, a disapproval would mean that the organization would find it to its advantage not to enter into the strike.

Commissioner Worthington: But that would be in the shape of moral influence, rather than direct power on its part?

Gompers: The system is governed more by moral influences than by force.

...

Source: U.S. Strike Commission, Report and Testimony on the Chicago Strike of 1894. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.

Document 9:

**Telegrams between Governor John Altgeld and
President Grover Cleveland**

July 5, 1894

5 July 1894

Hon. Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, Washington D.C.

Sir: I am advised that you have ordered Federal troops to go into service in the state of Illinois. Surely the facts have not been correctly presented to you in this case, or you would not have taken this step, for it is entirely unnecessary, and, as it seems to me, unjustifiable...At present some of our railroads are paralyzed, not by reason of obstruction, but because they cannot get men to operate the trains. For some reason they are anxious to keep this fact from the public, and for this purpose they are making an outcry about obstruction in order to divert attention.

Cleveland Replied:

5 July 1894

Hon. John P. Altgeld, Governor of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.

Sir: Federal troops were sent to Chicago in strict accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States, upon the demand of the post-office department that obstruction of the mails should be removed, and upon the representations of the judicial officers of the United States that the process of the Federal courts could not be executed through ordinary means, and upon the competent proof that conspiracies existed against commerce between the states...

Source: The Chicago Historical Society, The Pullman Era Collection

**Document 10: Excerpts from *Wealth Against Commonwealth*,
by Henry Demarest Lloyd**

1894

Nature is rich; but everywhere man, the heir of nature, is poor. Never in this happy country or elsewhere except in the Land of Miracle, where "they did all eat and were filled"-has there been enough of anything for the people. Never since time began have all the sons and daughters of men been all warm, and all filled, and all shod and roofed. Never yet have all the virgins, wise or foolish, been able to fill their lamps with oil.

The world, enriched by thousands of generations of toilers and thinkers, has reached a fertility which can give every human being a plenty undreamed of even in the Utopias. But between this plenty ripening on the boughs of our civilization and the people hungering for it step the "cornerers," the syndicates, trusts, combinations, with the cry of "over-production"-too much of everything. Holding back the riches of earth, sea, and sky from their fellows who famish and freeze in the dark, they declare to them that there is too much light and warmth and food. They assert the right, for their private profit, to regulate the consumption by the people of the necessities of life, and to control production, not by the needs of humanity, but by the desires of a few for dividends. The coal syndicate thinks there is too much coal. There is too much iron, too much lumber, too much flour-for this or that syndicate.

The majority have never been able to buy enough of anything; but this minority have too much of everything to sell.

Liberty produces wealth, and wealth destroys liberty. "The splendid empire of Charles V.," says Motley, "was erected upon the grave of liberty." Our bignesses cities, factories, monopolies, fortunes, which are our empires, are the obesities of an age gluttonous beyond its powers of digestion. Mankind are crowding upon each other in the centres, and struggling to keep each other out of the feast set by the new sciences and the new fellowships. Our size has got beyond both our science and our conscience. The vision of the railroad stockholder is not far-sighted enough to see into the office of the General Manager; the people cannot reach across even a ward of a city to rule their rulers; Captains of Industry "do not know" whether the men in the ranks are dying from lack of food and shelter; we cannot clean our cities nor our politics; the locomotive has more man-power than all the ballot-boxes, and millwheels wear out the hearts of workers unable to keep up beating time to their whirl. If mankind had gone on pursuing the ideals of the fighter, the time would necessarily have come when there would have been only a few, then only one, and then none left. This is what we are witnessing in the world of livelihoods. Our ideals of livelihood are ideals of mutual deglutition. We are rapidly reaching the stage where in each province only a few are common toil of all and the common gifts of nature, lands, forces, mines, sites, are turned from service to selfishness, and are made by one and the same stroke to give gluts to a few and impoverishment to the many-we must plan our campaign. The yacht of the millionaire incorporates a million days' labor which might have been given to abolishing the slums, and every day it runs the labor of hundreds of men is withdrawn from the production of helpful things for humanity, and each of us is equally guilty who directs to his own pleasure the labor he should turn to the wants of others. Our fanatic of wealth reverses the rule that serving mankind is the end and wealth an incident, and has made wealth the end and the service an accident, until he can finally justify crime itself if it is a means to the end-wealth-which has come to be the supreme good; and we follow him.

It is an adjudicated fact of the business and social life of America that to receive the profits of crime and cherish the agents who commit it does not disqualify for fellowship in the most "solid" circles-financial, commercial, religious, or social. It illustrates what Ruskin calls the "morbid" character of modern business that the history of its most brilliant episodes must be studied in the vestibules of the penitentiary. The riches of the combinations are the winnings of a policy which, we have seen, has certain constant features. Property to the extent of uncouthed millions has been changed from the possession of the many who owned it to the few who hold it:

1. Without the knowledge of the real owners.
2. Without their consent.
3. With no compensation to them for the value taken.
4. By falsehood, often under oath.
5. In violation of the law.

Our civilization is builded on competition, and competition evolves itself crime to so acute an infatuation has the lunacy of self-interest carried our dominant opinion. We are hurried far beyond the point of not listening to the new conscience which, pioneering in moral exploration, declares that conduct we think right because called "trade" is really lying, stealing, murder. "The definite result," Ruskin preaches, "of all our modern haste to be rich inassuredly and constantly the murder of a certain number be even temporarily and partially successful. The question in the end is, Does it inevitably tend to public injury?"

Those who insist that "there are none" are the fortunate ones who came up to the shield on its golden side. But common usage agrees With the language of Judge Barrett, because it exactly fits a fact which presses on common people heavily, and will grow heavier before it grows lighter.

The committee of Congress investigating trusts in 1889 did not report any list of these combinations to control markets, "for the reason that new ones are constantly forming, and that old ones are constantly extending their relations so as to cover new branches of the business and invade new territories."

It is true that such a list, like a dictionary, would begin to be wrong the moment it began to appear. But though only an instantaneous photograph of the whirlwind, it would give an idea, to be gained in no other way, of a movement shadowing two hemispheres. In an incredible number of the necessities and luxuries of life, from meat to tombstones, some inner circle of the "fittest" has sought, and very often obtained, the sweet power which Judge Barrett found the sugar trust had: It "can close every refinery at will, close some and open others, limit the purchases of raw material (thus jeopardizing, and in a considerable degree controlling, its production), artificially limit the production of refined sugar, enhance the price to enrich themselves and their associates at the public expense, and depress the price when necessary to crush out and impoverish a foolhardy rival." .

Laws against these combinations have been passed by Congress and by many of the States. There have been prosecutions under them by the State and Federal governments. The laws and the lawsuits have alike been futile.

In a few cases names and form of organization have been changed, in consequence of legal pursuit. The whiskey, sugar, and oil trusts had to hang out new signs. But the thing itself, the will and the power to control markets, livelihoods, and liberties, and the toleration of this by the public-this remains unimpaired; in

truth, facilitated by the greater secrecy and compactness which have been the only results of the appeal to law.

The Attorney-General of the national government gives a large part of his annual report for 1893 to showing "what small basis there is for the popular impression" "that the aim and effect of this statute" (the Anti-Trust Law) "are to prohibit and prevent those aggregations of capital which are so common at the present day, and which sometimes are on so large a scale as to practically control all the branches of an extensive industry." This executive says of the action of the "co-ordinate" Legislature: "It would not be useful, even if it were possible, to ascertain the precise purposes of the framers of the statute." He is the officer charged with the duty of directing the prosecutions to enforce the law; but he declares that since, among other reasons, "all ownership of property is a monopoly, . . . any literal application of the provisions of the statute is out of the question." Nothing has been accomplished by all these appeals to the legislatures and the courts, except to prove that the evil lies deeper than any public sentiment or public intelligence yet existent, and is stronger than any public power yet at call.

What we call Monopoly is Business at the end of its journey. The concentration of wealth, the wiping out of the middle classes, are other names for it. To get it is, in the world of affairs, the chief end of man. .

If our civilization is destroyed, as Macaulay predicted, it will not be by his barbarians from below. Our barbarians come from above. Our great money-makers have sprung in one generation into seats of power kings do not know. The forces and the wealth are new, and have been the opportunity of new men. Without restraints of culture, experience, the pride, or even the inherited caution of class or rank, these men, intoxicated, think they are the wave instead of the float and that they have created the business which has created them. To them science is but a never-ending repertoire of investments stored up by nature for the syndicates, government but a fountain of franchises, the nations but customers in squads, and a million the unit of a new arithmetic of wealth written for them. They claim a power without control, exercised through forms which make it secret, anonymous, and perpetual. The possibilities of its gratification have been widening before them without interruption since they began, and even at a thousand millions they will feel no satiation and will see no place to stop. They are gluttons of luxury and power, rough, unsocialized, believing that mankind must be kept terrorized. Powers of pity die out of them, because they work through agents and die in their agents, because what they do is not for themselves.

By their windfall of new power they have been forced into the position of public enemies. Its new forms make them seem not to be within the jurisdiction of the social restraints which many ages of suffering have taught us to bind about the old powers of man over man. A fury of rule or ruin has always in the history of human affairs been a characteristic of the "strong men" whose fate it is to be in at the death of an expiring principle. The leaders who, two hundred years ago, would have been crazy with conquest, to-day are crazy with competition. To a dying era some man is always born to enfranchise it by revealing it to itself. Men repay such benefactors by turning to rend them. Most unhappy is the fate of him whose destiny it is to lead mankind too far in its own path. Such is the function of these men, such will be their lot, as that of those for whom they are building up these wizard wealths. .

Business motivated by the self-interest of the individual runs into monopoly at every point it touches the social life-land monopoly, transportation monopoly, trade monopoly, political monopoly in all its forms, from contraction of the currency to corruption in office. The society in which in half a lifetime a man without a penny can become a hundred times a millionaire is as over-ripe, industrially, as was, politically, the Rome

in which the most popular bully could lift himself from the ranks of the legion on to the throne of the Caesars. Our rising issue is with business. Monopoly is business at the end of its journey. It has got there. The irrepressible conflict is now as distinctly with business as the issue so lately met was with slavery. Slavery went first only because it was the cruder form of business.

Against the principles, and the men embodying them and pushing them to extremes-by which the powers of government, given by all for all, are used as franchises for personal aggrandizement; by which, in the same line, the common toil of all and the common gifts of nature, lands, forces, mines, sites, are turned from service to selfishness, and are made by one and the same stroke to give gluts to a few and impoverishment to the many-we must plan our campaign. The yacht of the millionaire incorporates a million days' labor which might have been given to abolishing the slums, and every day it runs the labor of hundreds of men is withdrawn from the production of helpful things for humanity, and each of us is equally guilty who directs to his own pleasure the labor he should turn to the wants of others. Our fanatic of wealth reverses the rule that serving mankind is the end and wealth an incident, and has made wealth the end and the service an accident, until he can finally justify crime itself if it is a means to the end-wealth-which has come to be the supreme good; and we follow him.

Two social energies have been in conflict, and the energy of reform has so far proved the weaker. We have chartered the selfinterest of the individual as the rightful sovereign of conduct; we have taught that the scramble for profit is the best method of administering the riches of earth and the exchange of services. Only those can attack this system who attack its central principle, that strength gives the strong in the market the right to destroy his neighbor. Only as we have denied that right to the strong elsewhere have we made ourselves as civilized as we are. And we cannot make a change as long as our songs, customs, catchwords, and public opinions tell all to do the same thing if they can. Society, in each person of its multitudes, must recognize that the same principles of the interest of all being the rule of all, of the strong serving the weak, of the first being the last-"I am among you as one that serves -which have given us the home where the weakest is the one surest of his rights and of the fullest service of the strongest, and have given us the republic in which all join their labor that the poorest may be fed, the weakest defended, and all educated and prospered, must be applied where men associate in common toil as wherever they associate. Not until then can the forces be reversed which generate those obnoxious persons-our fittest.

Our system, so fair in its theory and so fertile in its happiness and prosperity in its first century, is now, following the fate of systems, becoming artificial, technical, corrupt; and, as always happens in human institutions, after noon, power is stealing from the many to the few. Believing wealth to be good, the people believed the wealthy to be good. But, again in history, power has -intoxicated and hardened its possessors, and Pharaohs are bred in counting-rooms as they were in palaces. Their furniture must be banished to the world-garret, where lie the out-worn trappings of the guilds and slavery and other old lumber of human institutions.

Source: Henry Demarest Lloyd, *Wealth Against Commonwealth*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1894.

**Document 11: Excerpts from *A Modern Lear*, by Jane Addams
Speech given at the Chicago Woman's Club and the
Twentieth Century Club of Boston**

1896

Those of us who lived in Chicago during the summer of 1894 were confronted by a drama which epitomized and, at the same time, challenged the code of social ethics under which we live, for a quick series of unusual events had dispelled the good nature which in happier times envelopes the ugliness of the industrial situation. It sometimes seems as if the shocking experiences of that summer, the barbaric instinct to kill, roused on both sides, the sharp division into class lines, with the resultant distrust and bitterness, can only be endured if we learn from it all a great ethical lesson. To endure is all we can hope for. It is impossible to justify such a course of rage and riot in a civilized community to whom the methods of conciliation and control were open. Every public-spirited citizen in Chicago during that summer felt the stress and perplexity of the situation and asked himself, "How far am I responsible for this social disorder? What can be done to prevent such outrageous manifestations of ill-will?"

If the responsibility of tolerance lies with those of the widest vision, it behooves us to consider this great social disaster, not alone in its legal aspect nor in its sociological bearings, but from those deep human motives, which, after all, determine events.

During the discussions which followed the Pullman strike, the defenders of the situation were broadly divided between the people pleading for individual benevolence and those insisting upon social righteousness; between those who held that the philanthropy of the president of the Pullman company had been most ungratefully received and those who maintained that the situation was the inevitable outcome of the social consciousness developing among working people.

In the midst of these discussions the writer found her mind dwelling upon a comparison which modified and softened all her judgments. Her attention was caught by the similarity of ingratitude suffered by an indulgent employer and an indulgent parent. King Lear came often to her mind. We have all shared the family relationship and our code of ethics concerning it is somewhat settled. We also bear a part in the industrial relationship, but our ethics concerning that are still uncertain. A comparative study of these two relationships presents an advantage, in that it enables us to consider the situation from the known experience toward the unknown. The minds of all of us reach back to our early struggles, as we emerged from the state of self-willed childhood to a recognition of the family claim.

We have all had glimpses of what it might be to blaspheme against family ties; to ignore the elemental claim they make upon us, but on the whole we have recognized them, and it does not occur to us to throw them over. The industrial claim is so difficult; the ties are so intangible that we are constantly ignoring them and shirking the duties which they impose. It will probably be easier to treat of the tragedy of the Pullman strike as if it were already long past when we compare it to the family tragedy of Lear which has already become historic to our minds and which we discuss without personal feeling.

Historically considered, the relation of Lear to his children was archaic and barbaric, holding in it merely the beginnings of a family life, since developed. We may in later years learn to look back upon the industrial relationships in which we are now placed as quite as incomprehensible and selfish, quite as barbaric and

undeveloped, as was the family relationship between Lear and his daughters. We may then take the relationship of this unusually generous employer at Pullman to his own townful of employees as at least a fair one, because so exceptionally liberal in many of its aspects. King Lear doubtless held the same notion of a father's duty that was held by the other fathers of his time; but he alone was a king and had kingdoms to bestow upon his children. He was unique, therefore, in the magnitude of his indulgence, and in the magnitude of the disaster which followed it. The sense of duty held by the president of the Pullman company doubtless represents the ideal in the minds of the best of the present employers as to their obligations toward their employees, but he projected this ideal more magnificently than the others. He alone gave his men so model a town, such perfect surroundings. The magnitude of his indulgence and failure corresponded and we are forced to challenge the ideal itself: the same deal which, more or less clearly defined, is floating in the minds of all philanthropic employers.

This older tragedy implied maladjustment between individuals; the forces of the tragedy were personal and passionate. This modern tragedy in its inception is a maladjustment between two large bodies of men, an employing company and a mass of employees. It deals not with personal relationships, but with industrial relationships.

Owing, however, to the unusual part played in it by the will of one man, we find that it closely approaches Lear in motif. The relation of the British King to his family is very like the relation of the president of the Pullman company to his town; the denouement of a daughter's break with her father suggests the break of the employees with their benefactor. If we call one an example of the domestic tragedy, the other of the industrial tragedy, it is possible to make them illuminate each other.

It is easy to discover striking points of similarity in the tragedies of the royal father and the philanthropic president of the Pullman company. The like quality of ingratitude they both suffered is at once apparent. It may be said that the ingratitude which Lear received was poignant and bitter to him in proportion as he recalled the extraordinary benefits he had heaped upon his daughters, and that he found his fate harder to bear because he had so far exceeded the measure of a father's duty, as he himself says. What, then, would be the bitterness of a man who had heaped extraordinary benefits upon those toward whom he had no duty recognized by common consent; who had not only exceeded the righteousness of the employer, but who had worked out original and striking methods for lavishing goodness and generosity? More than that, the president had been almost persecuted for this goodness by the more utilitarian members of his company and had at one time imperiled his business reputation for the sake of the benefactions to his town, and he had thus reached the height of sacrifice for it. This model town embodied not only his hopes and ambitions, but stood for the peculiar effort which a man makes for that which is misunderstood.

It is easy to see that although the heart of Lear was cut by ingratitude and by misfortune, it was cut deepest of all by the public pity of his people, in that they should remember him no longer as a king and benefactor, but as a defeated man who had blundered through oversoftness. So the heart of the Chicago man was cut by the unparalleled publicity which brought him to the minds of thousands as a type of oppression and injustice, and to many others as an example of the evil of an irregular sympathy for the "lower classes." He who had been dined and feted throughout Europe as the creator of a model town, as the friend and benefactor of workingmen, was now execrated by workingmen throughout the entire country. He had not only been good to those who were now basely ungrateful to him, but he felt himself deserted by the admiration of his people.

In shops such as those at Pullman, indeed, in all manufacturing affairs since the industrial revolution, industry is organized into a vast social operation. The shops are managed, however, not for the development of the workman thus socialized, but for the interests of the company owning the capital. The divergence between the social form and the individual aim becomes greater as the employees are more highly socialized and dependent, just as the clash in a family is more vital in proportion to the development and closeness of the family tie. The president of the Pullman company went further than the usual employer does. He socialized not only the factory but the form in which his workmen were living. He built and, in a great measure, regulated an entire town. This again might have worked out into a successful associated effort, if he had had in view the sole good of the inhabitants thus socialized, if he had called upon them for self-expression and had made the town a growth and manifestation of their wants and needs. But, unfortunately, the end to be obtained became ultimately commercial and not social, having in view the payment to the company of at least 4 per cent on the money invested, so that with this rigid requirement there could be no adaptation of rent to wages, much less to needs. The rents became static and the wages competitive, shifting inevitably with the demands of trade. The president assumed that he himself knew the needs of his men, and so far from wishing them to express their needs he denied to them the simple rights of trade organization, which would have been, of course, the merest preliminary to an attempt at associated expression. If we may take the dictatorial relation of Lear to Cordelia as a typical and most dramatic example of the distinctively family tragedy, one will asserting its authority through all the entanglement of wounded affection, and insisting upon its selfish ends at all costs, may we not consider the absolute authority of this employer over his town as a typical and dramatic example of the industrial tragedy? One will directing the energies of many others, without regard to their desires, and having in view in the last analysis only commercial results?

It shocks our ideal of family life that a man should fail to know his daughter's heart because she awkwardly expressed her love, that he should refuse to comfort and advise her through all difference of opinion and clashing of will. That a man should be so absorbed in his own indignation as to fail to apprehend his child's thought; that he should lose his affection in his anger, is really no more unnatural than that the man who spent a million of dollars on a swamp to make it sanitary for his employees, should refuse to speak to them for ten minutes, whether they were in the right or wrong; or that a man who had given them his time and thought for twenty years should withdraw from them his guidance when he believed them misled by ill-advisers and wandering in a mental fog; or that he should grow hard and angry when they needed tenderness and help.

Lear ignored the common ancestry of Cordelia and himself. He forgot her royal inheritance of magnanimity, and also the power of obstinacy which he shared with her. So long had he thought of himself as the noble and indulgent father that he had lost the faculty by which he might perceive himself in the wrong. Even when his spirit was broken by the storm he declared himself more sinned against than sinning. He could believe any amount of kindness and goodness of himself, but could imagine no fidelity on the part of Cordelia unless she gave him the sign he demanded.

The president of the Pullman company doubtless began to build his town from an honest desire to give his employees the best surroundings. As it developed it became a source of pride and an exponent of power, that he cared most for when it gave him a glow of benevolence. Gradually, what the outside world thought of it became of importance to him and he ceased to measure its usefulness by the standard of the men's needs. The theater was complete in equipment and beautiful in design, but too costly for a troupe who depended upon the patronage of mechanics, as the church was too expensive to be rented continuously. We can imagine the founder of the town slowly darkening his glints of memory and forgetting the common

stock of experience which he held with his men. He cultivated the great and noble impulses of the benefactor, until the power of attaining a simple human relationship with his employees, that of frank equality with them, was gone from him. He, too, lost the faculty of affectionate interpretation, and demanded a sign. He and his employees had no mutual interest in a common cause.

Was not the grotesque situation of the royal father and the philanthropic employer to perform so many good deeds that they lost the power of recognizing good in beneficiaries? Were not both so absorbed in carrying out a personal plan of improvement that they failed to catch the great moral lesson which their times offered them? This is the crucial point to the tragedies and may be further elucidated.

Lear had doubtless swung a bauble before Cordelia's baby eyes that he might have the pleasure of seeing the little pink and tender hands stretched for it. A few years later he had given jewels to the young princess, and felt an exquisite pleasure when she stood before him, delighted with her gaud and grateful to her father. He demanded the same kind of response for his gift of the kingdom, but the gratitude must be larger and more carefully expressed, as befitted such a gift. At the opening of the drama he sat upon his throne ready for this enjoyment, but instead of delight and gratitude he found the first dawn of character. His daughter made the awkward attempt of an untrained soul to be honest, to be scrupulous in the expressions of its feelings. It was new to him that his child should be moved by a principle outside of himself, which even his imagination could not follow; that she had caught the notion of an existence so vast that her relationship as a daughter was but part of it.

Perhaps her suitors, the King of France or the Duke of Burgundy, had first hinted to the young Cordelia that there was a fuller life beyond the seas. Certain it is that someone had shaken her from the quiet measure of her insular existence and that she had at last felt the thrill of the world's life. She was transformed by a dignity which recast her speech and made it self-contained, as is becoming a citizen of the world. She found herself in the sweep of a notion of justice so large that the immediate loss of a kingdom seemed of little consequence to her. Even an act which might be construed as disrespect to her father was justified in her eyes because she was vainly striving to fill out this larger conception of duty.

The test which comes sooner or later to many parents had come to Lear, to maintain the tenderness of the relation between father and child, after that relation had become one between adults; to be contented with the responses which this adult made to the family claim, while, at the same time, she felt the tug upon her emotions and faculties of the larger life, the life which surrounds and completes the individual and family life, and which shares and widens her attention. He was not sufficiently wise to see that only that child can fulfill the family claim in its sweetness and strength who also fulfills the larger claim, that the adjustment of the lesser and larger implies no conflict. The mind of Lear was not big enough for this test. He failed to see anything but the personal slight involved; the ingratitude alone reached him. It was impossible for him to calmly watch his child developing beyond the strength of his own mind and sympathy.

Without pressing the analogy too hard may we not compare the indulgent relation of this employer to his town to the relation which existed between Lear and Cordelia? He fostered his employees for many years, gave them sanitary houses and beautiful parks, but in their extreme need, when they were struggling with the most difficult question which the times could present to them, when, if ever, they required the assistance of a trained mind and a comprehensive outlook, he lost his touch and had nothing wherewith to help them. He did not see the situation. He had been ignorant of their gropings toward justice. His conception of goodness for them had been cleanliness, decency of living, and above all, thrift and

temperance. He had provided them means for all this; had gone further, and given them opportunities for enjoyment and comradeship. But he suddenly found his town in the sweep of a world-wide moral impulse. A movement had been going on about him and through the souls of his workingmen of which he had been unconscious. He had only heard of this movement by rumor. The men who consorted with him at his club and in his business had spoken but little of it, and when they had discussed it had contemptuously called it the "Labor Movement," headed by deadbeats and agitators. Of the force and power of this movement, of all the vitality within it, of that conception of duty which induces men to go without food and to see their wives and children suffer for the sake of securing better wages for fellow-workmen whom they have never seen, this president had dreamed absolutely nothing. But his town had at last become swept into this larger movement, so that the giving up of comfortable homes, of beautiful surroundings, seemed as naught to the men within its grasp.

Outside the ken of this philanthropist, the proletariat had learned to say in many languages that "the injury of one is the concern of all." Their watchwords were brotherhood, sacrifice, the subordination of individual and trade interests to the good of the working class; and their persistent strivings were toward the ultimate freedom of that class from the conditions under which they now labor.

Compared to these watchwords the old ones which the philanthropic employer had given his town were negative and inadequate.

When this movement finally swept in his own town, or, to speak more fairly, when in their distress and perplexity his own employees appealed to the organized manifestation of this movement, they were quite sure that simply because they were workmen in distress they would not be deserted by it. This loyalty on the part of a widely ramified and well organized union toward the workmen in a "scab shop," who had contributed nothing to its cause, was certainly a manifestation of moral power.

That the movement was ill-directed, that it was ill-timed and disastrous in results, that it stirred up and became confused in the minds of the public with the elements of riot and bloodshed, can never touch the fact that it started from an unselfish impulse.

In none of his utterances or correspondence did the president of the company for an instant recognize this touch of nobility, although one would imagine that he would gladly point out this bit of virtue, in what he must have considered the moral ruin about him. He stood throughout pleading for the individual virtues, those which had distinguished the model workman of his youth, those which had enabled him and so many of his contemporaries to rise in life, when "rising in life" was urged upon every promising boy as the goal of his efforts. Of the new code of ethics he had caught absolutely nothing. The morals he had taught his men did not fail them in their hour of confusion. They were self-controlled and destroyed no property. They were sober and exhibited no drunkenness, even though obliged to hold their meetings in the saloon hall of a neighboring town. They repaid their employer in kind, but he had given them no rule for the higher fellowship and life of association into which they were plunged.

The virtues of one generation are not sufficient for the next, any more than the accumulations of knowledge possessed by one age are adequate to the needs of another.

Of the virtues received from our fathers we can afford to lose none. We accept as a precious trust those principles and precepts which the race has worked out for its highest safeguard and protection. But merely

to preserve those is not enough. A task is laid upon each generation to enlarge their application, to ennoble their conception, and, above all, to apply and adapt them to the peculiar problems presented to it for solution.

The president of this company desired that his employees should possess the individual and family virtues, but did nothing to cherish in them those social virtues which his own age demanded. He rather substituted for that sense of responsibility to the community, a feeling of gratitude to himself, who had provided them with public buildings, and had laid out for them a simulacrum of public life.

Is it strange that when the genuine feeling of the age struck his town this belated and almost feudal virtue of personal gratitude fell before it?

Day after day during that horrible suspense, when the wires constantly reported the same message, "The president of the company holds that there is nothing to arbitrate," one longed to find out what was in the mind of this man, to unfold his ultimate motive. One concludes that he must have been sustained by the consciousness of being in the right. Only that could have held him against the great desire for fair play which swept over the country. Only the training which an arbitrary will receives by years of consulting first its own personal and commercial ends could have made it strong enough to withstand the demands for social adjustment. He felt himself right from the commercial standpoint, and could not see the situation from the social standpoint. For years he had gradually accustomed himself to the thought that his motive was beyond reproach; that his attitude to his town was always righteous and philanthropic. Habit held him persistent in this view of the case through all the changing conditions.

The diffused and subtle notion of dignity held by the modern philanthropist bears a curious analogy to the personal barbaric notion of dignity held by Lear. The man who persistently paced the seashore, while the interior of his country was racked with a strife which he alone might have arbitrated, lived out within himself the tragedy of King Lear. The shock of disaster upon egotism is apt to produce self-pity. It is possible that his self-pity and loneliness may have been so great and absorbing as to completely shut out from him a compunction of derelict duty. He may have been unconscious that men were charging him with a shirking of the issue.

Lack of perception is the besetting danger of the egoist, from whatever cause his egoism arises and envelopes him. But, doubtless, philanthropists are more exposed to this danger than any other class of people within the community. Partly because their efforts are overestimated, as no standard of attainment has yet been established, and partly because they are the exponents of a large amount of altruistic feeling with which the community has become equipped and which has not yet found adequate expression, they are therefore easily idealized.

Long ago Hawthorne called our attention to the fact that philanthropy ruins, or is fearfully apt to ruin, the heart, "the rich juices of which God never meant should be pressed violently out, and distilled into alcoholic liquor by an unnatural process; but it should render life sweet, bland and gently beneficent."

One might add to this observation that the muscles of this same heart may be stretched and strained until they lose the rhythm of the common heartbeat of the rest of the world.

Modern philanthropists need to remind themselves of the old definition of greatness: that it consists in the possession of the largest share of the common human qualities and experiences, not in the acquirements of peculiarities and excessive virtues. Popular opinion calls him the greatest of Americans who gathered to himself the largest amount of American experience, and who never forgot when he was in Washington how the "crackers" in Kentucky and the pioneers of Illinois thought and felt, striving to retain their thoughts and feelings, and to embody only the mighty will of the "common people." The danger of professionally attaining to the power of the righteous man, of yielding to the ambition "for doing good," compared to which the ambitious for political position, learning, or wealth are vulgar and commonplace, ramifies throughout our modern life, and is a constant and settled danger of philanthropy.

In so far as philanthropists are cut off from the influence of the Zeit-Geist, from the code of ethics which rule the body of men, from the great moral life springing from our common experiences, so long as they are "good to people," rather than "with them," they are bound to accomplish a large amount of harm. They are outside of the influence of that great faith which perennially springs up in the hearts of the people, and re-creates the world.

In spite of the danger of overloading the tragedies with moral reflections, a point ought to be made on the other side. It is the weakness in the relation of the employees to the employer, the fatal lack of generosity in the attitude of workmen toward the company under whose exactions they feel themselves wronged.

In reading the tragedy of King Lear, Cordelia does not escape our censure. Her first words are cold, and we are shocked by her lack of tenderness. Why should she ignore her father's need for indulgence, and be so unwilling to give him what he so obviously craved? We see in the old king "the overmastering desire of being beloved, which is selfish, and yet characteristic of the selfishness of a loving and kindly nature alone." His eagerness produces in us a strange pity for him, and we are impatient that his youngest and best-beloved child cannot feel this, even in the midst of her search for truth and her newly acquired sense of a higher duty. It seems to us a narrow conception that would break thus abruptly with the past, and would assume that her father had no part in her new life. We want to remind her that "pity, memory and faithfulness are natural ties," and surely as much to be prized as is the development of her own soul. We do not admire the Cordelia "who loves according to her bond" as we later admire the same Cordelia who comes back from France that she may include in her happiness and freer life the father whom she had deserted through her self-absorption. She is aroused to her affection through her pity, but when the floodgates are once open she acknowledges all. It sometimes seems as if only hardship and sorrow could arouse our tenderness, whether in our personal or social relations; that the king, the prosperous man, was the last to receive the justice which can come only through affectionate interpretation. We feel less pity for Lear on his throne than in the storm, although he is the same man, bound up in the same self-righteousness, and exhibiting the same lack of self-control.

As the vision of the life of Europe caught the sight and quickened the pulses of Cordelia, so a vision of the wider life has caught the sight of workingmen. After the vision has once been seen it is impossible to do aught but to press toward its fulfillment. We have all seen it. We are all practically agreed that the social passion of the age is directed toward the emancipation of the wage-worker; that a great accumulation of moral force is overmastering men and making for this emancipation as in another time it has made for the emancipation of the slave; that nothing will satisfy the aroused conscience of men short of the complete participation of the working classes in the spiritual, intellectual and material inheritance of the human race. But just as Cordelia failed to include her father in the scope of her salvation and selfishly took it for herself

alone, so workingmen in the dawn of the vision are inclined to claim it for themselves, putting out of their thoughts the old relationships; and just as surely as Cordelia's conscience developed in the new life and later drove her back to her father, where she perished, drawn into the cruelty and wrath which had now become objective and tragic, so the emancipation of working people will have to be inclusive of the employer from the first or it will encounter many failures, cruelties and reactions. It will result not in the position of the repentant Cordelia but in that of King Lear's two older daughters.

If the workingmen's narrow conception of emancipation was fully acted upon, they would hold much the same relationship to their expropriated employer that the two older daughters held to their abdicated father. When the kingdom was given to them they received it as altogether their own, and were dominated by a sense of possession; "it is ours not yours" was never absent from their consciousness. When Lear ruled the kingdom he had never been without this sense of possession, although he expressed it in indulgence and condescending kindness. His older daughters expressed it in cruelty, but the motive of father and children was not unlike. They did not wish to be reminded by the state and retinue of the old King that he had been the former possessor. Finally, his mere presence alone reminded them too much of that and they banished him from the palace. That a newly acquired sense of possession should result in the barbaric, the incredible scenes of bitterness and murder, which were King Lear's portion, is not without a reminder of the barbaric scenes in our political and industrial relationships, when the sense of possession, to obtain and to hold, is aroused on both sides. The scenes in Paris during the political revolution or the more familiar scenes at the mouths of the mines and the terminals of railways occur to all of us.

The doctrine of emancipation preached to the wage-workers alone runs an awful risk of being accepted for what it offers them, for the sake of fleshpots, rather than for the human affection and social justice which it involves. This doctrine must be strong enough in its fusing power to touch those who think they lose, as well as those who think they gain. Only thus can it become the doctrine of a universal movement.

The new claim on the part of the toiling multitude, the new sense of responsibility on the part of the well-to-do, arise in reality from the same source. They are in fact the same "social compunction," and, in spite of their widely varying manifestations, logically converge into the same movement. Mazzini once preached, "the consent of men and your own conscience are two wings given you whereby you may rise to God." It is so easy for the good and powerful to think that they can rise by following the dictates of conscience by pursuing their own ideals, leaving those ideals unconnected with the consent of their fellow-men. The president of the Pullman company thought out within his own mind a beautiful town. He had power with which to build this town, but he did not appeal to nor obtain the consent of the men who were living in it. The most unambitious reform, recognizing the necessity for this consent, makes for slow but sane and strenuous progress, while the most ambitious of social plans and experiments, ignoring this, is prone to the failure of the model town of Pullman.

The man who insists upon consent, who moves with the people, is bound to consult the feasible right as well as the absolute right. He is often obliged to attain only Mr. Lincoln's "best possible," and often have the sickening sense of compromising with his best convictions. He has to move along with those whom he rules toward a goal that neither he nor they see very clearly till they come to it. He has to discover what people really want, and then "provide the channels in which the growing moral force of their lives shall flow." What he does attain, however, is not the result of his individual striving, as a solitary mountain climber beyond the sight of the valley multitude, but it is underpinned and upheld by the sentiments and

aspirations of many others. Progress has been slower perpendicularly, but incomparably greater because lateral.

He has not taught his contemporaries to climb mountains, but he has persuaded the villagers to move up a few feet higher. It is doubtful if personal ambition, whatever may have been its commercial results, has ever been of any value as a motive power in social reform. But whatever it may have done in the past, it is certainly too archaic to accomplish anything now. Our thoughts, at least for this generation, cannot be too much directed from mutual relationships and responsibilities. They will be warped, unless we look all men in the face, as if a community of interests lay between, unless we bold the mind open, to take strength and cheer from a hundred connections.

To touch to vibrating response the noble fibre in each man, to pull these many fibres, fragile, impalpable and constantly breaking, as they are, into one impulse, to develop that mere impulse through its feeble and tentative stages into action, is no easy task, but lateral progress is impossible without it.

If only a few families of the English speaking race had profited by the dramatic failure of Lear, much heart-breaking and domestic friction might have been spared. Is it too much to hope that some of us will carefully consider this modern tragedy, if perchance it may contain a warning for the troublous times in which we live? By considering the dramatic failure of the liberal employer's plans for his employees we may possibly be spared useless industrial tragedies in the uncertain future which lies ahead of us.

Source: Jane Addams, "A Modern Lear," *Survey*, Volume 29, November 2, 1912.

Part Two: THE PATERSON SILK STRIKE, 1913

Document 1: The National Labor Relations Act of 1935

EXCERPTED

AN ACT To diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes.

FINDINGS AND POLICIES

Section 1. The denial by some employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by some employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest, which have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by (a) impairing the efficiency, safety, or operation of the instrumentalities of commerce; (b) occurring in the current of commerce; (c) materially affecting, restraining, or controlling the flow of raw materials or manufactured or processed goods from or into the channels of commerce, or the prices of such materials or goods in commerce; or (d) causing diminution of employment and wages in such volume as substantially to impair or disrupt the market for goods flowing from or into the channels of commerce.

The inequality of bargaining power between employees who do not possess full freedom of association or actual liberty of contract and employers who are organized in the corporate or other forms of ownership association substantially burdens and affects the flow of commerce, and tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions, by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners in industry and by preventing the stabilization of competitive wage rates and working conditions within and between industries.

Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

Experience has further demonstrated that certain practices by some labor organizations, their officers, and members have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by preventing the free flow of goods in such commerce through strikes and other forms of industrial unrest or through concerted activities which impair the interest of the public in the free flow of such commerce. The elimination of such practices is a necessary condition to the assurance of the rights herein guaranteed

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing,

for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. When used in this Act —

(1) The term “person” includes one or more individuals, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in cases under title 11 of the United States Code , or receivers.

(2) The term “employer” includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act , as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

[Pub. L. 93–360, § 1(a), July 26, 1974, 88 Stat. 395, deleted the phrase “or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual” from the definition of “employer.”]

(3) The term “employee” shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the Act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute or because of any unfair labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse...

(5) The term “labor organization” means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

(6) The term “commerce” means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(7) The term “affecting commerce” means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce...

(9) The term “labor dispute” includes any controversy concerning terms, tenure or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining,

changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee...

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Sec. 3. (a) The National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter called the "Board") created by this Act prior to its amendment by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 , is continued as an agency of the United States, except that the Board shall consist of five instead of three members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the two additional members so provided for, one shall be appointed for a term of five years and the other for a term of two years. Their successors, and the successors of the other members, shall be appointed for terms of five years each, excepting that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause...

Sec. 4. (a) Each member of the Board and the General Counsel of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment...The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed...

Sec. 6. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act , such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act .

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

Sec. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 8(a)(3) .

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

Sec. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 ;

(2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it: Provided, That subject to rules and regulations made and published by the Board pursuant to section 6 , an employer shall not be prohibited from permitting employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of time or pay;

(3) by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization: Provided, That nothing in this Act , or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8(a) of this Act as an unfair labor practice) to require as a condition of employment membership therein on or after the thirtieth day following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of such agreement, whichever is the later, (i) if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9(a) , in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made, and (ii) unless following an election held as provided in section 9(e) within one year preceding the effective date of such agreement, the Board shall have certified that at least a majority of the employees eligible to vote in such election have voted to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make such an agreement: Provided further, That no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, or (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than the failure of the employee to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership;

(4) to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this Act ;

(5) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9(a) .

Source: Our Documents, The National Archives

Document 2: “6,000 Weavers Quit; I.W.W. Leaders Held; Paterson Police break up Mass meeting and Arrest Elizabeth Flynn and Carlo Tresca,” *New York Times*

Paterson, NJ, Feb. 23.

Under the leadership of William Haywood's direct action branch of the "Industrial Workers of the World" the silk weavers and dyers here went out on strike today as a protest against new and improved machinery...

When the first 4,000 of the strikers left their looms this morning, they attempted to parade to the other mills in the hope of rallying supporters to their cause the Paterson police force, under command of Police Chief Bimson, bore down on the strikers, seized their leaders and sent the chief of them out of town on an Erie Railroad train.

Disconcerted in their attempt to parade, the strikers attempted to have a mass meeting in a hall they had hired for the occasion. Police Chief Bimson charged upon the meeting place and seized the three principal speakers, among them Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Carlo Tresca, both I.W.W. leaders associated in the waiters' strike in New York recently.

The strikers allowed their parade leader to be drummed out of town and allowed the speakers at their mass meeting to be placed under arrest without bringing on a general riot. But for many hours after the arrests the strikers moved in disorganized masses about town, threatening the police and the Mayor and denouncing the treatment accorded them...

Source: The New York Times, February 26, 1913

Document 3:

**Testimony of Moses Strauss to the Federal
Commission on Industrial Relations**

1916

“A good deal of trouble comes from the fact that the silk business is passing through a change, that is gradually becoming a business for females; that in the next 15 to 20 years the males employed in the silk industry will be nil. The change is coming very fast. For instance, as far as ribbons are concerned, the high-speed looms are gradually changing from male to female and, as I say, in 15 to 20 years, or possibly less time, the mills will mostly be run by female labor.”

Source: U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, Industrial Relations, Final Report

Document 4:

Article by “Big Bill” Haywood in the *International Socialist Review*

1913

...The women have been an enormous factor in the Paterson Strike. Each meeting for them has been attended by bigger and bigger crowds. They are becoming deeply interested in the questions of the hour that are confronting women and are rapidly developing the sentiments that go to make up the great feminist movement of the world.

With them it is not a question of equal suffrage but of economic freedom. The women are ready to assume their share of the responsibility, on the picket line, in hail, even to the extent of sending their Children away. Hundreds of children already have found good homes with their “strike parents” in New York.

Source: The International Socialist Review, October 1913

**Document 5: Excerpt from *One Big Union in the Textile Industry*,
by ribbon weaver and union leader Evald Koettgen**

1914

In a mill where there is no organization the boss is the absolute master. Whatever he says will be the law of the mill. He will determine what wages the workers shall receive, how long they shall work, under what conditions they shall work, how the work shall be distributed, who shall be employed or discharged, and so on. When the workers organize they will demand that they will have something to say as to what the wages shall be, how the work shall be distributed, what the sanitary conditions shall be, whether or not a worker shall be discharged or kept on, what the hours of the labor shall be, etc.

Source: Evald Koettgen, *One Big Union in the Textile Industry*. Cleveland: Charles Kare and Company, 1914.

Document 6:

“Golden Attacks I.W.W.,” *New York Times*

July 3, 1913

Fall River, Mass, July 3- John Golden, President of the United Textile Workers of America, has just returned from Paterson, where he was engaged in efforts to bring about a settlement of differences between employers and employes of the silk mills of that city. Here is what he has to say:

“Three years ago the United Textile Workers of America placed an organizer in Paterson and kept him there for over a year. A strong union of weavers was built up, the remnants of the I.W.W. driven out of the city, and work begun toward bringing about a standard list of prices weaving throughout the city. All the weavers were asked to do was to take pattern from the splendid achievements attained by our two other local unions, the Loomfixers and Twisters and the Horizontal Warpers, both of which had been successful in establishing good working conditions and reasonable wages for their members. This they failed to follow out, and it is safe to say that many of them, after what they have suffered during the last three months, realize their follow in allowing their local unions to dies for want of proper support.

“It is well known that some silk manufacturers did all in their power either to discourage or destroy the effort made to establish a strong union. It is also apparent that these same employers are beginning to realize that had there been a substantial union of silk workers, under sane and intelligent leadership, that such an organization as the one now existing in Paterson might never have got a foothold.

“The textile workers hours of labor in all branches of this industry are too long; no fair-minded person can argue against an eight-hour day for textile workers. Neither is there any question but what wages of the workers are too low and entirely inadequate to meet the present cost of living.

“Reforms do not come overnight. The textile workers have but to look back to the achievements of the best organized trades, which have established the forty-four-hour work week, with almost double the wages once received. These reforms were not obtained by waving the red flags or resorting to violence. The textile workers, wherever organized on proper lines, have made great advancement, despite the obstacles placed in their path.”

Source: The New York Times, July 3, 1913.

**Document 7: Testimony of Adolf Lessig to Federal
Commission on Industrial Relations**

1916

Lessig:...if the thing becomes general throughout the trade, the three and four looms it meant the filling of the street with unemployed, which would mean a general reduction in wages, and that is what all the weavers realized...

[When asked by a commission member how the employers originally persuaded weavers to run two looms instead of one, Lessig answered:]

...By the same methods and process Mr. Doherty is using today, by appealing to the hungriest of the workers and making him believe that is always going to continue on making that same amount of money. Thompson: If the rates of pay offered to the workers who would remain had been sufficient, would there still have been a complaint that the weavers would have refused to use the new system?

Lessig: Well, the workers all realized that it was only a matter of time: that the wages must come down if they were going to have that army of unemployed. They were wise enough to see that.

Source: U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations, 1st Session, 1916.

Document 8:

Interview with Carrie Golzio

My first job I had I went with my father to learn to weave on West Broadway; there was a mill right on the bridge...My father was a jacquard weaver so he took me in there. I was about 10 years of age.

[The bosses] were tough, oh they were tough. But I was tough too. That's one thing my father always taught; no matter where you go to work don't let them step on you. That was instilled in me when I was a kid.

With the boy and I wasn't home a year and a half. I worked all my life. I used to take the boy and take it my mother's go pick it up at night and bring it home. That's what I done. I washed, I ironed, and I cooked and I done everything. And I'm here at 95.

[During the 1913 strike, challenged by her husband:]

"What do you want to go out for? Stay home. You don't belong out." "I can't stay home," I said, "I got to go out and fight."

Source: Interview by historian, Steve Golin, June 13, 1983, Haledon, NJ.

Document 9:

The Mayor's View

1914

Mayor McBride: The agitators preached if there was any break in the line...the bosses would become more arrogant and conditions would become more intolerable and finally they would be treated just like slaves...

Thompson: And these people have been working in the mills for some time before they went on strike?

McBride: Yes.

Thompson: They were acquainted with their employers?

McBride: Largely, I believe.

Thompson: But in your opinion they preferred to take the word and say-so of outside agitators who came in at that time, and so stayed out?

McBride: Why, many of them were absolutely influenced by the preaching of the outside agitators. They believed everything that was told them, and they worshipped them really as heroes, and you could not talk with them.

Source: *U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations*, 1st Session, 1916.

Document 10: Letter from Peter W. Kirschbaum, Secretary of the Relief Committee to the Brooklyn Defense Conference

July 8, 1913

As is only natural our bread line is growing longer and longer day to day. Clothes are becoming more threadbare, toes are sticking out of shoes, tears and sighs are increasing...as father and mother stand on line to get what we can give them. No money for shoes, impossible to pay for rent or gas. We can only give them food, and it grieves me to say not much of that. Just imagine, on one particular day our funds were so low that we could only give bread, 5,000 loaves at three and one-half cents each (\$175), not to mention dinners to be paid for to keep all those who are single, at the rate of 28 cents per day...

Source: Paterson Evening News, July 8, 1913.

Document 11: Excerpt from the *American Silk Journal*

October, 1913

The main point upon which the silk manufacturers can congratulate themselves is that the operatives returned to work under the same conditions as existed before the strike, no concessions having been granted. The great important of concerted action when reinforced by a just cause, is thus shown in the strongest possible manner and it behooves the manufacturers to stand together in the way no matter how that are attacked. If labor agitators seek by attacking the individual mill to accomplish piecemeal what they had before sought to bring about in a wholesale manner by attacking a number of mills, it still behooves the manufacturer to put up the same strong fight individually. The very life of the individual manufacturer depends upon running his own mill without interference on the part of his operative. It is a basic principle of hiring and service that there must be a master and there must be a servant. The master must direct and success must depend upon skilled directions based upon justice.

Source: *The American Silk Journal*, Vol .xxxii, No. 10, October 1913.