MINIMUM WAGE AND SYNDICALISM

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 988 002 2

11-1-50

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

The Minimum Wage and Syndicalism

An Independent Survey of the Two Latest Movements Affecting American Labor

By

JAMES BOYLE

Formerly Private Secretary of Governor McKinley,
and American Consul at Liverpool, Eng.
Author of "What is Socialism?"
etc.

STEWART & KIDD COMPANY
PUBLISHERS - - CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1913, by
Stewart & Kidd Company

All rights reserved, Copyright in England

HD
4918
B69m

Introduction

The body of the text of this book is a reprint of two series of articles by the author which appeared in successive weekly issues of the Cincinnati *Enquirer,* from February 9 to April 6, 1913—both dates inclusive; and they are here re-published by the courteous consent of that journal, in revised and rearranged form.

The newspaper articles on the Minimum Wage contained several references of local and passing interest which have been deleted, and some particulars of the English Trade Boards Act of 1909 (affecting certain "sweated" industries) and the Coal Mines Act of 1912 (as to coal mining) have been added.

Reliable information as to Syndicalism is so fragmentary, and the developments of the movement are so rapid that it has been thought advisable to give an Appendix, in which much new matter will be found.

As separate questions, there is no connection between the Minimum Wage and Syndicalism. The first question is a proposition for the social and economic improvement in the condition of working-people along Constitutional lines, but as to the wisdom of which there is honest and legitimate difference of opinion not only among speculative reformers,

669642

but among practical Labor advocates themselves. The other is a revolutionary cult which is repudiated by all well-balanced minds, whether of radical or conservative mold.

But the agitation for the Minimum Wage and the propaganda of Syndicalism are akin in being phases of the same spirit of unrest and discontent now sweeping over the world, and which is the most significant characteristic of the twentieth century.

There is no occasion for pessimism or alarm, for out of the turmoil discriminating wisdom will evolve in the course of time;—the froth will be blown away and the chaff will be winnowed, and the residuum will remain to add to the ever-increasing sum of the happiness and betterment of the race.

J. B.

Columbus, Ohio, May, 1913.

Contents

THE MINIMUM WAGE

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER VI

SYNDICALISM

PART I

PART II

APPENDIX

The Minimum Wage

CHAPTER I

The Proposition Stated

A Practical Legislative Issue.

The question of a legal minimum wage is admittedly one of the most important now confronting the democratic countries of the world.

It has just become a practical legislative issue in a number of States, there being at least half a dozen bills pending to establish the system.

Ever since 1894 New Zealand, and since 1896 the British Colony of Victoria (now a State in the Australian Commonwealth), have been experimenting with the system; and the other Australian States have followed. In 1909 the British Government provided for a minimum wage in certain "sweated" industries, and a little later it applied the principle to coal mining, and there is now an agitation in England to extend it to other trades. In the United States only one State, Massachusetts, has passed a minimum wage law so far, and it goes into effect next July. It applies only to women in the "sweated" industries, it being based largely on the British law.*

*See p. 85, Note on Utah.

The only political parties to declare for a minimum wage are the Socialist (1912), which pledges itself to the "establishing of minimum wage scales," and the new Progressive party, one of the planks of its National platform being: "We pledge ourselves to work unceasingly in State and Nation for minimum wage standards for working women, to provide a living wage in all industrial occupations."

One of the Constitutional amendments adopted by the people of Ohio, September, 1912, was Section 34 of Article 2, as follows: "Laws may be passed fixing and regulating the hours of labor, establishing a minimum wage and providing for the comfort, health, safety, and general welfare of all employees, and no other provision of the Constitution shall impair or limit this power."

The Legal Difficulty.

Nearly all legal authorities favorable to a minimum wage agree that the greatest initial difficulty is to so frame a law that it will not conflict with the United States Constitution, and there is a concensus of opinion that the way it can probably be done is to make the law come within the "police power." It is because of this that the Massachusetts law was made to apply only to women, they being, by Court construction, under "the tutelage" of the State; and the basis of the Massachusetts law is that it is necessary to protect women from being compelled to receive wages which are "inadequate to supply the necessary cost of living and to maintain the workers in health." Thus

the beneficiaries of the act are brought within the "police power" of the State, and therefore, it is argued, the law comes within the limitations of the Federal Constitution. Experts confess that it is more difficult to bring men under the same protection, but some of the most learned authorities claim that it can be done. This was attempted in the Wisconsin bill prepared by Professor Commons. A section of that bill says: "All employment property is hereby declared to be affected with a public interest to the extent that every employer shall pay to every employee in each oppressive employment at least a living wage." An "oppressive employment" is defined in the Wisconsin bill as "an occupation in which employees are unable to earn a living wage."

The Argument for a Minimum Wage.

Prof. Henry R. Seager, of Columbia University, is the president of the American Association for Labor Legislation, and in that capacity he recently delivered an address which probably gives as good an argument, in concrete form, in favor of the legal minimum wage as can be found. Generalizing on his argument, he declared that "in the United States to-day the great majority of our industries pay living wages to the great majority of the workers they employ. Starvation wages, when encountered, are due to exceptional circumstances which justify extraordinary remedies. Under these circumstances a rigidly enforced requirement that living wages at least shall be paid to all workers will merely put a stop to the profits of the

exploiting type of employer, who pays his hands less than they are fairly worth to him, or hasten a more economical distribution of the available labor force, or compel society to face squarely and make adequate provision for classes which can not be and should not be required to be self-supporting. A minimum wage requirement would cause the individuals who are incapable of earning living wages to stand out clearly as unemployables for whose benefit society must organize labor exchanges, provide ampler facilities for industrial training, and develop wise systems of social insurance. These results should prove nearly if not quite as important as the gain in efficiency—not to speak of happiness—for the workers insured a living wage, and the lessening of that greatest disgrace of our civilization, prostitution in aid of wages."

In answer to the objections commonly urged against the proposal, Professor Seager maintained that the system was in harmony with the spirit of American institutions, that it would not lead to Socialism, but would help to make Socialism unnecessary, and that there was no ground in reason, or in the experience of the States of Australasia having the system, for fearing that all wages would be forced down toward the legal minimum. Finally, he admitted the serious practical difficulties in the way of the enforcement of minimum wage regulations, but he pointed out that great progress toward the better enforcement of labor laws was being made all over the United States, and he insisted that the most con-

clusive answer to practical objections is the fact that other countries are actually making minimum wage regulations effective.

The motto of the association of which Professor Seager is president is, "The fundamental purpose of labor legislation is the conservation of the human resources of the Nation." It is now a largely accepted axiom of political economists—as also of the trade unionists of America and England—that, so far as material things go, wages are the prime factor in determining the status of working people. One of the famous essays in economics for which prizes were given is by Frank Hatch Streightoff, entitled *The Standard of Living.* After enumerating the many proposals and undertakings for ameliorating the condition of American workpeople, Mr. Streightoff says, "Probably, however, it is the wage question which is the crux of the entire labor problem." In this declaration Mr. Streightoff is merely echoing what Macaulay declares in his *History of England* (Chapter 3), "The great criterion of the state of the common people is the amount of their wages."

Is it "Socialistic?"

The most common objection to the legal minimum wage is that it is "Socialistic" legislation. So it is; but that fact by itself has no terrors for those who understand the difference between real Socialism—"Collectivism"—and social reform. Bismarck was one of the Old-World statesmen who understood the difference; Lloyd George, of England, is another who

makes the differentiation, although his Tory critics denounce him as being at heart a genuine Socialist. It is true that in their National platform the Socialists declare for a minimum wage, as one of their "immediate demands," just as they do for a shorter working day. It is also true that the Socialists look upon the minimum wage simply as one of the stepping stones to full "Collectivism;" so they do as to the ownership by municipalities of waterworks and street railroads, and the operation by the Federal Government of the parcels post.

It is worth noting in this connection that the author of one of the standard American books in favor of the minimum wage *(A Living Wage)* is a Catholic priest—Rev. John A. Ryan, professor of economics at the St. Paul Seminary. It is hardly necessary to say that Father Ryan is not a Socialist. In his book he takes occasion to say that he "does not believe that Socialism is either practicable or desirable." Indeed, there are many who look upon the establishment of an all-round minimum wage as the only alternative to Socialism. Father Ryan claims that Pope Leo XIII formulated the doctrine of the minimum wage in his celebrated encyclical, "Rerum Novarum," when he said: "Let it be granted, then, that as a rule workman and employer should make agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage earner in reasonable

and frugal comfort. If through necessity, or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of fraud and injustice." And so, also, as Father Ryan observes, numerous and able representatives of the leading Protestant denominations have frequently protested against the doctrine of "unlimited bargaining" as to wages, and among them he names: Kingsley, Maurice, Hughes, and Headlam, in England; Pastors Stöcker and Todt, in Germany; Gide and Waddington, in France, and Bishop Potter and Dr. Gladden, Columbus, Ohio, in the United States.

But these authorities, conclusive as they may be as to the moral obligation of employers to pay a living wage, can not be accepted as settling the question of the wisdom of the State forcibly establishing a legal minimum wage covering the entire industrial field.

A Many-sided Question.

As will be clearly demonstrated in subsequent chapters, the proposition is not a simple one by any means; it will be shown that there are many viewpoints about it, and evidence will be presented that there is considerable variance of opinion as to the desirability and practicability of a general legal minimum wage under conditions as they exist in the United States; and that, too, among those who are strenuously in favor of a *living* wage, including trade unionists, and that even where the system has been

established testimony differs as to its successful operation.

It would seem that many of those who advocate the principle fail to distinguish between ethics and humanity on one side, and economics and practical administration on the other, and that they confuse the economic doctrine of a living wage with that of a compulsory minimum wage fixed by law as a universal code. Even among the most eminent and best-informed of men there is great difference of opinion. For instance, President Wilson doubts the efficacy of a minimum wage law and hazards the suggestion that the minimum wage would likely become the maximum, to which Ex-President Roosevelt replies that "the objection is purely academic." Yet no less an authority than Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, opposes a legal minimum wage for the very reason given by President Wilson.

New Zealand is said to be "the land without strikes," under compulsory arbitration and the minimum wage. But such a characterization of that wonderful land of experimental industrial democracy is not exactly true—indeed, so much of an experiment is the system still that it was only four or five years ago that there was danger of the entire complicated fabric tumbling down and being thrown on the scrap-heap of discarded legislative lumber.

In other words, there are several sides to this as to most questions; and, furthermore, there are degrees of agreement as there are modifications of opposition.

CHAPTER II

The Minimum Wage in New Zealand

THE PIONEER.

Although the system of State regulation of wages is many centuries old, New Zealand made the first practical attempt in modern times to establish minimum wages by law. This was in 1894. The original law was passed really to settle by compulsory arbitration the labor troubles—strikes and lock-outs—then common, and which threatened to "arrest the processes of industry." The outcome has been something not contemplated, for, under the law as amended, questions of wages, hours of labor, and the relations between employers and workmen generally have become subject to State regulation. The law is very complicated, and has been frequently amended. Provision is made for the incorporation of trade unions and associations of employers. Disputes go to a court of arbitration, consisting of two persons representing employers and two representing workmen respectively, and a judge of the Supreme Court. The awards of the Court are enforceable by legal process, penalties up to $2,000 being recoverable.

A well-known New Zealand journalist, Mr. Guy H. Scholefield, has written a most entertaining book, *New Zealand in Evolution,* in which he speaks very favorably on the whole of the State regulation of

industrialism; but he does not pronounce it an unqualified success. He says: "The fixing of wages and hours of work by a legal authority has certainly had some of the 'leveling tendency' which was predicted, but the minimum wage is not by any means the maximum, as casual observers are prone to believe." Mr. Scholefield concedes that under the restriction of the number of apprentices—which is part of the system—"most of the lower trades have been starved." In 1908, owing to great dissatisfaction with the law, radical changes were made in it.

Says Mr. Scholefield: "Long before the end of 1907 they [the workers] had thrown to the winds the last shred of their respect for the arbitration act, the Court, and the members themselves. The old reign of recrimination returned." In New Zealand the experience has been the same as in Australia in this respect—that when the Court grants a demand of the workmen for an increase of wages "everything is lovely," but that when such a demand is refused the Court is abused and sometimes defied, notwithstanding the compulsory arbitration feature of the law.

Strikes in New Zealand.

Again quoting the author of *New Zealand in Evolution* on this phase of the situation: "The judge was accused of partiality. . . . This was everyday language in 1907 and 1908. Revolt was in the air. Even a staid conference of farmers, enraged possibly by the action of a conciliation board in calling four hundred witnesses and incurring $15,000 in ex-

penses in investigating a farm laborers' dispute [the board finding that the trouble was caused by professional agitators], called upon the Government, 'in view of the failure of the act to prevent strikes and the unfair and weak manner in which it was administered,' to repeal it. The tramway [street-car] employees in the city of Auckland went on strike for the second time in six months, and a special board of conciliation—the first ever invoked under the original act—was finally set up to deal with the case." In the spring of 1908 there was a strike of coal miners—without justification, according to Mr. Scholefield. "Short of personal violence, all the old-time strike methods were adopted. . . . If the men's cause had been a good one, the act would certainly have been wrecked." The Court fined the miners' union $375 for striking. But the miners successfully defied the judgment of the Court, and when their goods and chattels were seized to satisfy the judgment the miners treated the sale as a joke, and the whole of the articles disposed of only brought three dollars. The men were out for eleven weeks, but public opinion was against them and they finally yielded under defeat. There was also a strike of the bakers in Wellington, and they refused to accept the judgment of the Court. Mr. Scholefield admits, "The failure of the law to prevent strikes was proved." So amendments were made in 1908 which were drastic against strikers. Specific fines were provided for participation in strikes or lockouts by workers or employers. Inciting to strikes or lockouts, aiding or abetting and

assisting with money are made penal offenses, and if more than half the members of a union are involved the union is deemed to be the instigator and is deprived of registration, which means that it loses the benefits of industrial agreements, and especially of preference in employment, which is one of the peculiar features of the New Zealand and Australian laws providing for compulsory arbitration and the minimum wage.

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (new edition) says of this New Zealand law, "As a method of putting an end to labor disputes its success has only been partial." But Dr. Victor S. Clark, who made an investigation for the United States Government in 1903, reported that "with all its apparent defects the act is a success beyond the expectation of many of its early supporters." So Charles Edward Russell, the Socialist writer, in his *Uprising of the Many,* speaks of the act as one that has "rid New Zealand of strikes and brought capital and labor to mark time together."

In 1907 the British Government sent an expert, Mr. Ernest Aves, to study the New Zealand and Australian systems. He remained away investigating for nine months. His report was rather conservative, and is considered impartial. It is quoted both by friends and opponents of compulsory arbitration and the legal minimum wage. Among other things, Mr. Aves reported that "I think the evidence is conclusive that present conditions in New Zealand are

tending, so far as adult male workers are concerned, and over a wide field, toward a lower efficiency."

This conclusion is an important one, because it is generally held by political economists favorable to the legal minimum wage, that to be successful it must be accompanied by increased efficiency. Professor Holcombe, of Harvard University, who is an advocate of the minimum wage, declares in the *American Economic Review* (March, 1912), that "the State which assumes the responsibility for the establishment of a minimum wage must also assume the responsibility for the establishment of a minimum standard of efficiency."

In the *Yale Review,* Volume 19, is the following statement by Paul Kennady, after speaking of the great legislative, judicial, and executive powers of the New Zealand Arbitration Court: "In its early days its awards were generally in favor of the workers in their demands—now for shorter hours, now for more pay, or again for enforcement of fines against employers for breaches of the act or of awards. Later the men were not so successful, and now the point seems to have been reached where little more in the direction of wage increase may be looked for."

For the American student who desires to see the situation from the different viewpoints, the best work is *State Socialism in New Zealand,* a joint production of Prof. James Edward Le Rossingnol, of the University of Denver, Colo., and William Downie Stewart, a barrister of New Zealand. The following

extracts and statements, in a condensed form, are taken from this volume:

By an amendment of 1908 the Arbitration Court is expressly authorized to refuse to make an award petitioned for if for any reason it considers it desirable to do so. "In most of the awards a minimum wage is granted; and this is never a bare subsistence minimum, but rather an ideal wage such as an able-bodied worker of average ability ought to earn; and it has generally been fixed at a point higher than the average wages prevailing in the trade at the time the award was made.

"One important effect of the establishment of so high a minimum wage is that workers of less than average ability find it hard to obtain constant employment. This difficulty has been partially met by granting under-rate permits to such workers. But most workers, other than old men, do not like to be branded as incompetent, so that not many under-rate permits are applied for or granted."

Does the Minimum Become the Maximum?

As to the question whether the minimum wage is likely to become the maximum, the testimony is confusing. "The most reasonable conclusion that one can draw from these facts in relation to the theory stated above, which certainly has some validity, is that the minimum wages awarded in most of the trades are not high, and that the average worker fully earns the award rate, and that it pays the

employer in most cases to give higher wages to better men. . . . But where the minimum is placed too high there must be a tendency toward a leveling down of wages, which can not but be discouraging to the more efficient worker, and injurious to the industrial efficiency of the Dominion."

As the law now stands the Court gives preference to trade unionists as to employment, provided that they are equally competent as the non-unionists, and the unions are not "a close guild," but are open to every workman of good character who desires to join. But the unionists are not satisfied, and are now demanding that Parliament amend the law so as to give them unconditional preference; this, however, the Government is opposed to granting.

Prof. Le Rossingnol and Mr. Stewart say in their joint work:

"The doctrine of a living wage is nothing but a starting point for the workers of New Zealand. They demand a living wage and as much more as they can get. Realizing the fact that some employers can afford to pay more than others, the workers desire that some form of profit-sharing be established by the Arbitration Court. But the Court has repeatedly stated that profit-sharing could not be taken as the basis of awards on the ground that it would involve the necessity of fixing differential rates of wages, which would lead to confusion, would be unfair to many employers, and unsatisfactory to the workers themselves. . . . In practice, the awards

appear to be based on two main principles: First, the desire and intention of the Court to secure a living wage to all able-bodied workers. Second, the desire of the Court to make a workable award. That is, to grant as much as possible to the workers without giving them more than the industry can stand."

The tendency seems, now that the scope of the system has been widely extended, to "abide by established conditions," to prevent serious disturbance to industry. An elaborate statistical examination of profits and wages shows that any but the smallest further increases in wages "would destroy the very source from which the profits are drawn," and our authors observe that this statement is but a step to the position that wages are determined chiefly by economic laws. "It is not easy to show that compulsory arbitration (which includes the question of the minimum wage) has greatly benefited the workers of the Dominion. Sweating has been abolished, but it is a question whether it would not have disappeared in the years of prosperity without the help of the Arbitration Court. Strikes have been prevented, but New Zealand never suffered much from strikes, and it is possible that the workers might have gained as much, or more, by dealing directly with their employers as by the mediation of the Court. As to wages, it is generally admitted that they have not increased more than the cost of living." Various reasons are given for the increased cost of living, one largely held being the awards of the Arbitration Court fixing high wages. "Manufacturers complain

that the awards have been so favorable to the workers as to make it difficult to compete with British and foreign manufacturers, and demand that either the arbitration system be abolished or that they be given increased protection by increased duties on imported goods. It is claimed that the growth of manufactures has not kept pace with the growth of population and the importation of manufactures from abroad.'' Authorities are quoted for the statement that industrial enterprise in New Zealand has been checked to a considerable extent by the labor laws, that but few new industries are started, and that investors are slow to put their money into industries in which labor is the chief item in expenditure. Complaint is also made that ''the arbitration system has resulted in a loss of industrial efficiency far greater than ever resulted from strikes.'' But our authors do not accept without qualifications these gloomy views.

They devote a chapter to an elaborate analysis of wages as compared with the cost of living in New Zealand since the adoption of the State regulation of industries. A contrast is made with conditions in Denver, Colo. (the home of Prof. Le Rossingnol), and in the city of Wellington, the capital of New Zealand. The conclusion the authors come to is ''that, while the cost of living is somewhat less in Wellington than in Denver, the wages of labor are considerably higher in Denver, and the Denver laborer is better off than his brother in Wellington.''

TESTIMONY OF AN AMERICAN EXPERT.

A highly interesting review of labor conditions generally in New Zealand is given by Dr. Victor S. Clark in Bulletin No. 49 of the United States Bureau of Labor. Considerable space is devoted to the system of compulsory arbitration with the minimum wage provisions incidental thereto. The verdict of this American expert is very guarded and is full of qualifications. As to the legal minimum wage being more beneficial to the New Zealand worker than "collective bargaining" is to the American trade unionist, the most favorable judgment—based on Dr. Clark's report—is that the evidence is inconclusive; and, indeed, the evidence is inconclusive as to whether, in the long run, compulsory arbitration and the legal minimum wage have not been as much a detriment as a benefit to the employees as well as to the employers and the State at large. And yet, as Dr. Clark says, the fact that this legislation remains on the statute book, after much criticism and amendment, is proof that there are some "good points in the law that helped to reconcile people to the novel restrictions it imposed."

Referring to the fact that men work harder in America than in New Zealand, Dr. Clark says: "Still, the practical effect of the minimum wage awards in the organized trades in New Zealand has made it as hard for the man sinking below the line of average efficiency to get employment as in America; and it is doubtful whether the old-age pensions

of between $7 and $8 a month compensate him for the possibilities of higher savings in youth and the cheaper living in the latter country." Dr. Clark remarks that there appears to be a larger proportion of home owners among American workmen than among those of New Zealand.

As to whether the minimum wage becomes the maximum, Dr. Clark presents many witnesses both for and against. Careful as to giving his own opinion, he notes that there has not been any special improvement in wages during the last preceding three years (this was in 1903), and that the established legal wages of skilled craftsmen are the average paid. He says that it is practically the unanimous testimony of employers that their men do not work as well under the minimum wage as before. It is rather significant, in a country where the Government is the largest single employer of labor, that "ca' canny" or "go easy"—or intentional soldiering on a job—is almost universally known, both among workmen and employers, as "the Government stroke;" and "there is pretty definite evidence to the effect that the Government stroke does exist at times in certain industries, and that it is occasionally encouraged or suggested by conditions created through the awards."

The testimony is emphatic that the minimum wage law in New Zealand, as in Australia, "throws the slow worker and the semi-competent wage earner out of employment." Up to the present this kind of labor has been given employment upon the public

works, as a sort of "outdoor relief;" but there has been a great deal of evasion of the law in both countries: "men got the minimum wage, but handed back a portion to their employer." Dr. Clark expresses the opinion that in America, with our enormous influx of immigrants whose standard of living is a low one, this difficulty would be vastly increased.

CHAPTER III

In Australia

"Wage Boards."

Coming to the island-continent of Australia, the movement dates back to 1884, when a Royal Commission for the Colony of Victoria on "sweated" industries reported in favor of Courts of Conciliation, "whose procedure and awards shall have the sanction and authority of law." In 1896 the Factories and Shop act was passed, it including a wage-board system. Originally it only applied to the trades of butchering, bread-making, furniture, and clothing, but it has been extended to include practically every trade, and the act now forms a complete industrial code, in which the principle of State regulation of wages is recognized and established. Boards are created, consisting of an equal number of representatives of employers and workmen respectively in any trade, under the presidency of an independent chairman. A special board may be formed on request of any association of employers or union of workmen, or on the initiative of the Labor Department. After hearing evidence the board issues a "determination" fixing the minimum rate of wages to be paid to various classes.

There is no attempt in the Victorian law at a

statutory definition of a "living wage." In fact, this negative feature is characteristic generally of the several laws in New Zealand and the different States in the Australian Commonwealth. In 1903 the Victorian law was amended so as to provide that the determination of wages should be based on "the average prices or rates of payment paid by reputable employers to employees of average capacity." The word "reputable" was construed as "best-paying." But this method was found to work very unsatisfactorily, and so in 1907 the boards were given complete discretion in the fixing of the minimum wage. They can fix wages not only for those receiving less than standard rates, but can also fix the lowest lawful rates for skilled and other highly paid grades, and even for industries in which there are no wage earners below the living wage level. There are now nearly one hundred special boards, regulating wages and hours of labor for nearly all the wage earners of Victoria, both men and women. The Victorian boards are "trade" boards as distinct from "district" boards. Apprentices are included.

Laws similar to the Victorian system were passed in South Australia in 1900, and in Queensland in 1908.

The States of New South Wales and Western Australia followed the New Zealand plan instead of that of Victoria. In the first-named State the law was passed in 1901. As in New Zealand, it created "conciliation boards," but, as there, they were found to work unsatisfactorily. So in 1908 the law was

changed so as to institute an Arbitration Court, consisting of a president and assessors representing the employers' associations and the workers' unions respectively. In any trade in which a dispute occurs any association or union registered under the act has the right to bring the matter before the Court, and, if the Court makes an award, it can be made a "common rule," which becomes binding over the trade affected. These "common rules" mostly relate to wages and hours of labor. The act forbids strikes, but the prohibition is occasionally defied, even against awards.

The law in Western Australia more closely follows that in New Zealand than does the act in New South Wales. In Western Australia, as elsewhere, the conciliation boards originally created were failures, and in 1903 were abandoned, the especial reason being that they did not prevent strikes. Yet in 1907, under the amended law, there was a serious strike in the timber trade.

In all this legislation in New Zealand and in the Australian States, one of the most hotly-contested points has been whether the Arbitration Court should be given power to declare that trade unionists should be given preference in employment over non-unionists. This power was given to the tribunal in New South Wales, but was withheld in Western Australia.

In the Commonwealth (Australia as an entirety) a difficulty similar to that experienced in the United States in such matters was encountered, each Australian State being supreme in this kind of legislation

within its own confines, so long as certain broad principles of Federal power are not violated. The result is that there are different laws in different States of the Commonwealth, and there has been difficulty in bringing interstate industry and commerce in harmony with the varying laws of the several States affected. For a number of years a fierce agitation prevailed throughout the Commonwealth over the proposition to establish a Federal law regulating industry, and the controversy caused the defeat of several ministries. In 1904 the Commonwealth Parliament passed a Conciliation and Arbitration Act. In regard to the much-disputed point as to preference to trade unionists, a compromise was reached; power to give such preference was conferred, with qualifying conditions. This Federal tribunal differs from those in the several States inasmuch as it consists of a single member, called "the President," he being appointed by the Governor-General from among the justices of the High (Supreme) Court. The president has power to appoint assessors to aid him. He has considerable authority to effect settlements by conciliatory methods. It is said that members of the Supreme Court have a great dislike for assignments to this duty, owing to the practice of the trade unions of violently denouncing Courts which decide against them, particularly as the idea is growing in Australia and New Zealand that there is an increasing tendency for the minimum wage to become the maximum.

An English Observer.

One of the most interesting and instructive books on Australia is by John Foster Fraser, an English journalist and traveler, *Australia—the Making of a Nation.* While giving credit to the arbitration and minimum wage law for improving the condition of the workers, he says, "The unfortunate fact remains that the law can be operative against an employer if he refuses to comply with an award, whilst it is practically inoperative in the case of workmen who ignore it." He confirms other reports that the workmen hail with approval awards benefiting them, but that they denounce Arbitration Courts when the decisions are against them. As to preference to trade unionists, which is part of the system, Mr. Fraser gives this instance: "A Mr. Wildman wanted a workman. Two applied. He chose the non-unionist because in his opinion he was a more competent man than the unionist. For doing this he was fined two pounds ($9.74) and two guineas ($10) costs, and the Arbitration judge told him that it was the Arbitration Court, and not the employer, who must decide as to the relative competency of employees. The consequence of all this legislation is to create the most unpleasant relationship between employers and employed. . . . I saw a bitterness, a vindictiveness, almost a savagery, between class and class, which, happily, in Great Britain, with all our industrial complications, we are very little acquainted with. These compulsory Arbitration Courts, having

for their object the amicable settlement of differences, have promoted strife."

It must be kept in mind that in several of the Australian States, as in New Zealand, compulsory arbitration is part of the system of which the minimum wage is another part, along with preference for trade unionists. There are occasions when the trade unionists rebel against compulsory arbitration as well as against decisions not to advance wages; then the farmer voters—who can, if they choose, control the situation—say, "Very well, we will take away trade union preference, and will leave compulsory arbitration in the law, and provide penalties to make you obey the decisions of the Court."

Mr. Fraser asserts that the complicated system in Australia is an interference with personal liberty, and that many of the regulations are absurd. As for example, a groom is not allowed to make any repairs on a piece of harness, however slight. "Men not trade unionists have the utmost difficulty in getting employment. Employers have been called upon to dismiss nonunionists who are good men, and then when, for the sake of peace, the men have expressed their willingness to join the union, they have been told the books are closed. . . . The preference clause in the New South Wales act amounts to the law of the land being utilized for furthering political purposes rather than to improve industrial conditions. The trade unions practically dictate the labor laws. Yet only a small minority of the working men of Australia belong to trade unions. Things

go even further, for an employer is not always allowed to decide what workman he should employ."

Dr. Victor S. Clark, the American expert, in an article in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (Volume 24, 1910), referring to the law as recently amended, says: "The new Wages Board is more popular with employers than was its predecessor, but it is less popular with workingmen." Dr. Clark elsewhere says: "The law has not eradicated the evils it was designed to meet, but nevertheless it appears to have mitigated them. Few, if any, strikes have occurred where wage determinations are in force."

Ernest Aves, who made an investigation for the British Government in 1907, reported, "The boards, especially those formed in the women's trades, are greatly valued and are widely believed in."

There are two observations pertinent to these conclusions: Dr. Clark's report is based on a visit to Australia in 1905, but subsequent to that visit serious trouble arose, and it was found necessary to radically amend the law, and it is rather early yet to pronounce a correct judgment as to the success or otherwise of the amended law. To a certain extent this is true of the British report, and then the latter refers more especially to industries that were "sweated." Formerly, owing to cheap Chinese labor, a number of industries in Australia were "sweated." It was largely because of this state of things that the agitation for a minimum wage developed. It is, however, now an open question with many trade

unionists whether the improvement of labor conditions in well-organized skillful occupations in New Zealand and Australia is to be attributed to the laws or to the unions themselves and to natural good times from purely physical causes; that is, except as to "sweated" industries and employment of women and minors, there is some doubt whether the special features of compulsory arbitration, preference, and minimum wage have secured any more advantages to skilled labor than could have been obtained by the usual methods of organization, voluntary wage scales and agreements and arbitration, as practiced in England, the United States, and Canada.

A Native Critic.

Australian Socialism is the title of a book written by A. St. Ledger, a Senator from the State of Queensland in the Parliament of the Commonwealth. Senator St. Ledger is frankly an anti-Socialist, and he claims that the Australian Labor party have made it an aim to profess Continental Socialism on the platform "and to suppress it in Parliament (State and Federal) in order to hold the balance of power." He declares that the Labor party of Australia "are being irresistibly borne along with the tide of Socialism. If they do not know it, the Socialists do." The Senator claims that neither in Australia nor anywhere else is there "sufficient data yet to determine clearly whether this legislation (State control of industries) has benefited or injured the worker." He does not take issue with legislation

regulating shops and factories, including the suppression of sweating. He holds that this is "solely humanitarian," while the State regulation of industries generally "is solely economic, and sooner or later must conform to the law of supply and demand and the economic limitations of a country's resources." He denounces Socialism in Australia as apparently preparing "to set up a political and parliamentary despotism such as Australia has not yet seen, and for which the only parallels in history are the oligarchies of Greece and Rome in ancient times, and Venice and Genoa in modern times." And he proceeds to say, "After all, Australian Socialism is far more the creation of low-down parliamentary intrigue than the deliberate expression of public opinion." He gives this warning, speaking of Australia: "No country in any era of its civilization, excepting China, has so enveloped freedom between employer and employee with legislative limitations, nor so strongly subordinated freedom of contract for the individual to the mere fiat of a majority of the workers. Australia has disregarded the warnings of the ages in this, as in other similar experiments. It will certainly afford either a striking lesson or an awful moral." He points out the fact, familiar to every student, that Socialists look upon this class of legislation as "a half-way house to the nationalization of industries."

Senator St. Ledger declares: "The verdict so far is against and not in favor of the experiments. At any rate, it is clear that the long-continued work

of this laboratory has given only negative results. One experiment has just ended in almost accepted failure: the method of compulsory conciliation and arbitration. But the operation of the wage boards shows far more hopeful results. In these the element of compulsion is either absent or has this limitation, that if after experience it is shown that the minimum wage is higher than the average worker can earn on his output the employer can dispense with the less-efficient worker, and engage only those who reach the standard. The worker then may get a permit to take a less wage. He is thus confronted with two forms of fear. His union looks upon him as a drag upon the standard limit, or as a species of loafer, whose wants and ambitions are easily satisfied, and whose work is subordinated entirely to this measure of them. The issue of these permits is almost always accompanied with an inquisitorial investigation, which must be more or less irritating to the unions, and humiliating to the individuals seeking them."

Senator St. Ledger emphasizes the fact that the establishment of the wage boards synchronized with an improvement of natural physical conditions; that is, bounteous harvests followed a period of drought. He also gives figures from the official *Labor Gazette* showing that the increased wages under the boards were closely followed by increases in the cost of living; and he casts doubt on the assumption that the wage boards and compulsory arbitration have ma-

terially improved the credit side of the workers' weekly balance sheet.

Our senatorial author insists that so far it has not been demonstrated that the workers have benefited by this Socialistic legislation, and he predicts that if the Socialists do not "make good" their claim in this respect the political pendulum will swing backward.

Sidney Webb's Commendation.

Sidney Webb, of England, the acknowledged greatest living authority on trade unionism and labor legislation and an advocate of a National minimum wage, had an article in the *Journal of Political Economy* (Chicago University) of December, 1912, on "The Economic Theory of a Legal Minimum Wage." Speaking of the results in Victoria, Australia, he says: "In the five sweated trades to which the law was first applied sixteen years ago wages have gone up from twelve to thirty-five per cent, the hours of labor have invariably been reduced, and the actual number of persons employed, far from falling, has in all cases, relatively to the total population, greatly increased. . . . Little remains now outside its scope except the agricultural occupations and domestic service. . . . Certainly no statesman, no economist, no political party, nor any responsible newspaper in Victoria, however much a critic of details, ever dreams now of undoing the minimum wage law itself."

It is difficult to understand how Professor Webb came to the latter conclusion, for there is certainly much opposition in both New Zealand and Australia to the entire scheme of State Socialism, including compulsory arbitration and the minimum wage. Whatever merit there is in a legal minimum wage, the best observers unite in saying that Australia has not yet worked out the problem—it is still very much in an experimental stage. Unfortunately, the true issue has been obscured by the fact that the New Zealand and Australian systems have been made political questions. The only men well organized politically have been those in favor of State Socialism. Until recently this element has been all powerful, but it has within the last four years met several rebuffs, for the Labor-Socialist party is really a small minority of the total voters. Lately the farmers have taken to organization. On this phase of the situation Dr. Clark says ("Labor Conditions in Australia," Bulletin No. 56, United States Bureau of Labor):

"This is especially true in Victoria, where farmers' leagues have been organized and an active campaign is being conducted antagonistic to Socialism and labor doctrines. Until the influence of the farmer has had time to be felt in Australia we shall know very little as to the relative forces at work for and against Socialistic legislation. The prediction one would naturally venture is that the result will be practical compromises, upon the whole, satisfactory to a majority of the workingmen, which will

throw over many of the theoretical ideals and principles of the Socialist political economy."

New Problems Introduced.

The truth seems to be that by the establishment of the legal minimum wage, new problems of industrial distress have been created. If a "fair wage" is fixed as the minimum, employers insist on taking on only the quickest and most efficient workers, and as a consequence the less competent employees and the aged and the slow workers are thrown out of employment; whereas, if a "true minimum wage" is fixed "it has been found that advantage is taken of this situation to force down the prevailing wage to the level of the board determination."

Dr. Clark makes this comment: "These are two horns of the dilemma presented by any attempt to fix wages by legislative authority, whether by arbitration or by minimum wage boards—and it can not candidly be said that much progress has been made as yet toward a solution of this difficulty in any of the Australasian countries."

Further on Dr. Clark shows how the law has had a reactionary effect, in that it has retarded the natural evolution to properly supervised factories and has driven the slow or semi-competent workmen—unable to secure employment at the regular minimum wage—into attic shops, where they make wares which they peddle around at starvation prices to the less scrupulous jobbers. "The whole question of the effect of the law upon industrial development," says Dr.

Clark, "must be considered an open one, for there are so many disturbing factors in the problem at present that any one of a score of different opinions upon the matter may be the right one."

It has been found that the system of granting permits to slow, incompetent, or aged workers to accept less than the minimum wage is not a sufficient remedy for the situation. After quoting a number of official reports supporting this statement, Dr. Clark observes:

"It is perhaps worthy of passing mention as evidencing how the problem of industrial regulation grows upon the hands of the authorities as soon as it is once undertaken by the Government, that the only solution of the difficulties mentioned that suggests itself to the Inspector (the State Inspector of Factories) is, 'To provide work at remunerative wages for men able to work, and old-age pensions for the old workers.' In other words, the outcome of regulative legislation—the only means by which it can accomplish even its most modest objects successfully—would be State Socialism."

In addition to repayment of part of the minimum wage to the employer by the workers, another way of evading the law is for the employer to sell the raw material to workmen, on credit, they manufacturing the goods and disposing of them to the employer at a stipulated cheap rate.

Dr. Clark says that while some manufacturers speak well of the system, the business community generally is opposed to it. There is a great deal of

uncertainty as to the next step of a Socialistic nature which will be taken, the result being that there is a lack of enterprise in New Zealand as compared with the United States.

It is surprising that such an authority as Sidney Webb should assume—as he does—that the problem of the legal minimum wage has been solved in Australia and New Zealand. A more correct assumption is that the whole problem is still in a state of experimentation.

CHAPTER IV

State Regulation of Wages in England

AN OLD QUESTION.

As England is the place of origin of most of the theories which form the basis of so-called Modern, Scientific Socialism, so it is England which made the first practical experiments in the State regulation of industries, including wages, leaving out of consideration classical times. In this connection Macaulay makes some observations in his *History of England* which are pertinent in these "progressive" days: "The more carefully we examine the history of the past, the more reason shall we find to dissent from those who imagine that our age has been fruitful of social evils. The truth is that the evils are, with scarcely an exception, old. That which is new is the intelligence which discerns and the humanity which remedies them."

Direct legislation regulating wages dates back to 1349 in England, during the reign of Edward III. The population had been much reduced by the plague; there was a demand for labor, and the workmen naturally demanded more wages. Some of the chronicles of the times declare that in certain instances the wages demanded were exorbitant, and

considering the purchasing power of money, they seem in some cases in excess of those which are paid even in these days. However this may be, the authorities determined to place a limit on wages, and that limit was far below what the laborers and skilled workmen were demanding. The preamble of this remarkable statute recited: "Because a great part of the people, and especially of workmen and servants, lately died of the pestilence, many, seeing the necessity of masters and great paucity of servants, will not serve unless they may receive excessive wages."

It was provided that wages asked for and paid should not be higher than they had been several years before the plague. This was unjust, because the price of food and other necessaries had advanced. But, to somewhat balance the low figures at which the maximum wages were fixed, dealers were required to sell provisions at reasonable prices. It appears, however, that some of the laborers and workmen came to an understanding with each other not to accept less than a certain wage—in some cases double and treble what they had been paid. So two years afterward an amendment was made in the statutes, fixing a scale of wages not only for farm hands, but for all classes of skilled workmen. This statute of King Edward is remarkable in that it is the first time in England that cognizance was taken of free laborers for hire. It not only fixed wages, but covered generally the relations of the laborer to his master.

"Statute of Laborers."

This law remained in force, with many amendments, until 1563, when the famous "Statute of Elizabeth" was passed. The laws of 1349 and 1563, with their amendments, constitute what is known as "The Statute of Laborers," the Elizabethan law being a codification as well as an amendment of all previous legislation on the subject. The Statute of Laborers is the most historic and complete code regulating industry ever enacted. King Edward's statute was avowedly for the purpose of compelling laborers and craftsmen to work for a lower wage than they demanded, and the general purpose of the law was to limit the freedom of action of the work people. The Elizabethan statute, however, had as one of its objects the amelioration of the hard conditions of the wage earners. "The Statute of Apprentices," which is included, legislated to "yield unto the hired person, both in time of scarcity and in time of plenty, a convenient proportion of wages," and heavy penalties were provided for violation.

The Elizabethan statute recited that its passage was "chiefly for that the wages and allowances limited and rated in many of the said statutes are in divers places too small and not answerable to this time, respecting the advancement of prices of all things to the said servants and laborers; the said laws can not conveniently, without the great grief and burden of the poor laborer and hired man, be put to good and true execution." This act regulated the terms of service, the hours of labor, and the

fixing of wages by the Justices of the Peace, and had minute provisions respecting every phase of the employment of servants, laborers, apprentices, and skilled workmen.

George Howell, formerly a member of the British Parliament and an advocate of old-fashioned Trade Unionism as opposed to the Socialist tendency of the present-day labor movement—he taking much the same position that Samuel Gompers does in this country—and a recognized authority on the subject, has an illuminating chapter on the State regulation of industrialism in his *Trade Unionism, Old and New.* Speaking of the Elizabethan "Statute of Laborers," Mr. Howell says: "Taking into account the times and circumstances, the previous action of the guilds, their ordinances and regulations, the legislation that had been enacted, and the general conditions of industry at that stage of our history, it was an ideal code of labor law, protecting at once the hired worker and apprentice and the master by whom they were employed."

State Regulation Condemned.

The Elizabethan code became the parent of numerous acts passed in later reigns, covering a period of 250 years, and Mr. Howell makes the following observations, which are instructive at this period, when so many reformers are seeking to establish a radical system of State regulation over the entire field of industrialism·

"The State having once entered upon the wild-

goose chase of attempting to regulate labor, thereby restraining the development of the individual in the pursuit of his own welfare, it found no halting place. As new industries arose, the law had to be extended. Each fresh discovery and invention was more or less handicapped in its application to industry. Capital was fettered, employers were harassed and hampered, and manufacturers were impeded by such laws; and, worse than all, they afforded but scant protection to the workmen. It so happened, however, that the latter sought to perpetuate them, because they feared that by repeal they would fare worse than under the law. The capitalists and employers, on the contrary, sought their repeal, and for about two centuries the contest raged fiercer and fiercer, on the one side for the retention of the laws, and on the other for their repeal. . . . But there was no halting place. Finis was nowhere written at the end of any chapter. . . . Industry groaned under the weight of regulation, restriction, and control. There was a revolt against it, first by one party, and then by the other, as it suited them, or as the nature of the industry demanded. It almost looked, at one period, as if the whole trade of the country would be crushed beneath the load of legislation; and it would have been had not other countries been simply stupid as regards the same kind of legislation, or at least such legislation as compassed nearly the same ends."

Mr. Howell notes the fact that there is an agi-

tation to return to this policy, and he makes these comments:

"If a cure for this frenzy be possible, probably the best cure will be a careful perusal of the legislation prior to the commencement of the present century, and a careful study of its effects. It nearly killed our early trade, and nearly starved our people. It needs no prophet to foretell that the same results would follow if such laws were re-enacted."

In 1728 the Gloucestershire weavers induced the Justices of the Peace to fix a liberal scale of wages, and in 1756 Parliament passed an act providing for the fixing of piece-work by the Justices to prevent wage-cutting and underselling. But from that time the tendency of Parliament was to adopt a policy of *laissez-faire*. In 1795, 1800, and 1808 the hand-loom weavers tried to get Parliament to establish a minimum wage, but the Committee to which the proposition was referred reported that it was "wholly inadmissible in principle, incapable of being reduced to practice by any means which can possibly be devised, and, if practicable, would be productive of the most fatal consequences." In 1805 the Glasgow Court of Sessions fixed a scale for printers, and again in 1812 declared that the Magistrates were competent under the law to fix a scale for cotton weavers. But in 1813 the "pernicious" law—as it was called by its opponents—was peremptorily repealed. In 1814 the apprenticeship clause was repealed, and a Parliamentary Committee declared:

"The right of every man to employ the capital he inherits, or has acquired, according to his own discretion, without molestation or obstruction, so long as he does not infringe on the rights of others, is one of those privileges which the free and happy Constitution of this country has long accustomed every Briton to consider as his birthright."

Not only in England, but throughout Western and Southwestern Europe, wages were legally regulated, directly or indirectly, during the Middle Ages.

The English "Trades Boards."

The establishment of "Trades Boards" or "Wage Boards" in England to meet certain conditions in modern industrialism is quite recent. For many years there had been an outcry against "sweated" labor—that is, employment under abnormally low wages and long hours, with unsanitary surroundings, although usually the term is now used specifically to the first-named condition.

In 1906 a "sweated industrial exhibition" was held in England, and the nation was shocked by the revelations. In 1907 a Select Committee of the House of Commons unanimously reported in favor of the establishment of wage boards in various sweated trades. In the same year Mr. Ernest Aves, an expert of the British Government Board of Trade, was sent to Australia and New Zealand to investigate the various systems in operation over there. There has been some controversy as to the extent

of the approval given by Mr. Aves to those systems; but it is certain that he did not feel justified in recommending their full adoption in England. He did, however, make recommendations for the establishment of Wage Boards to a certain extent, modeled something after the system in Victoria.

In 1908 a Select Committee of the House of Commons recorded its opinion "that it is quite as legitimate to establish by legislation a minimum standard of remuneration as it is to establish a standard of sanitation, cleanliness, ventilation, air space, and hours of work."

In 1909 the British Government enacted the Trades Board Act—going into effect January 1, 1910—providing for the establishment of boards for certain trades, to fix minimum wages, and thus to prevent sweating.

In introducing the measure the spokesman of the Government announced that he could not hold out any hope that a scheme for a general minimum wage would be embarked upon; and he declared that the effect of stereotyping a rate of wages might be to bring down to that rate the wages of workingmen who were now receiving a higher sum—that is, that the minimum might become the maximum, the very objection, by the way, raised by President Wilson in his argument with Colonel Roosevelt.

Mr. Winston Churchill said that the wages of the sweated worker bear no accurate relation to the ultimate price, and he contended that decent conditions made for industrial efficiency. Ex-Premier Balfour

admitted that in some sweated trades wages could be raised without increasing the ultimate cost to the consumer.

The English Act provides machinery both for deciding and enforcing a minimum rate of wages. The following trades came under the operation of the Act immediately after its passage, they being by general consent sweated industries: Ready-made and custom tailoring, paper-box making, machine-made lace, net finishing and mending, and lace curtain finishing, and certain kinds of chain making. Women are largely employed in all of these industries. The Act may be extended by the Board of Trade, on confirmation by Parliament, to other industries in which the Board is satisfied that exceptionally low wages are paid as compared with other employments. The Trade Boards are composed of representatives of employers and employed in equal proportions and of three members appointed by the Board of Trade, one of the latter of whom must be a woman, if women are largely employed in the particular industry, and in that case women are also eligible for selection as representatives of the employees. These Boards fix the minimum wages and give public notice of any time-rate or piece-rate determined upon. These rates are obligatory in the trades concerned, and any employer paying less than the minimum rate is liable to a fine of not exceeding twenty pounds, and to a further fine not exceeding five pounds for every day on which the offense is committed after conviction. No agreement for lower

wages is legal. The Board of Trade has power to enter workshops and inspect wage sheets.

It is significant that many employers welcomed the establishment of Trade Boards, they confessing that it was only the stress of severe competition which caused them to give the low wages they had been paying, and they arguing that if all were compelled to pay living wages none would be given an unfair advantage or placed at a disadvantage, as the case might be.

So far the testimony appears to be practically unanimous that the English system is a success where it has been applied. In an article in the *American Economic Review* for March, 1912, Mr. E. F. Wise, of Toynbee Hall, London, says: "There is every reason to be satisfied with the progress at present achieved. Already other trades are clamoring to be included. . . . There is every indication that a weapon has been forged that will greatly diminish, if it does not destroy, one of the worst evils of our industrial system."

It should be particularly noted that the determinations of the Trade Boards are the results of "bargaining," and are not based on the cost of living or a standard of living, but are affected by trade conditions. There is, therefore, variation in the minimum fixed.

For Miners.

The British Government subsequently passed an act providing for special District Boards for miners,

owing to exceptional conditions. It is to a certain extent an adaptation of the "run-of-the-mine" system contended for by American miners. Some English miners would be put in sections of the mines where, no matter how hard they worked, they could not earn a livelihood when their wages were based on the quantity of commercial coal they turned out. The miners demanded that a minimum wage of five shillings a day should be fixed by law, but the Government refused to do this, and left the amount to be determined by the District Boards according to the local conditions.

The *Century Magazine* of June, 1912, says that it is found that under the operation of this law some of the mines can not be operated at all, and that many miners, instead of having a minimum wage, have no wage at all. In the opinion of the *Century* the English Government has played into the hands of the Syndicalists, whose policy is to make the operation of the mines so unprofitable that the owners will, from sheer disgust, turn them over to the workmen to operate themselves for their own profit.

Special Provisions of the British Acts.

Following are important special provisions of the British "anti-sweating" minimum wage law, passed 20th October, 1909, and going into effect 1st January, 1910:

"The Board of Trade may make a Provisional Order applying this Act to any specified trade to

which it does not at the time apply if they are satisfied that the rate of wages prevailing in any branch of the trade is exceptionally low, as compared with that in other employments, and that the other circumstances of the trade are such as to render the application of the Act to the trade expedient."

"Trade Boards shall, subject to the provisions of this section, fix minimum rates of wages for time-work for their trades, and may also fix general minimum rates of wages for piece-work for their trades, and those rates of wages (whether time or piece-rates) may be fixed so as to apply universally to the trade, or so as to apply to any special process in the work of the trade or to any special class of workers in the trade, or to any special area."

"If a Trade Board report to the Board of Trade that it is impracticable in any case to fix a minimum time-rate in accordance with this section, the Board of Trade may so far as respects that relieve the Trade Board of their duty."

"A Trade Board may, if they think it expedient, cancel or vary any minimum time-rate or general piece-rate fixed under this Act, and shall reconsider any such minimum rate if the Board of Trade direct them to do so, whether an application is made for the purpose or not."

"If a Trade Board are satisfied that any worker employed, or desiring to be employed, on time-work in any branch of a trade to which a minimum time-rate fixed by the Trade Board is applicable is af-

fected by any infirmity or physical injury which renders him incapable of earning that minimum time-rate, and are of the opinion that the case can not suitably be met by employing the worker on piece-work, the Trade Board may, if they think fit, grant to the worker, subject to such conditions, if any, as they prescribe, a permit exempting the employment of the worker from the provisions of this Act rendering the minimum time-rate obligatory, and, while the permit is in force, an employer shall not be liable to any penalty for paying wages to the worker at a rate less than the minimum time-rate so long as any conditions prescribed by the Trade Board on the grant of the permit are complied with."

"Any agreement for the payment of wages in contravention of this provision shall be void."

Following are the trades—as officially described—to which the Act applied automatically without any Provisional Order from the Board of Trade, which body, it should be explained, is a Government body similar to the Department of Commerce and Labor of the United States:

1. Ready-made and wholesale bespoke tailoring and any other branch of tailoring in which the Board of Trade consider that the system of manufacture is generally similar to that prevailing in the wholesale trade.

2. The making of boxes or parts thereof made wholly or partially of paper, cardboard, chip, or similar material.

3. Machine-made lace and net finishing and mending or darning operations of lace curtain finishing.

4. Hammered and dollied or tommied chain-making.

In the above four trades women and girls are almost exclusively employed.

Following are some important provisions of the Act passed 29th March, 1912, by the British Parliament, applicable to miners of coal and of stratified ironstone—this Act to remain in force for three years, unless Parliament shall otherwise determine:

"It shall be an implied term of every contract for the employment of a workman underground in a coal mine that the employer shall pay to that workman wages at not less than the minimum rate settled under this Act and applicable to that workman, unless it is certified in manner provided by the district rules that the workman is a person excluded under the district rules from the operation of this provision, or that the workman has forfeited the right to wages at the minimum rate by reason of his failure to comply with the conditions with respect to the regularity or efficiency of the work to be performed by workmen laid down by those rules; and any agreement for the payment of wages in so far as it is in contravention of this provision shall be void."

"The district rules shall lay down conditions, as respects the district to which they apply, with respect to the exclusion from the right to wages at the minimum rate of aged workmen and infirm workmen (in-

cluding workmen partially disabled by illness or accident), and shall lay down conditions with respect to the regularity and efficiency of the work to be performed by the workmen, and with respect to the time for which a workman is to be paid in the event of any interruption of work due to an emergency, and shall provide that a workman shall forfeit the right to wages at the minimum rate if he does not comply with conditions as to regularity and efficiency of work, except in cases where the failure to comply with the conditions is due to some cause over which he has no control."

"Nothing in this Act shall prejudice the operation of any agreement entered into or custom existing before the passing of this Act for the payment of wages at a rate higher than the minimum rate settled under this Act, and in settling any minimum rate of wages the joint district board shall have regard to the average daily rate of wages paid to the workmen of the class for which the minimum rate is to be settled."

CHAPTER V

The Massachusetts Law

A Conservative Experiment.

It is an interesting historical fact that as Massachusetts was the only Colony which followed the example of the mother country in prescribing maximum wages, so Massachusetts is the only State so far which has again followed England's experiment in establishing minimum wage boards, but has limited it to women.*

In 1633 the General Court in Massachusetts Bay Colony laid down that carpenters, sawyers, masons, bricklayers, tilers, joiners, wheelwrights, mowers, and other master workmen should not receive more wages than two shillings a day, without board, but that if the workman boarded with his master he was to receive fourteen pence a day. The wages of inferior workmen were to be fixed by the constable. Skilled tailors were to be paid a shilling a day; poorer ones, eight pence. The law was frequently amended, and was finally repealed as being a failure.

Following a unanimous recommendation for a minimum wage by the International Conference of Consumers' Leagues, there has been a steadily growing movement in the United States in its favor. The

*See p. 85, Note on Utah.

American Consumers' League has a special committee on Minimum Wage Boards, of which Prof. Arthur N. Holcombe, of Harvard University, is chairman.

In May, 1911, the Legislature of Massachusetts adopted a resolution providing for the appointment by the Governor of a commission of five persons—one of whom was to be a woman, one to be a representative of labor, and one a representative of the employers—"to study the matter of the employment of women and minors, and to report on the advisability of establishing a board, or boards, to which shall be referred inquiries as to the need and feasibility of fixing minimum rates of wages for women or minors in any industry." The commissioners were to serve without pay, but $2,000 were provided for expenses. This sum, however, was insufficient, and public-spirited citizens furnished an additional $2,000. The Governor duly appointed the commission, and it made its report in January, 1912. Students of the subject consider that the statistics collected by Massachusetts are the best of any State; but they were not found adequate enough, and the commission had to mainly rely on its own direct inquiries, in which, it is satisfactory to note, it "received the sympathetic co-operation of a number of employers, who placed their wage sheets at the disposal of the investigators." Owing to the limitation of time and money, it was necessary to restrict the study to a few occupations.

The report gives statistics showing that of women, 41 per cent of the candy workers, 10.2 per cent of

the saleswomen, 16.1 per cent of the laundry workers, and 23 per cent of the cotton workers earn less than $5 a week, and that, respectively, 65.2 per cent, 29.5 per cent, 40.7 per cent, and 37.9 per cent of them earn less than $6 a week. "In these four industries, therefore, we find low wage rates for a very considerable number of persons." The commission notes great difference of women's wages in factories of the same grade. This difference was also found in stores.

"In the stores, indeed, the large and presumably prosperous establishments of Boston in many cases paid a lower wage than was paid in some of the small suburban establishments, and lower wages than were paid in Brockton or Springfield. . . . In so far as this is the case it is evidence that the industry will bear a higher rate of compensation than some employers pay. These latter, because of inefficient management or because they are making unusual profits, are doing business at the expense of their employees. These inequalities of wages in the same industry are evidence of the fact to which some of the more thoughtful employers testified—that the rate of wages depends to a large degree upon the personal equation of the employers and upon the helplessness of their employees, and, to a very inexact degree, upon the cost of labor in relation to the cost of production."

Referring to the minimum wage systems in England, in Australia, and New Zealand, the Commissioners say: "No accurate statement can be made

as to the effect of this legislation upon wages, and the difference in social and economic conditions renders comparisons of less value. Their experiences, while interesting and important, are not conclusive." The commission, however, recommended the establishment of wage boards something after the English plan.

Reasons for the Law.

The proposed legislation was recommended for the following reasons, and these reasons were presented in the Ohio Constitutional Convention last year as arguments in favor of the amendment authorizing the Legislature to enact a minimum wage law:

1. It would promote the general welfare of the State, because it would tend to protect the women workers, and particularly the younger women workers, from the economic distress that leads to impaired health and inefficiency.

2. It would bring employers to a realization of their public responsibilities, and would result in the best adjustment of the interests of the employers and of the women employees.

3. It would furnish to the women employees a means of obtaining the best minimum wages that are consistent with the ongoing of the industry, without recourse to strikes or industrial disturbances. It would be the best means of insuring industrial peace so far as this class of employees are concerned.

4. It would tend to prevent exploitation of helpless women, and, so far as they are concerned, to do away with sweating in our industries.

5. It would diminish the parasitic character of some industries and lessen the burden now resting on other employments.

6. It would enable the employers in any occupation to prevent the undercutting of wages by less humane and considerate competitors.

7. It would stimulate employers to develop the capacity and efficiency of the less competent workers in order that the wages might not be incommensurate with the services rendered.

8. It would accordingly tend to induce employers to keep together their trained workers and to avoid as far as possible seasonal fluctuations.

9. It would tend to heal the sense of grievance in employees, who would become in this manner better informed as to the exigencies of their trade, and it would enable them to interpret more intelligently the meaning of the pay roll.

10. It would give the public assurance that these industrial abuses have an effective and available remedy.

The Legislature passed a law which was practically a copy of one drafted by the commission, except in a particular noted below. The law was passed last June and takes effect on the first of July, 1913.

PROVISIONS OF THE LAW.

A Minimum Wage Commission is established for the State, consisting of three persons—one of whom may be a woman—to be appointed by the Governor. Each Commissioner is to be paid $10 a day for each day's service and traveling and other expenses. It is the duty of the Commission to inquire into the wages paid to the female employees in any occupation in the State if it has reason to believe that the wages paid to a substantial number of such employees are inadequate to supply the necessary cost of living and to maintain the worker in health. If, after an investigation, this should be demonstrated to be a fact, the Commission is to establish a Wage Board, consisting of not less than six representatives of employers in the occupation in question and of an equal number of persons to represent the female employees in the occupation, and of one or more disinterested persons appointed by the Commission to represent the public, but the representatives of the public shall not exceed one-half of the number of representatives of either of the other parties. The Commission shall appoint the Chairman of the Wage Board from among the representatives of the public. The members of the Wage Board are to be paid the same as jurors. When two-thirds of the members of the Wage Board shall agree upon a minimum wage determination they must report it to the State Commission, together with the names—as far as they can be learned—of employers who pay less than the mini-

mum wage so determined. The State Commission can approve or disapprove of the determination.

If it tentatively approve of it the Commission is to order a public hearing in which the employers can be heard; and if after this hearing the Commission finally confirms the Wage Board's determination, it is to enter a decree which establishes the minimum wage in that particular trade.

The original investigating Commission recommended that failure to obey such a decree should be treated as a misdemeanor, punishable by fine or imprisonment. But, instead of this, the law merely provides publicity—at the expense of the State—as a punishment. Those employers who, fourteen days after the issuance of a decree, refuse or fail to abide by it are to have their names published in four papers in every county in the State, with a statement of the minimum wage paid by each of these employers. But any employer can appeal to Court and have the decree set aside if he can show that if enforced it would endanger the prosperity of the business to which it was made applicable. Newspapers are liable to a fine of $100 for refusal to publish at regular advertising rates the names of delinquent employers; and newspapers are protected from claims for damages for publishing these names.

There is some criticism on the part of advocates of the minimum wage as to this feature of the law, it being claimed that it will be very expensive to the taxpayers, as well as ineffective.

As remarked by Prof. Holcombe, the Massachusetts law is frankly an experiment. Other States will watch its workings with intense interest, for, apart from those who might be directly concerned, there is no proposed plan for the amelioration of the lot of work-people which is attracting so much attention just now as this, particularly among political economists and social reformers.

Views of Two Governors.

Two of the newly elected Governors, both of the "progressive" type of Democrats, have recently made recommendations on the subject.

One is Governor Cox, of Ohio. He desires more definite information, to be obtained by a State Bureau of Research, which he asks to be established, before committing himself to the proposition of a general minimum wage law to apply to all industries. Until this information is obtained he is convinced that no law should be passed "except to provide for the obviously unjust conditions affecting the wages of women and children."

The other Executive, Governor Sulzer, of New York, is more sweeping and pronounced. After declaring that workers should receive a more equitable share of that which they help to produce, he says: "No compensation is fair which does not secure to each worker at least enough to permit him or her decent standards of life. The workers themselves have not been able to secure such compensation for themselves." And this is particularly true of women

and minors. Therefore, "to secure for those less accustomed to the competitive struggle protection that others workers have won for themselves, through organizations, we should carefully consider the establishment of wage boards with authority to fix a living wage for conditions of work below which standards no industry should be allowed to continue its operations." The New York *Sun,* in commenting on Governor Sulzer's message, raises the question whether such a law as he proposes would not be an invasion of the Bill of Rights, and it also asks the Governor whether he believes it is within the Constitutional power of the Legislature to prescribe maximum prices at which commodities shall be sold. The *Sun* intimates that the Governor "is on the edge of a morass and he had better look carefully ahead of him."

Criticism by Miss Kelley.

In the *Journal of Political Economy* (University of Chicago) for December, 1912, is an article by Miss Florence Kelley, secretary of the National Consumers' League (New York), which is one of the social-reform philanthropic organizations devoted to the propaganda for a general legal minimum wage. "As usual," Miss Kelley says, "in matters of industrial legislation Massachusetts marches conservatively at the head of the line of experimenting States." But she is critical as to the Massachusetts law. She claims that in regard to enforcing the "determinations" of the Wage Boards it is a "wide deviation in the direc-

tion of futility" as compared with the English and Australian precedents. It is condemned as "a much-mangled form of the bill" proposed by the investigating Commission of 1911,—that in order "to save the measure to pass at all" the provisions making publicity the punishment for violation were inserted.

Miss Kelley is an accepted authority on labor legislation, and her statements and opinions are entitled to great respect. She finds fault with the Massachusetts law because it is confined to women, her argument being that "studies of the pay of women with the view of ascertaining what constitutes a living wage for them will entail turning the light upon men's wage rates in the same industries. . . . Indeed, the wages of women, especially of married women, depend primarily upon the wages of men. It is the American tradition that men support their families, the wives throughout life and the children at least until the fourteenth birthday. In recent years this tradition has, however, been rapidly giving way under the pressure of immigration." Married women immigrants from the nations of Southeastern Europe respond to the demand for cheap labor in the cigar trades, the textiles, the laundries, the department stores, and an ever-widening range of other occupations.

"The Massachusetts law does not tend to check this retrograde movement. It does not face the question: Why is the man no longer the breadwinner? It does not contribute toward conserving the family

and the home with the man as its economic support. This is important because, as the Massachusetts law is the first one in this country, other States may incline to accept it as their model in place of the more comprehensive Australian and English laws."

Miss Kelley has nothing but praise for the Constitutional amendment recently adopted in Ohio with regard to the minimum wage.

"This amendment applies to men as well as to women. It expressly connects the establishment of a minimum wage with the concepts of health and working hours. This is significant, because the Supreme Court of the United States has held that freedom of contract of adults, both men and women, may be abridged in the matter of working hours, if it be shown to the satisfaction of the Court that the Legislature has acted for the benefit of the health of the employees. . . . The Legislature is, moreover, free to proceed as it may deem best, no restriction being placed upon the method by which it is to arrive at the minimum wage. The Legislature, thus given plenary power unprecedented in this country, confronts the task of creating machinery for ascertaining existing wages and determining, for future use, minimum rates which the Courts can not fail to recognize and uphold as reasonable. The large popular vote in favor of the amendment gives promise of prompt action during the legislative session of 1913. Under these circumstances, it would appear that more immediate practical results, in the wider

field of men's and women's occupations, may be looked for in Ohio than are yet in process of achievement in Massachusetts."

It is evident from the above that Miss Kelley will not altogether approve of the conservatism of Governor Cox in his message to the Legislature when he recommends that no law be passed until there is "a common understanding of this subject as developed by a survey of the wage question, . . . except to provide for obviously unjust conditions affecting the wages of women and children."

CHAPTER VI

A Serious and Complicated Problem

A "Living" Wage.

The preceding chapters justify the statement that to make a legal minimum wage practicable and effective there is a great problem to be solved. Such a friend of the proposition as Professor Holcombe, of Harvard University, admits (*Quarterly Journal of Economics,* Volume 24, 1910) that "there are greater difficulties, legal, administrative, and economic, to be overcome in America than in Great Britain." The same authority also holds that the minimum wage must go hand-in-hand with State insurance against accident, sickness, old age, and unemployment, and that the State must also set up minimum standards of efficiency—that with the minimum wage must go industrial training and vocational guidance.

The argument for a legal minimum wage is not merely the humanitarian consideration that the State should step in and protect defenseless men, women, and minors from being compelled—from their necessities—to work for wages insufficient to properly maintain life, but there is also the economic one that for the Nation's welfare the American standard of living must be maintained.

There arises an initial difficulty: What is the American standard of living?—and what is the mini-

mum wage which is sufficient to maintain that standard?

As far back as 1776 Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations,* held: "A man must always live by his work, and his wage must at least be sufficient to maintain him. They must even upon most occasions be somewhat more; otherwise it would be impossible to bring up a family, and the race of such workmen could not last beyond the first generation." Coming from such a strong advocate of what is known as the "Manchester School" of Individualism, this declaration is significant, but it shows that at the time Adam Smith wrote it every industry "stood upon its own bottom"—that is, "parasitic" industries, as now flourishing, were unknown, as for several generations men and women have been working at "sweated" trades which have not afforded them means of adequate subsistence.

Probably the first definition of a "living wage" by a trade union is found in the declaration of the United Silk Throwers of England, in 1872, when they declared that the true reward of their labor could be summed up in the words, "shelter, food, and raiment both for ourselves, our wives, and our children." In 1874, Lloyd Jones, of England—pronounced by the Webbs to be "the ablest working-class thinker of the time"—made this declaration in a labor paper called the *Beehive:* "The first thing that those who manage trade societies should settle is a minimum, which they should regard as a point below which they should never go: . . .

such a one as will secure sufficiency of food and some degree of personal home comfort to the workers; not a miserable allowance to starve on, but living wages."

Economists recognize a difference between a "minimum" wage and a "living" wage, but generally the terms are used synonymously; and for practical purposes, in America, they may be considered the same thing.

Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, in a debate with Edward Atkinson, in 1898, gave this definition: "A minimum wage—a living wage—which, when expended in the most economical manner, shall be sufficient to maintain an average-sized family in a manner consistent with whatever the contemporary local civilization recognizes as indispensable to physical and mental health, or as required by the rational self-respect of human beings." It must be pointed out that Mr. Gompers, in the above, is not referring to a legal minimum wage, to which he is opposed.

A large part of that masterly work of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Industrial Democracy,* is devoted to the minimum wage. They, as do most thorough thinkers on the subject, draw a distinction between a "minimum" wage and a "living" wage. The former, they say, can "be determined by a practical inquiry as to the cost of the food, clothing, and shelter physiologically necessary, according to national habit and custom, to prevent bodily deterioration. Such a minimum would, therefore, be low,

and though its establishment would be welcomed as a boon by the unskilled workers in the unregulated trades, it would not at all correspond with the conception of a 'living wage' formed by the cotton operatives or coal miners."

VARYING STANDARDS OF LIVING.

Both English and American economists agree that there is a great difference in standards of living, and a great difficulty in defining them; and this difficulty is particularly so where work-people of different standards of living come into competition with each other in industries in which the legal minimum wage is to be applied. In the *American Economic Review* (March, 1912), Professor Holcombe points out: "Unless the various groups of work-people are of equal efficiency, the attempt to establish a single standard for all might result in securing the industry to the most efficient group and excluding the others from all prospect of employment therein;" and he adds, "The truth is that there is no single American standard of living to-day."

In the Wisconsin bill—which was not passed, but is to be pressed for passage—a living wage is defined as "such compensation for labor performed under reasonable conditions as shall enable employees to secure for themselves and those who are or may be reasonably dependent upon them the necessary comforts of life." In the proposed Minnesota law—for women and minors only—the minimum wage is fixed as one "which will enable the workers af-

fected to procure a reasonable minimum of food, clothing, and shelter, to maintain themselves in normal health and working efficiency, and to obtain those general conditions of living which are practically necessary for right moral life."

Having settled—if possible—the question of a "standard of living" and a rule for ascertaining the minimum wage necessary to maintain a man or woman in physical health and efficiency, the next question is, What shall be the living or minimum wage?

Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree, the English radical reformer, in a recent article in the *Contemporary Review,* demonstrates that twenty-three shillings and eight pence a week is the absolute minimum in England, on which a family of five (two adults and three children), paying five shillings a week for rent, can be maintained in a state of physical efficiency; and yet, he declares, this is an unattainable ideal to the vast majority of those unskilled workers who have three children dependent upon them. Mr. Rowntree estimates that in England there are nearly 1,000,000 men working for less than twenty shillings a week, and over 1,500,000 working for from twenty shillings to twenty-five shillings.

American Wages.

Father Ryan, the famous Catholic advocate of a legal minimum wage, says in his book that in a large American city $600 a year is not a living wage, and he estimates that in all the industrial occupations in the country there are probably 4,000,000

men who have a less income than that. John Mitchell, the labor leader, puts the minimum at $600 in cities of less than 100,000 population. Prof. Albion W. Small says $1,000. The New York Commission, which collected and classified "budgets" of working-people's income and expenses, set the minimum at the point where the average family ceased to run into debt—and that amount is put at $825 for New York. Another authority puts it at $850. A committee of the New York State Conference of Charities and Corrections and of the Russell Sage Foundation (1906) found that the physical wants of a normal family in New York City can not properly be filled by an income of less than $800. Robert Coit Chapin, in his *Standard of Living Among Workingmen's Families,* gives $700 as the minimum necessary to support a moderate-sized family in a town or small city, and from $800 to $900 in the largest cities, and he claims that considerably more than half—probably two-thirds—of adult male workers receive less than $700 annually. Prof. R. C. Chapin estimates that a New York family, consisting of a man, wife, and three children under fourteen, can maintain a normal standard, at least so far as the physical man is concerned, on an annual income of $900.

In his study of Federal and State wage statistics (*Wages in the United States,* Macmillan's, 1911), Dr. Scott Nearing, of the University of Pennsylvania, comes to these remarkable conclusions: After making reductions for unemployment, etc., "it ap-

pears that half of the adult males of the United States are earning less than $500 a year; that three-quarters of the adult males in the country are earning less than $600 annually; that nine-tenths are receiving less than $800 a year, while less than ten per cent receive more than that figure." A corresponding computation of the wages of women shows that a fifth earn less than $200 annually, three-fifths less than $325, nine-tenths less than $500, and only one-twentieth more than $600, while three-quarters of the adult males and nineteen-twentieths of the adult females earn less than $600.

Yet the last British report on American wages and living (1911) says that the dietary of American working people is more varied and liberal than among British work-people, and that the proportion of income left after paying rent and food bills is larger in America than in Great Britain—that there is a higher standard of living, with a greater surplus for saving.

"Sweated" Industries and Women Workers.

Unquestionably there is a fast-developing sentiment in both America and England in favor of fixing a minimum wage by law in "sweated" industries—and particularly for women and minors—and, indeed, it is probably true that apart from a survival of the old *laissez faire* doctrine, there is very little opposition to the assumption of this function by the State, limited as stated. The opposition to

and the admitted difficulties apply to the proposition to establish a general scale of minimum wages for the entire range of industrialism.

"Sweated" industries—that is, those paying unusually low rates of wages—are said to be "parasitical," for the reason that they live off others, in the sense that the workers do not receive enough compensation to provide for the necessaries of life, and the difference has to be made up by relatives or friends, or by private or public charity. The contention of such economists as the Webbs is that "sweated" industries are receiving a "labor force" for which they do not pay, and are enabled to exist by "sponging" on the community at large, as well as starving the work people engaged in them, and they insist that the Nation would be better off without any such industries.

But little reflection is needed to show why women and minors are more subject to "sweating" than men are. Women are unable to form effective organizations for their own protection; in an industrial sense, women are less "mobile" than men—it is more difficult for them to go elsewhere if local conditions are unsatisfactory; and they are more easily coerced than men. Women are preferred by some employers because of their "cheapness" and "docility." As a rule, women are not as efficient as men in industrial occupations, not because of less inherent capacity, but because as a rule they do not exert themselves to master the details; there are physiological reasons for this, and then the majority of women do not

look upon industrial employment as their life work, for the reason that they expect to marry and to depend upon their husbands to support them. It is said that over seventy-six per cent of women workers receive less wages than men do in the same occupations. It is the general opinion of experts that the competition of women displaces men or reduces their wages, this being particularly true of the textile trades. While able lawyers differ as to whether a State law fixing a minimum wage for men—except at any rate under abnormal conditions—would be Constitutional, there is but little dissent from the view that the Courts would sustain a legal minimum wage for women and minors in "sweated" industries.

The Path Strewn With Difficulties.

Leaving out of consideration the old-fashioned and now largely discarded doctrine of *laissez faire*, many advocates of a legal minimum wage freely admit that the path is strewn with difficulties. Among international authorities who admit this are the two people who stand above all others as authorities on the history and philosophy of trades unions—Sidney and Beatrice Webb, of England, and they are among the foremost advocates of the minimum wage. In their profound work, *Industrial Democracy*, they say that "the most obvious drawback of the doctrine of a living wage is its difficulty of application." They point out that "the indispensable minimum conditions prescribed for each occupation can not practically be adapted to the re-

quirements of each individual, but must be roughly ganged by needs of the normal type; but a more serious difficulty is our lack of precise knowledge as to what are the conditions of healthy life and industrial efficiency." While the amount of food, clothing, and house accommodation necessary for the maintenance of a family in full physical and mental health might be ascertained, "we have as yet no data from which to estimate the cost of extra food, clothing, and recreation called for by the greater waste of muscle and nerve" of special classes of workers. In the opinion of the Webbs those trade unionists who by organization have succeeded in controlling the conditions of labor would oppose the establishment of a minimum wage. The Webbs lay emphasis on the fact, as a paradox, that while the trade union policy has been profoundly influenced by the demand for State regulation of employment in other respects, there has been but little acceptance of this doctrine so far as the State regulation of wages is concerned.

Of course, the Webbs are speaking of English trade unionists, but there can be no doubt that the same situation exists in this country, especially in the skilled trades. Although there are some American trade unionists who favor a legal minimum wage, yet the great bulk of its advocates are outside the ranks of manual workers—social reformers and university political economists. The conclusion of the Webbs is that the application of the doctrine "is likely for the present to be only gradual and

tentative" . . . and will only be adopted with regard to "those unfortunate classes whose wages are manifestly below the minimum required for full physical efficiency."

Attitude of Organized Labor.

President Wilson has criticised the plank of the Progressive party on this question. He assumes that a legal minimum wage for women would eventually lead to the application of the principle to industries in general, and he objects to that because he thinks it likely that the minimum wage would become the maximum.

Colonel Roosevelt replied to that criticism in the *Outlook,* he holding that "the objection is purely academic; it is formed in the school room; it will not have any weight with men who know what life actually is."

The fairest thing which can be said is that the evidence on this point in the experience of New Zealand and Australia is very conflicting. Reliable authorities can be quoted in favor of both sides of the contention. Striking a balance between them, it would seem that the truth is that when the minimum is put low by law there is a good percentage of wages paid above that minimum, but that when a fairly high wage is fixed as the legal minimum the rule is for it to become the maximum; and a review of the evidence as a whole certainly indicates that the general and increasing tendency in Australasia is for the minimum to become the maximum.

But, be that as it may, it is very significant that Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, opposes a legal minimum for the very reason given by President Wilson; and the Federation as a body opposes any legislative restrictions on the fundamental principle that workers own their own "labor power," and that they alone, acting individually or collectively, have the sole right to set the price and bargain for the same.

Strange as it may appear to many industrial reformers and professors of the new humanitarian political economy, the experiments in New Zealand and Australia do not appeal with much force to the American trade unionist in the skilled industries. The reason is that over there the minimum wage is, for the most part, an integral part of a system in which compulsory arbitration is a distinguishing feature; and as a rule American trade unionists, like their brethren in England, are strenuously opposed to compulsory arbitration—they look upon their right to strike as too valuable to exchange for the legal minimum wage, quite apart from their belief that the minimum generally becomes the maximum.

There can be hardly any disputing of the proposition that, as a rule, where American labor is effectively organized, it prefers "collective bargaining" to a legal minimum wage.

These objections on the part of organized labor to the legal minimum wage are likely to have a deterrent effect on legislative bodies in undertaking to regulate wages for industrial workers generally, al-

though the outlook is that the objections will be held not to apply to the fixing of a minimum wage for women and minors, and, in exceptional circumstances, even to men in "sweated" trades.

An official of the Ohio State Government, who is also a prominent trade unionist—and was appointed to his office largely because of that fact—gave to the writer three reasons why he was opposed to the legal minimum wage: First, it would be impracticable; second, it would drive industries out of Ohio; third, the minimum wage would become the maximum.

More Objections, and a "Scotch Verdict."

It is worth noting that at the last meeting of the Ohio State Grange (December, 1912) that body unanimously passed a resolution of opposition to a maximum working day and a minimum wage.

An important phase of the problem is that some of the most prominent advocates of a legal minimum wage concede that to secure effective results there would have to be restrictions placed upon the present enormous immigration of work people—both men and women—whose standard of living is considerably below that prevailing in the United States; and there are those who claim that the exigency—as declared by its advocates—for a legal minimum wage largely arises from the tremendous influx of this kind of immigration.

It is certainly impressive that the representative of the United States Government and also the rep-

resentative of the British Government who went to investigate the experiments in New Zealand and Australia both gave very guarded and conservative reports—that neither one indorsed the system to the extent with which they are credited by some enthusiasts. Practically in each case, taking the present full extent of the systems, a "Scotch verdict" was given.

Thoughtful and impartial—and even sympathetic—students of the New Zealand and Australasian experiments find it difficult to come to a definite judgment, largely because there seems to be no limit to the logical application of the principles held as justifying the regulation of wages by the State. The only end seems to be "State Socialism," which, as Dr. Clark observed, was an official view in Australia; and from a Socialist standpoint "State Socialism" is only the highway to full "Collectivism," and after that—the deluge!—socially, politically, and economically!

But the world will not stand still, and as the Australian working bakers have had their minimum wages fixed by law the public are now demanding that the State fix the maximum price which can be charged for a loaf of bread;—and here again, as in the case of the State regulation of wages, there would be a reversion to very ancient history. Commenting on this demand of the Australian public, our much-quoted American expert, Dr. Clark, remarks: "Of

this policy of Government control of industry it can truly be said, without prejudice to the question of its advisability or inadvisability, that, like fame, it increases as it goes."

And possibly, in these "progressive" days, it may be well to remember the saying of Machiavelli: "Let no man who begins an innovation in a State expect that he shall stop it at his pleasure or regulate it according to his intention!"

UTAH THE PIONEER.

It turns out that Utah, and not Massachusetts, is the first of the States in which a Minimum Wage law has gone into effect. On May 13, 1913, a law became operative establishing a Minimum Wage for women and minor girls. The minimum for a woman is 90 cents a day, and 75 cents for a minor girl, each with a maximum of 54 working hours a week.

Syndicalism

PART I

Its Origin and Philosophy

A New and Startling Movement.

The strike of the Akron rubber workers introduced Ohio to "Syndicalism."

A queer name; and it is so new that a definition of it can be looked for in vain in the largest dictionary or most comprehensive encyclopedia—not even in the latest Webster or the last edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. But within the past year there have been more references to Syndicalism in magazines and reviews than to any other one subject. Thoughtful men are eager to obtain full information about a movement which such a nonsensational journal as the *Engineering Magazine* (New York and London), of March, this year, declares "threatens to bring the world face to face with the greatest crisis of modern civilization—perhaps of any civilization."

The most succinct definition of Syndicalism which can be given is that it is revolutionary industrial unionism. It is Socialist, but it repudiates the prevailing form of modern political Socialism; it is an

exclusively labor organization, but it is opposed to the orthodox Trade Unions, and particularly to the American Federation of Labor. It is a conglomeration of revolutionary Trade Unionism, Socialism, Anarchism, and Nihilism—with special features of its own.

Syndicalism is foreign in origin and aims to be ultimately international in scope. It was hatched in France a dozen years ago, then taken to Italy, where it flourished and grew among the Anarchists of that country, without, however, attracting any particular attention; but it made the world "sit up and take notice" when it crossed the Channel to England, and its leaders assumed managerial direction of the unprecedented strikes in that country within the last three years. It found a lodgment in the United States about eight years ago (naturally in Chicago), but it did not make itself known outside the inner circles of revolutionary Socialists until the textile strikes at Lawrence, Mass., last year. And early this year the Syndicalists were active in fomenting the strike fever in Akron and in several other cities in the northern part of Ohio; and in saying this the writer ventures no opinion as to the wisdom or justice of the strikes themselves.

The American Syndicalists are the Industrial Workers of the World, better known by the initials "I. W. W."

It is proper to say at the outset that probably but few of the strikers at Akron understood anything of the principles of the organization with which

the imported strike agitators were connected; and it is also probable that a great many members of the "I. W. W." do not appreciate its revolutionary character.

Origin of Syndicalism.

The word "Syndicalism" is a new one in the English language, and there is great public curiosity to know its exact origin and meaning. It is the Anglicized form of the French word "Syndicalisme," which itself is new even in the French language; it is derived from the word "syndical," which is the adjectival form of "syndicat"—meaning union; "*syndicats ouvriers*" is French for trade unions.

Like the name itself, Syndicalism is French in origin; and, by the way, it is France, along with England, which is the country of origin of nearly all the varieties of Socialism,—Romantic, Utopian, Scientific, Revolutionary, and Opportunist—and not Germany, as popularly supposed. It has been remarked that in all her theories of political and social economy France is very logical, but extremely impractical. In this connection it is worth noting that Syndicalism has made but little impression in Germany, although Scientific Socialism has attained far greater headway in that country than in any other. Professor Sombart, of Berlin, who has made a special study of Socialism in all its varieties, remarks that Frenchmen and Italians are the only people who could possibly act up to such a system as Syndicalism, they being men "who do things impulsively

and on the spur of the moment, men who are seized upon by a sudden passionate enthusiasm."

The origin of Syndicalism is traced to the decline of the revolutionary form of Marxian Socialism and the substitution for it of the prevailing political, Opportunist, practical, State Socialism, called in Germany the Revisionist form of Socialism, and in England Fabianism; and in a secondary degree it originated from dissatisfaction with the methods of the old-style Trade Unions.

Objects of Syndicalism.

The following are the tenets and objects of Syndicalism, either as formally declared in official utterances or avowed by acknowledged leaders of the movement, it being observed that in some countries more stress is laid on some of the objects than is the case in others:

1. Organization of the wage earners into "industrial groups" instead of "craft unions," as is the rule now.

2. Fostering a spirit of not only "class consciousness" (as is the aim of the Socialists), but of bitter, irreconcilable *class hatred* on the part of all wage earners against all members of the community who do not perform manual work and who are "capitalists," or who receive their means of livelihood through profit on industry or income from investments.

3. Rejection of all forms of political organization and of parliamentary action, and the denial of

the legitimacy of all forms of government, constitutional and representative, as well as autocratic.

4. Indifference to all ameliorative and reformative labor, social, and political measures.

5. Especial opposition to the police and military.

6. The habitual use of the strike, particularly the "general strike," not so much to remedy specific grievances or to establish improvements in conditions of labor,—and then only for "training" purposes—as to cripple and ruin employers, and to paralyze the industries of the country.

7. The use of "sabotage"—that is, damage to and the destruction of machinery and the means of production and distribution, including such damage to plants as will prevent the operation of what are classed as "public utilities;" and any means to interfere with the process of production and transportation.

8. The possession of the means of production and distribution by the wage-earners in each industrial group, either by the collapse of capitalism through the general strike or by forcible seizure, if necessary, —in either case no compensation to be paid.

9. The establishment of an "Industrial Commonwealth," to be ruled by executive committees of each labor group, which shall take the place of all civil government as now constituted, including parliaments, congresses, legislatures, and councils, and all executive and administrative officers, and all courts, no matter whether the form of government be republican, monarchical, or autocratic.

Syndicalism Defined.

Syndicalism is such a new phase of "Industrial Democracy," and it already has such a variety of interpretations, that a precise and brief and at the same time comprehensive definition is rather difficult to give.

The London *Times* was the first public journal in the English language to draw attention to Syndicalism; this was less than three years ago, the cult having just crossed over from the countries of its origin, France and Italy. The *Times* gave this definition: "The aim of Syndicalism is to hand over the means of production and distribution to the Trade Unions whose members now operate them, so that each Union will control its own means of livelihood in the common interest, and the workmen thus secure the whole product for themselves."

The first book in the English language to give an authoritative exposition of Syndicalism was the Epstein translation of *Socialism and the Social Movement,* by the well-known German writer, Prof. Werner Sombart, the sixth edition of which was published jointly in London and New York in 1909. (Professor Sombart, by the way, has been in America to make studies in sociology, and he is on record as saying that while Socialism is as yet very backward over here, yet the conditions are such that America is the most fruitful soil of any country for its development.) In his book above named Professor Sombart thus defines Syndicalism:

"Syndicalists advocate the formation of Trade

Unions for whole industries rather than for individual callings in any one particular industry; rather a large Ironworkers' Union than union of boiler makers and steelworkers and engineers. Their policy is to attempt to bring these large unions into federations in order to combat any narrowing tendencies. For that reason they would do away with contributions and with strike funds or insurance funds, and they will hear nothing of making terms with their masters [employers]. In the same way they object to any policy which makes for social peace—to compromise in parliaments, to social reform, to humanitarian institutions which are due to the 'social spirit,' and which serve to keep that spirit alive. Indeed, they will have none of the 'nonsensical talk about humanitarianism.' It is war to the knife they preach. The proletarian policy of violence is therefore in the interests of human progress. It is vital to help forward everything that tends to strengthen the 'will of revolution,' to lay stress on all that accentuates the class differences between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and to stir up the hatred of the proletariat against the existing condition of things. The most effective means for doing all this to-day are strikes."

Professor Sombart goes on to explain that from the Syndicalist standpoint the strike "must burst out spontaneously as a result of the provocation of the masses, . . . and, as to assistance, it must look to the support of other groups of workers who are prepared voluntarily to help those on strike.

Any strike is thus a means of kindling revolutionary passions, but the general strike, the *grève générale,* serves such a purpose in the highest degree.'' The Syndicalists, as Sombart asserts, regard the general strike as ''the symbol of the social revolution; for them it is equivalent to Socialism.''

The most prominent Syndicalist in England is Tom Mann, who has made himself conspicuous in the establishment of State Socialism in Australia. During the great labor troubles in England in 1910-1911, Tom Mann exhorted privates of the regular British army not to obey their officers when they were ordered to shoot at rioters, for which he was confined in jail for several months. At that time he was editor of the *Syndicalist,* which openly advocated the doctrines of the new form of Continental extreme revolutionary Socialism. In his paper Mann said:

''The essence of Syndicalism is the control by the workers themselves of the conditions of their work. To-day the capitalist owns and controls the tools formerly owned by the worker, with the result that the worker is practically his slave. Syndicalism proposes that this control of the technical processes now exercised by the capitalist shall pass to the various groups of organized workers of the various industries. The product which is now the property of the capitalist would become, under Syndicalism, the property of the community.''

Mann appealed to the low-paid, unorganized wage-workers of England with tremendous effect,

both on the stump and in his paper. He argued that all changes favorable to the workers could only come through the organization of trade unions of the revolutionary type. "Organized labor," he claimed, "means the control of wealth production to the extent to which labor is organized. It is only when labor is partially organized that recourse to strikes is necessary; not even the general strike is necessary when labor is universally organized. Universal organization must carry with it industrial solidarity, *i. e.,* universal agreement upon the object to be attained, or otherwise the capitalists will still triumph; but with solidarity on the industrial field the workers become all-powerful." Mann's theory to bring about the industrial millennium was a very low maximum of working hours daily.

Socialists Abandon "Fundamentals."

It is an extraordinary fact that just at the period when Socialism has become the most active force in the political and economic field, its "fundamentals" should be shaking—indeed, should have been practically abandoned by nearly all its intellectual advocates, notwithstanding that they are still loudly proclaimed by the street-corner, "soap-box orators." These "fundamentals" are:

1. "Economic determinism," or "the materialistic conception of history," which, interpreted, means that man has had no "free will" or volitionary influence in his evolution from savagery, but that "the prevailing mode of economic production and

exchange'' at any particular period exclusively explains his social and intellectual, and even his moral and religious, status at that time; in other words, that man is merely the creature of blind matter and that every problem of life is simply one of ''bread and butter.''

2. The theory of ''surplus value''—the alleged discovery of which, along with that of No. 1, according to Engels, made Socialism ''Scientific'' and entitled Marx to rank in political economy along with Darwin in science. In simple form the theory of ''surplus value'' is that the capitalist pays the wage-earner only enough to subsist upon, the product to pay for which Marx estimated consumes about half the worker's labor time, and that the capitalist then steals the labor product of the other half—the latter being the ''surplus value,'' the contention of Marx being that the worker is entitled to all the product of his entire time of labor.

3. The ''catastrophic theory''—which is that the condition of the laboring class would grow increasingly worse, until it became absolutely unbearable; that the wealth of the country would become all concentrated in a few hands, until Capitalism would ultimately collapse through its top heaviness and own inherent rottenness and the ever-increasing pressure of the clamorous and starving proletariat; and that then, suddenly, in a catastrophic manner—no one knows how—the Industrial Commonwealth would find itself established some fine morning, Labor would come into its own, and the industrial millennium

would reign, with everybody abundantly supplied with everything he wanted and very little work to do!

But quietly, gradually, almost imperceptibly, a great change has come over the doctrinaire spirit of Socialism. Three or four years ago the most brilliant—but not the most profound—Socialist living, Bernard Shaw, the great playwright, boasted in a preface to a new edition of the famous English *Fabian Essays* that "since 1889 the Socialist movement has been completely transformed throughout Europe; and the result of the transformation may be fairly described as Fabian Socialism." What is Fabian Socialism? It is nothing but practical Socialism or State Socialism, known as "Revisionism" in Germany, and sometimes called Opportunism or Political Socialism—with Collectivism, or the Industrial Commonwealth still mildly professed as "the ultimate aim," but put in the distant future as a vague, nebulous dream.

It is impossible to trace here the stages of the process by which this tremendous change has been wrought in the conception of Socialism; but that conception has been accompanied by an entire reversal of the attitude of modern Socialism to practical affairs. In its form or organization, methods, and direct aims, the prevailing Socialism of these days has become political; it has nearly abandoned its revolutionary propaganda against civil government, and it has become almost exclusively an agency for the agitation of social reforms and the "nation-

alization'' and ''municipalization'' of public utilities and of industries, this program to be carried through by Constitutional political methods.

Syndicalism Versus Socialism.

Syndicalism is a vehement protest against this new and modified prevailing form of Socialism. It is a harking back to the old Marxian theory that labor is entitled to its entire product, and to the Proudhon pronouncement that as society is at present constituted ''all property is theft.'' Syndicalism denounces modern Socialism as being false to the proletarian movement, as having bartered its revolutionary principles for the sake of legislative representation and for the loaves and fishes of office-holding.

The writings of the French and Italian leaders of Syndicalism leave no doubt on this score, and the same is true as to the leaders of Syndicalism in England and the United States; and the reason given here is admitted to be correct by the ''old guard'' of Marxian Socialism—those who, however, have refused to embrace Syndicalism.

The most profoundly philosophical Socialist in the English-speaking world is E. Belfort Bax, of London—and some consider him the greatest living Socialist, not even excepting Bebel and Kautsky, of Germany. Bax is a revolutionary Socialist—a Marxian of the old school (although, like nearly all the ''Intellectuals,'' he has discarded the ''catastrophic theory''), and bitterly anti-Fabian. In the English

Socialist Annual for 1913 Bax has a criticism of Syndicalism, but he confesses that the reason it has become so popular among Socialists—notwithstanding that it is opposed to logically thought-out Socialism—"is due mainly to disgust at the apparent ineffectiveness of parliamentary action hitherto to produce any real changes in a Socialist direction. The corruption of political life and its wire pulling, the effect of the parliamentary atmosphere in 'taming' labor leaders and Socialist agitators, and similar considerations, have engendered in many persons a contempt and antipathy for all political, as opposed to revolutionary action."

Syndicalists the world over complain that the Socialists have become like ordinary "burgeois" political parties—a party of what is called "rational opportunism."

Aside from the difference in methods, wherein is Syndicalism different from Socialism?

The great difference is that while Socialists believe that the means of production, distribution, and exchange should be owned and operated by the community at large for the benefit of the community, Syndicalists believe that the industrial trade union is "the cell of the future social and economic organization."

A second fundamental difference is that while nearly all Socialists believe that their Industrial Commonwealth of the future must be administered by some form of State government elected by the people at large, the Syndicalists, like the Anarchists,

believe in the abolition of all forms of government as now in operation; but they also contemplate the substitution of the former State by the regulation and management of industries by executives appointed by the different industrial groups—and they claim that this is all the government which would be necessary.

In his criticism of Syndicalism, in the English *Socialist Annual* for this year, Bax, the revolutionary Marxian Socialist, claims that Syndicalism "is by no means a new phenomenon in the evolution of Socialist thought . . . that Syndicalism, so far from being a new doctrine, is but a thinly-disguised Anarchism seasoned with reminiscences of Proudhon and the constructive theories of Louis Blanc and of Lassalle." Bax shows clearly how Syndicalism differs from Marxian Socialism, as follows:

"One thing is clear, the communism assumed by the Syndicalist theory is of the kind which in reality is no communism at all, since it only transfers private property (or, as it is termed in legal phrase, 'property in severalty'), in the means of production, from the individual capitalist or joint-stock company to the trade union, as against the whole people. If each trade union in its corporate capacity is to have complete possession and unconditional control of the means of production in its own particular trade, it is perfectly clear that we have parted company with the fundamental economic principle of modern Socialism or Social Democracy—viz., the communiza-

tion of the means of production and exchange. Without the complete possession and final control by the whole of society of its own productive instruments and forces, Socialism, as a system of society, is impossible."

Syndicalism and Trade Unionism.

The idea of "industrial" trade unions as opposed to "craft" unions is not a new one. In the United States it goes back to the days of the Knights of Labor, which organization embodied the principles of one great union. In time, however, the idea of "craft" unions prevailed over that of one general labor union, and the present powerful American Federation of Labor was the result.

There is another basic difference between the principles underlying the industrial union of the Syndicalist and the craft trade union as generally understood—the different organizations belonging to the American Federation of Labor, for instance. The latter organizations recognize the existence and the legitimacy of capitalists and of the wage system—so long as the wage is high enough; they also favor "trade agreements" between employers and the employed, and a persistent, though Constitutional, agitation for the amelioration of the conditions of labor in all particulars. Syndicalists, however, like the regular Socialists, aim at the complete abolition of Capitalism and of the wage system; the Syndicalists oppose all "trade agreements" on the ground that

they are unfair to the workers, as the employers can close their factories whenever they find it to their advantage to do so, while the employees are bound by the agreement so long as the factory is running; and the Syndicalists openly justify the breaking of trade agreements whenever the mood strikes the workers. And then, Syndicalists profess indifference to labor reforms, whether resulting from an understanding with the employers or through legislative action, and if they accept them it is simply to give the workers a more advantageous position from which to fight the employers.

Eugene V. Debs, the four-time Socialist candidate for President of the United States, was one of the organizers of American Syndicalism, under the name of the Industrial Workers of the World, better known now by the initials "I. W. W." Speaking of "craft unionism," Debs said: "I aver that trade unionism no longer meets the demands of the working class. I aver that the trade union has not fulfilled its mission and has outlived its usefulness, but that it is now positively reactionary, and is maintained not in the interest of the workers who support it, but in the interests of the capitalist class, who exploit the workers who support it. . . . There is but one hope, and that is in the economic and political solidarity of the working class—one revolutionary union and one revolutionary party. It is for this reason that the Industrial Workers of the World, an economic organization, has been

launched, and now makes its appeal to you as wage slaves aspiring to be free." And in a pamphlet, *The Growth of Socialism,* Debs exultantly exclaims: "The new unionism is being heard. In trumpet tones it rings out its revolutionary shibboleths to all the workers of the earth!"

PART II

In Operation

A New Form of Anarchism.

Syndicalists claim that they are only reverting to original Marxism, but their opponents in the Socialist ranks charge that the new movement is a revival of the doctrines advanced by Marx's rival for proletarian favor, the Russian Anarchist, Bakunin, except that Anarchism embraced the community generally while Syndicalism is confined to the laboring class. Syndicalists have adopted the old war cry of the International, "The emancipation of the workers must be wrought by the workers themselves," and they declare that emancipation must come from "direct action," and not by the Marxian "catastrophic," fatalistic collapse of capitalism, nor by any political movement or governmental agency.

"Direct Action."

Like the other peculiar principles of Syndicalism, "direct action" is French in origin. The term, with its present sinister meaning, was first used in 1897 by Fernand Pelloutier, General Secretary of the French Labor Exchanges, which organization has adopted the revolutionary principles of Syndicalism. Pelloutier distrusted the State as an instrument of

good for the working classes, so he urged them to obtain *directly*—hence the term "direct action"—what they could not hope to get through participation in politics.

Specifically, "direct action" means anything done by the working classes themselves, particularly of a violent, revolutionary nature, to further the ultimate aim of Syndicalism, which is the ownership and operation of the industries of the country for their exclusive benefit and profit. In securing this object, any kind of "direct action" short of actual murder is justifiable, from the real Syndicalist standpoint, whatever may be said by individual members of Syndicalist organizations, such as the "I. W. W.," the controlling force or decision being the question of tactics or advisability under the circumstances of the case.

To fully appreciate the philosophy and the claimed justification of "direct action," one must keep in mind the fact that Syndicalists hold the most extreme views of Marxian Socialists in denying the right of capital to "exploit" labor, and in holding that only the workers are entitled to receive any portion of the profits of their industry and to own the instruments of production; that they hold that all private property—except that which they themselves possess as reward for their labor—is robbery; and that they look upon all government as tyrannical and capitalistic, and all participation in political affairs as foolishness.

A recent number of the New York *Independent*

had an article—really a boastful confession—by an avowed Syndicalist named Andre Tridon, who is the American correspondent of the leading French Syndicalist paper, *La Bataille Syndicaliste*—The Union Battle. This article was submitted to and approved by W. D. Haywood, Frank Bohn and Joseph Ettor, prominent members of the "I. W. W." Andre Tridon says: "Direct action is a new and elaborate weapon, the most formidable which the working classes have ever used; it is so formidable, in fact, that trade unionists and Socialists are quite afraid of using it, and the latter have passed a motion disqualifying any member of the party who advocates direct action." Haywood is quoted with approval by Tridon in declaring that "the best form of popular propaganda is 'quick results.'" By the way, there is now a movement in the regular Socialist party to expel Haywood from it because of his advocacy of violent "direct action."

The "General Strike."

Of the different phases of "direct action," the strike, especially the "general strike," is most in favor with the Syndicalists. According to their creed, any strike, at any time, for any reason, is a desirable thing,—better than no strike at all—for it engenders class hatred and causes the employers to lose money, and inconveniences the public; and these things, they imagine, are "all to the good" in hastening the day of the industrial millennium! Hence, Syndicalists are always to the front in strikes. This was con-

spicuously so in England, when Tom Mann and Ben Tillett, two of the leading Syndicalists of that country, took charge of the gigantic strikes of the railroad men, dock laborers, and miners over there within the last three years, although it is probable that a majority of the strikers had never heard of Syndicalism. The same has been true in several big strikes in America, particularly that at Lawrence, Mass., a short time ago, and more recently that of the rubber workers at Akron, Ohio. In France the Syndicalists have paid professional organizers called "delegates," and it is altogether fair to assume that the American "I. W. W." have agents who "smelleth the battle afar off," and are paid to hurry there to make all the trouble they can.

The history of labor organizations, both in this country and England, is largely an unhappy recital of strikes; but they have all been entered into for the purpose of securing some claimed right or to remedy some real or fancied wrong. But while the Syndicalists support such strikes, they look upon them as only incidental to a grand movement, as a sort of training for a general strike.

The general strike is the soul of Syndicalism. It is often said that Socialism is the religion of the proletariat; the general strike is the religion of Syndicalism. Georges Sorel, the great French literary expounder of Syndicalism—and called "the Marx" of the new doctrines—prophesies that the day is not far distant when the best definition of Socialism will be the "General Strike."

Syndicalists have a very plausible theory which they claim justifies the general strike. It is that if labor universally lays down its tools and folds its arms the employers, from sheer disgust and from actual bankruptcy, will be compelled to turn over their factories and mills to the workmen, and that if they do not do so the public, from a sentiment of self-preservation, will force them to yield. The idea is not exactly a new one. A century ago Mirabeau declared that any people would be formidable if they were immovable—that is, if they went on a general strike. The old International, at a congress held at Brussels in 1868, gleefully pointed out "that if production were arrested for a certain time society could not exist, and that it was only necessary for producers to cease to produce in order to make government impossible." A year later the organ of the International announced "that the extension of strikes from one trade to another showed the existence of a tendency to develop into a 'general strike,' and that, with the ideas of the emancipation of labor then prevalent, such a strike could only end in a cataclysm in which society would be reborn." The International favored an organized solidarity of labor upon an international basis as a preparation for a universal strike in order to bring the entire capitalistic wealth and industrial system of the world under the domination of labor. But, although the idea of the general strike was indorsed by the International, it was abandoned for the time being as then impracticable. In 1892, however, the principle was

adopted by the French Federation of Trade Unions on motion of no less a personage than M. Aristide Briand, who was then one of the leaders of the revolutionary Socialists, and who afterward became Minister of Justice and finally Prime Minister of France.

Revolution Through the Strike.

M. Briand is called "the father of the general strike." In 1899 he delivered an extraordinary speech, which plagued him afterward when he assumed the responsibilities of the office of the Premiership. In that speech he did not altogether repudiate political action, but he urged the workers to "create the revolution."

If they entered the battle with the ballot, that was all right, but they should enter it "with pikes, sabers, pistols, guns; far from disapproving of your action, I shall feel it my duty, if the necessity should arise, to take a place in your ranks." M. Briand claimed that in the last resort, if the workers "rose as a vast and united force," the army would no longer be a passive instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie, but "the soldiers would refuse to fire upon the people, and, besides, the army itself, even if discipline were maintained, would be helpless in the presence of so huge a danger" But M. Briand lived to "eat his own words," for when he became Premier he not only turned the army of France against revolutionary strikers, but made them, under the law of the Republic, "join the colors" to pre-

serve the peace and protect life and property. This act was bitterly resented by the revolutionists, and, while it was applauded by the patriotic citizens of France, it gave an impetus to the Syndicalist propaganda, although ever since then the advocates of "direct action" have manifested a wholesome respect for the power of the National Government. The birth of Syndicalism is generally dated from the indorsement of the general strike by the French Federation of Trade Unions in 1892, on motion of M. Briand.

Andre Tridon, the Franco-American Syndicalist, in his article in the New York *Independent*, before quoted, thus describes a model strike, such as would meet his approval:

"The workers must be able to strike at the very time when the mills and factories are rushed with orders and are least able to stand a sudden cessation of production; secondly, they must close not only one part of a mill or factory, but the whole plant. Therefore, no agreement binding either the whole working force or one craft must ever be entered into with the employers. All crafts must be ready to stop work simultaneously at any time. The mere betterment of living conditions is not an aim, but a means to an end; the end being the ousting of the employers as such and the taking over of their industries by the workers. This will be brought about by the general strike, for which, according to Griffuelhes, former secretary of the French General

Federation of Labor, 'the workers must keep themselves in training, a training more rigorous every day.' By that daily training we must understand the practice of sabotage. Strikes may gain certain advantages for the workers, but sabotage well conducted is sure to bring about the employers' discomfiture."

Then this frank revolutionist gives an exposition of the different varieties of sabotage—of which more anon. Tridon favors short but frequent strikes—as they "can inflict heavy losses upon the industry they disorganize without impoverishing the workers."

The *Atlantic Monthly* of last January had an article by Ernest Dimnet, professor of English and French literature in the College Stanislas, of Paris, on Syndicalism. He pictures as follows the Syndicalists' dream of the "Great Strike:"

"The great hope, the great vision, which haunts and delights them is that of the final storming, which they call the Great Strike. When all the world of labor has become Syndicalist, when there are no fools left to fight against their own interest, one fine evening—*le grand soir*—a universal strike shall be decreed. Next day there will be no bakers to make bread, no butchers to kill meat, no colliers to dig up coals, no railway men to take bourgeoisie about. In a few days of this awful stagnation capitalism will realize that gold in itself is nothing, while labor is everything, and machines will be either made over or quietly appropriated by the workmen."

"Sabotage."

"Sabotage" is "direct action" in its highest exemplification, next only to the grand climax of Syndicalism—the wholesale surrender or forcible seizure of factories and plants and the other means of production. Originally, "sabotage" was solely applied to acts of strikers in injuring or destroying machinery, the word being coined from an incident in which a workman during a strike threw his wooden shoe—called in French a "sabot"—into the machinery. But, speaking Syndically, "sabotage" has now a very wide meaning, in that it covers any act the object of which is to embarrass or injure financially the employer, or to cause public inconvenience so as to compel the community to "take notice."

Prof. Louis Levine, of Columbia University, explains that sabotage "consists in obstructing in all possible ways the regular process of production in order to obtain any demand. It may express itself in slow work, in bad work, and even in the destruction of the machinery of production. An application of this method (in France) which has recently attracted attention is the so-called *grève perlée*. This is practical on railway lines, and consists in a more or less systematic obstruction of the regularity of the railroad service. The Syndicalists, however, strongly condemn any act of sabotage which may result in the loss of life."

In his confession in the New York *Independent*, Andre Tridon quotes, quite as a matter-of-fact inci-

dent, minute instructions given by French Syndicalist experts as to how to stop industries in which electricity is the motive power—how to put steam boilers out of order, how to corrode boiler tubes with acids and to ruin cylinders and piston rods, how to put dynamos and transformers out of running, and how to destroy underground cables. Special instructions are given as to how to stop the mining of coal or its output from the mine, or its transportation on railroads; and "if the fuel reaches its destination, what is simpler than to set the pockets on fire and have the coal burn in the yards instead of the furnaces? It is child's play to put out of work the elevators and other automatic devices which carry coal to the fireroom." "In this fight," boasts the doughty Tridon, "Syndicalists do not even pretend to observe the rules of civilized warfare. The flag of truce does not protect emissaries."

Professor Dimnet, in his article in the *Atlantic Monthly,* avers that all of the bandits who for several weeks scoured the environs of Paris, waylaying motorists, plundering banks, and massacring policemen were members of Syndicalist bodies, one of them being a "delegate,"—a professional strike promoter—or were found to be in possession of Syndicalist literature. Four of these bandits were recently sentenced to the guillotine.

"Sabotage" now covers so wide a scope that it embraces not only physical acts, but nonactivity, so long as the contemplated result is the ruin of the

employers. This queer idea also came from France, the revolutionary workmen of which country have developed an actual genius in this direction.

A little over a year ago the London *Times* and a leading Welsh paper, the *Western Mail,* startled Great Britain by exposing a system which had taken root among the coal miners of "gallant little Wales." At that time a coal strike was raging. A pamphlet was extensively circulated among the strikers, its title being, *The Miners' Next Step.* It advocated the formation of an organization of all the workers in the mines, acting under an executive clothed with arbitrary powers. The old method of striking to remedy specific minor grievances was to be discouraged, but the organization was to adopt "the more scientific weapon of the irritation strike." This "irritation strike" was explained to be the policy of "simply remaining at work," but to dawdle away the time, and to purposely "make the colliery unremunerative" by the nonproduction of coal; to refrain, however, from any overt act. In this way—so ran the plan—the colliery owners would, out of complete disgust, abandon their property and turn it over to the miners, who, when this happened, were to resume work for their exclusive profit! The pamphlet gave another method of procedure: "That a continual agitation be carried on in favor of increasing the minimum wage [which has since been granted] and lessening the hours of labor until we have extracted the whole of the employers' profits. That our object be to build up an organization that will ultimately

take over the mining industry and carry it on in the interest of the workers."

Many of the most responsible leaders of the British labor movement repudiated this program, but it took a great hold on the imagination of the masses of the miners.

American Syndicalism—The "I. W. W."

The American interpretation of Syndicalism is presented by the Industrial Workers of the World ("I. W. W."), which organization was formed in Chicago on the initiative of Eugene V. Debs and W. D. Haywood. In 1904 six men met and issued a call, and a second conference was held in 1905. Daniel de Leon—a leader in a small revolutionary Marxian organization called the Socialist-Labor party, in opposition to the regular Socialist party—and a number of his followers were denied recognition later on, and so, in 1908, another organization of the "I. W. W." (with the same name) was formed, with headquarters at Detroit. The original organization still has its headquarters at Chicago, the much-advertised J. J. Ettor being on the Executive Board. When the Industrial Workers of the World (or "I. W. W.") are mentioned, reference is generally meant to this one. The other one, which is small numerically, is differentiated by being called "the Detroit Industrial Workers of the World." Both organizations have identically the same preamble to their declaration of principles, "The working class and the employing class have nothing in common."

The "principles" of the two bodies are expressed in slightly different language, and there is some minor variation in the details of organization, but practically the methods are the same and the aims are one. A prominent declaration of the Chicago "I. W. W." is: "Instead of the conservative motto, 'A fair day's wage for a fair day's work,' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, 'Abolition of the wage system.'" In the matter of trade union organization there is a slight difference from European Syndicalism. Affiliation with all existing political and non-political organizations is repudiated, and the "I. W. W." is declared to be composed exclusively of workingmen; but this declaration has recently been extended by some associated bodies to include physicians, teachers, artists, and other professional men, although the general sentiment appears to be opposed to the recognition of any but wage-earning manual workers.

It is declared that the struggle between the laboring class and the employing class "must go on until the workers of the world, organized as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production and abolish the wage system." At the close of 1912 the Chicago "I. W. W." was composed of 160 local unions and two National Industrial unions (in the textile and lumber industries). Its total enrolled membership at the end of the year is given as 70,000, including members in Hawaii, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

It appears that originally the motive of the forma-

tion of the "I. W. W." was the advancement of Marxian revolutionary Socialism on the basis of industrialism, and that the idea of European Syndicalism was not specifically in mind. But in a recent pamphlet on Syndicalism by Carl C. Ford and Wm. Z. Ford—the latter being the secretary of the Syndicalist League of North America—it is stated that since its organization in 1905 the "I. W. W." "has progressed far toward Syndicalism by the rejection of political action and the adoption of 'direct action' tactics."

Dr. Wm. E. Bohn, a university man formerly connected with the movement, in an article in the *Survey* says:

"A direct actionist may or may not believe that violent measures are justifiable in the fight against capitalism. It is safe to say that all the members of the Detroit I. W. W. are consistently opposed to violence. . . . Moreover, very many of the members of the I. W. W. (Chicago) are also opposed to violence. Some of the latter organization, however, believe that violence is always justifiable, and sometimes more effective than any other means. . . . Violence is used against them (the workers), and it is necessary to fight fire with fire."

Andre Tridon, the Franco-American Syndicalist, explains in his confession in the New York *Independent* "that American Syndicalists prefer to be spoken of as 'Industrialists.'" He says that certain Anarchistic groups in America call themselves "Syndicalist Circles," but that the "I. W. W." repudiate

all affiliation with them. Tridon professes to speak with a full knowledge of the "inside workings" of the American Syndicalist organizations. He makes the audacious boast in his article in the New York *Independent* that Ettor and Giovanitti, who were tried for murder—accessories before the deed—in connection with the riots incidental to the textile strike at Lawrence, Mass., were acquitted and freed because of Syndicalist threats made to the Court. He claims that "a warning" resulted in their trial being put forward—"a date was at once set." And then he says: "When it became evident that the world would witness a repetition of the Haymarket incident (the Chicago Anarchist riots) another warning reached the Court, and Ettor and Giovanitti were freed." Tridon denies that the affair at Lawrence has been settled. He claims that the ending of the strike "was a mere truce during which the attacking force (the strikers) planned to recuperate and fit themselves for a renewed attack on an enemy with whom no treaty shall be signed, and who must finally either destroy the workers or be destroyed by them."

A concrete example of the application of the doctrines and methods of Syndicalism in America is given in the report of the Cleveland *Leader* of March 10th of the Akron (Ohio) rubber workers' strike: "The men also were instructed to tear up their union cards before the bosses in order to get a job, and when they got back into the factory practice sabotage and do all possible damage to the machines."

And the strikers were advised to "fight the machines and not the police."

With amazing frankness witnesses before the Legislative Committee investigating conditions at Akron testified that they believed in sabotage, and they undertook to defend it as the only method through which labor could secure its rights.

Future of Syndicalism.

The New York *World Almanac* for 1913 states that there are 600,000 avowed Syndicalists in France, but this number is probably excessive, as another authority gives 300,000, out of 900,000 trade unionists, the total number of French wage earners being 9,000,000. So, anyhow, the Syndicalists are in a decided minority; but Syndicalists generally take the position that an alert, well-organized minority has the right to "lord it over" an inert and unorganized majority;—this view, by the way, being also expressed by many intellectual Marxist Socialists, like Bax. It is for this reason that Socialist and Syndicalist "intellectuals" are opposed to the initiative and referendum where the farming population predominates, but only approve of "direct democracy" where the Socialists and trade unionists are well organized and are a controlling force in the cities. Syndicalism in France is suffering from the lack of intellectual leadership and also from the rivalry between it and Marxist Socialism.

Italy is a hotbed of Syndicalism, which is to

be expected, as its Socialism has always taken on an Anarchistic form. Organized farm laborers, professing Syndicalism, operate 200,000 acres of tillable land co-operatively, and the Industrial Union of Bottle Blowers, which professes Syndicalism, has a large co-operative establishment. A great many of the employees of the railroads—which are under State control—are avowed Syndicalists, and clashes between them and the authorities are frequent.

In spite of occasional revolutionary outbursts, there are indications that the movement in both France and Italy is on the wane, partly from factional differences, but principally because intelligent men withdraw from it when they fully comprehend its philosophy and methods. Quite recently several of the literary advocates of Syndicalism in Italy have announced their weariness with the propaganda.

In 1910 a Syndicalist conference was held in England, in which it was claimed that 60,000 adherents were represented. This was at the commencement of the extraordinary "strike fever" which swept over Great Britain. But the revolutionary movement in that country seems to have subsided greatly during the last six months. Syndicalism is being fought by every school of regular Socialism—the Marxist, as well as the Opportunist Fabian. Last year the British Trade Union Congress discussed and condemned Syndicalism, and defended political action; it also advocated the "nationalization" of railroads and mines.

Opposition to Syndicalism.

The *Socialist Year Book* for 1913, issued by the British Independent Labor Party, has a signed article by the editor, J. Bruce Glasier, deprecating the idea of Syndicalism being at the bottom of the labor unrest, and claiming that it has no hold on the working class of England or any other country. In the same article Editor Glasier condemns the general strike as a method of industrial warfare in the following manner:

"The moment a general strike takes place the workers begin to starve, and the terror of famine which the strike involves falls at once with devouring jaws on the strikers themselves. There is only one power that can subdue famine, and that is food, and in order to get food the strikers must return to work. As a method of revolution the general strike is likely to be as effective as general suicide would be so long as capitalism remains entrenched behind the needs of the community and the political forces of the State. . . . The social revolution can not be achieved by the simple device of laying down tools."

David Lloyd George pointed out in the British Parliament that no leaders of the Labor Party (which is Socialist, of the Fabian order) had committed themselves to Syndicalism; that, indeed, Syndicalism and the Socialism of that party were mutually destructive. "We can console ourselves with the fact," said Lloyd George, "that the best policeman for the

Syndicalists is the Socialist''—meaning the Laborite. J. Ramsay McDonald, the intellectual leader of the British Labor-Socialist movement, has spoken of Syndicalism in much the same terms as those used by Lloyd George.

In the United States the outlook is that ''the revolutionary measles''—as the British Socialists dub Syndicalism—has not yet reached its full growth, and already it has had to face much opposition, both from Socialists and trade unionists. At the last annual convention of the Socialist party (held at Indianapolis) the following resolution was adopted as part of their Constitution:

''Any member of the party who opposes political action or advocates crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership of the party. Political action shall be construed to mean participation in elections for public office and practical legislation and administrative work along the lines of the Socialist party platform.''

While outwardly, and to the uninformed, the Socialists and the Syndicalists may appear to be one, there is really an intense antagonism between them, although there are many Syndicalists in the Socialist party, and, indeed, the former claim that a majority of American Socialists are sympathetic toward Syndicalist views; and this claim has some foundation from the fact that most of the Socialist papers incline to Syndicalism. What the final result will be it is difficult to say, but it will probably eventuate

in a radical split among American Socialists, such as happened between the partisans of Marx and Bakunin at the Congress of the "International" at The Hague, Holland, in 1872, when the Russian Anarchist was "excommunicated" by the Marxists because of his extreme views. It is expected that there will be a bitter clash between the two wings of the American Socialist organizations at this year's convention.

A Temporary Phenomenon.

Syndicalism must be considered as a temporary psychological hysterical phenomenon, something similar to the outbreaks of the militant branch of the British "suffragettes" incidental to the wave of social and industrial unrest sweeping over the world. That it will ever be able to become a reality in the application of its ideas in an Industrial Democracy is not believable by any person of normal reasoning powers. Unlike Socialism proper, it has not been indorsed by a single recognized authority on politics or economics, and outside of France and Italy there is not an advocate of Syndicalism of any acknowledged ability. On the contrary, Syndicalism is only advocated, speaking generally, by men of mediocre mental parts, whose only claim to public attention are their ruffianly and revolutionary speeches and acts, and their unfortunate capacity to mislead ignorant workingmen. Syndicalism is actively opposed by the brainiest leaders of the Socialist party and of Trade Unionism in Germany, England, and the

United States—both as to its methods and its aims, although, of course, Socialists profess to believe in a coming Industrial Democracy,—only as previously explained, it is to be of a different kind from that of the Syndicalists.

That Syndicalism will leave its impress upon the proletarian movement is altogether likely, but that it is doomed to extinction as a permanent force in the evolution of industrial and social economics is the concensus of opinion of students of the subject.

A closing observation is to be made—and it is not an agreeable one; that before Syndicalism has been consigned to the fate of Anarchism and Nihilism, it is probable that it will bring much suffering, turmoil, and even bloodshed. The best way to obviate these disasters is to expose the true nature of Syndicalism, and to forward every sane movement for the establishment of justice and brotherly feeling between man and man.

Appendix

ORIGIN OF SYNDICALISM.

John Graham Brooks, in his new work, *American Syndicalism*, goes far back for the forerunners of the modern "I. W. W.,"—and again it is staid old England which is the birthplace, as of Scientific Socialism, the Minimum Wage, etc.:

"It is an even eight years since Owen and his followers proposed—almost to the last detail—all that our I. W. W. now urge,—'eliminate politics, band labor together at the bottom with light dues or no dues at all, with power decentralized, the general strike, and the dream of the co-operative Commonwealth.' The 'means of production' were, of course, to be 'taken over,' but 'were to become the property not of the whole community, but of the particular set of workers who used them. The trade unions were to be transformed into national companies to carry on all the manufactures. The agricultural union was to take possession of the land, the miners' union of the mines, the textile unions of the factories. Each trade was to be carried on by its particular trade union, centralized into one grand lodge.'"

Then came the English "Chartists;" and Disraeli, in his *Sybil*, thus describes what occurred:

"Every engine was stopped, the plug was driven out of every boiler, every fire was extinguished, every man was turned out. The decree went forth that labor was to cease until the charter was the law of the land; the mine and the mill, the foundry and the loomshop, were, until that consummation, to be idle; nor was the mighty pause to be confined to these great enterprises. Every trade of every kind and description was to be stopped—tailor and cobbler, brushmaker and sweep, tinker and carter, mason and builder, all, all."

After that came the "International," with the "Solidarity

of Labor'' as its shibboleth; and the founder of French Syndicalism, Pelloutier, acknowledged the parenthood of the ''International.''

And John Graham Brooks traces the origin of the American ''I. W. W.'' to the Knights of Labor.

THE ''I. W. W.''

Following are the declared principles of the ''I. W. W.'' (the Chicago organization):

PREAMBLE.—The working class and the employing class have nothing in common.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system.

We find that the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trades unions unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class. The trades unions foster a state of affairs which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage wars. Moreover, the trades unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers.

These conditions can be changed and the interest of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all.

Instead of the conservative motto, ''A fair day's wages for a fair day's work,'' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, ''Abolition of the wage system.''

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for the everyday struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been over-

thrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.

Excerpts from Constitution and By-laws follow:

The Industrial Workers of the World shall be composed of actual wage-workers brought together in an organization embodying thirteen National industrial departments, National industrial unions, local industrial unions, local recruiting unions, industrial councils, and individual members.

The annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be held on the third Monday of September each year at such place as may be determined by previous convention.

Members-at-large shall pay an initiation fee of $2 and $1 per month dues and assessments. No working man or woman shall be excluded from membership in local unions because of creed or color.

That to the end of promoting industrial unity and of securing necessary discipline within the organization, the Industrial Workers of the World refuse all alliances, direct or indirect, with existing political parties or anti-political sects.

CONDEMNATION OF THE "I. W. W.:"

An Ohio Legislative Committee investigated the causes leading to the strike of the rubber workers in Akron the past winter, and incidentally it inquired into the activities of the "I. W. W." in managing the "revolt." At the head of this Committee was one of the leaders of the Trade Union movement in the State—an official of the United Miners. The report of the Committee was in part condemnatory of the employers, particularly for their refusal to confer with their employees at the commencement of the trouble,—and had they done so, the Committee found, the strike might have been averted; but it was also found that, on the whole, the wages paid the rubber workers compared favorably with those in other industries, and in one department were better. The Committee unanimously scathingly denounced the "I. W. W." In reference to "sabotage" the Committee said:

"We submit to the General Assembly that this dangerous doctrine is a matter of grave importance and public concern, not only to the State of Ohio, but to the Nation at large. The line of distinction between this doctrine and anarchy is so indistinct as to be almost imperceptible. Those who labor must suffer in the end because of the spread of a doctrine of this kind. There can be neither moral nor material improvement among those who labor, if they allow the leadership of men who practice and preach such immoral and destructive doctrine. In the last analysis, it is labor which is injured most. The leaders of the organization of the Industrial Workers of the World instead of helping the striking employees of the rubber factories of Akron, did them much injury and are largely responsible for their failure to secure a redress for any wrongs which may have existed and the adjustment of any grievances about which they complained.

"Very few of the striking employees, however, testified that they believed in the doctrine of sabotage, but almost universally they stated they had affiliated with the Industrial Workers of the World's organization because they hoped, through collective action, to increase their wages and improve their conditions of employment. Many of them admit this doctrine as dangerous and destructive, and asserted they would not subscribe to such principles or practice.

"The testimony strongly indicated that the reason why no conferences were held between committees representing the striking employees and the management of the different rubber factories was because of the teaching of sabotage, etc., by the leaders of the Industrial Workers of the World. To this extent, therefore, this organization and its leaders injured rather than helped the thousands of men and women on strike."

The Question of Violence.

There are some professed "Intellectual" Syndicalists who are really nothing but philosophical Socialists, except that they believe that the Industrial Commonwealth will come through "group" trade unionism; and they disapprove of

the "General Strike," and claim to abhor "Sabotage." But this type of Syndicalists are not numerous. Nearly all Syndicalists—as do Revolutionary Socialists—either frankly and defiantly advocate violence, or acquiesce in it, or else secretly condone it. The plain truth is that physical violence—either brutally open or scoundrelly treacherous and secret—is one of the main tenets of Syndicalism. William English Walling,—an avowed anti-political Marxian Socialist, with a mildly critical view of Syndicalism—says in the *New Review:*

"Violence also is usually condoned on the unconsciously humorous ground that if the police and militia were not present, there would be little violence. No unions *advocate* violence, but none surrender to the law those among their members who succumb to temptation under critical or exceptional circumstances, and it is rarely that they do not furnish defense funds. Even the I. W. W. does not advocate violence, but it is more frank in its attitude towards it than the older unions."

John Graham Brooks, in introducing the chapter on "Violence" in his *American Syndicalism,* says: "Among some of the ablest expositors of I. W. W. principles, there seems to me very little pretense that violence may not be necessary at certain stages and under certain conditions. They are now but just started on their journey." And the author gives ample quotations from "I. W. W." leaders for his assertion. He quotes the amiable Ettor, who is on the Executive Board of the "I. W. W." as quite jovially admitting:

"Yes, gentle reader, our ideas, our principles, and object are certainly dangerous and menacing; applied by a united working class would shake society, and certainly those who are now on top sumptuously feeding upon the good things they have not produced would feel the shock. To talk of peace between capital and labor is 'stupid or knavish.' "

W. E. Trautman, one of the "big guns" of the American Syndicalists, frankly declares that from their standpoint there can be no agreement between employers of labor "which the workers have to consider sacred and inviolable,"—that they are justified in doing just the opposite of what they had agreed

to do "when occasion arises to gain advantage to the worker," and that to disobey court injunctions is a "duty."

Vincent St. John, the National Secretary of the "I. W. W.," writes in his *History:* "As a revolutionary organization the Industrial Workers of the World aims to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of 'right' and 'wrong' does not concern us."

One of the organs of American Syndicalism is *Solidarity.* On January 4, 1912, it declared that members of the "I. W. W." would decline to join in condemnation of the McNamaras and the other dynamiters who sacrificed so many lives at Los Angeles; to them it was only "another incident in the class struggle." And this organ of the Industrial Millennium asks: "Must we meekly apologize for those of our kind who occasionally strike back under great provocation? The capitalist sowed the wind and reaped a little zephyr of a cyclone in this case under consideration. Let the blood be upon the heads of our masters!"

Speaking of the thirty-three "dynamiters" who had just been imprisoned at Leavenworth, after a lengthy trial at Indianapolis, Frank Bohn, one of the editors of the *International Socialist Review* (favorable to Syndicalism), referred in the *Call* (another "red" Socialist paper) to the McNamaras and their colleagues as "the John Browns of the social revolution," and as "the soldiers of the working class." To-day, he said, they are passing through the doors of Leavenworth prison. "Let every revolutionary worker in the land stand with bowed head as they pass. They are fighters of the working class. That is enough for us now." And he winds up with this fervent wish: "May every one of you thirty-three live to come out of jail so that we may grasp you by the hand and welcome you as comrades into the ranks of an army which can never know defeat!"

"SABOTAGE."

In an anti-strike law passed by the Briand administration in France, "Sabotage" is officially defined as "the willful destruction, deterioration, or rendering useless of instruments or other objects, with a view of stopping or hampering work, industry, or commerce."

According to J. H. Harley, M. A., an English writer, whose booklet entitled *Syndicalism* has recently reached America, "Sabotage" "might mean dropping petroleum into the kneading-trough. It might mean a short circuit in the electric installation. It might mean a nail in the wood to be cut by the circular saw. It might even mean a gash in the capitalist's chin by the action of a Syndical razor." This writer, by the way, points out that Sorel, the French Syndicalist—sometimes called "the Marx of Syndicalism"—detests Sabotage.

Although Debs was one of the founders of the "I. W. W.," he is now quoted as declaring that "Sabotage repels the American worker,"—for which some of his "red" comrades have reproved him.

John Graham Brooks in *Syndicalism* says:

"The issues raised by sabotage have furnished continuous occasion for the sharpest differences in opinion, not only among Socialists, but within the ranks of Syndicalism.

"The fine, technically trained intelligence of Sorel showed a wholesome fear of sabotage and cried out lustily against it, as does also Edouard Berth. H. G. Wells is the easy peer of M. Sorel. He has M. Sorel's dislike for Fabian politics, but these features of Syndicalism offer him no possible plan of social development. It is to him merely 'a spirit of conflict.' It is 'the cheap labor panacea to which the more passionate and less intelligent portion of the younger workers drift.' It is the 'tawdrification of the trade unionism' and even its dream is 'an impossible social *fragmentation.*' Kautsky and the uncompromising Guèsde, who despises parliamentary action, are little less severe. I do not bring against the I. W. W. the hostile opinions of the Webbs, Keir Hardy,

MacDonald, and German leaders. Such opposition is to be expected. It is more serious when men as untrammeled as Sorel, Guèsde, Bax, and Wells rise up against it. These writers, one and all, look upon sabotage as a clumsily out-of-date and reactionary device.

"With still more severity W. J. Ghent (a leading American Marxian Socialist) says in the Socialist National Organ: 'To preach violence and sabotage to the working class is to preach not a working-class morality, not a Socialist morality, but a slave morality. It is the morality of Roman slaves in the days of the empire. By lying, deceit, craft, and theft they sought to lessen the evils of their lot. They did not heroically strive for emancipation. . . . But the slave system as a whole was not affected by this form of resistance—if it may be called by that term. Nor will the tenure of the capitalist system be affected by a like policy.'"

"La Grève Perlée."

In the explanation of "Sabotage," in the body of this work, a quotation is given from Prof. Louis Levine in which attention is drawn to the French practice of *la grève perlée*. John Graham Brooks says in his *American Syndicalism* that Prof. Ernest Dimnet, of Paris, has written to him explaining that *la grève perlée* is "railway slang. For several months the men just changed the addresses stuck on the cars, so they (the cars) were as hard to find as pearls that had dropped off the string."

During the strike on the French railroads—crushed by the Socialist Premier, M. Briand—one of the hints given to them by the Syndicalist leaders was: "Quietly change the address on freight cars filled with perishable foods, so they shall go one or two hundred miles south instead of north of Paris, and then get sidetracked a few days more."

The Belgian "General Strike."

The "general strike" in Belgium in April, 1913, was in several respects the most remarkable in history,—in its exhibi-

tion of the "solidarity of labor" and in the success which it achieved. It illustrated Mirabeau's declaration of the formidability of a people who adopted the principle of "immovability"—simply becoming passive. Victor Hugo, in *Histoire d'un Crime,* refers to "La Grève Universelle," and coined the very term now frequently used by Syndicalists—"folding the arms" *(croisant les bras).* But it should be pointed out that the recent demonstration of the Belgian workingmen was not a Syndicalist "general strike." It was a strike for a specific purpose—and that purpose was entirely political; it was to compel the Government to take steps to do away with the unfair system of plural voting and to establish the suffrage on the basis of "one man, one vote." There was no question of wages or of improvement of labor conditions involved. By agreement among themselves, and by positive orders of the leaders, the strikers were not to be guilty of any violence or of any breaking of the law; the Government and the public were duly warned of the strike in advance, and the men protected the public as far as possible from any inconvenience; and directly the Government gave an undertaking to bring about a reform of the suffrage system, the men returned to work.

In *American Syndicalism* (published just before the Belgian strike), John Graham Brooks asserts: "Apart from its political uses, the 'general strike' has been found to be a weapon so dangerous to labor that no instance can be shown of its *economic* triumph. No one has seen this so clearly as the Socialist leaders in every country. If Jaurès, Kautsky, Vandervelde flirt with it, they make it clear that its uses are political. . . . These leaders feared the very thing that has happened in Sweden, France, and England since the Swedish 'general strike' in 1909—namely, its increasing *uncontrollable economic disorders.*"

Socialists and "Direct Action."

The indications multiply that while the "Intellectuals" among the American Socialists are becoming increasingly con-

servative, the mass of the party are becoming saturated with Syndicalism, particularly the spirit of "direct action." Within recent years the "Intellectuals" have largely controlled the organization of the Socialist party, but the present outlook is that power is slipping from them, and that the genuine proletarian "reds" are to soon seize the reins.

At a State Convention of Ohio Socialists, held April 26, 1913, one-third of the delegates voted for a resolution declaring that "Socialists elected to office shall use their power solely in the interests of the working class, regardless of all capitalistic laws." The incidental discussion made it plain that what was meant by "capitalistic laws" was any law duly enacted by Congress, a State Legislature, or a municipality, which workingmen might take it into their heads to violate. In other words, one-third of the delegates practically declared themselves to be Anarchists. It is significant that among those who so voted were several men holding important official positions in municipalities. As the Convention proceeded the "reds"—or Syndicalists, or "direct actionists"—grew in strength over the "yellows," as the conservative political Socialists are called. Officials of the party who had been disciplined for espousing violence and "sabotage" (and thus violating the rule laid down at the last annual National Convention) were restored to power, this reinstatement following as the result of a referendum which was a specific endorsement by the membership at large of these officials in advocating Syndicalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

There are not many books in the English language which can be referred to as authorities on Syndicalism, the reason being that it is only within the last two years that even students and literary professors of Socialism and economics in England and America became acquainted with it,—or if they did know anything about it, thought it of sufficient importance to give it serious attention.

President Wilson recently paid a compliment to the London

Times as an authority on the real news of the world; and it is now widely recognized by observers of important developments in all branches of human endeavor and thought, that no other publication keeps up with the staid old London *Times*. It was the *Times* which first exposed Continental Syndicalism and sounded the alarm in England—and that alarm reached across to America. That was less than two years ago. Since then there has been an increasing stream of expository articles in the English and American magazines, reviews, economic and social-reform journals, and the daily press. Most of the literature in the English language on Syndicalism is fragmentary, and is of such a character that it does not come under the observation of the casual reader; and nearly all the standard original authorities are in the French and Italian languages.

As a matter of record, it might be noted that probably the first independent and comprehensive exposition of Syndicalism to appear in America was by the writer, in the *Forum*, of August, 1912.

J. H. Harley, M. A., in his booklet *Syndicalism* (which has recently come from London), says:

"The writings of the Syndicalist leaders are scattered about here and there in magazines, newspapers, and pamphlets, and some of the magazines and newspapers have long ceased to be issued. The volumes of *Le Mouvement Socialiste* for the last seven or eight years, however, contain more of the Syndicalist views of opinions than any other single magazine or pamphlet. For America, consult one of the latest volumes of the *International Socialist Review*."

The following books in the English language are recommended to the student of Syndicalism:

Syndicalism, by J. H. Harley, M. A.; published by T. C. & E. C. Jack, London, and the Dodge Publishing Co., New York. (1912.)

The New Social Democracy, ditto.

American Syndicalism—The I. W. W., by John Graham Brooks; published by the Macmillans, London and New York. (1913.)

The New Socialism, by Jane T. Stoddart; published by Hodder & Stoughton, London and New York. (1912.)

Syndicalism and Labor, by Sir Arthur Clay, Bart.; published by John Murray, London. (1912.)

Socialism As It Is, by William English Walling; published by the Macmillans, New York and London. (1912.)

Socialism and the Social Movement, by Werner Sombart, of Berlin; translated from the sixth German edition by M. Epstein, M. A., Ph. D.; published by J. M. Dent, London, and E. P. Dutton, New York. (1909.)

Syndicalism and the General Strike, by Arthur D. Lewis; published by T. Fisher Unwin, London. (1912.)

The Worker and His Country, by Fabian Ware; published by Edward Arnold, London. (1912.)

Syndicalism, by J. Ramsay MacDonald; published by Constable, London. (1912.)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL
LD-URL
JUL 1971
REC'D LD-URL
MAY 17 1971
REC'D LD-URL
FEB 12 '73
FEB 9 1973
REC'D LD-URL
MAY 25 1978
JAN 7 1982
DISCHARGE-URL
NOV 20
DEC 8 1987
REC'D L
JUL 0 3 1988
REC'D LD-URL
AUG 08 1988
ORION
LD-URL
MAY 21 '89
MAY 23 1989
ORION
LD-URL
DEC 15

Form L9–Series 444

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

3 1158 00308 6542

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 988 002 2