1961

Editorial Attitude Toward Unionism with Regard to Important Labor Issues, the Years 1919-1921 Inclusive

Eugene William Monroe

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1651

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1961 Eugene William Monroe
EDITORIAL ATTITUDE TOWARD UNIONISM WITH
REGARD TO IMPORTANT LABOR ISSUES,
THE YEARS 1919-1921
INCLUSIVE

by
Eugene William Monroe

A Thesis Submitted To The Faculty Of The Graduate School
Of Loyola University In Partial Fulfillment Of
The Requirements For The Degree Of
Master of Social And Industrial
Relations

June
1961
LIFE

Eugene William Monroe was born in Hartford, Wisconsin, April 10, 1936.

He was graduated from Hartford High School, Hartford, Wisconsin, June, 1954, and from Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June, 1959, with the degree of Bachelor of Science.

He began his graduate studies at Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts, in September, 1959, transferring to Loyola University in February, 1960.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. BACKGROUND OF UNIONISM 1919-1921</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. War and Industrialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Government Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Recession and Depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. IMPORTANT LABOR ISSUES</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. &quot;Red Scare&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Strikes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Police Strike</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Steel Strike</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coal Strike</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rail Strike</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seamen Strike</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Union Organizing</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. &quot;American Plan&quot;</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Corruption</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. SCALE</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Five Point Scale</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Tables</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. CONCLUSION</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The fluctuation within union growth has been a topic of extensive theorizing and debate. In an effort to interpret this change in growth, the significant impact of editorial attitude toward unionism is to be explored.

The years of economic depression in the United States have precipitated various theories of speculation with regard to this union growth issue. It was assumed that numerous factors had an impact upon this rise-fall of unionism. The manifold factors presented include variations in business activity, the attitude of the courts, of legislation, of management, and the changes in technology. Another factor offered as a possible cause of union development is the attitude evidenced in newspaper editorials (and space devoted to pertinent labor issues), the years 1919 to 1921.

The purpose of this study is to examine and interpret editorial attitude of two newspapers toward unionism with regard to important labor issues during this period.


2Julius Rezler, Union Growth-Reconsidered, Kossineth Foundation (New York, 1961.)
Two prominent newspapers representing segments of readers in the Midwest and Eastern seaboard have been selected to investigate editorial attitude. The New York Times (1919 to 1921) and The Chicago Daily Tribune (1919 to 1921) will serve as representative newspapers. Basis for this selection was determined by the similar circulation figures of the two newspapers throughout this period. Distribution of the two papers in their respective areas was well over three hundred thousand.³

Widely regarded as representative of community interests is the newspaper. Its role has become more than a purveyor of news; the public expects it to perform a leadership function in the community and provide, in essence, a community conscience.⁴ Neil Chamberlain states a newspaper's "editorial column becomes the medium through which social policies are advocated or denounced, .... actions are applauded or condemned."⁵

As an equally correlating portion of my study, documentation will be utilized from a recognized labor history source. In Chapter IV of this study, reference will be made to a five point scale in an effort to measure editorial attitude of the two newspapers in question.

CHAPTER II

THE BACKGROUND OF UNIONISM—1919–1921

From the years 1915 to 1920, trade unionism reflected almost every success that the economic history of the United States provided. This period, during and after World War I, saw a tremendous gain in union membership of almost 2.5 million people,¹ from 2.7 million in 1916 to 5.1 million by 1920.² But as the economic tide began to turn in early 1920, so did the tide in union membership, losing almost one million members by 1921.³

The economic and social aspects of this period point up an important consideration involved in this reversal of membership growth. The war was not the sole cause of union development in this period. Although it no doubt assisted in creating a favorable atmosphere for the growth of unionism, an important factor in unionism's support during World War I was the benevolent attitude of the Federal government through the War Labor Board, which extended its protection over all the unions.⁴

The war in Europe and its demands for war supplies was one contributing factor in the increase of industrial production and employment, thereby

⁴Resler, p. 5.
increasing union ranks. Foreign borrowing and buying provided an impetus to American industry. Industrial activity greatly increased and wages and prices went up. Employment increased and immigration into the labor force from Europe practically stopped. The war had set the scene for industrial expansion and increased union activity and membership.

America entered the war in 1917, adding its demands for war materials to those of its allies in Europe. Extensive federal spending stimulated new war production industries and our armed forces withdrew over five million men from the labor force, thereby providing jobs for the still remaining surplus of the unemployed. Labor was now considered strategic to the war effort and received Federal protection through newly established labor standards in regard to government contracts. General supervision over labor relations was placed in the hands of administrative adjustment boards created for the purpose of maintaining industrial peace. "On many of these agencies officials of labor organizations served in advisory and executive capacities, and the unions they represented naturally profited from their positions of influence and authority."

Labor was on the upswing and government protection insured this.

With the end of the war, inflation continued to rise along with prices, bank credit and business activity. Despite the fact that there was ample work and demand for labor, and while wage rates and earnings steadily climbed, the cost of living continued to soar, causing considerable unrest in labor's ranks.

5 Leo Wolman, p. 21.
6 Ibid., p. 22
7 Ibid., pp. 22-23.
With its continuance into 1920, wholesale prices rapidly fell and the pressure on business and cost liquidation became overwhelming. Unemployment by 1921 had increased to over four million. Wages, in many instances, were drastically cut to save businesses from going under. "The shortage of labor in the preceding years was turned into a labor surplus."9

Although a number of strikes in 1919 produced a sharp set-back for labor, and the feeling of being betrayed by the Wilson Administration, the wartime advance of labor had not yet come to a halt. But labor was militant in spite of its defeats.10

The American Federation of Labor nonetheless found itself in a very difficult predicament. The government support it had enjoyed gave way to a revival of injunctions. The Federation's course continued to be one of non-political action, merely proclaiming a Labor Bill of Rights seeking recognition, a living wage and restriction in the use of injunctions. With the depression and its consequent business failures, falling prices, work slowdowns and stoppage, wage cuts and resultant unemployment, industry took every advantage in intensifying its anti-union campaigns. Injunction and arrest smashed a seamen's strike, with many unions so badly defeated that the industry reverted to an open shop and a railroad shopmen's strike proved almost disastrous.

8Ibid., p. 24.
9Ibid., p. 23.
Blacklisting and yellow-dog contracts once again effective demonstrating that government intervention had swung once again the scales in favor of the employers.\textsuperscript{11}

The entire labor movement lost ground during the 1921 depression, and due to unemployment was unable to defend itself adequately against the onslaught of the open shop campaign and the injunction.

Court decisions during this period also acted against the unions. The Supreme Court in 1921 held that nothing in the Clayton Act legalized secondary boycott or protected unions against injunctions brought against them for conspiracy in restraint of trade. (Duplex Printing vs Deering) The Arizona law forbidding injunctions in labor disputes and permitting picketing was held unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment. (Traux vs Corrigan - 1921) And in 1922, labor unions were held liable for strike action not held in conspiracy to restrain commerce within the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. (Colorado Coal Co. vs U.M.W.O.)\textsuperscript{12}

The economic recovery after the collapse of 1921 found industry determined to stop organized labor from regaining its war-attained position of government protection. Anti-union campaigns were intensified upholding the open shop, which left union members subject to discrimination and complete refusal to recognize the union under any circumstances. "Union membership, which had touched a peak of 5,047,800 in 1920 . . . . .fell precipitously to

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 435.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated "the average number of employees in the manufacturing industries at 8,983,900 in 1919 and 9,065,600 in 1920 . . . . The cataclysmic drop in 1921 saw 2,165,900 employees laid off." 14 By 1922 there were 1,472,900 less employees in manufacturing than in 1920 and the annual payroll was down $875,000,000 from the 1920 figure." 15

---

13 Irving Bernstein, The Lean Years (Boston, 1960), p. 84.


CHAPTER III

IMPORTANT LABOR ISSUES

A. RED SCARE

In the months following World War I, hysteria that had had its basis against socialist groups and the then declining I. W. W. began to fade. This proved to be only a temporary respite, for by mid-1919, a wave known as the "Red Scare" swept the nation. Bolshevik victory in Russia and radical revolts in other countries as well as the organization of the Third Communist International, brought cries of "red" from newspapers in America, which they saw as a target for similar upheaval.¹

With the end of the war came a series of strikes, treated by the press as Communist inspired and threatening the United States with the gravest of perils.²

"...That the radical element is active in unions, that it was never so busy, that its voice is always for war upon the employer, ... that this is the element that is pressing the extreme demands of labor and urging strikes ... these things are well-known to any person familiar with conditions in the labor world."³

¹Perlman, p. 435.
²Ibid., p. 435.
Thus, the "red" handle was fastened to labor disputes in such a way that all labor discontent was led by radicals. "... The radicals in the labor ranks are seeking to control the industries. They are agitating for a revolution in the industrial world."  

Here again, there is emphasis of revolt by radical industrial workers to abolish capitalism. The consciousness of that fact, further spread the fear of radical revolution within labor's ranks. But they did not tie the radical tag to the American Federation of Labor as such. In speaking of Mr. Gompers, President of the A. F. of L.: "He has always been a sound and loyal American, ... steadily opposed to setting apart of workingmen as a class ... and not by the formation of a special party... Against violence, against radicalism, against socialism, against all methods and notions foreign to the United States, his face has always been set sternly..."  

This set the radical apart from the honest union leader, with his actions unsanctioned by the Federation. As an enemy of Bolshevism and revolution" ... radicals long to depose him ... break up the Federation... divide into units, ... suppress the general and sober voice of the majority, ... put into practice some of the theories and measures of foreign fanatics."  

These reactionaries were opposed to the policy of Gompers and the Federation, while labor's friends acknowledged and supported labor policy and

---

its promoter. The revolutionaries who in their supposed attempts to control production, were denounced as the "shortest way to the ruin of labor organizations, to employment and misery for wage earners, to the destruction of the country's productive capacity."\(^7\)

These agitators were battling against labor's authorized leaders, with their ends seemingly quite different from the wage adjustment ends of the Federation. This element or influence was "openly or secretly abetting most of the strike movements reported in the news ... The leaders know it, the sober and American part of the membership cannot too soon inform itself of the truth."\(^8\)

Editorial attitude was violently opposed to a revolt as envisioned by the radical elements it saw at work within labor's ranks. In essence, "... There is one big union here. Its name is the United States of America. It will lay strong hands on aliens and economic perverts that try to bore into it."\(^9\)

The nation's answer to the Red Scare was oppression. Socialists were jailed for violation of criminal-syndicalist laws and some were deported. Many states indicted members of the existent Communist and Communist Labor parties under criminal-syndicalist laws and were sent to jail. Almost 250 aliens, considered radicals and communists were sent to Russia for advocating revolution or overthrow of the government by means of force.\(^10\)

---

\(^7\) *New York Times*, September 18, 1919, p. 12.

\(^8\) *New York Times*, September 18, 1919, p. 12.


\(^10\) *Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 8, 1920, p. 6.
The red scare did not end with the arrests of communist and communist labor party members. As early as spring 1919, wages were an immediate cause of labor disputes that were to become nationwide in scope. And the 'red' element was echoed throughout these disputes. With wartime price rises continuing well into 1919, the cost of living continued to soar with little or appreciable wage adjustment.

An early 1919 editorial decried that there ought to be declared a nationwide truce as regards the existing wage disputes. But it saw this as never materializing unless labor can be assured the maintainence of the American standard of living and a fair division of the profits of American enterprise. Although many employers were willing to grant or even compromise on wage issues, they all saw a management threat to any extension of collective bargaining and recognition of union representatives as spokesmen. Labor insisted on the right to organize without discrimination as the only means of assuring the recognition of national unions.

The role of Moscow and its alleged activity in this country led to many believing that practically all strikes were instigated by the communists. The legitimate rights and the justified grievances of the workers were forgotten in a fearful eagerness to make Bolshevism the cause of all labor unrest. A ceaseless campaign was waged by employer's and their associations to identify any and all labor disputes with the Kremlin. They were pointed out as radical, and that Labor, in essence, had begun to turn un-American, had thrown off American principles.

---

The attack against radical and reactionary continued, in varying degree, throughout the 1919-1921 period, using the red scare refrain as a convenient vehicle for warning, criticizing, and denouncing unionism. "Radicalism, with its borrowed European ideas, is doing its best to destroy the American labor movement. . . prosperity and peace. Every American will fight it until it is cleaned out, as it will be."\(^{12}\)

B. STRIKES

1. Police Strike

Due to the high cost of living and low wages, with particular attention to fixed income public employees, the police of Boston had formed a union called the Boston Social Club. It applied for affiliation with the American Federation of Labor in hopes of adjusting their grievances. The mayor of Boston attempted conciliation between the commissioner and men but the commissioner refused the mayor's efforts. Having forbidden any type of affiliation, Police Commissioner Curtis suspended nineteen men who had joined the union. On September 9th, the policemen took matters into their own hands and went on strike, leaving the city without any police protection. Three days after the strike was declared, the Boston Companies of the State troops were called in to reinstate order.\(^{13}\)

Calvin Coolidge, then governor of Massachusetts, said: "There is no right

\(^{12}\)Chicago Daily Tribune, April 8, 1920, p. 6.

\(^{13}\)Perlman, Pp. 447-48.
to strike against the public safety" when asked by Mr. Gompers to remove the police commissioner. The governor thereby refused to rehire any striking policemen. Quoted from one editorial:

"A policeman has no more right to belong to a union than a soldier or sailor. He must . . . obey orders, the orders of his superiors, not those of an outside body. One of his duties is the maintainence of order in case of strike violence. In such a case, if he is faithful to his union, he may have to be unfaithful to the public, which pays him to protect it."14

This editorial further states that this situation is false and impossible. In reference to the police strike in England and in particular Liverpool, where it had developed to dangerous proportions, here it was seen as an imported, revolutionary idea and that there should be a stern law against it. It is practically an analogue of military desertion and while no such severe punishment as military desertion entails would be thought of in connection with wholesale police desertion, it most certainly ought to be punished suitably and repressed.15

As reiterated in a Chicago paper, the affiliation of a policemen's organization with a labor federation divides its allegiance, an allegiance above allegiance to the government. It is, in fact, looked upon as a revolutionary act to desert one's government on orders from his union. It goes on to assert:


We do not think either Mr. Gompers or the great majority of union labor has any intention to overthrow our government or the American system of democracy. But if they support public officials, especially those sworn as guardians of the public safety, in desertion of their posts, they are denying the sovereignty of the people and the essential supremacy of government.

We do not think the American people ... ready for government by trade unions or any other minorities. ... If a group of policemen or firemen ... can strangle the public into submission to any demands they see fit to make, there is the end of democracy... the way to tyranny.16

This type of attitude only served to magnify the police strike into a Red-inspired movement aimed at toppling the pillars of our democratic society. But while this movement was supposedly undermining our society, the American was looked upon as unanimous in his efforts to preserve the democratic principles through orderly liberty and government by and according to the laws.17

A Chicago Tribune editorial seems to coincide with that of government in general and Governor Coolidge in particular. "Boston has ... a fine chance to renovate its police force with some splendid young, vigorous ... men ... It may be a temptation for Boston to smooth over the strike ... But if this is done a poisonous precedent will have been set and the whole country will some day pay for it."18

17New York Times, October 2, 1919, p. 16.
2. Steel Strike

On August 1, 1918, a conference of officers of the international unions with jurisdiction in the steel industries was called in Chicago, for the purpose of setting up a National Committee for the organization of the iron and steel industry. Leaders of this committee included Gompers as chairman, Fitzpatrick (President of the Chicago Federation of Labor) as vice-chairman, and W. Z. Foster as secretary. Due to their success in Gary, Hammond, South Chicago, and with Bethlehem Steel of Pittsburgh, the campaign did not slacken.

Despite discharge of union men and the prohibiting of union meetings, new locals sprang up in every steel district. In late May of 1919, the National Committee appointed a Conference Committee to begin negotiations with United States Steel Corporation. In reply, discharge of union members multiplied. In mid-July (1919), a strike ballot was circulated and approved and demands were drawn up seeking the right to collective bargaining, reinstatement of men discharged for union activities, a living wage, double pay for over-time, check-off and seniority, abolition of company unions, and many more. Additional organizers were expelled and meetings broken up. Six days before the strike was to take place, Chairman Gary of the United States Steel Corporation again reaffirmed his stand on the open shop. The strike was called as planned, affecting nearly every steel producing region.  

---

19 Perlman, Pp. 461-62.

20
Violence between strikers and guards began almost at once. The newspapers hammered at the radical past of W. Z. Foster, the secretary of the National Committee. In early October, violence between strikers and Negro strikebreakers in Gary shifted the entire strike center of interest to the Chicago area. Federal troops were ordered in and martial law was instated. The companies now were making progress in restoration of operations with the aid of union deserters and strikebreakers. On January 8, 1920, the National Committee declared the strike at an end. 21

The failure of the strike was in no small part due to the twenty-four jurisdictional areas involved, placing serious restrictions both on the resources of the organizing committee and on its power to organize effectively. 22

In Labor's Rights, a New York Times editorial, union objects and methods are discussed at length. It follows in part:

... Labor demands as a right, economic advantages, and if necessary, proposes to take them by force... in disregard alike for humanity and the law, which should protect all... The objects declared are admirable. Only the methods are open to remark. No one objects to either labor or capital setting its own values upon itself, but neither should think it has the right to get that valuation either by fair means or foul... Capital has been brought under the law. Labor defies the law, rivals capital in securing lawmaking to suit itself, decides its own case against capital, and passes sentence upon those who have no part in the quarrel, (the communities) making the innocent suffer in an economic war. 24

21 Ibid., pp. 466-67.
22 Ibid., p. 468.
Just previous to the strike, an editorial article appeared declaring that strike was essentially a struggle for power. The Corporation wants to deal directly with the employees, and for justification shows an exceptional record of consideration and liberality. It holds that its employees are better off in its case then they would be if subject to the control of union leaders who will call strikes, lose wages, and weaken the industry. Thus, the corporation, in many respects, was seen as a model employer.  

To this, the union replied "... this is paternalism .... the only path of progress for the worker is by collective bargaining, organization, and agitation. Mr. Fitzpatrick is conscientiously opposed to industrial peace. He believes it means enslavement and stagnation."  

The union, as envisioned by the newspapers, was out to force the steel industry in its entirety to recognize the right of employees to deal with them through union representatives, in the name of organized labor. While the strike was not condoned, the labor movement, per se, was not considered at fault. The following, cited from a Chicago Tribune editorial confirms this:  

The defeat of the strike will not be a defeat for organized labor so far as it is represented by constructive leaders. It should be a setback to radicalism in the labor movement. . . . If the strike is lost by the men, it should not be permitted to defeat their just claims for relief. There are abuses in the steel industry, particularly as to the hours, . . . If they are not corrected, the next strike will have the backing of press and public, and it will win.  

27Chicago Daily Tribune, October 2, 1919, p. 8.
Once again, the convenient radical tag was applied to the dispute, as it was believed that this strike was distated by radical leaders bent on gaining power rather than correcting conditions, and because the policy of the greatest employers had been liberal and progressive. But where this policy had not been applied, reforms were called for. The failure of a strike, it was felt, should not postpone needed reform.28

Mr. Gary's position regarding the workers' right to work appeared in an editorial of the New York Times entitled Steel Strike Facts and Issues. The article which follows in part states that: "... No man who has labor to sell can doubt whether his interests are promoted more by the unionists who demand the right to call him from his work at their will ... or by those employers who agree with Mr. Gary about allowing a man to work where he pleases, whether he belongs to a union or not."29

The editorial continues to state that within the zone of contract and free will there is a large field for the benefit of workers by unions, but that the individual and the community alike have rights which restrict union rights. The overstepping of these rights is the issue under attack.

As Mr. Gary of U. S. Steel was quoted, "the minority must not be allowed to control the majority if we reach the stage where industries are to be controlled by unions, it will mean decay."30

28Chicago Daily Tribune, October 2, 1919, p. 8.
29New York Times, October 2, 1919, p. 16.
30New York Times, October 2, 1919, p. 16.
Thus, the newspapers see the individual and the community as prior to considerations of union men and their organizations. In essence, the minority must not control the majority.

3. Coal Strike

Unrest in the bituminous coal industry was due to rising living cost and little or no corresponding wage increases. A strike in August of 1919 in Illinois was met by mine operator's insistence that the Washington Agreement, a wartime measure was still in effect and no new wage scale would be discussed. The union demanded a six hour day, a five day week, a sixty per cent wage increase for all classes of labor, time and a half for overtime and double-time for Sundays and holidays.31

The operators remained steadfast in their insistence that the agreement was to remain in effect until March 31, 1920. A strike was called for November 1st. The government ordered the strike ended, and even though officially terminated on November 10th, the miners did not immediately return to work. An arbitration commission was appointed to decide on the demands. A twenty-seven per cent increase in wages was granted. The "hours" demands were branded unreasonable and no changes were made.32

On August 23, 1919, the anthracite mines met to formulate their demands. They adopted and ratified a new contract ratifying and prohibiting individual contracts, to run for no longer than two years, a sixty per cent increase in tonnage rates and a two dollar a day increase in wages, a uniform wage scale

31Perlman, Pp. 470-471.
throughout the region, a six hour day, five day week, time and a half for overtime, doubletime on Sundays and holidays, and a closed shop with full recognition of the United Mine Workers. 33

Negotiations proved fruitless and, in May of 1920, resumed in Washington under the guidance of Secretary of Labor Wilson. The miners finally offered to accept the same ratio of increase just granted to the bituminous coal miners by the President's Commission, but they still demanded a closed shop. Negotiations again broke up, and a commission was appointed by the President who accepted the majority report and decision. At this, a group of insurgents demanded acceptance of the minority report and while the new agreement was being drawn up by the union officers and mine operators, eighty-five thousand miners left the pits. They stayed away for more than a month, until the regular union officials succeeded in getting the men back to work. 34

Just previous to the Illinois strike in the bituminous coal fields, in mid 1919, an editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "Labor's Unsocial Policy," which affirmed: "... Under the guidance of the less wise among labor leaders the nation is being separated industrially and torn asunder internally. ... Factories can no more produce goods without coal than laborers can work without food. The shortage of coal means a shortage of everything else, not even excepting natural products, for they depend on coal for carriage

33 Ibid., p. 477.
34Perlman, Pp. 478-79.
from where they grow to where they are wanted. No one knows better than the unions what key industries are. They are industries upon which other industries depend for their ability to work to advantage or in some cases, to work at all.35

The necessary demand of the community for coal and the undue hardship the strike created upon the community was not overlooked as an issue. On November 17, 1920 the Chicago Daily Tribune avowed that at a time when troubles in production and distribution of coal all causing considerable apprehension, it means something to the community which has no coal reserves and finds itself living from bucketful to bucketful with apprehension of the time there will be none.36

The New York Times sees the only possible solution in "cooperative competition . . . in the coal fields especially, that is what is needed."37 Meanwhile, the only means of adjustment is the wasteful and often violent weapon of the union, the strike.

4. Railroad Strike

The biggest manifestation of insurgent union action occurred with the switchmen's strike in April of 1920, beginning in Chicago and spreading to nearly every section of the country. It was an expression of resentment by railroad workers who had waited for the government to raise their wages to meet

37 New York Times, April 1, 1922, p. 1h.
the increased living cost of the workers. In January of 1919, with the railroads still under government control, the six shop crafts demanded wage increases and better working conditions. President Wilson, upon hearing these demands, urged against them and promised to lower the living cost. In February of 1920 these demands were once again renewed. On February 28th, the Transportation Act creating the Railroad Labor Board was passed, providing for worker-employer controversy settlement through joint administration boards. Demands were again pressed but to no avail. 38

The strike began over the removal of a Chicago yard foreman and spread to every railroad in the Chicago area. By the fourth of April, nine thousand switchmen had left their jobs. The railroad brotherhoods then issued an ultimatum threatening strikers who did not return to work by April 7th, with expulsion and procured nearly five hundred yardmen to break up the strike. Even the threat of loss of seniority had no effect in halting the insurgent switchmen. The strike spread to such rail centers as Los Angeles, St. Louis, Omaha, and Detroit. Engineers, firemen, and conductors joined the strike. "The railroad brotherhood's, "... have condemned the switchmen's strike, calling the strikers renegades and sending union switchmen to work as strikebreakers... with the result that firemen and enginemen joined the strikers and refused to work with union 'scabs'." 39 The brotherhoods launched an all out assault against that strike which threatened their position and standing with the rail-

---

38 Perlman, p. 452-53.

President Wilson hastened to appoint the railroad board to hear demands by representatives of the brotherhoods. The yardsmens' association were refused a hearing on grounds that they had ignored due process as specified in the Transportation Act, namely, to honor their contracts. The brotherhoods hired strikebreakers to replace the strikers and twenty-three strike leaders were charged under the Lever and Sherman Acts. Men slowly began to return to work. Management and the brotherhoods jointly refused to rehire employees who had participated in the "outlaw" strike except as new employees. In Chicago, out of four hundred and fifty applications for rehire, all but one hundred and thirty-seven were rejected, and these lost their seniority. This was their way of weeding out the more active "rebels." 41

The outcome of the strike resulted in the formation of the United Association of Railway Employees of North America. On September 20th, this new organization called an end to the strike, the majority of strikers finding their way back into rail employment. The insurgent union never took root. 42

An editorial entitled "Industrial Prussianism" placed sole blame for the strike on the radical element acting within the confines of the railroad industry.

"... and avers, threats and forces are a double-edged weapon liable to wound those who begin its use when turned against them. The new International

40 Perlman, Pp. 543-54.
41 Ibid., p. 455.
42 Perlman, p. 456.
(Communist) which is uniting against all the world is uniting all the world against Industrial Prussianism, as surely as all the world united against German domination by similar methods."

In reference to the switchmen's demands for wage increases and decrease in the cost of living, organized labor was looked upon as setting itself back along way if it turned from its experienced and levelheaded leaders, whose loyal guidance has brought it so far, and follow the "foolish incitements of impracticals and troubleseekers." Here, experienced leaders are approved, while outlaw or radical leaders are strongly denounced. In the rail industry discontent and dispute were thus the vehicles of the troublemakers.

"Labor's leadership in its action in the switchmen's strike ... sounds a note of warning which organized labor, we trust ... will heed. If it does, the country will emerge quickly from its present costly situation ...."

The radical bore the burden of editorial attack, while the honest tried leadership in unionism was looked upon with optimism.

 Shortly thereafter a New York Times editorial titled "Labor's Worst Enemy," appeared waving the "red" flag in an attempt to persuade the workingman that the radicals" ... do not want settlement of labor disputes, or if a settlement is reached by accession to the demands they have preferred, they


\[\text{Chicago Daily Tribune, August 30, 1919, p. 6.}\]

\[\text{Chicago Daily Tribune, August 30, 1919, p. 6. "(the quotation is a continuation of the last quotation on the previous page as there was no further space to begin the paragraph of the corresponding portion.)}\]
regard it only as a preparation for further demands..."

Fighting and mob action caused considerable damage in the rail industry. On the subject of violence and sabotage, an editorial article from a Chicago paper treats it in this way:

Chicago railroad men who are being slugged or in constant danger of being slugged... by the outlaw switchmen and their sluggers are said to be raising a fund for self defense for sluggers who will retaliate. . . . .

This is meeting lawlessness with lawlessness.

"If a private war starts in the railway terminals and yards it will be because the railroad men operators see no other way of protecting themselves."46

Concerning the public and its welfare, which the Chicago Tribune cited as the hapless victims of the 'outlaw' strike, an editorial decries:

"This strike is inexcusable... They care nothing for the interest of the public and make themselves the enemy of the public."47

The outlaw strikers were epitomized in their attempt to seize power and overthrow the regular organization and officials. It therefore deserved no support from either union labor or the general public and should be promptly broken. Loyal unionists should be given ample protection and union labor sentiment should make itself felt against the radicals... who organize strikes to disrupt union organization and defy its responsible leadership, and


46 Chicago Daily Tribune, September 6, 1920, p. 8.

turning public opinion against labor."  

Union men outside the rail industry, while continuing to remain loyal to the general cause of labor, could not be seen as indefinitely supporting a strike which would eventually throw them out of work.

To emphasize this stand, the following appears in part from a Chicago paper:

... The mass of the people are with organized labor when it shows its loyalty to iron principles and a decent respect for the general interest, and it is the support of the people that is necessary ... Neither this strike nor any other which thrusts aside the means offered ... to avoid the interruption of transportation can be recognized by the Board or the public. No organization which calls strikes in defiance of the law can be recognized.

With the end of the strike, an editorial enumerating the abuses of the rail strike, "Lessons of the Outlaw Strike," appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune. It stated that not only had the outlaw strike finally ended but that it was a complete defeat and an unconditional surrender on the part of the striking union workmen. The men who struck had a real grievance and an adjustment of wages was probably called for. But while the switchmen probably had justifiable cause for complaint, they took an unjustifiable method of protesting in that they broke contract. And in such circumstances, "... their defeat was foredoomed."

The newspapers did not revel in the unions' defeat in the rail industry. They merely suggest that the union's methods of protest is unacceptable and its

48 Chicago Daily Tribune, April 6, 1920, p. 4.
49
50 Chicago Daily Tribune, April 21, 1920, p. 8.
activation unjustifiable. In short, while there was cause for complaint, breaking contract was inexcusable. And so ended the railroad strike, defeat, and loss of seniority for those who were rehired.

5. Seamen Strike

To meet foreign competition, the International Seamen's Union was approached by the American Shipowners Association, seeking a new agreement allowing for a twenty-five per cent wage reduction and no overtime pay. Negotiations produced no results and on April 19, 1921, the United States Shipping Board abolished three watches, took away the privilege of union representatives to enter docks or board vessels, and withdrawal of preference to union men in hiring.52

On the 1st of May, 1921, shipping from Maine to Texas was curtailed by the striking seamen and Pacific coast shipping was also affected. By the end of the second week, three hundred picketeers had been arrested. Injunctions followed and strikebreakers were recruited. At a conference called by Labor Secretary Davis, the unions were willing to make the wage concessions but they demanded their three watches and their former degree of union recognition.53

The marine engineers accepted reductions in overtime pay, greatly weakening the strike. Their return made a union victory impossible and the firemen's and sailors' union, after a vote, returned to work without an agreement.

52 Perlman, Pp. 494-95.
53 Perlman, p. 495.
The strike had lasted fifty-two days, the defeat resulted in blacklisting and discrimination against unionized maritime workers. \(^{54}\)

Spring of 1921 found many out of work and a strike at this time seemed to the newspapers to be a bit unwise. "There is some surprise that they should select a time when so many are unemployed, and when the sympathy for the jobless makes it difficult to sympathize with those who quarrel with their jobs ... (Their) demand for a closed shop means that preference would be given to union foreigners over non-union Americans." \(^{55}\)

In a May, 1921 editorial entitled "The Strike Against Strikes," the New York Times declared, that the American public was weary of industrial wranglings and has gone on strike against the striking seamen. "The organized cogs which stop the machine need to be taught that their interests are not supreme... ." \(^{56}\)

Labor's best bet was seen as a policy of cleaning house, and coming out for eight hours work of guaranteed quality for eight hours pay. In that case it would be to the public's interest to stand behind the unions and their cause. But labor had pushed its demands beyond the general standard of wages and it was now looked upon as placing its selfish interests above that of the general welfare. \(^{57}\)

The Chicago Tribune concurred that this was a very bad time to go on strike. Many industries were shut down or were running at greatly reduced

\(^{54}\) Ibid., Pp. 495-96.

\(^{55}\) New York Times, April 17, 1921, p. 16.


\(^{57}\) New York Times, June 23, 1921, p. 16.
forces and the only sensible thing for labor to do, it was suggested, was to accept reasonable wage reductions.

"Employers will not take advantage of their employees. . . . and try to restore excessive hours or to make unnecessarily drastic cuts in pay. They will not attempt to destroy responsible organizations."\textsuperscript{58}

Thus, the seamen were looked upon as being selfish in their demands, considering the economic situation prevailing during this period. Management was seen as the benevolent protector of its employees and the responsible organizations (seamen's union) these employees joined.

C. UNION ORGANIZING

Perhaps the most intensive drive for union organization took place in the bituminous coal fields of West Virginia by the United Mine Workers. By the end of World War I, only about one half of the state was organized. Many newly developed and growing fields were non-union, the controlling influence being of the United States Steel Corporation and other large industrial concerns. In many instances, the local governments were company controlled and union organizers were strictly excluded. In September of 1919, a large force of armed union miners assembled near the Logan County line, preparing to invade non-union territory. They were met with pleas from the Virginia governor and

\textsuperscript{58}Chicago Daily Tribune, April 24, 1921, pt. 2, p. 6.
union officials. This merely stalled the union move temporarily.59

The strike began in Mingo County over the discharge of some active members. The mine operators brought in detectives who began eviction proceedings. Violence followed, leaving six dead in its wake. The strike spread into Pike County, Kentucky, and its surrounding areas, precipitating more open clashes between strikers and guards. At this point, an armed guard was dispatched to the Logan County line to protect against possible infiltration of any union men. Additional violence at length brought in Federal troops. Union district president Keeney threatened a general strike unless federal troops discontinued strikebreaking activities. With violence still erupting, the Governor declared martial law. By January of 1921, order had been restored and the federal troops were withdrawn, but to the cost of sixteen lives. (9 miners and 7 guards).60

On May 12, 1921, violence again erupted between miners and mine guards-deputies. Martial law was reinstated. The union organizers and striking miners were now more determined than ever of opening the non-unionized territory, by all out force of arms if necessary. President Keeney once again averted a battle by turning back the miners, whose ranks by now were four thousand strong. As they were dispersing, news came of armed deputies raiding a mining camp and killing five miners. At this point, President Harding ordered the miners to disperse but was met with refusal. The advance began and on August 31st,

59Perlman, p. 479.

60Perlman, Pp. 479-80.
deputies were fought on five different fronts. Federal troops were ordered in and the miners war was ended.

The Logan County Grand Jury then indicted three hundred and twenty-five on counts of treason and two hundred more for conspiracy and the bearing of arms. Late in May, 1922, the cases were dismissed and the union officially ended the strike in October, 1922. A bitter anti-union campaign, which broke the backbone of the U. M. W. in West Virginia, followed hard upon defeat. 62

In early 1919, before any outward signs of an organizing drive were discernable, an editorial entitled "Labor's Rights" said this of the worker and his cause: "... The workers have resolutely set their faces toward some order of society which will improve their lives and conditions in accord with the new valuation they have set upon themselves." 63

With low wages and poor working conditions, the coal mines were a prime target for union organizing, with their only weapon, the strike. The power of this weapon was recognized, as evidenced by the following comment. "... whether employer or employed, strikes with their stoppage of production continue, and, we suppose, cannot be avoided in many cases; in some because one side is unyielding, in some because the other in unreasonable." 64

By mid-1920, the pendulum was swinging in the other direction. In

61Perlman, Pp. 479-80.
62Ibid., p. 481.
64Chicago Daily Tribune, September 20, 1919, p. 8.
denouncing class labor laws, the New York Times asserts:

No government can claim respect or support unless it is just to all, including even offenders against the laws. Unionists ought not to be outlawed, merely because they outlaw others than themselves. It will suffice that the law shall decide where the right lies, and compel compliance with the right, irrespective of who asserts it or denies it . . . there shall be one law over all class laws.65

The offenders of the law were looked upon as many of organized labor's paid leaders, who were seen as seekers of power and fortune at the sacrifice of the interests of craftsmen whom they were representing. However, in its entirety, the labor movement was not blamed. The offenders were "... the demagogues who have found it easy to talk the less thoughtful and more emotional members . . . into a state of resentment... With this resentment aroused they have found it easy to obtain a strike vote..."66

By March 20th, radicals and union organizers had become practically synonymous. Those unions not actively organizing or striking were the conservative, self-respecting unions and they, the newspapers claimed, should not be forced to carry the brand of graft which the newspapers saw as union agitator's pay. Thus the conservative and lawabiding unions will do well to refuse to be associated with the others. If they do not disassociate themselves... the law abiding methods of 'labor-for-loot' organizations will

force a reaction which will have grave consequences for all."67

In direct reference to the then conservative labor, an editorial specifically mentions its President, Mr. Compers. However, he is now viewed as having to compromise his position by claiming "... ... for unions the right to decide what their rights are and how they shall be asserted."68 Thus, faultfinding even in the conservative element of labor is evidenced.

With the advent of spring, 1921, came the all-out attack against organizing. 'All the jobs for us' was the slogan for union organizers. "Class consciousness conceals from multitudes the immorality and inhumanity of that false philosophy."69 Thus, all class consciousness is emphatically denounced.

The only way to avoid the wastefulness and violence of a strike is discerned as settlement of disputes by agreement. The Chicago Daily Tribune decries any "force" as not only a tremendous loss to union men, but more important, to the country. This editorial of October 22, 1921, feels that such agreements can and should be reached now, not later when both sides have been exhausted by the dispute and have less to give.70

The following editorial admirably portrays the attitude toward the weapon of unionism in this critical year-1921. Taken from the December 8th New York Times and entitled "Labor and the Public," it reads in part:

---
70 Chicago Daily Tribune, October 22, 1921, p. 6.
There was a time when strike and lockout were almost exclusively the concern of labor and capital. . . Today a strike on the Railways, in the steel trade, the coal mines, financial loss but often much suffering. It is Mr. Gompers who is 'reactionary' when he insists upon the right to 'bargain collectively,' with the threat of strike always in the background. To laud such procedure as the method of 'voluntary agreement' is to fly in the face of experience and common sense.... When the property and the lives of the community are at stake, the only thing that can be 'voluntary' is obedience.... The A.F. of L. has a notable record of achievement and is still potentially a great power for good. But if it is to continue to exert that power, it must be voluntary and speedily array itself upon the side of the law and justice, considering first the interest of the nation as a whole.71

D. AMERICAN PLAN

To promote the drive against unionism, open shop associations were formed across the country. The association's objectives advocated a return to our American principles, the inalienable rights of every American to enter into trade of business of his choice, and to accept employment under conditions satisfactory to him without any interference from unions and their agents.72

It proposed to abolish the closed shop but as in previous open shop crusades, set out to destroy unionism. By fall of 1920, this network of anti-union associations depicted union leaders as Bolsheviks, spoilers, and power-wealth seekers.73 An editorial article however, did not spare the worker either, stating that "the more wage earners are paid, the less work they seem to be willing to do. This is the accumulated effect of a policy of output restriction supported by labor, openly or secretly, on the theory that work

72 Perlman, pp. 491-92.
must go around..... The common sense of American labor should be able to choose which is the better way, and it is time to choose. Labor is injuring itself and its future."74

In another and later labor editorial, the law of the land was not to be overriden by the law of one of its classes. This New York Times editorial declares that "... it is not to be endured that for any reason whatever union law shall prevail over the common law, or the law proclaimed by the freely elected representatives of the people."75

In the area of the federation and its standing steadfast with various insurgent unions, the press questions labor's reluctance in accepting proposals from capital by asking:

"...How often have the approaches of well-meaning capital been rejected by labor with aspersions of hypocrisy and treachery? How often does labor learn that it has been tricked and betrayed by other sectors of itself and yet without resenting it."76 (unauthorized or outlaw strikes) The Chicago Tribune also implies that a good deal of trouble could be averted by labor and the country if labor will listen to and consider the well meaning approaches and offers of and from capital. 77

Early in 1921, editorial comment centered around the idea that both capital and labor were on trial and that the country was in need of a better sort. The

76Chicago Daily Tribune, September 6, 1920, p. 8.
77New York Times, February 19, 1921, p. 16.
first and best advice advanced by the New York Times for both capital and labor was to avoid disputes even if it is necessary to sacrifice something in order to reach some agreement. 78

The anti-union crusade continued into 1921, carrying the torch of efficiency and freedom, giving labor as little credit as possible. "Whenever unionism has gained control, its waste, inefficiency, and indeed tyranny have been notorious." 79

The definition given for the open shop was a shop that cannot be dominated from without by labor leaders who are as ignorant as the workers themselves of the inner and vital needs of an industry. 80

In deriding labor for espousing many of the lost causes—Greenbackism, populism, socialism, the editorial comments that "...even in its saner moments, its economic theory has been destructive." 81

As 1921 drew to a close, the only solution was seen as a subordination of selfish politics and prejudices to the common interest, which was industrial peace and prosperity. 82 And this was the byline of the ever increasing anti-union crusade.

78 New York Times, April 19, 1921, p. 16.
81 New York Times, April 19, 1921, p. 16.
82 Chicago Daily Tribune, October 29, 1921, p. 6.
E. CORRUPTION

In summer of 1920, a joint investigating committee of both houses of the New York Legislature called the Lockwood Committee, was set up to investigate the New York City building industry. A tripartite arrangement between certain contractors, Mr. Brindell, who dominated the Building Trades Council, and the material dealers was uncovered. Contracts were being allotted with the aid of a card system and controlled by one John Hettrick, who manipulated several building employers' associations. Four per cent of the gross amount went into a special fund, out of which Hettrick received one per cent. If a contractor refused to go only with this "code of practice," he was turned over to Brindell, who had the absolute power to call a strike. In the investigation, nineteen contractors confessed to having paid Brindell sums from as low as two hundred to thirty-two thousand dollars "as strike insurance." It was also discovered that Brindell sold favors to some sub-contractors and compelled general contractors to hire them at very high fees.83

Graft and corruption were also found among the building materials dealers, with combinations and collusive bidding among the manufacturers of concrete, brick, lime, and the like. In February of 1921, Brindell, Hettrick, and a number of contractors were convicted on charges of extortion and sent to prison. By early spring, the A.F. of L. had reorganized the Building Trades Council of

---

83Perlman, Pp. 504-05.
In spring of 1921, an exposure in Chicago brought to light affairs differing only slightly from that of the New York Building industry. This investigation, by the Dailey Committee, resulted in indictments of a number of officers as well as the President and Vice President of the Chicago Building Trades Council for extortion and graft. The cases were never brought to trial however. This investigation aroused comment in regard to the high cost of building in the city. Contractors proposed a wage cut larger than was acceptable to the workers. All building halted and arbitration by Federal Judge Landis turned the union into factions, but was strictly enforced. It set a maximum wage and did away with the uniform wage of all skilled trades. In spite of its enforcement, the anti-Landis unions prospered due to the building boom of 1922.

The New York Times with the exposure of corrupt practices in the city's building trades, on October 23, 1920, referred to the legitimate or honest element of organized labor as aware of the fact that leaders like Brindell, et al, were nothing but vultures preying upon employers, public, and the worker. "...It is an evil of long standing and no less harmful to labor than to the public." It continues to state that trade unionism in modern life is

84 Ibid., p. 505.
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a welcome force with a noble cause, high achievements, and great potential for
the future. It is "... cheerful news... to learn that the oppression of these
corrupt despots has reached its limits and that relief is at hand." The
attitude was thus one of corruption exposed - corruption eliminated. This evil
has been cast out of the honest element of labor, for its own protection and
that of the whole country.

In denouncing the corrupt practices in the building trades, uncovered by
the Dailey Committee in Chicago in April of 1921, the point is emphasized that
such crimes discredit the entire organization of union labor practically as
much as the specific union organization involved. "Such disclosures merely
serve to give unionism a black eye .... In self-defense the unions must clean
house." 39

This graft and corruption was looked upon as a result of a long period of
contempt of law and justice that has gone unpunished. The only remedy to this
situation, noted by the Chicago Daily Tribune, is prosecution and jail for the
guilty. 90 It was this Chicago paper's expressed opinion that the mere fact
that the individual workmen were honest didn't save them or their organizations
from the disapproval of the public. Hundreds of thousands of dollars in graft
were extracted with the end result of enriching a few crooks while depriving
hundreds of men of their jobs because of the restrictive influences this shake-

88 Chicago Daily Tribune, April 29, 1921, p. 8.
89 Chicago Daily Tribune, May 19, 1921, p. 8.
90 Chicago Daily Tribune, May 9, 1921, p. 8.
down had on building.\textsuperscript{91}

With regard to the above mentioned graft and extortion, it was hoped that the intelligent union man will recognize this corrupt practice, and, it is stated, will lend every insistence to the authorities in rooting out and punishing those guilty of such criminal methods.\textsuperscript{92}

The crusade against corrupt practices with prosecution of guilty union (and materials) dealers later shifted to one of bringing down building costs, a natural consequence of graft and corruption exposure in the building trades.

Here, in connection with the high cost of building with subsequent increases in rentals, the blame was squarely placed on the laborer. "... it is chiefly his own in-efficiency that makes new building so difficult. Of all the cost items involved, the far largest is what he himself demands."\textsuperscript{93} This same editorial ascertains his demands as four or five times the cost of the land and over three-fourths of the cost of the house. Along with the increasing power of the unions had come the decrease in productivity of labor.\textsuperscript{94}

Precipitated by the disclosures of the Dailey Committee in Chicago, contractors proposed a twenty per cent wage cut, which, being unacceptable to the workers, went to Judge Landis through arbitration. His decision, setting a maximum wage and doing away with the uniform wage for all skilled trades, was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{91}\textit{Chicago Daily Tribune}, May 19, 1921, p. 8.
\item \textsuperscript{92}\textit{Chicago Daily Tribune}, April 29, 1921, p. 8.
\item \textsuperscript{93}\textit{New York Times}, March 29, 1921, p. 14.
\end{itemize}
looked upon with disfavor by some of the unions it applied to, but the Chicago Daily Tribune valued it as a good decision. "In justice to the building trades men who accept... a cut in pay, there must be a concerted effort on the part of the public and the law enforcing authorities to stop profiteering and extortionate prices." With this acceptance, the workmen were, whether willingly or unwillingly, seen as helping to bring prices of their product down. The editorial does not declare that prices of that product, i.e. housing, will come down. It simply states that those commodities which they produce ought to come down in proportion to the building worker's income. Consequently, the Landis decision is here looked upon as a good one. "The adjustment which it starts ought to be wide spread." And it was. The building trades unions eventually accepted the decision however, in May of 1923, with the expiration of the Landis Award contract, the pre-Landis uniform scale was re-established.

95 Chicago Daily Tribune, September 9, 1921, p. 8.
CHAPTER IV

To provide comparison with regard to the change in attitude (re: editorial articles) to further substantiate the thesis, the author has decided upon a scale of content analysis as cited in Berelson. This scale, as originally introduced by Bales, has been modified by combining certain of its twelve categories to provide a five point scale.

Scale

The five point scale, indicated below, will be incorporated in Tables II and III.

Table I consists of the frequency of editorials of both newspapers as concerns the important labor issues under consideration.

Table II concerns the frequency of editorials of both newspapers adjudged according to this scale:

Very Favorable
Favorable
Neutral
Unfavorable
Very Unfavorable

1Berelson, p. 155.
Table III consists of a summary including the above mentioned scale, the frequency of editorials of both newspapers adjudged in each category of the scale, and the percentages of editorials in each category.

With reference to the scale, the writer considers an editorial as Very Favorable when it concurs with union objectives in bringing about reforms. For example; "...if the strike (steel) is lost by the men, it should not be permitted to defeat their just claims for relief."

An editorial adjudged as Favorable is illustrated by the following excerpt dealing with graft and corruption. "...it is an evil of long standing and no less harmful to labor than to the public." Its tone is one of acknowledgement of evil and by its elimination the betterment of not only the general welfare but the labor movement as well.

An example of a Neutral editorial is one adjudged as taking neither the side of management or labor. "...whether employer or employed, strikes with their stoppage of production continue, and, we suppose, cannot be avoided in many cases, in some because one side is unyielding, in some because the other is unreasonable."

An Unfavorable editorial can be illustrated by the following. "...in desertion of their posts, they are denying the sovereignty of the people..." With reference to the Boston Police Strike, this editorial article looks with disfavor upon police desertion, yet the tone is not one of complete disagreement or antagonism with the strike.

Where unionism is viewed as in possession of no worthwhile qualities, the writer has appraised that editorial as Very Unfavorable. To illustrate:
"Whenever unionism has gained control, its waste, inefficiency, and indeed tyranny have been notorious."
### TABLE I  NUMBER OF EDITORIAL ARTICLES PER LABOR ISSUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Chicago Daily Tribune</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Scare</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Strike</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Strike</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Strike</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Strike</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaman Strike</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Organizing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II  FREQUENCY OF EDITORIAL ARTICLES PER NEWSPAPER
ADJUSTED ACCORDING TO SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>New York Times</th>
<th>Chicago Daily Tribune</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III SUMMARY TABLE, INCLUDING SCALE, NUMBER OF EDITORIALS OF BOTH NEWSPAPERS COMBINED, AS ADJUDGED IN EACH CATEGORY OF THE SCALE AND THE PERCENTAGES OF EDITORIALS IN EACH CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Total Number of Editorials</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Editorial attitude toward unionism with regard to important labor issues has been explored in an effort to interpret a decline in union growth during the year 1919-1921. It has been noted that the labor issues under consideration drew considerable editorial comment from both newspapers represented.

Of the seventy-two editorial articles:

- 7% were very favorable
- 21% were favorable
- 10% were neutral
- 47% were favorable
- 15% were very unfavorable

From the above percentages, it has been ascertained that only 28% of the editorials were of a favorable nature as against 62% of an unfavorable nature. Thus, editorial attitude, as expressed by the New York Times and the Chicago Daily Tribune, in the years 1919-1921, is considered as unfavorable toward unionism as an organization, its leadership, the means used by union organizations, and the behavior of membership.

Consequently, the aforementioned decline in union growth during the period in question can be attributed, in part, to expressed editorial attitude and its possible effect on public opinion.
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