1965

A Great Industrial Experiment

Edward A. Heberg
Loyola University Chicago

A GREAT INDUSTRIAL EXPERIMENT

by
Edward A. Heberg, Jr.

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 Arts

June
1965

PREFACE

The purpose of this paper is to investigate why George M. Pullman built a company town that provided its inhabitants with living conditions far better than those enjoyed by the average worker at the end of the nineteenth century. This paper will attempt to show that Pullman acted in conformity with the dominant philosophy of his time and even further was in some ways ahead of the other industrialists of the period from 1865 to 1900.

At the time that this paper was conceived it was thought that there would be more than enough material to achieve the objective of the author. Unfortunately, there was a shortage of material on the early career of Pullman and on the Pullman Company. This has meant that there are gaps in the first chapter and some events for which there are not adequate explanations. More than enough material was found on the town of Pullman and any inadequacies in the last three chapters are solely the responsibility of the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Great Industrial Experiment

INTRODUCTION

The period of American history following the Civil War until roughly 1900 has been labeled the "Gilded Age," the age of the "robber barons," or the age of "the triumph of industry" by various students of American history. None of the labels is entirely suitable. It was a "Gilded Age" for only a few. The bulk of the American people had a standard of living that bordered on poverty. Yet the few who enjoyed the comforts of a "gilded" existence cannot all be categorized as "robber barons." Certainly there were some businessmen who were interested only in making money and gaining power, but most were intent on building a business. They were not wreckers or despoilers. The methods that these entrepreneurs employed seem criminal today, but during the 1870's and 80's these methods were good business practice. Industry became the dominant force in the United States, but it did not "triumph." As the businessman began to have a larger and larger voice he generated his own opposition, the worker. As the post-Civil War era progressed, the conflict between the dominant employer and the struggling employee became violent.

Prior to the Civil War few businesses employed so many workers that the manager could not get to know at least the older ones. The owner and manager were generally the same man. The employee felt that he had a personal interest in the business. He also could hope that, if he were thrifty and worked diligently, he would eventually own his own business. As industries grew larger the personal relation between worker and manager disappeared. There were too many employees for a manager to know. The owner became more and more remote as successive layers of managers and foremen were interposed between himself and his employees. At the same time, the worker realized

that, no matter how hard he worked or how much he saved, he would not be able to start his own business. The worker could not hope to accumulate enough capital.

While the personal relation between manager and worker was disappearing, the worker's job was becoming more monotonous. Machinery was making work more and more impersonal. Men worked long hours in dark, dirty buildings at repetitive tasks. The disagreeable working conditions of the plants were duplicated in the poor housing facilities provided for workers. "Decent housing was simply not on the market for the unskilled workers of most cities."[1]

The entrepreneur failed to recognize what was happening. Owners and managers who had been trained to think in numbers no larger than 500 found themselves employing thousands of workers. These workers "needed education and guidance, but in keeping with laissez faire ideas neither government officials nor businessmen were willing to assume the necessary leadership."[2]

One result of the workers' growing dissatisfaction with their condition was a change in their attitude toward the businessman. He was no longer someone to be emulated but rather an enemy, to be fought. The method of warfare that the workers chose was the strike. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century there were several strikes that ended in violent riots.

Employers fought back against the strikers, using private detectives and "scab" labor to break strikes. Known trouble makers and union organizers were blacklisted across whole industries. Few employers sought to strike at the root of the problem low wages, poor living conditions and no job security. It was considered good business practice to let workers go during slack periods. Gradually some businessmen began to realize that it paid to have capable workers available and to avoid strikes. Entrepreneurs tried

various methods to lure good workers and to keep them contented. One of the most spectacular was George Mortimer Pullman's model town.

1. Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961, p. 235.

2. Ibid., p. 228

I

THE PULLMAN COMPANY

On March 3, 1831, in the small town of Brockton in upstate New York, the third of ten children was born to James and Emily Pullman. Only five months before the first regular passenger service on an American railroad had been inaugurated on the Charleston and Hamburg Railroad in South Carolina.[1] The two events were connected, for the boy, who was named George Mortimer by his parents, devoted most of his life to making the railroad passenger service safer and more comfortable and, not incidentally, to making millions of dollars from this labor. George Mortimer Pullman is famous as the man who developed and popularized the railroad sleeping car. He is so closely associated with this invention that it bears his name. But the sleeping car was not the only innovation that George Pullman introduced to the United States. The period from 1870 to 1900 was one of great labor upheavals in the United States and Pullman attempted to provide a solution for these troubles. His answer was a company town, but not such a company town as had previously been seen in the United States.

Pullman's town was much broader in scope than anything that had arisen in America. It provided for all of the wants of the inhabitants. It was designed as the perfect industrial community. And yet it failed, and because the town failed it is no longer remembered except as the occasion for another of the disastrous labor explosions that it was designed to prevent.

The life of George Mortimer Pullman was not typical of the lives of the industrialists of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Rather, it calls to mind the familiar Horatio Alger myth. The majority of the

business leaders of the "Gilded Age" came from upper or middle class families and received a good education. Few were self-made men.[2] Pullman came from a family that was never well off economically and his schooling at the Chautauqua County schoolhouse was completed when he reached fourteen. His first job was as a clerk at a small store in Westfield, New York, at a wage of forty dollars a year. After three years he became bored with the selling of dry goods, nails and crackers to the local farmers and he left to work for an older brother who had started a cabinet business in Albion, New York. It was here, according to Pullman's biographer, that

> He found that his customers generally were "willing to pay for the best provided they got the worth of their money." He turned this theory into a philosophy of life and his every act from that time on was guided by it. Financial return never worried him. If the product was the very best, he reasoned, cash dividends would follow automatically.[3]

George Pullman was always interested in experimenting with mechanical things, a tendency he perhaps had inherited from his father who had made his living as a general mechanic. George found enough free time in working for his brother that he was able to take outside jobs. In a conversation with Dr. John McLean, the Pullman Company surgeon, in 1881, Pullman reminisced that the first of these was building mule barns along the Erie Canal. Then, during the early 1850's, the Erie Canal through Albion was widened and many buildings had to be moved to clear the way. There was more work than there were house movers and the state accepted bids from amateurs to complete the work. James Pullman had developed techniques for moving buildings with which his son was familiar. George bid for and was awarded several contracts and successfully moved a number of houses and warehouses back to the new banks of the canal.[4]

Once in the housemoving business, Pullman found it more profitable than cabinet making. At this time Chicago was troubled with the sinking of downtown buildings into the sandy soil and it was decided to raise whole blocks of buildings. Pullman heard of this and, in 1855, moved to Chicago where he bid on and was awarded contracts to raise certain buildings.[5] Urban G. Willis, tutor for the Pullman grandchildren, in one of his manuscripts on George M. Pullman, relates the story of Pullman's greatest success as a housemover, the raising of the Tremont House at Lake and Dearborn, one of Chicago's leading hotels. Pullman raised this six-story building without disturbing the tenants by placing thousands of jackscrews in the basement and having each turned one half turn in unison by an army of workmen hired for that purpose.[6] With the profit made from these operations George Pullman turned to a new venture which was to be the development of an improved railroad sleeping car.

The pre-Civil War sleeping cars were extremely uncomfortable. Bunks were bolted to the floor of regular railway cars and there were no partitions between the bunks. No sheets or blankets were provided for the straw mattresses. Men slept with their boots on, using their overcoats for blankets. Because of the primitiveness of the cars women rarely used them. In later years Pullman recalled that he had ridden in one of these cars on a trip he made between Westfield and Buffalo, New York, in 1853. He found the accommodations so uncomfortable that he was unable to sleep and spent the night sitting up in the back of the car trying to determine how it could be improved.[7]

Pullman did not enter into the sleeping car business entirely through his own initiative. While working in Albion, Pullman had become acquainted

with Ben Field, the local assemblyman. Field, among his other duties, protected the interests of the Woodruff Sleeping Car Company in the New York Legislature. The Woodruff Company rewarded Field for his services by giving him the right to run sleeping cars on the Chicago and Alton Railroad with which the Woodruff Company had a contract. Field was in need of money and contacted Pullman, who had moved to Chicago, hoping to borrow some money from him. As collateral for the loan Field proposed that Pullman become his partner in running the sleeping cars. According to his agreement with the Woodruff Company, Field did not have to use Woodruff cars on the Chicago and Alton. He had the option of furnishing his own sleeping cars. Pullman agreed to loan Field the money on the condition that they provide their own sleeping cars.[8] Of the two men, Pullman became the leader in the partnership.

Realizing that he would need capable help for his project, Pullman sought it among the best mechanics in the Chicago area. This was to become characteristic of Pullman who would always attempt to have the best possible laborers in his employ. He was advised to get the assistance of Leonard Seibert, an expert in woodcraft, who had a shop in Bloomington, Illinois. Mr. Seibert later described the modifications that were made in two coaches of the Chicago and Alton Railroads:

> In 1858 Mr. Pullman came to Bloomington and engaged me to do the work of remodeling two Chicago and Alton coaches into the first sleeping cars. The contract was that Mr. Pullman should make all necessary changes inside of the cars. After looking over the entire passenger car equipment of the road, which at that time constituted about a dozen cars, we selected Coaches No. 9 and 19. They were forty-four feet long, had flat roofs like box cars, single sash windows, of which there were fourteen on a side, the glass in each sash being only a little over one foot square. The roof was only a trifle over six feet from the floor of the car. Into this car we got ten sleeping car sections, besides a linen locker and two washrooms - one at each end.[9]

In this primitive sleeper Pullman had already incorporated his idea for an upper berth. It was suspended by ropes and pulleys from iron rods that reached from the floor to the ceiling of the car. During the day the bunk was hoisted up to the ceiling and at night lowered for use. The lower berth was made from the seats which were hinged so that they would fold into it, just as the lower berth of a Pullman is made today.[10] The cost of each coach was between $1,000 and $2,000 and at their completion, Pullman received a contract to remodel twelve more coaches for the line.[11]

Whether Pullman momentarily lost interest in the sleeping car business or felt that he needed more capital before carrying his innovations further we do not know, but, in 1859, he left Chicago to take part in the Colorado gold rush.[12] He failed to strike it rich in the gold fields, but did succeed in compiling a small fortune by supplying the other miners with goods. In 1863, he returned to Chicago with $20,000 and proceeded to build the first real Pullman car.[13]

Pullman and Field were still partners and together they took out a patent on the basic change that made Pullman cars the most successful sleeping cars in America. This change was the hinged upper berth which could be used to store bedding. Pullman and Field patented the hinged upper berth in April, 1864. They took out an additional patent on the lower berth, which was made by folding down the back of one seat until it joined with the next seat, in September, 1865.[14] The first car that incorporated these changes was built by Pullman and Field at a cost of $18,000 to $20,000 and took almost a year to build. It was named the "Pioneer".[15]

In this first car Pullman showed that his early lessons in the commercial value of the very best had not been forgotten. The new car was much more comfortable than the old sleepers and much more ornate. There were

two bunks to each set of seats, just as in the modern Pullman. Each car had a porter who made up the beds in the evening. Another advantage was that since the new cars were heavier and more substantial than their predecessors they were safer. In naming this first car Pullman reflected his confidence in the appeal of a product of superior quality, for he added an "A" to designate that this was just the first of many "Pioneers."[16]

This confidence was almost misplaced for the railroads were reluctant to test the appeal of the "Pioneer" since it was a foot wider and two and one-half feet higher than any car then in service. This meant it was too large for the existing railroad bridges and stations. Pullman was faced with the problem of selling his product to the railroads. In doing this Pullman made extensive use of publicity and advertising. After the assassination of President Lincoln a great mourning train was put together to carry the President's body from Washington to Springfield, Illinois, where he was to be buried. This train stopped in every town and village along the way in order that the people could pay a final tribute to the President. Pullman offered his new car to Mrs. Lincoln for part of the trip and the offer was accepted. The "Pioneer" was to be attached to the train at Chicago and make the trip to Springfield. The Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad could not refuse the request of Mrs. Lincoln to have the "Pioneer" attached to the train and changed the dimensions on its bridges and stations to accomodate the car. The "Pioneer" was thus exposed to the gaze of many of the citizens of Illinois and gained a great deal of publicity. It had also gained a line on which it could travel. By 1866, there were five Pullman sleepers in operation on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.[17]

But other railroad companies were still not willing to give the new

cars a chance. The general opinion of the railroad managers was that people would not use the Pullman sleepers, preferring instead the older cars at a cheaper price. This was probably as much an excuse by the railroad executives to save themselves the cost of changing their bridges and stations as a real belief that the public would not accept the Pullman cars. At this point the genius of Pullman showed itself. He fully believed that his cars were the best and that people would be willing to pay a somewhat higher charge to use the very best. He therefore proposed a test, matching his sleepers against the older model on the same train.

A short time after the "Pioneer" had been introduced on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, General Grant, the hero of the North and a close personal friend of Pullman, had requested the use of the car for a trip he was taking from Chicago to his home at Galena, Illinois. This time the Michigan Central had found that it would not refuse a prominent public figure and had made the appropriate changes on its equipment.[18] Pullman now went to the president of that line with his proposal for a trial between the old and the new. He wanted a train to be made up with both the old sleepers and his Pullmans on it. The idea was accepted and the price for a bunk on one of the older sleeping cars was set at $1.50, for a Pullman berth the price was $2.00. Within a few days the Pullmans were filled and the other cars were withdrawn from service.[19] George Pullman had found his belief in the commercial value of the best vindicated. He also used the success of his cars over the older models as an advertising point to sell his cars to other railroads. The Chicago, Burlington and Quincy and the Michigan Central advertised that they could provide Pullman sleepers for their passengers and took passenger traffic away from their competitors.

The demand for the new sleepers quickly spread, but before their use could become widespread another difficulty had to be surmounted. This was the wide variance in gauge of the many railroads in the United States which made it impossible to go any great distance in the same car. The railroads of New England had adopted a gauge of four feet, eight and one-half inches because this was the gauge that was used in England and the early New England railroads used English locomotives. As locomotives were built in the United States varying gauges were tried to see which would be the best. Southern railroads commonly used a five-foot gauge, although this was not exclusive. It was in the Midwest that the gauge showed the most variation. These differences were partially due to the fact that many early railroads were built to obtain a monopoly on the trade of a certain region and the railroad did not want it to be easy to divert that traffic. For example, the Erie Railroad decided on a gauge of six feet so that its cars could not be used on any other railroad.

During the Civil War there was great pressure to standardize the gauge in both North and South to make the transportation of men and supplies easier. This pressure was answered by many expedients including the use of carriages on which the wheels could be placed at varying widths and carriages from which the car could easily be lifted by cranes and placed on another carriage. After the Civil War it was decided by the Federal Government, under the influence of New Englanders, that the first transcontinental railroad should have a gauge of four feet, eight and one-half inches. Gradually all of the railroads of the United States adopted this gauge.[20]

In 1867, the Great Western Railroad became the first to standardize its gauge for the Chicago to New York run. To celebrate this an excursion

was planned between the two cities and the newest Pullman car, the "Western World", was chartered for the train. This was an hotel car, a car with a kitchen at one end. The train left Chicago on January 8, and arrived in New York on January 14, occasionally reaching speeds of 40 miles an hour.[1] This excursion is an example of Pullman's use of nineteenth century promotion techniques. The accounts of the trip in the newspapers devoted a great deal of space to the beauty and luxury of the Pullman car. It was all free advertising and worth millions of dollars. Those railroads which did not have Pullman cars quickly tried to get them.

With the reputation of the Pullman car for comfort and luxury safely established the Pullman Company set about expanding. In 1867, Pullman cars were operating on four railroads, the Michigan Central, Great Western, New York Central, and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy. Pullman cars were not sold to the railroads. The railroads had to contract for them and Pullman kept complete control, even supplying his own employees to operate them. All other sleeping car companies followed the policy of leasing cars rather than selling them. As a result of long term leases some sleeping car manufacturers were able to stay in business long after the Pullman cars were generally accepted as the best. The leading competitors of the Pullman Company were the Gates Sleeping Car Company, the Mann Boudoir Company, the Woodruff Sleeping Car Company, the Flower Sleeping Car Company, and the Wagner Sleeping Car Company. Although Woodruff had been in the field before Pullman, the Pullman Company was the leader by 1867.

Pullman was fortunate in that his first major expansion brought him into contact with a man whose major interests lay outside the area of railroading, Andrew Carnegie. Carnegie was at that time superintendent of the

Pennsylvania Railroad and had organized the Central Transportation Company to produce sleeping cars. Both he and Pullman wanted to obtain the contract for the soon-to-be-completed Union Pacific Railroad. The two men were invited to present their bids in person and Carnegie, as he was leaving the room, met Pullman, who was about to enter. Carnegie proposed that rather than compete they join forces to obtain the contract. Pullman accepted and, as a result, the Pullman Palace Car Company, with Pullman and Carnegie as chief stockholders, was incorporated in 1867.[22] In 1869, when the Union Pacific met the Central Pacific at Ogden, Utah, Pullman cars were on the train.

The merger with Carnegie, who used his stock to back his move into the steel industry,[23] had even more benefits for Pullman. Carnegie was quite pleased with the business ability of Pullman and, after the formation of the Pullman Palace Car Company, he urged the complete consolidation of the Central Transportation Company with the Pullman interests. This was accomplished and Pullman acquired the contract for the Pennsylvania trunk line to the Atlantic seaboard.[24]

Getting the contract to run sleepers on the Union Pacific gave Pullman a tremendous propaganda edge on the other companies that produced sleeping cars. He again received a great deal of newspaper coverage and people started to ride on lines that used Pullman cars. To promote this publicity to the utmost Pullman arranged for another tour. This one would be coast to coast, from Boston to San Francisco. In May, 1870, the members of the Boston Board of Trade left on the first through train from Boston to the West Coast. The train was made up primarily of Pullman sleepers and one of the new dining cars that Pullman had introduced in 1868. Even the menu that was served as printed in the newspapers.[25] Pullman was again

demonstrating his theory of the value of the very best.

Using his control of patents, new developments in cars such as the dining car, and making maximum use of publicity, Pullman gradually squeezed his competitors out of existence. The Woodruff Company and the Mann Boudoir Company operated at a disadvantage because of the design of their cars. The Mann cars had their berths placed across the car rather than parallel with the sides. This allowed greater privacy to the passengers, but meant that the cars could contain less than half the berths that the Pullmans could.[6] The Woodruff cars had their berths along the sides of the car but had fewer berths than the Pullman cars. Neither company was able to take in as much money as Pullman could, due to this disadvantage.[7] In 1889, the two companies combined as the Union Palace Car Company and the same year Pullman bought the combined company.[8]

The Flower Sleeping Car Company operated entirely on a few small lines in New England and was never a threat to Pullman. In these cars the berths were placed next to each other up the center of the car. This enabled them to be made into double berths.[9]

The most stubborn of Pullman's competitors was the Wagner Sleeping Car Company which had the backing of Commodore Vanderbilt and an exclusive contract to supply sleepers for all of the lines that the Commodore controlled. Wagner had started on his own policy of consolidation in 1869, when he absorbed the Gates Sleeping Car Company, headed by G. B. Gates, manager of the Lake Shore Railroad. The Gates Company had been one of the earliest in the field after Pullman and, just before being taken over by Wagner, the Gates' cars had replaced Pullman's on the New York Central. This happened when Vanderbilt was allowed to merge the Hudson River Railroad

with the New York Central to form the New York Central System.[30]

In 1875, Pullman rented certain of his patents to the Wagner Company and then saw Wagner cars replace his on the Michigan Central when Vanderbilt purchased that railroad.[31] Pullman retaliated by bringing suit against Wagner for infringement of certain basic patent rights and hiring Roscoe Conkling, Senator from New York, to represent him.[32] This began a long series of suits between the two companies. In January, 1880, a Chicago newspaper reported that a merger between the two companies was near,[33] but in June Pullman started another suit.[34]

The final suit between Pullman and Wagner started in 1881 over the vestibule. A connecting vestibule between passenger cars had been invented by John Sessions, a Pullman employee, and was patented by Pullman in 1881.[35] Wagner had immediately copied this invention and Pullman sued the Wagner Company for $1,000,000 in damages. A decision was given in favor of Pullman by a United States Circuit Court in 1889. Wagner still had his contract with Vanderbilt lines which enabled him to stay in business until the late 1890's, when his company was absorbed by the Pullman Company and the last of the competition had disappeared.[36] Perhaps Andrew Carnegie summed up this phase of George Pullman's career the best when he said, "Pullman monopolized everything. It was well that it should be so. The man had arisen who could manage and the tools belonged to him."[37]

There were complaints about this monopoly that Pullman was building. One of the earliest was an article that was carried in the St. Louis Daily Democrat on February 28, 1873, which stated, "The Pullman palace-sleeping-car [sic] business is, as our readers are aware, one of the most grasping and gigantic monopolies that exists in the present age". This was not the prevailing opinion, however, and most periodicals looked upon Pullman as

a public benefactor. Only in the South was there ever any strong resentment against the Pullman dominance and this was short lived. The resentment was a result of Pullman's compliance with the Civil Rights Bill of 1875.

At the end of the Civil War the South had been one of the most fertile grounds for the expansion of the Pullman Palace Car Company. Sleeping cars had been almost unknown in the South before and during the war so there were no competitors when Pullman moved in.[38] As early as 1866, even before his combination with Carnegie, Pullman made his first moves into the South. His ally in this venture was Hannibal I. Kimball, a carpetbagger from Connecticut, who was a close friend of Rufus Bullock, the Reconstruction Governor of Georgia. Kimball became the president of many railroads in Georgia and naturally Pullman cars were used on these railroads.[39]

Pullman abided by the state laws that required segregation of the races on railroad trains until the 1875 law. Then Pullman ordered his superintendents to allow people to purchase tickets regardless of race. In the North he was applauded:

> One thing is certain: if any man can give the Civil Rights law practical opinion, PULLMAN is the man. Besides, he is a warm personal friend of President Grant, and it is more likely that the move gets its inspiration, or at least encouragement, from the Executive. Between the two it will be very apt to go through, for both are "very obstinate men."[40]

In the South there was a strong reaction against the use of the sleeping cars:

> We got along without sleeping cars in the olden times, and we can do it again. Let every white person avoid Pullman's sleeping cars and surrender them to the exclusive occupancy of the negroes [sic]. We shall see who will get tired first, the white people or the Pullman Sleeping Car Company [sic].[41]

Pullman did not maintain his support of the Civil Rights Bill, for with

the end of Reconstruction, Negroes in the South were again barred from riding on Pullmans with whites except as porters and the Pullman cars became the most popular sleeping cars in the South, as they were throughout the nation. As evidence of this popularity the Chicago, St. Louis and New Orleans, one of the South's leading railroads, contracted for Pullman cars in 1878, soon after the Louisiana Reconstruction government was forced out.[42]

Pullman does not appear very "obstinate" in his support of the Civil Rights Bill. The Chicago Post and Mail's reference to Pullman's friendship with Grant provides a possible clue to his behavior. Pullman and Grant were good friends and Grant and his family often visited with the Pullman family at Pullman's summer home in the Thousand Islands.[43] Grant was engaged at this time in a struggle to hold several of the Southern states in the Republican Party and was courting the votes of the Negroes. Any help that a leading industrialist like Pullman could give would be greatly appreciated. Pullman, who was also a staunch Republican, would naturally like to see the Republican Party stay in power. He had very little to worry about in giving this help. No competing sleeping car company had been able to develop in the South after the Civil War and he knew that he could not lose any business permanently.

By 1880, George Mortimer Pullman was 49 years old and a millionaire. He had seen his early confidence in the commercial value of the best supported by public opinion. His sleeping cars were widely recognized as the best and Pullman did everything possible to see that they kept this preeminence. Pullman had introduced new cars such as the restaurant car, dining car and parlor car to hold his position. He incorporated all the newest inventions like the air brake into his cars and went further, having his employees develop improvements such as the vestibule. He controlled many

of the basic patents on these cars and inventions and had made use of newspapers in advertising his cars. In all of this Pullman had shown a tendency to be an innovator and experimenter. He was a man who was always willing to try new ideas and developments.[44]

Pullman had other characteristics that helped to make him a successful businessman. It was well known that he was an extremely stubborn man. This stubborness showed itself in his long fight with the Wagner Sleeping Car Company. It was also evident in his relations with his workers during the Pullman Strike. This stubborness always made Pullman a dangerous adversary. Loyalty to family and friends was another of Pullman's traits. Two of his brothers were executives in the Pullman Company and Pullman always maintained the closest relations with his family.[45] John Sessions, who had started out as a mechanic, ended up as the superintendent of the plant at Pullman Illinois. But to most of his employees Pullman was inaccessible. He lived with his wife and family in Chicago at 18th and Prairie, near the home of his friend Philip Armour.[46] Pullman was rarely found at any of his plants except when he was showing them to some group.

Pullman presents a picture that fits well into the stereotype of the "robber baron" at this point. He was a monopolist who was crushing out all competition. He was allied with other "robber barons." But he was not a Jay Gould. Pullman was no destroyer; he always tried to produce the best possible product and build an industry. He was a poor boy who made quite good.[47] Pullman had shown at this stage in his life nothing that was unique. He had dominated an industry and made millions of dollars, but so had others. He had carved out a place for himself in our industrial history just as Rockefeller of Carnegie had, but he did not attempt to form a philosophy of business as Carnegie did, he did not develop new forms of business

organization as Rockefeller did. Then, in 1880, Pullman started on his biggest experiment. It would occupy the rest of his life and provide him with his own niche in the history of the United States.

This new experiment would reflect Pullman's character. It would be an attempt to provide the very best accomodations for workers. The best accomodations should attract the best workers and the best workers would give the Pullman Company the best product. Pullman's belief in the value of the best was still being shown. These workers would not be lost because Pullman would supply them with unmatched working and living conditions. And if any difficulties should arise Pullman would pursue his object with the same stubborness that he showed in his relations with the Wagner Company.

1. George Rogers Taylor, The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1951, pp. 75-76.

2. In reference to this see Frances W. Gregory and Irene D. Neu, "The American Industrial Elite in the 1870's: Their Social Origins," Men in Business, ed. William Miller. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 196 .

3. Carroll B. Harding, George M. Pullman (1831-1897) and the Pullman Company. New York: The Newcomen Society in North America, 1951, p. 9.

4. John McLean, One Hundred Years in Illinois. Chicago: Peterson Linotyping Company, 1919, p. 219 and The Daily Inter Ocean, October 20, 1897.

5. Carl W. Mitman, "George M. Pullman," Dictionary of American Biography, edited by Dumas Malone, Vol. XV. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935, p. 263.

6. Urban G. Willis, Manuscript in the collection of Mrs. C. Philip Miller, granddaughter of Mr. Pullman.

7. The Daily Inter Ocean, October 20, 1897.

8. Ibid. Pullman later bought Field's share of the business.

9. Joseph Husband, The Story of the Pullman Car. Chicago: A. C. McClurg, 1917, p. 28.

10. Ibid., pp. 30-31

11. Harding, p. 11

12. Urban Willis in one of the manuscripts in the Miller collection states that Pullman's twelve cars were taken over by the government in 1861.

13. Harding, p. 12.

14. Mitman, p. 264.

15. St. Louis Post Despatch, May 26, 1885. Clipping in the Pullman Collection at the Newberry Library.

16. Husband, pp. 33 and 39.

17. The Daily Inter Ocean, October 20, 1897.

18. Ibid.

19. Husband, p. 41.

20. The information about railroad gauges in the last two paragraphs is taken from George Rogers Taylor and Irene D. Neu, The American Railroad Network 1861-1900. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1956, pp. 13-57.

21. Chicago Tribune, January 9, 1867, and Husband, p. 51

22. Chicago Times, February 17, 1875, and Andrew Carnegie, Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920, pp. 159-161.

23. Carnegie sold his shares in the company during the panic of 1873, to protect his steel interests. Carnegie made this judgement of Pullman: "He was one of those rare characters who can see the drift of things, and was always to be found, so to speak, swimming in the main current where movement was the fastest." Autobiography, p. 161.

24. Ibid.

25. Boston Daily Evening Transcript, May 23, 1870.

26. Slason Thompson, A Short History of American Railways. Chicago: Bureau of Railway News and Statistics, 1925, p. 145.

27. Husband, p. 81.

28. Ibid., pp. 83-84.

29. Ibid., p. 81.

30. This brought Pullman into alliance with Jay Gould, Vanderbilt's major enemy in the railroad business.

31. Chicago Tribune, October 19, 1875.

32. Kansas City Journal, November 12, 1875. Clipping in the Pullman Collection at the Newberry Library. The nation-wide interest in Pullman is reflected by this article in a Kansas City newspaper.

33. Chicago Times, January 31, 1880.

34. Chicago Tribune, June 8, 1880.

35. Husband, p. 17.

36. Ibid., pp. 83-85.

37. Quoted in Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961, p. 145.

38. Robert C. Black, The Railroads of the Confederacy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1952, p. 19.

39. John F. Stover, The Railroads of the South 1865-1900. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955, pp. 80-82.

40. The Chicago Post and Mail, April 8, 1875.

41. Vicksburg Daily Herald, May 9, 1875. Clipping in the Pullman Collection at the Newberry Library.

42. Stover, p. 182.

43. When Grant's second term as President was completed, Pullman hired Horace Porter, Grant's personal secretary, as president of the Pullman Palace Car Company.

44. When one of his employees invented a horseless carriage, Pullman made a trip to the town of Pullman to inspect it, planning to invest in the invention if it seemed workable. Unfortunately the machine broke down a mile from the train station and Pullman had to walk back. It was a hot summer day and Mr. Pullman's always short temper became shorter as he walked along. He fired every man who spoke to him. Later he rescinded the firings, but never invested in the horseless carriage.

45. Interview with Mrs. C. Philip Miller, granddaughter of Mr. Pullman, July 20, 1963, Chicago, Illinois.

46. The Daily Inter Ocean, October 20, 1897.

47. The opinion of Andrew Carnegie, quoted in Cochran and Miller, p. 153.

II

THE START OF THE GREAT EXPERIMENT

In 1880, Pullman had shops in St. Louis, Detroit, Wilmington, Delaware, and Elmira, New York. The Detroit shop was engaged in manufacturing new cars while the other three were mainly involved in repair work. The expansion of the Pullman business between 1867 and 1880, required a new plant. Pullman had also decided to branch out and to start building freight cars which would require new shops.[1] But Pullman had much more on his mind than just a new plant. He had determined to build a new town.[2]

This town was to be Pullman's answer to the labor upheavals of the nineteenth century. A brochure published by the Company for distribution at the Columbian Exposition attached great importance to this decision. Its realization in the town of Pullman was intended to establish Pullman's place in American industrial history. It would help the workers by providing decent living conditions and management by attracting workers of the highest quality.[3]

George M. Pullman was faced with a problem common to all manufacturers, attracting the "quality" worker. All of his previous business experience emphasized the value of the best and Pullman realized that the best workers would produce the best product. As his business expanded Pullman required more and more of these men. The common practice of entrepreneurs during the nineteenth century was to hire workers at fair wages during good times and to let them go or cut their wages during periods of business inactivity.[4] Pullman did not intend to change this prevailing concept. He needed something besides job security to influence the "best" workers to work for him.

Pullman's answer was a company town, a town that would provide accomodations superior to any that a worker could then find elsewhere. During periods of high employment and high wages the town would attract workers. During periods of low wages the workers would be encouraged to stay on because of the quality of the living conditions.

It is impossible to determine where Pullman got the idea for building a model town. The most famous experiment of this sort in 1880, was the town of Saltaire in England. This was a factory community built by Sir Titus Salt for his textile workers. Saltaire had been well publicized and Pullman surely must have been aware of it. In 1880, Pullman had just returned from a European trip which included a visit to England. There is no record of his having visited Saltaire, but it was possible that he did. There were similarities between Saltaire and Pullman's town.[5]

A model town would have many attractions for the average laborer of 1880. Without modern means of transportation, workers had to live close to their jobs. This meant that any large factory that was not located in a town soon had a town grow up around it. These towns were primitive and factory owners were quick to see that building towns for their employees could be profitable. It would be possible to pay the workers in food and lodging instead of money. By 1830, two types of towns had been developed, the Rhode Island and the Waltham. In the Rhode Island system, tenements were provided for families to live in. These tenements were dreary and insufficiently lighted and ventilated. Plumbing facilities were nonexistent and there often was no pure water supply. Under the Waltham system, the workers, usually young women, lived in boarding houses. These boarding houses were well regulated but the living conditions were no better than under the

Rhode Island system.[6] As the century progressed, the conditions seem to have worsened rather than improved.[7]

The conditions in the cities were generally worse than in the factory towns. People were forced to live in filthy basements where there was no plumbing and frequently no windows. After a storm flooded floors were common.[8] Even if a family was fortunate enough to obtain an apartment above ground, they were crowded into a small space so that there were often eight to ten persons to a room.[9] These were the conditions that George Pullman hoped to remedy with his model town.

While George Pullman planned to construct a huge industrial complex, he did not propose to pay more for it than he had to. With typical carefulness, he kept all of his plans secret until he had purchased the land at the lowest possible price. Pullman even attempted to misdirect those who hoped to speculate on the land he wanted. He looked at possible sites all over the Midwest, planting stories about a number of them. For awhile St. Louis was thought to be the place.[10] By 1880, it was known that the plant would be up in the Chicago area, but Pullman had led people to believe that it would be to the west of the city, possibly in Aurora.[11] Actually, Pullman planned to build south of Chicago, but he had done such a good job of camouflage that just two months before the official announcement of the site, the Chicago Times carried a story stating:

> This THE TIMES cannot answer definitely, but it is in a position to make a shrewd guess, and can state with positiveness, on the personal assurance of Mr. A. B. Pullman [brother of George Pullman and General Manager of the company], that the prize will not go to South Chicago, nor anywhere in that southern region.[12]

Pullman almost failed to keep his secret thanks to clever detective work by Fredrick Cook, the head of the real estate department of the

Chicago Times. Cook had his suspicions aroused when Pullman visited every area around Chicago except the far south side. The reporter noticed that some men he knew to have previously associated with Pullman were buying property around Lake Calumet. One day he confronted Pullman with his suspicion.

> It was always a pleasure to interview Mr. Pullman, for he had a way of making you feel at ease, and I entered heartily into the humor of his jocularity. But, as in a bantering way, I let out link after link of my chain of evidence, he became more and more serious, and finally --- without commiting himself, however --- took the ground that even if true, in view of the importance of their plans, no paper having the good of Chicago at heart ought by premature publication to interfere with them . . . , On the other hand, if I withheld publication, he promised that I should have the matter exclusively . . . .

Cook asked his editor if this arrangement would be agreeable and the editor, who owned property on the south side and hoped to profit from a general improvement of the area, agreed.[13]

Up to two weeks before the publication of the choice, Pullman continued his plan of misdirection by visiting Hinsdale, Illinois, as a possible choice.[14] Finally, on April 26, 1880, Pullman made the official announcement that the plant would go up in the southern part of the village of Hyde Park which lay just south of Chicago.[15]

In selecting the site for his town and new plant, George Pullman showed much of the foresight that had enabled him to build his sleeping car empire. To carry out his plans, Pullman had purchased 4,500 acres in the Lake Calumet area and had set aside 500 for the town and factory site. The rest was saved for future expansion.[16] Pullman planned an industrial development that would fit in with his theory of the commercial value of quality. His town would be the best that could be built and it would pay, pay in many ways.

The location of the town itself was picked with an eye towards the future possibilities for expansion of the whole area. Pullman believed that the region would eventually become the greatest manufacturing district in the United States. He told John McLean, the company surgeon, that Lake Calumet would make an "unexcelled" port, giving an all-water route for the iron of Minnesota and northern Michigan to be brought to his plant. The great coal fields of southern Illinois were near, providing fuel for the factories and, finally, Chicago was the logical railroad center for the nation,[17] ensuring easy distribution of products. In all this he forecast accurately, as the area between Chicago and Gary shows today. Pullman's belief in the future development of Lake Calumet lasted for the rest of his life and was restated in the pamphlet prepared by the Pullman Company for the Chicago Fair of 1893: "It is only a matter of a short time when Lake Calumet, along which the Pullman land stretches for miles, will become an inside harbor."[18]

Lake Calumet figured in Pullman's plans as more than a future port. The clay that made up the shore and bottom of the lake was ideal for the making of bricks which would be used to construct the factories and houses of the town.[19] A dual purpose would be served, as the clay was dredged, the lake would be deepened and slips for the future port would be excavated. Water gas, to be used for the illumination of the shops and dwellings, could be manufactured on the shore of the lake.[20] Ice could be cut from the lake in the winter.[21]

Another, and perhaps even more important, advantage of the Lake Calumet area was that as it developed, other manufacturing enterprises would settle there. These, of course, would have to buy or rent land from Pullman and

would indirectly come under his control. McLean believed that this was the reason for the purchase of the extra 4,000 acres and that Pullman planned eventually a large industrial community, constructed in harmony with his model city.[22] This was one hope which Mr. Pullman never saw realized. In fact, Pullman's actions probably did more to keep other enterprises out, than to attract them. One such company that did locate at Pullman was the Allen Paper Car Wheel Company. This company manufactured wheels for locomotives and railroad cars by a new method using wood pulp that was placed in forms under hydraulic pressure. The pulp became as hard as granite and was sheathed in steel bands and faced with iron plates. Wheels made in this manner were supposed to last longer than solid steel wheels, but the method has now been abandoned. The Allen Company did most of its business with Pullman and was absorbed by the Pullman Company.[23] This was the experience of the other companies that settled in Pullman and, according to Dr. McLean, after a few instances of absorption, no other firms decided to locate there.[24]

It is obvious that Pullman had investigated all the possible advantages of the Lake Calumet area before picking it for the town site. The same planning that had gone into picking the location was shown in the actual construction of the town. Pullman hired two men who had previously done work for him to plan the town. One, Nathan F. Barrett, a landscape engineer, had laid out the grounds for Pullman's estate at Elberton, New Jersey. The other, Spencer S. Beman, an architect, had been recommended by Barrett and had designed the house on the Elberton estate. Pullman was thoroughly impressed with the work of both men and when he decided to build his town he asked Beman to do the designs for the buildings and Barrett the landscaping

for the town. These two men hired their own crew of architects and draftsmen and proceeded to draw up the plans. One of these draftsmen has left us an account of what Beman and Barrett hoped to produce:

> There was no attempt in Pullman to produce sophisticated architecture but, rather, to build buildings including shops and dwellings where human beings could work in comfort and rest in bodily enjoyment and spiritual content. [sic] If the elements of style consist in honest construction, adaptation to purpose, appeal to comfort, and the unostentatious application of the principles of good taste including harmony and unity, then not only the buildings but the town as well were bathed in an essence of style.[25]

This quote explains very well Pullman's idea of what his town should be. It was to be functional and to serve certain definite purposes. It was not planned as a sub-division is today, to be beautiful, but rather to be adaptable to Pullman's objectives. Still, the town was attractive and, in 1881, when the town was ready for occupancy, Pullman remarked to Dr. McLean that "beauty has an intrinsic value." McLean thought that "this was his central idea in working out the plans for the town of Pullman."[26]

Construction started on May 26, 1880, and progressed rapidly.[27] Most of the buildings were of brick. By 1892, 1717 of them had been constructed. All of these houses had front and back yards with a wood and coal shed for each. Most of the buildings were two stories high. These contained two flats, having from two to four rooms and renting for from six to nine dollars a month. There were, in addition, large tenements in which the apartments were of five rooms with a basement and separate entrances for each. These rented for from $14 to $16 per month. Finally, there were single houses whose rents varied from two dollars a day to $5,000 a year.[28]

All of the brick houses were furnished with water, gas, and sewage facilities and all had basements. A few of the more expensive dwellings had bath tubs and were heated by steam.[29] These were items that most

laborers' homes lacked at that time. Perhaps the most noteworthy features of the town were the measures taken to promote sanitation. All of the brick houses had complete sewage facilities. The sewage pipes were deep enough to pass under all of the surface drains which carried rain water to Lake Calumet. The sewage was carried to a large cistern at one end of the town and there pumped to a farm three miles away and used as fertilizer. This sewage farm was considered one of the landmarks of the town. It was one hundred and forty acres in size. Pipes had been laid over the whole area for the distribution of the sewage. The organic matter became the fertilizer and the excess water which was filtered by the soil was run off to Lake Calumet.[30]

The town's water supply for drinking was purchased from Chicago which got its water from Lake Michigan.[31] Garbage was collected daily at company expense from containers provided by the company.[32] All of these sanitation facilities, which so many laborer's homes of the 1880's lacked, helped to give the town a low death rate of 7 to 14 per thousand, as compared to 20 per thousand in Chicago during the period Pullman was independent of Chicago.[33]

Pullman's desire for a beautiful town was reflected in the landscaping of the town. The town was laid out in rectangular blocks, with the shops to the north of Florence Avenue (now 111th Street), the main street, and the dwellings and commercial buildings to the south. The more impressive buildings and the better homes were placed near the train tracks where they were immediately visible, as was a small park. The tenements were on the east side, farthest from the tracks. Pullman had 30,000 trees planted, oak, elm, maple, and aspen, to beautify the streets and parks.[34] In August, 1881, Pullman wrote to his mother:

> The place has improved wonderfully since June and I am sure you would be quite delighted to see it. Florence Avenue and all the little parks are now quite complete. There are great quantities of flowers which with the trees, shrubbery and fresh green lawns makes a beautiful picture.
>
> If the Hotel was ready for occupancy I think I would prefer to stay there instead of Chicago.[35]

The hotel was one of the major features of the town. It was named after Pullman's daughter, Florence, for whom the main thoroughfare was also named. The many famous visitors who came to see the town were lodged there. The hotel was located on Florence Avenue and was just east of the Illinois Central Station. The hotel was unique in that it contained the only bar in the town of Pullman.[36]

The largest building in the southern part of the town was the Arcade Building which housed many of the businesses which supplied the town's people with their necessities. It was an irregularly shaped building of the local red brick with a three-story central portion and a two story outer ring. The whole structure covers nearly an acre of ground. On the first floor were the bank, post office, a restaurant and numerous stores. The second story contained the library, theater, town offices, halls which were rented by various lodges and churches, and offices for doctors and dentists. On the third floor were the rooms where the Masons, Odd Fellows, Ancient Order of United Workmen, and Royal League met.[37]

The Arcade Theater was located over the west entrance of the Arcade and had a seating capacity of nearly 1,000. It was decorated in a very ornate style with frescoes on the ceiling, dragons in the corners of the ceilings, and a drop curtain that was painted as an oriental pavilion.[38] The theater was used three or four times a month. The entertainment consisted mainly of minstrel shows and touring companies. Also located in the Arcade was the

Pullman Library which was established for the use of all of the inhabitants of the town. The library officially opened on April 10, 1883.[39] By 1892, there were 7,750 volumes in the library and the circulation reached 20,221 for the year ending July 31, 1892.[40]

The town had one church, a block south of the hotel, which was a Gothic building of green serpentine stone which had been brought from New England. It was the only building in the town not built of the native brick. There was also a school building which was three stories high and equipped with the most modern facilities of the period.[47]

The planning that went into the construction of the town of Pullman shows that George Pullman had not forgotten the lesson that he had learned in his cabinet-making days. He had produced a product of the best quality, convinced that it would provide its worth. In this case, though, Pullman was not completely interested in making money directly from his investment. The town would prove its worth by attracting workers of the best quality to the Pullman enterprises. Money would be made indirectly through the savings in labor costs that the best workers would accomplish. Pullman, of course, was thinking in an entirely materialistic vein. Everything had been provided for the physical comfort of the employees that the town would attract; the spiritual -- as we will see -- was ignored.

The work of building the town of Pullman was never completed for buildings were added up to the date of its disappearance as an independent entity. However, some homes were completed within a year and the first inhabitant, E. A. Benson, a practical car builder, moved in, in January 1881.[42] In April, the machinery was installed in the car shops and the factory went into operation.[43]

During the next few years, most of the more important buildings were

finished. In the case of some of the public buildings, Pullman invited noted orators of the day to be present at their openings and to give an address. These speeches were always highly complimentary to Pullman and to his town. The first of these was made by Stewart Woodford, Congressman from New York, who gave the address at the opening of the Pullman Theater on January 9, 1883. In his audience were George M. Pullman and his family, the guest of honor, General Philip Sheridan, military commander of the Chicago district, and an imposing list of Chicago's leading citizens including Judge Lyman Trumbull, Marshall Field, and John Crerar.[44]

According to Representative Woodford:

> Here capital does not seek to pauperize labor nor does it seek to rob it. Labor earns its own pay, pays its own way, and respects itself. This experiment in a factory town where beauty, books, art, and culture adorn labor and lighten its labors and burdens and increases its joys and well being, is alreay an accomplished success. But better than material production, sweeter than flowers and more beautiful than theater, library, or school, shall be the manhood that will be developed here.[45]

He concluded that "It was wise to give labor a chance to grow upward."[46]

Representative Woodford was not the only one who regarded George Pullman as a great benefactor. A few months later, at the opening of the Pullman Library, the Reverend David Swing, a leading Chicago minister, gave an address along the same lines. According to Reverend Mr. Swing, the town of Pullman provided an answer to the question of the manner in which a man should live. He praised Pullman for his intelligent planning and the "sense of harmony" of the town. But "the material symmetry of this new city is only the outward emblem of a moral unity among its inhabitants. Unity great enough to hold men together but not strong enough to cramp human nature in any of its honorable departments." This unity was founded on industry and work for all. Finally, Reverend Swing made the startling

comment that "industry will always surpass philosophy as the basis of welfare. Wise is the age that bases society upon industry."[47]

These two speeches illustrate the ideas that predominated among a fairly large and very influential segment of the American population during the so-called "Gilded Age". This was a group that had been drenched in the writings that poured forth from Herbert Spencer, William Graham Sumner and other proponents of the "gospel of wealth". The capitalist was looked upon by them as the highest form of mankind and the accumulation of wealth as the highest object of man. To these men Pullman was an innovator who had added a new dimension to the theory of capital accumulation. "Give labor a chance to grow upward" and reap the benefits of a better class of laborers. The town of Pullman was certainly an indication of the wisdom of the age for it was based upon industry and it appeared successful. George Pullman believed that he had accomplished one of his objectives. His workers had started to improve themselves. He commented, in 1885, that he was "at first . . . sick at heart," when he saw the poverty and poor possessions of the workers who first moved into the new buildings. Six months later he was "greatly encouraged" to see the progress that had been made. "Evidently they were striving to make their homes correspond to their surroundings; and, if able to do nothing more to beautify them, they at least kept them cleaner and planted flowers in their windows."[48]

Pullman was too much the capitalist to ignore the possibility for direct profit that lay in his town. His workers did not receive their opportunity to better themselves for a bargain rate. In fact, many commentators later reached the conclusion that the town was strictly a business venture, the most important item being the stockholders' return.[49] The rents for

the houses and flats were set originally to provide a six percent return on the investment and were never changed.[50] Later, these rents were to bring about the ruin of the experiment and prove both Representative Woodford and Reverend Swing wrong in their estimation of the town. The harmony and unity that they saw never existed.

Pullman himself gave a final summary of his reasons for building the town in 1894, at the investigation into the causes of the Chicago strike. In this defense of his motives some of his personal philosophy became apparent. First, Pullman wished to establish a "great manufacturing business." But this had to rest on the laborers who were "the most important element which enters into the successful operation of any manufacturing enterprise." To attract these workers, attractive homes were built and "all baneful influences" were excluded. This "would result . . . in a tendency toward continued elevation and improvement of the condition not only of the working people themselves, but of their children growing up about them." This for Pullman showed a point of view that was rather advanced for an industrialist of the late 1880's and 90's. He recognized that the workman was the basis for any successful business and that it was important to attract the best workman. He also showed an interest in the families of his workmen that certainly was not common in the late nineteenth century. But then Pullman went on to state that:

> The relations of those employed in the shops are, as to the shops, the relations of employees to employer, and as to those of them and others living in the homes, the relations are simply and only the relations of tenant to landlord.[51]

Here Pullman fits the stereotype of the late nineteenth century industrialist. He was interested in making as large a profit as possible and was willing to exploit his workers, if necessary, to do this. The

dichotomy of Pullman's desire to help his workers to better themselves and his desire to take large profit from them was never solved. The experiment could not survive the conflict between these two objects, but it did last for thirteen years and for that length of time was an object of interest in the United States.

Pullman did much to further this interest. He was extremely proud of all of his accomplishments and regarded his town as his supreme achievement. Many individuals and groups were invited to visit the town and later their favorable comments were given widespread publicity. There undoubtedly was more than just pride motivating Pullman. Every time that the word "Pullman" was printed in a newspaper or magazine the Pullman cars received free publicity.

Some of the opportunities that were provided for the citizens of the town of Pullman were in the area of athletics. Bicycle races, sailing regattas, track meets, and baseball games were regular events in the summer. The Pullman Athletic Association was formed by officials of the Pullman Company to sponsor competitions that attracted some of the best athletes of the day. For example, on Sunday, March 11, 1883, the Chicago Herald announced that the Athletic Association would sponsor professional sculling races on Lake Calumet in June, with prizes totaling $2,300. Besides invitational meets, Pullman had its own teams, the best of which was the cricket team which won the championship of the Chicago Cricket Association in 1890, and compiled a three-year record of 41-1-2.[52]

Associated with the Pullman teams was the Pullman Band, made up of company employees and supported by proceeds from the theater. Mr. Pullman was supposedly willing to hire a man for his musical ability alone.[53] The

band was excellent and provided Pullman with a great deal of publicity. In 1890, it won the Illinois State Fair Band Contest[54] and, in 1893, the band was invited to play at President Cleveland's inauguration.[55]

During the years before the strike most periodicals reacted very favorably to Pullman's plan in their articles about the town. One of the most favorable was Boston's The Christian Register, which echoed the statements of Reverend Swing and Congressman Woodford. Pullman was "a growth around a central idea . . . an attempt to combine philanthropy and business . . ." It was definitely not a charity but an attempt to combine good business and good works.[56] The Scientific American emphasized the advantages to the Pullman Company of a permanent group of laborers who would be loyal to the company because of the knowledge that it had "with a great wisdom and foresight, to leave out the idea of beneficence, shown a practical consideration for their comfort and happiness . . ."[57]

Not all of the reports were completely approving. The Inter Ocean, in 1884, pointed out that everything appeared too mechanical with the buildings and streets being laid out in strict geometrical patterns and the homes all massed together. "And yet one feels that there are fine principles underlying it; that the scheme is founded upon wise plans; and that from a moral and sanitary standpoint, the city is an ideal combination of work and rest, of capital and labor."[58] This article, even while seeing weaknesses, could not condemn the town but instead praised the principles upon which it was based. Again, the "wise plans" or "central idea" seemed to fascinate the reporter. The idea of an employer helping his employees to a better life must be good, no matter what means were used to bring this about.

Pullman made use of excursions and reports to publicize his town just as he had made use of them to publicize his sleeping cars. His most ambitious project was the meeting of the State Commissioners of Labor in 1885. The Commissioners held a conventionaat Pullman and were given the red carpet treatment. At the end of their convention they issued a report on the town which was generally favorable although note was taken of some problems which could become serious. It is interesting that the chief author of this report was Carroll D. Wright, the head of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, who later headed the Commission that investigated the Pullman Strike of 1894. The object of the investigation, according to the Commissioners, was to supply information about the town to the industrialists of the various states represented.[59]

The Commissioners started by interviewing several of the families that lived in the town. The women were found to be very happy with their surroundings. The cleanliness of the area was what most impressed these women, especially as it made housekeeping so easy.[60] The cleanliness was also responsible for another pleasing aspect, the good health of the inhabitants. With only one quarter of the doctors that was usual for a town of similar size, the death rate was only one quarter of the normal. The report stated, "The healthful conditions here are unequalled by those in any city in the world."[61]

Since the question of rents had already arisen, the Commissioners spent some time looking into them. They decided that the rents were higher than would be paid in Chicago or the other parts of Hyde Park. A comparison was made between the rents in Pullman and the rents in the manufacturing areas of Massachusetts and again the rents in Pullman were found to be

higher. In defense of the rents the report pointed out that the inhabitants of Pullman were furnished with sewage and garbage disposal which would not be available elsewhere and they paid no taxes to the town for these services. The Commissioners stated that, although it cost at least as much to live in Pullman as it would outside the town, the advantages to be found there made the actual rent rates much lower.[62]

The Commissioners' report finished with a long discussion of Pullman's objectives, how successfully they were attained, and the effect of the town on its inhabitants' way of life. This section of the report sounds almost as if Pullman had written it himself. The Commissioners found many of the original inhabitants had been used to living in dirty quarters and this had effected their habits. "Their presence in the new city was like a rubbish heap in a garden . . ."[63] These people were left to absorb some of the good influences of the town and naturally improved their former habits after a few months there. All this, of course, was the object of George Pullman, whom the report praised in this way:

> Beginning at the bottom rung of the ladder and therefore familiar with the wants and aspirations of the workers of society, he has risen by the force of his own character and genius to his present position; he does not care to leave the world and look back upon his actions and see that he has only offered a glass of water to the sufferer by the wayside, but he wishes to feel that he has furnished a desert with wells of living water that all may come and drink through all time. So he commenced with the foundation idea of furnishing his workmen with the model homes, and supplying them with abundant work, with good wages, feeling that simply better conditions would make better men and his city become a permanent benefaction.[64]

When looking for weaknesses in the experiment the Commissioners could see only one, the company ownership of all the homes. This they felt was bad and in the future would lead to instability, but they excused it at that time because during the early years of the town they believed that

the workers would be financially unable to buy their homes.[65] The report concluded, "If the workman at Pullman lives in a 'gilded cage', we must congratulate him on its being so handsomely gilded; the average workman does not have his cage gilded."[66]

This report showed that, besides the periodicals most of which were favorable to capital and would normally back any of the schemes of the leading industrialists, more neutral and objective observers were also influenced favorably by Pullman's experiment.

The Report of the State Commissinners of Labor was not the only report on the town of Pullman to be published in 1885. Richard T. Ely, one of the leading liberals of the period and Professor of Economics at the University of Wisconsin, made his own investigation of the town in that year. Professor Ely was very much concerned with the state of the working class in the United States. He believed that the city, as an institution, was failing to provide for the workers. Ely saw a danger to the American principles of democracy if reforms were not made, and was looking for any new ideas that might improve the city.[67] Ely studied the town of Pullman with the hope that it might provide at least some of the answers for reforming the city.

Ely was, like all of the commentators on the town, very impressed with its outward appearance. He found the buildings sturdy, clean, well-lighted and healthful. The well-kept atmosphere of the town he believed had influenced the workers to be neater and cleanlier themselves. Ely expressed it as "the all-pervading air of thrift and providence."[68] Thus far, in Ely's opinion, Pullman had been successful in providing a better place for his workers to dwell than they could otherwise have obtained. He further

believed that they would be improved by the experience.

Ely recognized that George Pullman was unusual in his treatment of his employees:

> One of Mr. Pullman's fundamental ideas is the commercial value of beauty, and this he has endeavored to carry out as faithfully in the town which bears his name as in the Pullman drawing-room and sleeping cars. He is one of the few men who have thought it a paying investment to expend millions for the purpose of surrounding laborers with objects of beauty and comfort.[69]

The Pullman laborers were provided with all of the material comforts that it was possible for them to enjoy, especially the women, one of whom Ely quotes as saying, "I just hate the ugly old city."[70]

Ely also looked into the question of rents, finding that they were only three-fifths of what would be paid for comparable housing in Chicago. He could find no one living in the town who had any complaints that the rents were too high. But Pullman had still made his profit for Ely estimated that the land Pullman had paid less than $200 an acre for in 1880, was worth $5000 an acre in 1885.[71] Ely went on, "We may shrug our shoulders at the philanthropy which demands a good round sum for everything it offers, but certainly it is a great thing to have demonstrated the commercial value of beauty in a city of laborers."[72]

The Report of the Commissioners of Labor implied that Pullman had achieved his objectives, including the attraction of a permanent group of able workers. Ely felt that Pullman had failed in this. According to Ely, both workers and supervisors changed constantly and the supervisors played favorites in making appointments to the best jobs. The attractive homes had not become a bond to hold the workers. Ely stated, "Nobody regards Pullman as a real home, and, in fact, it can scarecely be said that there are more than temporary residents at Pullman."[73]

It was not only the difficulty of working under unfair supervisors that drove the workers from Pullman. The company seemed to be all-pervasive to the inhabitants, who regarded it as a huge monopoly. Further, they believed that they were being continually watched by agents of the company and were afraid to speak with strangers about either the company or the town.[74]

In drawing his conclusions, Ely was not satisfied with the town of Pullman as a possible answer to the problems of the city. He found that the organization of the town was almost feudal and certainly did not conform to American ideas of democracy and freedom. Ely believed that the town's purpose was to make the workers happy and contented, but that the company decided the conditions of happiness. This was his major objection and he pointed out that it was also the inhabitants' major objection to the town. While the town was a success economically and even artistically, it was a failure from a social standpoint for the workers were not happy and did not remain in the town. Ely called the town a partial success. He did not think that it was worthy of imitation. What George Pullman had done was to provide a partial answer to the question of how the wealthy could distribute their wealth among the workers who had created it. The town itself was good, the way in which it was administered was bad.

The general interest that people had in the town of Pullman was shown by the amount of comment that Ely's article aroused, both pro and con. He was vigorously condemned by Inter Ocean which always was sympathetic to Pullman.[75] The New York Sun came to Ely's defense and stated that Pullman was doomed from the beginning as a social experiment since people liked to plan their own lives.[76] Surprisingly, The Nation, which was never very taken with Ely, agreed with his conclusions. It considered the town of Pullman to be an idea worthy of Thomas Carlyle who had said that a man should be

as well taken care of as a horse. The Nation believed that the town of Pullman had achieved this objective.[77]

After Ely's article there was a period of seeming disinterest with Pullman on the part of the national periodicals. In 1894, when the Pullman strike started, there was, of course, a renewal of interest but these later articles were all colored by the strike and were either attacks on or defenses of Pullman, not attempts at objective analysis. There did appear, in 1893, two items that are worthy of consideration.

One of these was a compilation of the lives of several of the leading citizens of the United States entitled Contemporary American Biography. The article on George M. Pullman in this book stated that he had done more, through his town, for working men than any socialistic enterprise had been able to do. The town's main characteristic was stability which only a large amount of capital could guarantee. This capital made it possible to supply the inhabitants with all of their requirements at a lower price than elsewhere. The result was a town that was "wholly admirable [and] whose population of working men are believed to be at least forty per cent better off in all the conditions of their life than is the case with the working men in any other part of the country."[78] This shows that as late as 1893, the town was still thought to be successful and a new reason had been added to praise George Pullman. He had outdone the socialists.

The second item was a pamphlet prepared by the Pullman Company for the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The company had a large exhibition at the fair and this pamphlet served to introduce the Pullman Company and the town of Pullman to the public. In this pamphlet there is another statement of Pullman's belief in the commercial value of beauty. "That which is harmonious and beautiful has been recognized as having an incitive energy

of its own, capable in its way of being turned to account as force in the production of results . . . "[79] The town of Pullman was the result of this force and, according to the pamphlet, the most important and most logical result.[80] It was "beautiful and harmonious" with lovely parks and streets and "bright and wholesome" homes, "where all that is ugly, and discordant, and demoralizing, is eliminated, and all that inspires to self-respect, to thrift and to cleanliness of person and of thought is generously provided."[81] The author of this pamphlet obviously believed that Pullman had succeeded in designing a town that would provide the proper influences for the workers and stated that the object of this was to make the worker a greater asset to the Pullman Company. The advantages of the town were not a hand-out but were to make it easier for the workers to help themselves without interfering with their personal freedom.[82]

George M. Pullman had started out his business life with the belief that people would be willing to pay a little extra for a product of top quality. This belief was proved to Pullman many times over as he rose from cabinet maker to millionaire. Along the way Pullman added a corollary to his basic credo, that beauty itself had a commercial value. These beliefs were implemented in the products that Pullman produced, his railroad cars which were the standard for elegance. In these he showed also that he was an experimenter as he moved from sleepers to diners to parlor cars. But Pullman was more than an innovator in the railroad business. He also experimented with his laborers and tried to establish with them the ideal industrial community. This was a reflection of his beliefs, for he was providing them with a town of the best quality and of great beauty. While the town was very important to Pullman, he was not able to treat it any way

except as a product and therefore it would have to pay the highest return. But in this case the most important return was not money but men. The important object was to provide the Pullman Company with the best laborers.

Pullman was no philanthropist but, while he did not give his money away, he does not fit the stereotype of the "robber baron." Pullman realized that a successful company was built on more than money. The worker was important. Pullman occasionally said that the worker was the most important item in any firm's success, a conclusion that few, if any, of the other leading industrialists seem to have reached. Pullman's great misfortune was that he could not go far enough in his innovating. He could recognize the importance of the worker to a company but not that the worker had a stake in the company. To Pullman the worker was just another tool, the most important one, but a tool. The workers objected to being classified as tools or worse being treated as tools. The Pullman experiment shattered on this.

1. United States Strike Commission Report. (Senate, Executive Document No. 7, 53rd Congress, 3rd Session). Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895, p. 496. Pullman had his first shop at Palmyra, New York, but found it too small and moved to Detroit.

2. Ibid., p. 17

3. Anonymous, The Story of Pullman. Chicago: The Pullman Company, [1893], pp. 20-23.

4. Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961, pp. 228-232.

5. Almont Lindsey, The Pullman Strike. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942, p. 33.

6. The information in this paragraph is taken from George Rogers Taylor, The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1951, pp. 270-276.

7. Ibid., p. 276.

8. Ibid., p. 298.

9. Cochran and Miller, p. 63.

10. The Republican (St. Louis), November 25, 1879. Clipping in the Pullman Collection at The Newberry Library.

11. Aurora Herald, January 30, 1880. Clipping in the Pullman Collection at The Newberry Library.

12. February 22, 1880.

13. Fredrick Cook, Bygone Days in Chicago. A. C. McClurg and Company, 1910, pp. 261-262.

14. Chicago Tribune, April 14, 1880.

15. Chicago Times, April 26, 1880.

16. John McLean, One Hundred Years in Illinois. Chicago: Peterson Linotyping Company, 1919, p. 229.

17. Ibid., p. 223.

18. The Story of Pullman, p. 19.

19. McLean, p. 229.

20. Chicago Tribune, August 14, 1882.

21. Richard Ely, "Pullman: A Social Study," Harper's Magazine, LXX (Feb., 1885), p. 455.

22. McLean, p. 247.

23. Ibid., p. 248, and Anonymous, "A Great Reporter's Observations," The Development of Chicago 1647-1914, edited by Milo Quaife. Chicago: The Caxton Club, 1916.

24. McLean, p. 247.

25. Irving K, Pond, "Pullman - Americas First Planned Industrial Town," Illinois Society of Architects Monthly Bulletin, 18-19 (June-July, 1934), p. 7.

26. McLean, pp. 224-225.

27. Anonymous, "Report to the State of Illinois on the Status of the Town of Pullman Relative to Housing, Population, Sewerage, Water Supply, Plumbing, Streets, Public Health and Etc., 1885," p. 1, in the Pullman Collection at the Pullman Branch of the Chicago Public Library.

28. Mrs. Duane Doty, The Town of Pullman. Chicago: T. B. Struksacher, 1893, pp. 104-106.

29. Ibid., p. 31.

30. Ibid., pp. 155 and 163-164.

31. "Report to the State of Illinois on the Status of the Town of Pullman Relative to Housing, Population, Sewerage, Water Supply, Plumbing, Streets, Public Health and Etc., 1885," p. 6, in the Pullman Collection at the Pullman Branch of the Chicago Public Library.

32. Doty, p. 50.

33. United States Strike Commission Report, p. 496.

34. Anonymous, "An Industrial City," The Scientific American, L(1884), p. 280.

35. George M. Pullman to Helen S. Pullman, August 17, 1881. From the collection of Mrs. C. Philip Miller.

36. "Report to the State of Illinois on the Status of the Town of Pullman Relative to Housing, Population, Sewerage, Water Supply, Plumbing, Streets, Public Health and Etc., 1885," p. 25, in the Pullman Collection at the Pullman Branch of the Chicago Public Library.

37. Doty, pp. 8-10.

38. According to Mrs. Doty, "In this painting nearly every component part was a matter of careful study from the real objects" which were borrowed from the Marshall Field Store, p. 16.

39. Bertha Medsker, "Out Pullman Pioneers," Calumet Index, January 19, 1955.

40. Doty, pp. 133-134.

41. Lindsey, p. 45.

42. McLean, p. 227.

43. Pond, p. 7.

44. The Daily Inter Ocean, January 10, 1883, McLean, p. 234, and Doty, p.17.

45. The Daily Inter Ocean, January 10, 1883.

46. Ibid.

47. Address of the Reverend David Swing. (Reprinted in the appendix of Doty).

48. The Christian Register (Boston), February 1, 1882. Clipping in the Pullman Collection at The Newberry Library.

49. See especially Carroll B. Harding, George M. Pullman (1831-1897) and the Pullman Company. New York: The Newcomen Society in North America, 1951, p. 25 and Lindsey, p. 32.

50. Testimony of George M. Pullman in the United States Strike Commission Report, p. 530.

51. Ibid., pp. 529-530.

52. The Arcade Journal (Pullman), October 11, 1890.

53. Bertha Medsker, "Our Pullman Pioneers," Calumet Index. Newspaper clipping in collection at the Pullman Branch Library.

54. McLean, p. 249

55. Medsker.

56. February 1, 1882. Clipping in the Pullman Collection at The Newberry Library.

57. "An Industrial City," L(1884), p. 279.

58. May 22, 1884.

59. Carroll D. Wright, et. al., "The Report of the State Commissioners of Labor Statistics on the Industrial, Social and Economic Conditions of Pullman, Illinois," p. 1, published in the appendix to Mrs. Doty.

60. Ibid., p. 7.

61. Ibid., p. 14.

62. Ibid., p. 11.

63. Ibid., p. 16.

64. Ibid., p. 17.

65. Ibid., p. 19.

66. Ibid., p. 22.

67. Sidney Fine, "Richard T. Ely, Forerunner of Progressivism, 1880-1901," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXVII (Mar., 1951), p. 600.

68. Ely, p. 457.

69. Ibid., p. 461.

70. Ibid., p. 464.

71. Ibid., p. 457.

72. Ibid., p. 461.

73. Ibid., p. 463.

74. Ibid., p. 464.

75. January 17, 1885.

76. January 25, 1885.

77. January 29, 1885.

78. Anonymous, "George Mortimer Pullman," Contemporary American Biography, part 6. New York: Atlantic Publishing and Engraving Company, 1893, p. 269.

79. The Story of Pullman, p. 2.

80. Ibid.

81. Ibid., p. 21.

82. Ibid., p. 23.

III

THE END OF THE GREAT EXPERIMENT

The weaknesses of the town of Pullman, which were apparent to so few observers before 1893, were never corrected by George Pullman. These weaknesses were essentially embodied in Pullman's conception of the place of his workers, who were to provide the Pullman Company with the best possible labor force. The inhabitants were given very little freedom in their actions while they lived in Pullman. The company sought to provide all of the necessities and most of the comforts for the families and kept all "baneful influences" from them. Everything in the town was regulated closely, from the collection of garbage to the replacement of broken windows. The most important tools of the Pullman Company had to receive the best care.

An example of this controlled environment was the absence of bars in the town. Pullman was not a believer in the temperance movement, but alcohol was one of the "baneful influences." Therefore, there were no bars in the town of Pullman with the exception of the bar in the Florence Hotel, which was for the use of guests and not frequented by the citizens of the town.[1] This did not mean that the workers did not drink. There were many saloons in the neighboring towns of Roseland and Kensington which were well patronized by the Pullman employees. Also, the streets of Pullman were often filled with wagons delivering beer from those towns to the homes of the workers.[2] But drinking was kept to a minimum and most of the reports on the town comment on the absence of drunkenness. Pullman's attitude in regard to his employees' drinking reflected his concept of the part his workers played in the company.

The workers would perform poorly if they were able to drink heavily, so heavy drinking was made difficult by the absence of bars. The drinking of moderate quantities of beer would not interfere with their labor and was allowable. It could be said that this was one case where Pullman did not want his tools "well oiled."

The inhabitants naturally objected to this close control of their lives. Especially galling was the fact that they were not able to own their own homes. This would have been a violation of Pullman's principles. If the workers owned their homes, they would be independent of Pullman. They would cease to be controllable, cease to be tools. Pullman could not allow his workers to own their homes, but their protests forced him to promise that eventually they could.[3] Ely had pointed out that the lack of private ownership was un-American and the Commissioners of Labor called it the major weakness of the experiment. Pullman ignored these warnings and never fulfilled his promise to allow the workers to purchase homes.

Pullman went further than this. It was not enough to merely rent homes to the workers. There had to be control of the workers in these homes. The first method of control was the lease that the workers signed which contained a clause that allowed either party to break the lease with ten days' notice. This clause applied not only to homes but to all the buildings in the town. According to the Pullman Company, the purpose of this clause was to allow the eviction of any business or family that would be damaging to the morals of the community.[4] The workers interpreted this clause in a different sense. To them it was a means of insuring conformity to the rules laid down by the company. A troublesome worker lost not only his job but also his home. There is no evidence that the

company ever invoked this clause. Businesses were screened before being allowed to rent stores and there was very little likelihood that they would violate the rules. The inhabitants of the town obeyed the rules. Even during the strike, in 1894, when the workers were unable to pay their rent, the company allowed them to stay and there were no evictions.[5] But it was the fact that they could be evicted that controlled the workers and to which they objected.

A second objection that the inhabitants had to the leases was the clause that concerned upkeep and repairs for the houses. The renters were responsible for all repairs, according to the leases. Usually the company took care of all repairs except those for malicious damage.[6] It was not that they were responsible for paying for repairs that disturbed the workers but that they had no say in these repairs. The company repaired when it wanted to and what it wanted to. The inhabitants had to request that repairs be made. They could not make the repairs themselves. Even if a family wished to put up a clothing hook, it was necessary to ask the janitor who took the request to the town agent who would approve or disapprove it and who would send out a man to do the job, if approved.[7] While most repairs were paid for by the company, certain items in the upkeep of the houses were to be paid for by the renters. The company took care of these repairs and the cost was deducted from the workers' wages. Occasionally one of the renters would complain publicly about this, as one woman did to a reporter from the Chicago Sun:

> If your house needs a new coat of whitewash, one fine morning a number of men, with lime and pail and brushes, will knock at your door and tell you that they have come to whitewash your house . . .

You would have liked to wait another week with the white-wash, you say, because you wanted to buy a pair of shoes for your boy? The company can't care about that![8]

To the workers these actions showed the lack of democracy in the town. They felt that they had no freedom of choice concerning their homes. The company could do anything it wanted to with their homes. The result was that many of the men chose to live in the towns such as Kensington and Roseland that were near Pullman. These towns could not provide homes that matched those found in Pullman nor could they equal the sanitary conditions found there; but these homes could be owned. They were not subjected to company control.

While the company raised no objections to some of its workers living outside of Pullman during periods of full employment, it was believed by the workers that when there was not enough work to go around, those who lived elsewhere would be the first to be laid off.[9] The company denied this and claimed that there was never any discrimination shown as to where the workers lived. The company declared that family men were always the last to be let go regardless of where they lived. The Strike Commission that investigated the strike of 1894, found that, if there were a choice between two family men, the one who lived at Pullman was always preferred.[10]

While Pullman felt that his attempts to improve the taste of the towns inhabitants were successful, the inhabitants did not always accept them. The town library was a cause of dissatisfaction. Pullman had set charges of $3.00 a year for adults and $1.00 a year for children for use of the library. The workers believed that this was too high a fee to pay and there were never more than 250 members enrolled in the library.[11] The fees were used for magazine subscriptions and book binding, but the workers'

opinion was that a large, wealthy company should provide these services free of charge .

The complaints about the library reading room varied from its small size to its luxuriousness which discouraged the laborers from using it. This is surprising because the library had been praised so highly at its dedication and by later writers. One author commented in 1894 that,

> Thoughtfulness has been carried to the extent of having a private room with a separate stairway for the use of men fresh from their work. Many, who would not be tempted to come into the main rooms of the library with soiled hands and faces, readily go into this private reading-room [sic] set aside for their exclusive use, where all the books of the library are at their disposal.[12]

The Reverend William Carwardine, pastor of the town's Methodist Evangelical Church, disagreed with this author. Reverend Carwardine believed that the library had tended to produce a caste spirit in the town.[13] The common laborers flet that they were segregated in a back room where they could not mingle with their betters.

While some of the inhabitants of the town did not use the library because they felt uncomfortable in it, this cannot explain a maximum membership of 250 in a maximum population of 14,000. The nationalities of the inhabitants of Pullman provides a better explanation for the paucity of members. 51 percent of the population of Pullman was foreign born in 1884. By 1893, the foreign born had increased to 72 per cent.[14] Most of these people would not have been able to read English and would have had little use for the library.

A basic defect in Pullman's thinking becomes more obvious as his rules governing his model town become known. He hoped to attract the best workers but he then hedged them in with a variety of rules. The best workers would certainly be the more intelligent ones, the ones who would react to

the restrictions in the worst (to Pullman's way of thinking) way. Pullman did not seem to know how to handle them. The workers believed that Pullman had established an espionage system to watch them and report any who deviated from the rules or who complained about the rules. When Professor Ely made his investigation of the town he complained of the obvious reluctance that the inhabitants had to talking with him. The men feared the loss of their jobs if it were known that they had criticized the company. Ely undertook several subterfuges to get individuals alone in order to interview them. This fear of reprisal was present not only in the company employees but also in the businessmen who rented from the company.[15] The Reverend William Carwardine accused the company of having a regular espionage agency that made weekly reports on the conditions in the town. He related an incident concerning a parishioner of his who had been injured in an accident while at work. Carwardine visited this man immediately after the accident. That night he was gotten out of bed by one of the company agents who asked him to repeat the story that the injured man had told. The object seems to have been to make sure that the injured man could not later sue the company.[16]

The men's grievances with the company included complaints about the work itself. They were paid for piece work rather than a given an hourly salary. This gave a great deal of power to the foremen who decided which man did which job. There were continual complaints about the favoritism that the foremen showed to certain friends. Occasionally the foremen, some of whom were not very well trained, made mistakes in the work. When this happened the laborers were forced to redo the ruined piece with no extra pay. Many of these abuses were unknown to the managers but anyone who complained was looked upon as a dissatisfied worker and was in danger of losing his job.[17]

Pullman's attempts at controlling his employees were not entirely relegated to the materialistic sphere. He occasionally tried to control their thoughts as well. The most glaring incidents of thought control concerned religion. The whole Pullman family were Universalists. Two brothers had become ministers in that church. Pullman attempted t establish the Universalist belief as the town religion. When the Green Stone Church was completed in 1881, a brother, James M. Pullman, D.D., preached the dedication sermon.[18] In the spring of that year, Pullman called a meeting to be chaired by Duane Doty, one of the town's engineers, to discuss the organization of a church society. A plan was presented by Doty and a few others to unite all of the citizens in one body and hire a broadminded minister to serve the town. To Doty's surprise, this plan was rejected by those present, all of whom held out for their own denominations.[19] In reaction to this Pullman set the rent on the church so high that no single denomination could pay it. The rent was $1,200 per year with a charge of $2.25 per 1,000 feet for gas and $186.00 a year for steam heat. The parsonage which was attached to the church was to rent for $65.00 a month.[20]

The Presbyterian congregation finally rented the church but the parsonage remained empty throughout the life of the town. The Presbyterians soon went into debt to Pullman for $750 and held a meeting in Chicago to raise the money. One of the clergymen present at the meeting stated that he had preached once in Pullman and would never return. "The word monopoly seems to be written in black letters over the pulpit and pews. It blazes forth from every window and seems to burn between the lines of the hymn book. I though the organ groaned 'monopoly, monopoly' in all its lower

tones."[21] By February, 1886, the Presbyterians had given up the church.[22] The general opinion of the citizens of Pullman was that the church building had been constructed merely to make the town architecturally complete. Some even felt that it was looked upon as another source of income by Pullman, to be rented only to that group which was financially responsible enough to pay for it.[23]

Pullman had a very noisy and noisome fight with Father John Waldron, a Roman Catholic priest, over the question of a church site in the town. It had been Pullman's practice to refuse to sell any of the land within the limits of the town. This forced the various churches which could not afford the Green Stone Church to rent rooms in the Arcade or Casino Building, the two large buildings in the town which had rooms usable for meetings. As the town grew in population the Roman Catholic congregation became too large to use any of these rooms. Father Waldron, who was the pastor at Pullman, tried to get permission to use a tract of land in the town to build a church. George Pullman refused and Father Waldron finally obtained land for a site outside of Pullman at 110th and Indiana. There, on January 21, 1883, the first Holy Rosary Church was dedicated. Its cost was $7,500, of which the parishioners had raised $6,500 by the time of dedication.[24]

Within three years it became evident that the building was too small for the growing parish. Father Waldron again approached George Pullman for the right to use a site in the town. This time Pullman agreed to donate an area, not in the town, but in the extra 4,000 acres that had been purchased for the expansion of the town. Father Waldron got a verbal agreement to the construction of a new church at 113th and South Park. The congregation raised another $6,000 and the building was started. With

the foundation and basement completed Pullman announced that he would not give up the lease to the land. Father Waldron, who had an Irish temper, exploded and accused Pullman of reneging on a deal. Pullman retaliated by attempting to smear Father Waldron. On February 11, 1887, the Chicago." Daily News carried a story that accused the priest of "gross immorality Father Waldron answered these charges by stating that Pullman wanted to get rid of him because of the trouble he was causing and accused Pullman of hiring private detectives to follow him.[25] Following this exchange Father Waldron resigned his post at Holy Rosary and was reassigned to a parish in Oak Park.[26]

How much pressure to resign was exerted on Father Waldron by the Bishop it is impossible to tell, but his replacement was certainly picked with the hope that his background would enable him to get along with George Pullman. Father J. P. Tinian had worked as a railroad telegrapher before studying for the priesthood and he used his knowledge of railroading to good advantage. He quickly became friendly with Pullman and obtained a 99-year lease to the land on the condition that the church building would cost at least $ 5,000, which was the minimum price for which Pullman felt a building could be constructed to fit in with the other major buildings of the town. Pullman at first demanded that the church be finished in a year but later granted an extension until 1890 for its completion.[27] Father Tinian was able to keep all further relations with Pullman pleasant and stayed on as pastor until after Pullman's death and the breakup of the town.

A few years after Father Tinian obtained his lease Pullman granted a similar one on Pullman land outside the town to the Swedish Evangelical Lutherans. The rest of the denominations remained in their rented rooms

until the end of the great experiment. As a result of these actions of Pullman the workers concluded that Pullman cared nothing for their souls but was interested only in the amount of work they could produce.[28]

Pullman's other major attempt at thought control involved a subject equally as explosive as religion, politics. Pullman was a Republican in his politics and on many occasions attempted to influence the inhabitants of his town in their voting. He took an interest in all elections, national and local, and appears to have had a good deal of success in controlling the voting of those who lived in his model town.

The town of Pullman was part of the village of Hyde Park and came under its ordinances,[29] but the company assumed full control of municipal functions, so that Hyde Park did not have to assume any responsibilities.[30] To insure that there was no interference Pullman kept at least one of his employees on the Hyde Park Board of Trustees. In 1883, the Pullman member was Samuel Pullman, one of the brothers, who was an assistant engineer at the Pullman water works.[31] All of the officials of the town of Pullman were appointed by the Pullman Company with the exception of the members of the school board who were elected but were employees of the company.[32] A town agent, appointed by George Pullman, was the actual manager of the town.[33]

Since it was located in Hyde Park, the Pullman Company had to pay a yearly assessment to the village. There was always a controversy between the assessor and the company over how large this assessment should be. In the village election in the spring of 1883, George Pullman supported a reform ticket that included a Pullman employee who was running for village assessor.[34] Pullman was accused of intimidating his employees to vote for the reform candidates. Pullman denied this vigorously, claiming that any dictation in the matter of voting would be contrary to his "notions of

American citizenship." He stated that his employees always had complete freedom to vote according to their own inclinations.[35] The reform candidates won and the Pullman Company paid the relatively small assessment of $35,000. In 1885, with a new village assessor the assessment went up to $214,000, although it was later lowered to $150,000.[36]

Again in 1887, Pullman was accused of influencing the village elections when the Chicago Herald charged that the head timekeeper and chief accountant of the company were stationed near the polls to observe how the men voted after they were driven to the place of election in company wagons.[37] In 1890, after the annexation of Hyde Park to Chicago, Mr. Sessions, the general superintendent of the company, was accused of intimidating voters in an aldermanic election and of firing three men who voted for the wrong candidate.[38]

The question of the annexation of Hyde Park to Chicago was the most important local political question to arise during the history of the town of Pullman. Hyde Park was the largest village in the world at this time. By 1886, it was obvious that the village needed to be reorganized and annexation to Chicago seemed to be the easiest way to do this. George Pullman feared that if the village were annexed to Chicago he would lose much of his power over the town of Pullman so he determined to fight the annexation. It was to be a long fight starting in 1886, and lasting thee years with each side winning battles. Inter Ocean led off for the anti-annexationists with an article that stated that it would be unfair to the industrial companies that had located in Hyde Park to join with Chicago. These firms had settled in Hyde Park because of the low tax rates and the rates would now be raised if the village joined Chicago.[39] For the next year there was continual maneuvering as to how the annexation was to be accomplished. By October, 1887, it was decided that the fairest way would be to have an election with

all of the inhabitants of Hyde Park voting. Pullman supported this plan with the qualification that the town of Pullman and the surrounding areas of Kensington, Riverdale and Roseland be excepted from the annexation. Pullman's alternative was accepted and he became a strong backer of annexation.[40]

On Tuesday, November 8, the election was held and the citizens of Hyde Park voted to join with Chicago. The town of Pullman and the surrounding areas were excepted from the annexation.[41] It appeared as if George Pullman had won his fight. He would now be able to continue his great experiment with no outside interference.

Pullman's triumph did not last long. Within a week the constitutionality of the law governing the election was being questioned. The case was taken to the Illinois Supreme Court which agreed with the objectors and found the law unconstitutional.[42] No further action was taken until 1889, when the objections of the court were met by a new law especially drawn up by the state legislature, and another election was scheduled for June, 1889. This time the whole village was to be included in Chicago.

Now Pullman had to come out into the open and lead the anti-annexationist cause. He started this phase of the battle with an attack on the Democratic ticket which was backing the annexation in the regular spring election. The foremen of the shops were told to influence the men on their crews to vote for the Republican slate of candidates.[43] Pullman ran into strong objections from the inhabitants of his town. The leader of the opposition was John Hopkins who was the president of the Arcade Trading Company which operated several stores in Pullman. Hopkins was a devoted Democrat, who organized several Democratic rallies in the town. In the election the

Democrats swept Hyde Park including Pullman.[44] Hopkins later went on to become Mayor of Chicago and held that office during the great strike of 1894, when he opposed Pullman and backed Governor Altgeld.

After this defeat Pullman did not give up but continued to organize the opposition to annexation. He went so far as to bring in a minister to preach a sermon in the Green Stone Church against the annexation.[45] All of his maneuvering was of no use. Pullman was going against the current. He was defeated and, on June 29, 1889, the whole of Hyde Park was joined to Chicago. In this election Pullman had better control of his own employees and the anti-annexationists carried his town by 843 votes,[46] but this was not enough to overwhelm the great majority of pro-annexation votes from the rest of the village.

In the two instances of religion and politics George Pullman suffered failure. He had gone too far in attempting to control his employees. In both these cases the newspapers were unfavorable to Pullman. He had attempted something that was contrary to American principles.

In all of his other attempts at control Pullman was successful. The workers did not rebel against the rules that governed the model town. They accepted them, but this did not mean that the great experiment was a success. Pullman attracted a high quality of worker but could he hold him? The answer appears to have been no. There was a regular turnover in men due to many causes. Some objected to the lack of freedom in the town, others to the great power that the foremen had. One worker wrote a letter signed "A Mechanic" to the Herald, in which he objected to the foremen and piece work which he claimed was affraud for only the friends of the supervisors were given enough jobs to make a good wage. He did not sign his name for fear of being dismissed and he wished to keep his job until spring when he

was to leave for the Dakotas with a large group of the workers.[47]

When the Pullman shops were opened at Pullman many of the workers from the Detroit factory, which was partially closed down, moved down to Pullman for what they hoped would be better jobs. As time went on, these men became dissatisfied with conditions in the model town. When the Detroit plant was reopened at full capacity they decided to move back there. This movement soon became a rush and the company officials became worried that there would not be enough trained men left to operate the shops at Pullman. George Pullman issued an order to the foremen at Detroit to refuse all laborers who came from Pullman.[48] Even this order did not stop the exodus.

Ely found that the majority of the population of the town was transient and attributed it generally to the lack of freedom which he called un-American, and particularly to the inability of the employees to purchase their own homes.[49] Pullman had failed in his major objective. He was not able to keep the skilled workers he attracted. The advantages of the model town did not appear to be very advantageous at closer appraisal. The most important tools had minds of their own and objected to the type of care that they received.

Pullman's major objective was not reached, but what of his second objective, to make a profit of six per cent on the town? Here again, there was a failure, although not a complete one. For the first years of its existence the town returned a revenue of four and one half per cent, but from 1892 on the revenue decreased to 3.82 per cent due to increased taxes and repair costs.[50] While the town always showed a profit, it was never as great as had been expected.

Even though the town of Pullman had not achieved the success that it

was hoped it would, the town still carried on, relatively unchanged, until 1894, In that year occured the great railway strike which showed the weaknesses of the experiment to all observers. The cause of the strike was Pullman's inability to see the connection between the wages he paid and the rents he charged. The error in his thinking was nowhere more evident than in this instance. The workers were tools and yet he must make a profit on them.

One major point of friction between the workers and the company was the charge for water. The workers believed that Pullman was making a large profit on the sale of water.[51] Actually the company had made a very small profit of $30.86 a month until January, 1894, when Chicago raised its rates. The company did not raise the rates for the inhabitants of the town and was losing $591.07 a month on water charges at the time of the strike.[52] What is important here is the lack of communication between company officials and the town's inhabitants. The workers could easily have been shown their error but no official seemed to feel that it was worth the trouble.

Another objection of the workers was the indignity of being paid with two pay checks, one which exactly covered the rent and another for the remainder of their salary.[53] Payment by two checks was a fairly recent development. During the first years of the town's existence the rent had been deducted before the workers were paid, but this had been declared illegal and the two check plan adopted by the company.[54] The laborers saw little improvement. They picked up their pay checks at the bank and the rent collector was waiting there to take the rent checks from them.

There was disagreement on whether the rents were set too high [see chapter two] in normal times, but it was agreed by all except the Pullman Company that the rents were too high in 1894. In 1893, the Pullman Company had had an excellent year due mainly to the need for passenger cars to carry

tourists to the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Late in that year the general business slump caught up with the Pullman Company. In the spring of 1894, the company ordered a general reduction in wages for all piece work. The object of this reduction was to enable the company to keep all of its employees working rather than to be forced to lay some of them off.[55] This was a fair solution to the problem but there was no corresponding cut in the rents that the employees had to pay.

A previous cut in wages had precipitated a strike in 1884, but it had ended quickly.[56] A later wage reduction was made slowly department by department, so that the workers would not organize. At this time many men quit but there was no strike.[57] There was one other strike, in 1886, in which the employees took the initial action. The men requested an eight-hour day which was denied them. The strike lasted nine days and the workers returned without gaining concessions.[58]

The cut in wages in the spring of 1894 affected all of the workmen in all of the departments at the same time. Soon the workers were complaining that their pay was merely enough to cover rent costs and left nothing over for food. Several petitions were presented to the company and a group of workers requested permission to see Mr. Pullman for the purpose of either getting wages raised or the rents lowered. Mr. Pullman talked with the men, but no changes resulted.

As spring turned into summer the situation in the town became worse. Familities used up their savings and faced starvation. Most men chose not to pay their rents rather than see theirfamilies hungry. This led to a fear that the company would evict or fire them.[59] As the situation worsened the workmen began to organize into groups and several became members of the

American Railway Union which was attempting to organize all workers who were connected with railroading in any way. Finally, on May 11, the workmen at Pullman struck. Their demands were still the same, higher wages or lower rents.

At first the strike was very peaceful without any picketing at the Pullman plants. Eugene V. Debs, the head of the American Railway Union, issued a proclamation of sympathy, but offered no other help. Then, on June 21, the American Railway Union, which had been meeting in Chicago, decided to boycott all trains that had Pullman cars attached to them. This would tie up most of the railroads in the United States and the managers of the lines agreed to drop their Pullman coaches. The Pullman Company protested that the railroads had had contracts with the company guaranteeing the use of Pullmans on their passenger trains. If these contracts were not honored the Pullman Company would sue the railroads for damages.

The managers of the various railroads, faced with a choice between favoring labor or another industrialist, chose the industrialist. Pullman cars were run on the passenger trains and the American Railway Union called a nationwide strike. It was this phase of the strike that quickly blazed into violence as the railroads attempted to run trains without using union members, who relatiated by jamming switches, wrecking cars and burning terminals. There was a great deal of rioting in Chicago and several other cities, but Pullman was one of the quietest areas. The railroads appealed to President Cleveland and Attorney General Olney for help on the grounds that the federal mails were being interfered with. Olney, who had been counsel for the rail managers, agreed and convineed Cleveland, who ordered the army to end the strike.

The army was called out in many locations, including Chicago which was placed under martial law over the objection of Governor Altgeld of Illinois and Mayor Hopkins, who claimed that the army was not needed to maintain order. By the beginning of August the strike was ending and the workers returning to their jobs. One of the first places where men returned to work was Pullman.[60]

After the strike was over a committee of the Pullman strikers who were still living in Pullman but had not been rehired by the company, asked Governor Altgeld to make a visit to Pullman and investigate the condition of the workers. Altgeld did this and on August 21, he was taken on a tour of the town by August Rapp, chief designer for the company, Chief Wilde, the head accountant, and four members of the strikers' committee. The Governor found that more than a thousand of the families were destitute and that almost two thousand of the old employees had not been rehired. The relief association that had been formed to provide food had suspended operations when swamped with requests for aid.[61]

Before making his visit Altgeld had sent a letter to Pullman asking him to provide some relief for the families,

> Assuming that they were wrong and foolish, they had yet served you long and well and you must feel some interest in them. They do not stand on the same footing with you, so that much must be overlooked . . . It seems to me that you would prefer to relieve the situation yourself, especially as it has just cost the state upward of $50,000 to protect your property and as both the state and the public have suffered enormous loss and expense on account of disturbances that grew out of the trouble between your company and its workers.[62]

Pullman did not answer this letter.

After the visit Altgeld again wrote Pullman asking him to provide charity for the workers. The Governor suggested that Pullman cancel all rents from August 21 to October 1, so that the men could pay other bills, and then that he work all of the men half time rather than just some of the men full time. Then every family would have enough for food.[63]

Pullman replied to this second letter and agreed that there were many cases of need but he attributed it to the fact that many of the men refused to return to work at Pullman either beaause they would not accept the wages offered or because they would no longer work for the Pullman Company. He refused to cut the rents in any way and offered to help the situation only by employing as many men as possible at full time work.[64]

An obvious question arises when this argument of Pullman's is studied. If the men no longer wanted to work for Pullman, why did they continue to live in the town of Pullman? Pullman never supplied an answer to this question, but the United States Commission that investigated the strike provided at least a possibility. Many of the men who had participated in the strike were black-listed. Several of the men who testified at the Commission hearings stated that the company was rehiring only those former employees who took an oath that they would never again belong to the American Railway Union. Many of the leaders during the strike were never to be rehired.[65] Pullman was not going to evict any of these men who he hoped to eventually rehire, at his own wages of course. These were still the most important tools of the Pullman Company and should not be thrown away.

The Strike Commission, which was headed by the same Carroll D. Wright who had led the 1885 investigation of the town, held extensive hearings on the strike. Most of the testimony was concerned with the rioting and

the conflict between the American Railway Union and the Railwayd Managers Association. The Commission did accept testimony from several of the inhabitants of Pullman and called some of the company officials including George M. Pullman. While no recommendations were made, the Commission did reach some conclusions. The exclusion of the inhabitants of the town from any part of its management probably prevented their appreciation of the town's "advantages." "Men, as a rule, even when employees, prefer independence to paternalism in such matters."[66] The direct cause of the strike at Pullman was laid to the reduction in wages with no accompanying reduction in rents. This caused the workers' resentment against the defects of the town to burst forth and destroyed the town.

A closer look at the town of Pullman supports the thesis that Pullman appreciated the importance of his employees only as he felt they were necessary to the success of his company. He provided the best possible material environment to keep his workers healthy and in good working condition. He allowed no "baneful influences" to ruin the good condition of his workers just as a mechanic keeps his tools dry so that they will not rust. But Pullman could not make the next step to the realization that his tools were really men who had a right to a share in the profits of his company. They were merely tools, albeit complex ones. This is shown in Pullman's attempts to control religion and politics in his town. Tools could be used in any way. But the men were not tools. They refused to accept this control. Eventually, Pullman went too far. He forgot one necessity of his tools, they had to eat. The tools rebelled openly and all of the weaknesses that had been hidden in the great experiment became apparent to all. The model town was a failure, a failure from which George Pullman did not recover.

Three years after the strike he was dead. The town lived on after him under constant attack from liberal reformers, until 1907, when it was ruled by the Illinois Supreme Court that the Pullman Company's corporate charter did not allow it to hold more land that was actually needed for company operations. All property not used for shops had to be sold. Over the next ten years the Pullman Company disposed of all of the land that the town was built on.[67] The great experiment was over.

1. Anonymous, "Report to the State of Illinois on the Status of the Town of Pullman Relative to Housing, Population, Sewerage, Water Supply, Plumbing, Streets, Public Health and Etc., 1885," p. 25, in the Pullman Collection at the Pullman Branch of the Chicago Public Library.

2. United States Strike Commission Report. (Senate, Executive Document No. 7, 53rd Congress, 3rd Session). Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895, pp. 486 and 529.

3. Chicago Daily News, December 11, 1883.

4. Testimony of Duane Doty, town agent for Pullman, before the Strike Commission. United States Strike Commission Report, pp. 504-505.

5. The testimony of several Pullman employees before the Strike Commission.

6. United States Strike Commission Report, pp. 531-533 and 636-637.

7. A letter from F. J. Masten, a former Pullman employee, in the Mechanical Engineer, August 9, 1884.

8. May 19, 1886.

9. United States Strike Commission Report, p. XXXV.

10. Ibid., p. 18.

11. Ibid., pp. XXI-XXII.

12. T. C. Crawford, "The Pullman Company and Its Striking Workmen," Harper's Weekly, XXXVIII (1894), p. 687.

13. William Carwardine, The Pullman Strike. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1894, p. 18.

14. The Pullman Journal, February 25, 1883, and United States Strike Commission Report, p. 9.

15. Richard L. Ely, "Pullman: A Social Study," Harper's Magazine, LXX (Feb., 1885), p. 464.

16. Carwardine, p. 50.

17. United States Strike Commission Report, pp. 480-481 and XXXIII.

18. John McLean, One Hundred Years in Illinois. Chicago: Peterson Linotyping Company, 1919, p. 236.

19. Mrs. Duane Doty, The Town of Pullman. Chicago: T. B. Struksacher, 1893, p. 47.

20. Chicago Herald, January 13, 1886.

21. Ibid.

22. Chicago Herald, February 4, 1886.

23. Chicago Herald, February 4, 1885.

24. Anonymous, Holy Rosary Parish. Chicago: no publisher, no paginationa A pamphlet prepared for the 75th anniversary of the parish in 1957. At the Pullman Branch Library.

25. The Chicago Mail, February 11, 1887, The Evening Edition.

26. Holy Rosary Parish, at the Pullman Branch Library.

27. Ibid.

28. Ely, p. 464.

29. United States Strike Commission Report, p. 529.

30. "Report to the State of Illinois on the Status of the Town of Pullman Relative to Housing, Population, Sewerage, Water Supply, Plumbing, Streets, Public Health and Etc., 1885," p. 24, in the Pullman Collection at the Pullman Branch of the Chicago Public Library.

31. Chicago Tribune, February 11, 1887.

32. Almont Lindsey, The Pullman Strike. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. 63.

33. McLean, pp. 252-254.

34. Chicago Herald, March 23, 1883.

35. Chicago Tribune, March 27, 1883.

36. Chicago Herald, June 25, 1885, and The Daily Inter Ocean, July 8, 1885.

37. October 29, 1887.

38. Chicago Times, May 1, 1890.

39. July 30, 1886.

40. Chicago Herald, October 20, 1887.

41. Chicago Herald, November 9, 1887.

42. Chicago Times, May 13, 1889.

43. Chicago Herald, March 31, 1889.

44. Chicago Times, April 4, 1889, and Chicago Herald, April 5, 1889.

45. Chicago Times, May 13, 1889.

46. Chicago Times, June 30, 1889.

47. Chicago Herald, February 8, 1883.

48. Detroit Evening Journal, February 8, 1886. A clipping in the Pullman Collection at the Newberry Library.

49. Ely, p. 464.

50. United States Strike Commission Report, p. 530.

51. Ibid., p. 450.

52. Ibid., pp. 598-601.

53. Ibid., p. 509.

54. Ibid., p. XXXVI.

55. D. McG. Means, "Principles Involved in the Recent Strike," The Forum, XVII (Aug., 1894), p. 634.

56. Chicago Tribune, March 6, 1884.

57. Chicago Times, October 4, 1885, and Chicago Herald, October 3, 1885.

58. Chicago Times, May 5, 1886, and Chicago Tribune, May 14, 1886.

59. There is no evidence that this was ever done.

60. The material on the strike itself is taken from Almont Lindsey, The Pullman Strike (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), pp. 122-270.

61. Governor Altgeld, "Proclamation to the People of Illinois and Chicago," August 21, 1894. Reprinted in W. F. Burns, The Pullman Boycott. St. Paul: The McGill Printing Company, 1894, pp. 297-298.

62. Altgeld to Pullman, August 19, 1894. In Burns, pp. 301-302.

63. Altgeld to Pullman, August 31, 1894. In Burns, pp. 303-304.

64. Pullman to Altgeld, August 21, 1894. In Burns, pp. 306-307.

65. See the testimony of several Pullman employees, especially that of Thomas Heathcoate, in the United States Strike Commission Report.

66. United States Strike C mmission Report, pp. XXI-XXII.

67. McLean, p. 84.

IV

CONCLUSION

George Mortimer Pullman's great experiment ended disastrously. It failed to achieve its purpose, the attracting and holding of a large body of capable workers to the Pullman Palace Car Company. The reason for the town's failure is easily apparent today. The town of Pullman was to act as a replacement for the old personal relationship between owner and worker. Perhaps the town could have replaced that relationship, if Pullman had looked upon its inhabitants as human beings. But, to Pullman, his workers were tools, to be used to bring in the largest possible profits. His employees could not feel that Pullman had any interest in their welfare when he cut wages without reducing their rents.

Pullman's attitude toward his workers was not unusual, nor was it condemned by most of the leaders of public opinion in the United States. Politicians, educators, writers, even churchmen, defended the actions of the businessman. According to William Miller, " . . . public sanction for the pursuit of private fortune had always been strong in America."[1]

The Puritans had believed that economic success was a sign of divine favor. The Quakers devoted themselves almost entirely to economic pursuits. This atmosphere was still prevalent throughout New England and most of the North during the 1830's.[2] The men who achieved business success after the Civil War were raised to believe that thrift and diligence were the most important virtues. Success came to the man who worked hardest. The leading exponent of American individualism during the first half of the nineteenth

century, Ralph Waldo Emerson, wrote:

> Success has no more eccentricity than the gingham and muslin we weave in our mills . . . We must reckon success a constitutional trait. . . There is always a reason, in the man, for his good or bad fortune, and so in making money.[3]

There was as yet little questioning the uses of wealth for there were few really wealthy men. The problem was to make money, not to dispose of it.

Twenty years later questions about the uses of an individual's wealth were asked more frequently in American society. Stephen Girard and John Jacob Astor had both died before 1850, leaving large fortunes. There was for a time a belief that the workers who had helped to create these fortunes were entitled to a share in them. The theories as to how this could be accomplished were hazy and ill-defined but an important question had been asked, Do the rich owe anything to the society that enables them to become rich?[4]

This question posed a problem for which the press, the courts, the schools and the pulpit quickly provided an answer. The uses to which an entrepreneur put his wealth were not important, and,further, were not society's business. What was important were the ways in which the entrepreneur's business effected society. Did he provide work for hundreds, even thousands, of men? This was the most important question. If he did, the entrepreneur was an asset to society and could accumulate all the wealth that he was able to with society's blessing. Sigmund Diamond points out that by the time of Vanderbilt's death this was the official position of most of the opinion makers in American society.[5] The idea, that the businessman's major responsibility was to provide work for others and no more than that, lasted until 1900 as a potent force and was often referred

to by Rockefeller and other big businessmen in justifying their actions.[6] It is still heard today among certain groups.

After the Civil War the old Calvinistic doctrines of thrift and diligence were reinforced by Herbert Spencer's interpretation of the scientific theories of Charles Darwin. In addition there was a conservative reaction that is common at the end of a war and a deep desire for a period of quiet to exploit the natural resources of the continent. As a result the leading businessmen were not strongly challenged in their actions. The excesses of several of these businessmen cut short their period of freedom. Reform sentiments were heard in the United States by 1876. These gradually grew stronger until, by 1900, American opinion had shifted from support of the entrepreneur to a more balanced consideration of the problems of employer and employees.[7]

Between the Civil War and 1900 the dominant philosophy of the American business community was Social Darwinism. This socio-economic theory had been formulated by Herbert Spencer in England and its greatest advocate in the United States was William Graham Sumner. In its popular version, Social Darwinism was survival of the fittest in the economic sphere. Costs should be slashed to the absolute minimum and prices driven to the highest possible limit. The payment of starvation wages was justified by an inviolable law of economics. Not to do so meant business failure. Richard Hofstadter has made the connection between the older Calvinistic attitudes and Social Darwinism. He points out the concern of the followers of Social Darwinsim with the obvious rigors of life and the necessity to work hard and practice self-denial. "Theirs is a kind of naturalistic Calvinism in which man's relation to nature is as hard and demanding as

man's relation to God under the Calvinistic system." This concern led them to accept an economic philosophy that was fitted to a rapidly expanding economy. Their philosophy called for hard work and great thrift and "put a premium on those qualitites that seemed necessary for the disciplining of a labor force and a force of small investors." Economic life called for men of good character and punished the lazy, careless and inefficient.[8]

There were many corollaries to the theory of Social Darwinism and some of these corollaries produced severe strains in the web of American beliefs. According to Sumner and his followers, there were no absolute "rights" to which men were entitled. Rights were merely the accepted mores of the present civilization, the "rules of the game of social competition which are current now and here."[9] The accumulation of wealth became the great goal of society and in fact the only way society could advance. The right thing to do was to make money and the good man was the one who could make the most money.[10] The rich man was to be praised for the good he was doing society.

Hofstadter, in his study of Social Darwinism, points out that, "American society saw its image in the tooth-and-claw version of natural selection . . . ."[11] The makers of opinion in the United States, press, schools, courts, most of the churches, were tied to the businessman and preached natural selection as a justification for prevailing business and political actions. Sumner, minister, professor, scientist, wrote:

> The millionaires are a product of natural selection, acting on the whole body of men to pick out those who can meet the requirements of certain work to be done . . . They get high wages and live in luxury, but the bargain is a good one for society. There is the intensest competition for their place and occupation. This assures us that all who are competent for this function will be employed in it, so that the cost of it will be reduced to the lowest terms.[12]

Earlier, Sumner had written, "Competition, therefore, is a law of nature. Nature is entirely neutral . . .. She grants her rewards to the fittest... . If we do not like it, and if we try to amend it, there is only one way in which we can do it. We can take from the better and give to the worse."[13]

Businessmen were quick to seize upon these and like pronouncements as a justification for their actions. But feedback was inevitable. When clergymen, teachers, and others justified cutting wages and eliminating competition, the justifications served to encourage businessmen to do more cutting and eliminating.

Beyond the question of the guiding philosophy, there were very real problems involved in the industrialization of the United States that even the most astute of men seem to have recognized only rarely, if at all, before 1900. There was the loss of personal contact between worker and laborer which had such disastrous effects on employer-employee relationships; the monotony of the work which broke down worker morale; the rapid expansion of immigration which brought into the United States a huge body of workers unfamiliar with the language or customs. These are problems that are still with us today, but in the post-Civil War era they were complicated by the results of the philosophy of Social Darwinism. There were no provisions made for retirement, accidents, or the periodic lay-offs that afflicted every industry. No entrepreneur dared to provide pensions or insurance for his workers in the cutthroat economy that Social Darwinism engendered. His competitors would derive too much of an advantage from his increased labor costs.

Since the employers would not voluntarily provide relief measures for their workers, the workers decided upon unionism as the way to gain their

objectives. The union movement in the United States went up and down with the economy. During periods of depression the union movement practically disappeared, to return as conditions bettered. After 1879, at the end of the depression which had started in 1873, militant unionism was accepted by the workers.[14] The labor organizations assumed the nature of a class movement, during the summer of 1885.[15] Some of the foreign immigrants who entered the United States were advocates of socialistic theories, others were anarchists. Many of these men became leaders in the labor movement. There was a definite danger that the conflict between employers and employees could evolve into a class war.

The situation began to improve in the 1890's. Some employers began to discover that their employees produced more work when they received the proper inducements. Shorter hours and better working conditions, even welfare plans, allowed wage cuts and increased production.[16] However, it has been estimated that by 1908 only one and a half million workers had been effected by these new ideas.[17] There was a reaction to these reforms in the business community. Charles Elliott Perkins, the President of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad, objected to payments for injuries and relief payments, arguing that such payments "relieved the men of the care and responsibility for themselves, and care and responsibility were developmental."[18] This is the old argument praising hard work and thrift in a slightly disguised fashion. It was wrong to deprive men of a chance to build their own character by being thrifty.

Finally, there is the relationship between the entrepreneur and the city to consider. Cochran and Miller have noted that the effect of the city on business and the effect of business on the city were the same. Each

caused the expansion of the other.[19] Large industries required large concentrations of workers just as large concentrations of workers attracted large industries. The cities were always overcrowded and dirty. It was not thrifty to use land for wide streets or parks when land values were high. There were no large profits to be made from collecting garbage. It was not until the twentieth century that the desire for maximum profit was overcome enough to provide the needed open spots which were necessary for the better health of the inhabitants.

By the late 1890's even a few of the "robber barons" had come to realize that they owed a debt to society. Carnegie thought it,

> ... the duty of the man of wealth ... to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer ... to produce the most beneficial results for the community ... the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer brethern, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.[20]

Pullman's idea of a company town fitted Carnegie's theory of the rich (fit) administering wealth for the poor (unfit). Everything that his employees were unable to provide for themselves, Pullman provided for them. Pullman was operating within the limits of Social Darwinism. His town was intended to lure the best workers, leaving his competitors the less efficient. He intended to make as great a profit as possible from the town. But he also intended to provide the best living place for his workers. Pullman had early learned the value of the best. He tried to provide the best possible product; he tried to provide the best possible town. Certainly pride in his town, as pride in his product, drove Pullman to provide the best. But Pullman had also recognized the importance of the worker. He was a predecessor of those businessmen who introduced shorter

hours and higher wages, not from altruism, but to increase production.

It is apparent that Pullman could have received no impetus to follow any scheme of thought other than Social Darwinism. He was born in a small rural community in upstate New York and was raised to be a laborer or small businessman. In contrast to the majority of his later associates, he had little education. Through hard work, thrift, and luck (although he would never have called it that) Pullman rose to dominate an industry. As a boy he must have been subjected to Calvinistic ideas on the value of working hard and saving money. Certainly these ideas were reinforced by most of the people with whom he came in contact in later life. Within his family there were two ministers to provide divine approval. Leading citizens were his friends. The press regarded him favorably. An occasional eccentric like Ely could easily be dismissed.

Yet Pullman managed to break out of the Social Darwinist theme at least partially and attempted a remarkable experiment to find an answer for the labor problems that were plaguing the country. The town of Pullman violated many of the dogmas of Social Darwinism. The town was laid out with wide streets and parks although the land they occupied carried a high valuation. Free services, such as garbage collection, were provided. Perhaps most significant, while the town never paid the return it was supposed to, the rents were never raised. All of these items contradicted the theory of the survival of the fittest and should have provided Pullman's competitors with an advantage. It is a credit to Pullman's business ability that they did not.

The great weakness in Pullman's thought was in his ideas concerning the treatment of his workers. Pullman felt that his responsibility to them

ended when they had good living conditions. He had fulfilled his debt to society by providing work for many and properly administering his wealth. Now his workers must fulfill their duties, one of which was to provide a profit for the Pullman Palace Car Company. As long as the economy remained sound this was possible but, when there was a depression, something would have to give. The dichotomy in Pullman's thinking, the conflict between giving the workers good treatment and yet making a profit on them would become evident. When the depression did come Pullman would not bend, nor would his workers. Pullman had placed them in an impossible situation to which they reacted in the only way they were able. The strike pointed out the faults of the experiment and it failed.

1. William Miller, "The Realm of Wealth," The Reconstruction of American History, ed. John Higham. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962, p. 142.

2. Sigmund Diamond, The Reputation of the American Businessman. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1955, p. 20.

3. Quoted in Diamond, p. 21, italics Diamond's.

4. Ibid., p. 51.

5. Ibid., p. 75.

6. Edward Chase Kirkland, Dream and Thought in the American Business Community, 1860-1900. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956, p. 154.

7. John R. Commons says that in 1902 during the anthracite coal strike the public adopted a "non-hysterical" view of labor problems. John R. Commons, et al., History of Labour in the United States, 4 Vols. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1936, vol. III, p. 505.

8. Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1944, pp. 9-10.

9. Sumner's thoughts on natural rights are contained in William Graham Sumner, "Some Natural Rights," Social Darwinism: Selected Essays of William Graham Sumner. Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963, pp. 65-69.

10. Robert Green McCloskey, American Conservatism in the Age of Enterprise. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1951, p. 171.

11. Hofstadter, p. 201.

12. Sumner, p. 157.

13. Ibid., p. 76.

14. Commons, p. 309.

15. Ibid., p. 357.

16. Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961, p. 245.

17. Ibid.

18. Edward Chase Kirkland, "Divide and Ruin," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLIII (June, 1956), p. 5.

19. Cochran and Miller, p. 153.

20. Quoted in Kirkland, Dream and Thought in the American Business Community, 1860-1900, pp. 146-147.

APPENDIX

Interpretations

Until 1940, historians had taken one of two positions in regard to the place of the businessman in American history. These two positions were the obvious ones of either defending or condemning the actions of the businessman. Prior to 1900, the defenders of entrepreneurial freedom were in the majority. After 1900, in line with the Progressive revolt, those who condemned the actions of the businessman predominated. As the United States climbed out of the depression some historians again took up the defense of the businessman. Today both sides are heard.[1] In approximately 1940, a third group of historians began to publish a few articles. This group has "... been more interested in understanding American material success..."[2] than in occupying a definite position in regard to it.

The early observers of the American businessman, in accordance with the accepted system of laissez faire economics, did not challenge his right to run his business in any way that he chose. Generally, the question of whether a businessman's actions were right or wrong was never raised. When it was, scholars, including historians, tended to defend the businessman.

During the early 1900's historians began to question the American attitude toward the businessman. Historians, following the Progressive Movement, pointed out the many faults of the large industrialists. The Beards and Vernon Parrington worked out an almost complete indictment against the businessman by the 1920's.[3] This indictment was further

embellished during the depression of the 1930's. Perhaps the most famous statement of it is Matthew Josephson's The Robber Barons.[4]

Allan Nevins, in the 1940's, led a revival in favor of the businessman. While Nevins is the most prolific of the modern defenders of the businessman, Edward C. Kirkland is the most eloquent. Kirkland feels that the "Robber Baron" concept sponsored by the Progressives needs revision. In his opinion the Progressives have failed to see democracy as a whole. He finds his justification for the businessman in "our whole democratic organization."[5]

A small group of economists and historians, among whom the leading figures are William Miller and Thomas Cochran, have attempted to study the whole system of American economic development and the entrepreneurs' place in it. In general, these men have backed the Progressive indictment, laying special emphasis on the businessman's political manipulations. Unfortunately, as yet, little has been published by this group.[6]

At the present time, therefore, there is a controversy concerning the exact place of the businessman in the development of the American economy. There have been many recent studies of individual entrepreneurs, but no general interpretation has replaced the Progressive indictment.

Just as the general historical interpretations of the role of the businessman in the era after the Civil War have changed, so have the interpretations of Pullman and the Pullman strike changed. Before the strike there was widespread approval of Pullman's experiment, the only real exception being Ely's article in The Nation. During the strike most periodicals were too busy condemning Eugene Debs and the American Railroad Union to devote much space to the problems of Pullman. Then, in the fall

of 1894, several articles were published which concerned themselves with the question of the town of Pullman. Most of these articles backed Pullman, although there were a few which expressed dissatisfaction with the principles behind the town.

Early in July, The Nation published an article which admonished the workers to "grin and bear it." According to this article, the Pullman inhabitants should have realized that, since profits were down, wages were not available. Reference was made to the "iron law of wages" which could not be circumvented. This article followed the straight Social Darwinist line. The entrepreneur determined prices and wages and, also, how large a profit margin was a fair return on his manufactures. The workers' duty was to be hard working. Perhaps if they had been more frugal, they would have saved enough to tide them over. At any rate they should not complain because they were being hurt by a basic economic "law."[7]

There were several other articles defending Pullman published in leading magazines. The major orator of the day, Chauncey Depew, in Our Day, attacked Debs as the primary villain of the strike.[8] The Review of Reviews carried two articles on Pullman in its August issue. The first contained a lengthy quote of George Pullman stating that the town of Pullman had achieved its objective of making better citizens of its inhabitants. The inhabitants, again according to Pullman, were 40 per cent thriftier than any other comparable group of workmen.[9] High praise from an expert in the school of thrift! The second article recommended that other manufacturers follow Pullman's example and build model towns for their employees.[10]

In August, there also appeared two articles attacking Pullman. One, in The American Journal of Politics, was virulently opposed to Pullman

personally and went as far as accusing Pullman of forcing the town's inhabitants to shop at the stores in the Arcade.[11] There was never any proof of this and it does not seem probable, especially as the stores were in no way owned by the Pullman Company. The Social Economist compared Pullman to the "autocraft of all the Russias" in "ignoring the fundamental principles of American institutions." Pullman was charged with not believing in Democracy,[12] which was probably true, but was not an unusual thought then and is not unheard of now.

Hermann von Holst, a Professor of History at the University of Chicago, defended Pullman in the December issue of The Journal of Political Economy. He also attacked Debs as the instigator of the trouble.[13] In December, Charles H. Eaton, a prominent Universalist Minister, attacked the idea that there was a lack of freedom at Pullman. "The only difference between this and other factory towns is, that with equal or larger freedom, the most healthful and stimulating surroundings are afforded."[14] Eaton went on to argue that workingmen generally had a "promiscuous character" and advocated strict supervision as the only way to control laborers.[15]

The Yale Review, in February, 1895, concluded the press debate on Pullman with a balanced article discussing the different aspects of paternalism with regard to the town. This article pointed out the inconsistencies of both parties. Pullman had taken credit for a great many acts that benefited the workers but had definitely not operated paternalistically when it came to lowering the rents. The workers were usually glad to accept the advantages that paternalism brought them but objected to all the restraints. Self-interest was really the dominating force behind both the company and the laborers.[16]

This is not a complete summary of the articles on Pullman after the strike, but the proportion is accurate, three articles defending Pullman to every one attacking him. There were very few articles that adopted an unprejudiced view as the article in The Yale Review had done. The articles defending Pullman all followed the postulates of Social Darwinism closely. The workers had no "rights" which Pullman had to respect. Pullman had been, in the eyes of many, a philanthropist who furnished his workers with more than they merited. In striking they were being ungrateful to their benefactor. According to the theory of survival of the fittest, Pullman had a duty to cut wages when the market for railroad cars broke. He was bound by the "iron law of wages" just as his workers were.

The articles attacking Pullman were of a different sort. There was no guiding philosophy for these articles. Some merely attacked Pullman, others made recommendations as to how the problem of employer-employee relations could be solved. Several were written by workers or avowed socialists and it was easy for them to be dismissed, in 1894, as the work of crackpots. They showed just as much prejudice as those articles that praised Pullman and sometimes were much more extreme in their conclusions, going beyond pension plans or accident insurance, to recommend state ownership of industry.

At the time of the strike, press comment as expressed by journalists, teachers and ministers reflected the conflicts in society, Moderates were not heard and extremists held the stage. The United States had not matured enough to take a balanced view of the relationships between labor and capital. What of historians?

It appears that historians also tended to follow the prevailing ideology

of the times. One study has reached the conclusion that "most of the early 'legitimate' historians tended to shift the blame for the conduct of the strike to the shoulders of the American Railroad Union leaders and Governor Altgeld of Illinois."[17] It was not until the depression of the 1930's that views began to change.

The historian who had done the greatest amount of work on Pullman, Almont Lindsey, tended to follow the lead of the Progressives. In a 1939 article, Lindsey wrote that Pullman had hoped that paternalism would give his company stability in labor conditions.[18] Two years later, in The Pullman Strike, Lindsey condemned Pullman's attitude, referring to the "heroic strikers" and "hardheaded businessmen." His work lacks perspective and "is as much a part of the labor movement itself as of the historical profession."[19]

Contemporary material on Pullman and the town of Pullman does not come from historians. A book by Mrs. Duane Doty, wife of the last town manager, contains a complete catalog of the town including the sizeoof rooms and the area covered by buildings. Doty worked in the town from its inception and had determined the rents for the buildings.[20] The Pullman Company doctor, John McLean, in his autobiography supplies a good description of life in the town and several interesting anecdotes about George Pullman. McLean is very favorable to Pullman.[21] One inhabitant of the town who disliked Pullman was the Reverend William Carwardine. His book supports the thesis that the town was a feudal barony which George Pullman ran to suit himself.[22] These are the major contemporary sources on the town of Pullman.

In 1917, Joseph Husband published his study of the Pullman Company. It is taken almost entirely from newspaper articles. Husband praised Pullman's

business acumen and had a high regard for the idea of the town.[3] The latest work on Pullman, in 1951, is by Carroll B. Harding, then President of the Pullman Company. It is a reiteration of Husband, McLean and Doty.[4] All of the studies of Pullman have suffered from the lack of company records, or their unavailability.

1. Two articles that have been published attacking the "robber baron" thesis are, Hal Bridges, "The Robber Baron Concept in American History," Business History Review, XXXII (Spring, 1958), pp. 1-14, and John Tipple, "The Anatomy of Prejudice, Origins of the Robber Baron Legend," Business History Review, XXXIII (Winter, 1959), pp. 510-524. For a defense of the thesis see Chester McArthur Destler, "The Opposition of American Businessmen to Social Control During the 'Gilded Age'," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXIX (March, 1953), pp. 641-673.

2. William Miller, "The Realm of Wealth," The Reconstruction of American History, ed. John Higham. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962, p. 154.

3. Ibid., p. 147.

4. New York: Harcourt, Brace Company, 1934.

5. The best statement of Kirkland's thought on this subject is found in "Divide and Ruin," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLII (June, 1956), pp. 3-18. Also see Dream and Thought in the Business Community, 1860-1900. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956, and Industry Comes of Age. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

6. See Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961, and William Miller, ed., Men in Business. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.

7. H. B. White, "The Pullman Boycott," The Nation, LIX (July 5, 1894), p. 5.

8. "The Debs Strike," XIII (July-August, 1894), pp. 356-364.

9. Anonymous, "The Progress of the World," X (August, 1894), p. 136.

10. Anonymous, "Ho, for the Country!" X (August, 1894), p. 137.

11. Thomas Burke Grant, "Pullman and Its Lessons," V (August, 1894), p. 203.

12. Anonymous, "How Pullman Was Built," VII (August, 1894), p. 85.

13. "Are We Ashamed," II (September, 1894), pp. 485-515.

14. "Pullman and Paternalism," The American Journal of Politics, V (Dec., 1894), p. 573.

15. Ibid., p. 577.

16. Editorial, "The Ethics of Paternalism," III (February, 1895), pp. 347-351.

17. James B. White, "The Different Views About the Pullman Strike of 1894," The Social Studies, LI (December, 1961), p. 257.

18. Almont Lindsey, "Paternalism and the Pullman Strike," The American Historical Review, XLIV (January, 1939), p. 273.

19. Rowland Berthoff, "The Working Class, " The Reconstruction of American History, p. 131.

20. The Town of Pullman. Chicago: T. B. Struksacher, 1893.

21. One Hundred Years in Illinois. Chicago: Peterson Linotyping Company, 1919.

22. The Pullman Strike. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1894.

23. The Story of the Pullman Car. Chicago: A. C. McClurg Company, 1917.

24. George M. Pullman (1831-1897) and the Pullman Company. New York: The Newcomen Society in North America, 1951.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

There are three collections of material on George M. Pullman, the Pullman Company, and the town of Pullman. The best of these collections is at the Pullman Branch of the Chicago Public Library. This collection is made up of books, newspapers, manuscripts, reports, and pictures of the town. The Newberry Library in Chicago has a large collection of clippings of newspaper articles about the Pullman Company. These clippings date back to 1867 and four of the scrapbooks contain articles on the town. The collection of material at the Chicago Historical Society contains a few letters written to Mr. Pullman and a wide variety of other items, mainly newspaper articles on the Pullman area after the company was forced to sell its holdings. Mrs. C. Phlip Miller, Pullman's granddaughter, has a small collection of personal letters written by Mr. Pullman.

Original and Contemporary Sources

I. Documents:

1. "Report to the State of Illinois on the Status of the Town of Pullman Relative to Housing, Population, Sewerage, Water Supply, Plumbing, Streets, Public Health and Etc., 1885." (A copy of the official report to the state on the conditions of the town. At the Pullman Branch Library).

2. United States Strike Commission Report. (Senate, Executive Document No. 7, 53rd Congress, 3rd Session). Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895.

3. Wright, Carroll D., et al., "The Report of the State Commissioners of Labor Statistics on the Industrial, Social and Economic Conditions of Pullman, Illinois." (A copy at the Pullman Branch Library).

II. Newspapers:

All newspapers from outside the Chicago area were found in the collection at the Newberry Library.

1. The Arcade Journal (Pullman)
2. Aurora Herald
3. Calumet Index
4. Chicago Daily News
5. Chicago Herald
6. The Chicago Mail
7. The Chicago Post and Mail
8. Chicago Sun
9. Chicago Times
10. Chicago Tribune
11. The Christian Register (Boston)
12. The Daily Inter Ocean
13. Detroit Evening Journal
14. Kansas City Journal
15. The New York Sun
16. The Republican (St. Louis)
17. The St. Louis Post Despatch
18. Vicksburg Daily Herald

III. Periodicals:

1. Anonymous, "The Arcadian City of Pullman," Agricultural Review, III (1883), pp. 68-69.
2. _____, "Ho, for the Country!" The Review of Reviews, X (August, 1894), p. 137.

3. _____, "The Progress of the World," The Review of Reviews, X (August, 1894), p. 136.

4. _____, "How Pullman Was Built," Social Economist, VII (August, 1894), pp. 85-88.

5. _____, "An Industrial City," The Scientific American, L (1884), pp. 279-280.

6. Crawford, T. C., "The Pullman Company and Its Striking Workmen," Harper's Weekly, XXXVIII(July 21, 1894), pp. 686-687.

7. Depew, Chauncey M., "The Debs Strike," Our Day, XIII (July-August, 1894), pp. 356-364.

8. Eaton, Charles H., "Pullman and Paternalism," The American Journal of Politics, V (December, 1894), pp. 571-579.

9. Editorial,"The Ethics of Paternalism," The Yale Review, III (February, 1895), pp. 347-351.

10. Ely, Richard, "Pullman: A Social Study," Harper's Magazine, LXX (February, 1885), pp. 452-466.

11. Grant, Thomas Burke, "Pullman and Its Lessons," The American Journal of Politics, V (August, 1894), pp. 190-204.

12. von Holst, Hermann, "Are We Ashamed," The Journal of Political Economy, II (September, 1894), pp. 485-515.

13. Mason, J. W., "Pullman and Its Real Lessons," The American Journal of Politics, V (October, 1894), pp. 392-398.

14. McDermot, Rev. George, C.S.P., "The Pullman Strike Commission," The Catholic World, LX (February, 1895), pp. 627-635.

15. Means, D. McG., "Principles Involved in the Recent Strike," The Forum, XVII (August, 1894), pp. 633-644.

16. Ogden, R., "The Report on the Chicago Strike," The Nation, LIX (November 22, 1894), p. 376.

17. Pond, Irving K., "Pullman - America's First Planned Industrial Town," Illinois Society of Architects Monthly Bulletin, 18-19 (June-July, 1934), pp. 6-8.

18. Pullman, George M., "The Debs Strike," Our Day, XIII (July-August, 1894), pp. 364-368.

19. Robinson, H. P., "The Humiliating Report of the Strike Commission," The Forum, XVIII (January , 1895), pp. 523-532.

20. White, H.B., "The Pullman Boycott," The Nation, LIX (July 5, 1894), pp. 5-6.

21. Wright, Carroll D., "May A Man Conduct His Business as He Pleases," The Forum, XVIII (December, 1894), pp. 425-432.

IV. Books and Pamphlets:

1. Anonymous, The Story of Pullman. Chicago: The Pullman Company, [1893]. (A pamphlet prepared by the Pullman Company for their exhibit at the Worlds Fair in 1893).

2. Anonymous, "George Mortimer Pullman," Contemporary American Biography, part 6. New York: Atlantic Publishing and Engraving Company, 1893.

3. Burns, W. F., The Pullman Boycott. St. Paul: The McGill Printing Company, 1894.

4. Carnegie, Andrew, Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.

5. Carwardine, William, The Pullman Strike. Chicago: Carles H. Kerr, 1894.

6. Cook, Fredrick, Bygone Days in Chicago. Chicago: A. C. McClurg Company, 1910.

7. Doty, Mrs. Duane, The Town of Pullman. Chicago: T. B. Struksacher, 1893.

8. M'Lean, John, One Hundred Years in Illinois. Chicago: Peterson Linotyping Company, 1919.

9. Quaife, Milo, editor, The Development of Chicago 1674-1919. Chicago: The caxton Club, 1916. (A collection of original sources on Chicago).

Secondary Sources

I. Periodicals:

1. Bridges, Hal, "The Robber Baron Concept in American History," Business History Review, XXXII (Spring, 1958), pp. 1-14.

2. Destler, Chester, "The Opposition of American Businessmen to Social Control During the 'Gilded Age'," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXIX (March, 1953), pp. 641-673.

3. Fine, Sidney, "Richard T. Ely, Forerunner of Progressivism, 1880-1901," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXVII (March, 1951), pp. 599-615.

4. Kirkland, Edward C., "Divide and Ruin," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLII (June, 1956), pp. 3-18.

5. Lindsey, Almont, "Paternalism and the Pullman Strike," American Historical Review, XLIV (January, 1939), pp. 272-290.

6. Tipple, John, "The Anatomy of Prejudice, Origins of the Robber Baron Legend," Business History Review, XXXIII (Winter, 1959), pp. 510-524.

7. White, James B., "The Different Views About the Pullman Strike of 1894," LI (December, 1961), pp. 254-260.

II. Books and Pamphlets:

1. Anonymous, Holy Rosary Parish. (Chicago: no publisher, no pagination. A pamphlet published on the 75th anniversary of the parish in 1957. At the Pullman Branch Library).

2. Black, Robert C., The Railroads of the Confederacy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1952.

3. Bunley, James, Millionaires and Kings of Enterprise. Philadelphia J. B. Lippincott, 1901.

4. Cochran, Thomas C., and William Miller, Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.

5. Commons, John R., et al., History of Labour in the United States. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1936, 4 vols.

6. Curry, Seymour, Chicago: Its History and Its Builders. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1912.

7. Diamond, Sigmund, The Reputation of the American Businessman. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1955.

8. Harding, Carroll B., George M. Pullman (1831-1897) and the Pullman Company. New York: The Newcomen Society in North America, 1951.

9. Higham, John, editor, The Reconstruction of American History. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.

10. Hofstadter, Richard, Social Darwinism in American Thought. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1944.

11. Husband, Joseph, The Story of the Pullman Car. Chicago: A. C. McClurg Company, 1917.

12. Josephson, Matthew, The Robber Barons. New York: Harcourt, Brace Company, 1934.

13. Kirkland, Edward Chase, Dream and Thought in the Business Community, 1860-1900. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956.

14. _____, Industry Comes of Age. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

15. Lindsey, Almont, The Pullman Strike. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

16. McCloskey, Robert Green, American Conservatism in the Age of Enterprise. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1951.

17. Miller, William, editor, Men in Business. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.

18. Mitman, Carl W., "George M. Pullman," Dictionary of American Biography, edited by Dumas Malone, Vol. XV. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

19. Pierce, Bessie, A History of Chicago, 3 vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.

20. Stover, John F., The Railroads of the South 1865-1900. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955.

21. Taylor, George Rogers, The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1951.

22. _____, and Irene Neu, The American Railroad Network 1861-1900. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press.

23. Thompson, Slason, A Short History of American Railways. Chicago Bureau of Railway News and Statistics, 1925.

24. White, Morton G., Social Thought in America: The Revolt Against Formalism. Chicago: The Viking Press, 1949.

III. Manuscripts:

1. Willis, Urban, a collection of manuscripts, some at the Pullman Branch of the Chicago Public Library, others in the collection of Mrs. C. Philip Miller. Willis was the tutor for the children

of Pullman's daughter, Florence Lowden. Much of his material came from interviews with the family.

2. Lindsey, Almont, "Pullman: A Social Study." An unpublished master's essay for the University of Illinois, 1936. At the Pullman Branch Library.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Edward A. Heberg, Jr., has been read and approved by three members of the Department of History.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

6/15/65
Date

Robert W. McElroy
Signature of Adviser