

The High Cost of Striking.

It was some thirty years ago that I had my first lesson in a strike become a riot. I had driven over a hill into a little iron and steel town where the men had been out for weeks. I had gone among them many times in these days and always there had been order and apathy. But the moment had come when exasperation born of hunger and consciousness of defeat had broken their restraint. Five hundred men and half as many women were charging on a plant into which strike breakers had been successfully introduced. The scene was worse than that of a battle, for here was no plan of campaign, no order of attack, no recognized leader. At the head of the mob were half a dozen shrieking women, their hair loose, their clothes torn. Their frenzy was almost bacchanalian in its wildness.

This accidental experience has always remained with me, one of those unforgettable shocks that reality sometimes gives a theorist. It has bred in me a wholesome dread of the potentiality of strikes as well as a habit of counting their cost, keeping their balance sheet, the gain and loss of them.

Put aside for this discussion the right to strike, that is, to quit work. I would be the last to question it. Put aside, too, for the moment, the causes of strikes. I have heard great leaders of industry say that they had never known of a strike that had not a legitimate grievance somewhere behind it, excepting of course those born in the struggle for power between two political factions, such strikes as those of which we have had such numerous examples recently. Put these questions aside, and count the cost of the exercise of the right to strike, whatever the reason for it.

The High Cost of Striking.

It was some thirty years ago that I had my first lesson in a strike become a riot. I had driven over a hill into a little iron and steel town where the men had been out for weeks. I had gone among them many times in these days and always there had been ^{order} order and apathy. But the moment had come when exasperation born of hunger and consciousness of defeat had broken their restraint. Five hundred men and half as many women were charging on a plant into which strike breakers had been successfully introduced. The scene was worse than that of a battle, for here was no plan of campaign, no order of attack, no recognized leader. At the head of the mob were half a dozen shrieking women, their hair loose, their clothes torn. Their frenzy was almost bacchanalian in its wildness.

This accidental experience has always remained with me, one of those unforgettable shocks that reality sometimes gives a theorist. It has bred in me a wholesome dread of the potentiality of strikes as well as a habit of counting their cost, keeping their balance sheet, the gain and loss of them.

Put aside for this discussion the right to strike, that is, to quit work. I would be the last to question it. Put aside, too, for the moment, the causes of strikes. I have heard great leaders of industry say that they had never known of a strike that had not a legitimate grievance somewhere behind it, excepting of course those born in the struggle for power between two political factions, ^{in a union} such strikes as those of which we have had such numerous examples recently. Put these questions aside, and count the cost of the exercise of the right to strike, whatever the reason for it.

Begin with the money, end of it, and run over the loss in wages alone in some of the more conspicuous disturbances of the last fall.

The printers and press men of New York City, 7,000 of them, their average pay being \$35 a week, lost in five weeks a million and a quarter dollars.

In one month the longshoremen of the same city deprived themselves of \$3,600,000 in wages.

The steel workers in the U. S. Steel Corporation had given up in wages by the first of December something like twelve and a half million dollars.

All these figures are guesses, you say; but they are conservative guesses, coming from sources thoroughly familiar with the different industries. But the analysis of loss in a particular strike gives nothing like an adequate idea of what the labor of the whole country suffers. It is only when we take the statistics of what is going on all over the land in a specific period that a graphic notion can be obtained. The Bureau of Statistics of the United States Department of Labor enables one to get a fair notion of the extent to which industry has been recently held up for one reason or another. Take the second quarter of 1919, April, May and June and figure out what happened. There were 1016 strikes and lockouts reported to the Bureau in this period (lockouts 42, strikes 974) Consider the number of people involved. 775,000 is rather an under than an over-estimate.

The Bureau calculates that the average number of days that the workmen involved were out was 29. Now multiply 775,000 by 29, and see what you get --- 2,257,500 days of labor lost in three months of a year when labor was never more needed to help the shaken world back on its feet. What does this mean in money? The great number of these strikers were in at least fairly well paid

Begin with the money end of it, and run over the loss in wages alone in some of the more conspicuous disturbances of the last fall. The printers and press men of New York City, 7,000 of them,

The printers and press men of New York City, 7,000 of them, their average pay being \$35 a week, lost in five weeks a million and a quarter dollars.

In one month the longshoremen of the same city deprived themselves of \$3,600,000 in wages, and a half million dollars.

The steel workers in the U. S. Steel Corporation had given up in wages by the first of December something like twelve and a half million dollars.

All these figures are guesses, you say; but they are conservative guesses, coming from sources thoroughly familiar with the different industries.

The Bureau of Statistics of the United States Department of Labor enables one to get a fair notion of the extent to which industry has been recently held up for one reason or another. Take the second quarter of 1919, April, May and June and figure out what happened. There were 1016 strikes and lockouts reported to the Bureau in this period (lockouts 42, strikes 974) Consider the number of people involved. 775,000 is rather an under than an over-estimate.

The Bureau calculates that the average number of days that the workmen involved were out was 29. Now multiply 775,000 by 29, and see what you get --- 2,257,500 days of labor lost in three months of a year when labor was never more needed to help the shaken world back on its feet. What does this mean in money? The great number of these strikers were in at least fairly well paid

industries. But supposing that the average wage was not over \$3 a day, an estimate below the fact, I am convinced. We have then a wage loss this three months of about \$68,000,000!

I have only quoted dollars above, and dollars themselves are nothing. It is only when we translate them into things that men need and want that they are of any use. Take these wares that were lost -- the three and a half millions in a month by the long-shoremen; that means three and a half millions dollars less of milk for the baby, shoes for the children, coal for the house, medicine for the wife. Take these \$68,000,000 in three months, and consider the pinch it brought in food, in rent, in amusement, in education.

To this proposition of course it can be opposed that the striker is not without income in these periods, that is, he is usually getting a larger or smaller proportion of his regular wage out of the strike chest, ~~there~~, while he ~~was~~ at work he and his fellows had been frugally laying aside through their unions a percentage of their wage for just such an emergency as this; like governments salting away in a war chest funds for the time when they shall go to battle. But what a destructive use of capital, for the laborer's war chest is capital -- accumulated labor, the kind of thing that if he were on a rational peace basis could be used either by him individually or by his union for purposes of education, cultivation, home-building. Instead the sum goes as war funds go, for destruction; destruction to be sure intended to bring about greater justice, and less need for future destruction. But what a commentary on human intelligence that such a method should be necessary or possible.

industries. But supposing that the average wage was not over \$3 a day, an estimate below the fact, I am convinced. We have then a wage loss this three months of about \$68,000,000!

I have only quoted dollars above, and dollars themselves are nothing. It is only when we translate them into things that men need and want that they are of any use. Take these wages that were lost -- the three and a half millions in a month by the long-shoremen; that means three and a half millions dollars less of milk for the baby, shoes for the children, coal for the house, medicine for the wife. Take these \$68,000,000 in three months, and consider the pinch it brought in food, in rent, in amusement, in education.

To this proposition of course it can be opposed that the striker is not without income in these periods, that is, he is usually getting a larger or smaller proportion of his regular wage out of the strike chest, that is, while he is at work he and his fellows have been frugally laying aside through their unions a percentage of their wage for just such an emergency as this; like governments salting away in a war chest funds for the time when they shall go to battle. But what a destructive use of capital, for the laborer's war chest is capital -- accumulated labor, the kind of thing that if he were on a rational peace basis could be used either by him individually or by his union for purposes of education, cultivation, home-building. Instead the sum goes as war funds go, for destruction; destruction to be sure intended to bring about greater justice, and less need for future destruction. But what a commentary on human intelligence that such a method should be necessary or possible.

Labor is not blind to this waste. One of the most recent suggestions from a labor leader in the American Federation is that all strikes be henceforth stopped, and the money saved for their *strike* benefits and expenses be used in a nation-wide campaign to educate the public to the just claims of the working men, to the reasons for his organization in unions; and, it is to be hoped, to showing how these organizations rightly used might be the greatest of peaceful and progressive forces.

The indirect loss of strikes are always many, and often very great. Many of them hit the home almost as hard as cutting ^{out} the weekly envelope. The longshoreman's interference with the housekeeper's is serious enough to excuse her if she harbors serious resentment against him. In the first place, for weeks, six or more, he cut off millions of people in greater New York from their daily supplies of fresh fruit and vegetables. Most of these goods, to be sure, sought other ports, and ^{a portion} may have reached the city by other channels before decay set in; but a decreased supply and an increased price ^{in these necessary foods} was one of the direct pinches of this particular strike.

It was the housekeeper's sugar bowl, however, that suffered most from this disturbance. For weeks cargoes of raw sugar were held up in New York harbor, forcing dealers to draw on the sugar reserves. So seriously were these reserves invaded, that the country had to be rationed as in the war. The rationing came in the months when people were putting up fruit. Arthur Williams, Food Commissioner of New York City says that hundreds, if not thousands of tons of fruit intended for preserving were a total loss this last fall. This loss, of course, comes hardest on the woman of limited means. It is the family of the longshoreman,

~~4~~

Labor is not blind to this waste. One of the most recent suggestions from a labor leader in the American Federation is that all strikes be henceforth stopped, and the money saved for their benefits and expenses be used in a nation-wide campaign to educate the public to the just claims of the working men, to the reasons for his organization in unions; and, it is to be hoped, to showing how these organizations rightly used might be the greatest of peaceful and progressive forces.

The indirect loss of strikes are always many, and often very great. Many of them hit the home almost as hard as cutting the weekly envelope. The longshoreman's interference with the housekeeper's is serious enough to excuse her if she harbors serious resentment against him. In the first place, for weeks, six or more, he cut off millions of people in greater New York from their daily supplies of fresh fruit and vegetables. Most of these goods, to be sure, sought other ports, and so may have reached the city by other channels before decay set in; but a decreased supply and an increased price was one of the direct pinches of this particular strike.

It was the housekeeper's sugar bowl, however, that suffered most from this disturbance. For weeks cargoes of raw sugar were held up in New York harbor, forcing dealers to draw on the sugar reserves. So seriously were these reserves invaded, that the country had to be rationed as in the war. The rationing came in the months when people were putting up fruit. Arthur Williams, Food Commissioner of New York City says that hundreds, if not thousands of tons of fruit intended for preserving were a total loss this last fall. This loss, of course, comes hardest on the woman of limited means. It is the family of the longshoreman,

the families of wage earners generally which will suffer most from this destruction. It is not only what it takes away from the table of the thrifty during the present winter that one cries out against, but it is the way it offends the canning conscience of the woman, a conscience aroused to patriotic patch by her experience in the war. That she should be prevented from contributing this mite to the resources of the country seems to her as unjust as she knows it is wasteful. ¶ The devastation travels beyond the family. Go into a town where a strike has persisted for weeks, and see what happens not only to the strikers and to the plant, but to the town itself; visit the shops that serve the people, the butcher, the baker, the grocer; visit the boarding house keepers. For a few weeks all these people hold on, but gradually the strike fund gets lower, bad accounts pile up. The butcher gets anxious; the dealer who supplies him has become suspicious; he is less and less ready to give credit; gradually withdraws it. Don't make any mistake: he does not do it willingly. There is many a butcher, grocer, baker, in a town of strikers who has practically ruined himself because he could not refuse meat to women whose little children he knew were hungry. It can only go on so long, then butcher and grocer and baker shut up shop. One of the pathetic things about these towns which have undergone long strikes is these gradually closing down of all trading places. The town is going to pieces.

There is a worse side to it than all this material waste and physical suffering. One of the saddest things about continued industrial idleness is the undermining of men's characters. In war it is only by continued action or promise of action that morale is saved. The soldier will often rise to supreme heights of

Digital Image, 2011. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Digital Library.

*any of family
includes receipts
A*

-6

the families of wage earners generally which will suffer most from this destruction. It is not only what it takes away from the table of the thrifty during the present winter that one cries out against, but it is the way it offends the canning conscience of the woman, a conscience aroused to patriotic pitch by her experience in the war. That she should be prevented from contributing this mite to the resources of the country seems to her as unjust as she knows it is wasteful. The devastation travels beyond the family. Go into a town where a strike has persisted for weeks, and see what happens not only to the strikers and to the plant, but to the town itself; visit the shops that serve the people, the butcher, the baker, the grocer; visit the boarding house keepers. For a few weeks all these people hold on, but gradually the strike fund gets lower, bad accounts pile up. The butcher gets anxious; the dealer who supplies him has become suspicious; he is less and less ready to give credit; gradually withdraws it. Don't make any mistake: he does not do it willingly. There is many a butcher, grocer, baker, in a town of strikers who has practically ruined himself because he could not refuse meat to women whose little children he knew were hungry. It can only go on so long, then butcher and grocer and baker shut up shop. One of the pathetic things about these towns which have undergone long strikes is these gradually closing down of all trading places. The town is going to pieces.

see A
There is a worse side to it than all this material waste and physical suffering. One of the saddest things about continued industrial idleness is the undermining of men's characters. In war it is only by continued action or promise of action that morale is saved. The soldier will often rise to supreme heights of

nobility and self-sacrifice, if you give him something definite to do and keep him at it; but put him in a trench, settle him down in camp with no other activity than the daily round, and the inactivity will eat into his morale, until he crumbles. The recent war gave us numberless examples of this. Some of the best troops in the world when held in trenches too many months mutinied. Our own organization in France began to deteriorate as soon as they took away the necessity of action. Men out on strike sitting in the house, hanging around the street corners, discussing idly with their fellows the pros and cons of the situation inevitably fall into vicious habits. It was my fortune last summer to pass through a town close to certain great mines where the men were out. There was a charming park in the town, and here all day long scores upon scores of men sat for the most part silent, brooding, heads hanging. The idleness offended their manhood. Lucky enough for them and their families, where was no liquor to be had, so that everybody was spared the old orgies of long drawn out strikes; but nothing more depressing and alarming could have been than these fine fellows capable of making so great a contribution to the well-being of the land, proud to do it too when they felt they were receiving justice, sitting, brooding in idleness day after day on the park benches. An un

An undermining of family life, that is beyond estimate, frequently follows the strike. Without having any figures to support it, my impression is that 75% of the women concerned, disapprove of strikes. It attacks the woman at the point where she is almost savagely protective, her home, her children; and it must be a very flagrant cause indeed which will make her entirely approve the man

Digital Image, 2011. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library.

A few years ago I spent some time in a town near New York City which had been hopelessly tied up for weeks by a most disastrous strike, one stained by terrible bloodshed. The prolonged idleness was gradually wearing down every interest in the community. A capable and experienced woman, the keeper of a popular workers boarding house that I ran across gave me a graphic version of the situation.

"The town is on the bug," she said, "three months more of this and there wont be anything left of the town. Look at me. I have been here ten years, had a good business; if I do say it, the boys liked me, always had my rooms full, and was buying this house, had it half paid for; but I have not a half dozen men left, and those can't pay me. How can you expect men to stand around forever waiting for work? They can't do it. Besides this, the thing has made him sick. You see a man you have worked beside shot down by plant guards, and you want to get out. I don't blame the boys for going off. Most of them had used up all their money and could not hang on any longer.

'Hard on me?' Not so hard as on most of the women around me. I am single, no kids to worry over. All over this town there are women that don't know where they are going to get their next meal for their young ones, living on charity; men gone looking for work. And you believe me, some of those men will never turn up again! It is always so in strikes. I have seen it again and again. Man lights out, looks honest enough for work, don't find it, gets discourages, just turns tramp, never see him again. Believe me though it is better than having him sit around the saloons, getting lazier and lazier and uglier and uglier every day. I tell

-A. Insut's

A few years ago I spent some time in a town near New York City which had been hopelessly tied up for weeks by a most disastrous strike, one stained by terrible bloodshed. The prolonged idleness was gradually wearing down every interest in the community. A capable and experienced woman, the keeper of a popular workers boarding house that I ran across gave me a graphic version of the situation.

"The town is on the bug," she said, "three months more of this and there wont be anything left of the town. Look at me. I have been here ten years, had a good business; if I do say it, the boys liked me, always had my rooms full, and was buying this house, had it half paid for; but I have not a half dozen men left, and those can't pay me. How can you expect men to stand around forever waiting for work. They can't do it. Besides this, the thing has made him sick. You see a man you have worked beside shot down by plant guards, and you want to get out. I don't blame the boys for going off. Most of them had used up all their money and could not hang on any longer.

"Hard on me?" Not so hard as on most of the women around me. I am single, no kids to worry over. All over this town there are women that don't know where they are going to get their next meal for their young ones, living on charity; men gone looking for work. And you believe me, some of those men will never turn up again! It is always so in strikes. I have seen it again and again. Man lights out, looks honest enough for work, don't find it, gets discourages, just turns tramp, never see him again. Believe me though it is better than having him sit around the saloons, getting lazier and lazier and uglier and uglier every day. I tell

you a strike is an awful thing for the women. Government ought not to allow it."

My talkative friend touched here on a side of the strike that is worse than all the material waste and physical suffering, the steady undermining of men's character that the idleness brings. In war it is only by continued action or promise of action that morale is saved. The soldier will often rise to supreme heights of

nobility and self-sacrifice, if you give him something definite to do and keep him at it; but put him in a trench, settle him down in camp with no other activity than the daily round, and the inactivity will eat into his morale, until he crumbles. The recent war gave us numberless examples of this. Some of the best troops in the world when held in trenches too many months mutinied. Our own organization in France began to deteriorate as soon as they took away the necessity of action. Men out on strike sitting in the house, hanging around the street corners, discussing idly with their fellows the pros and cons of the situation inevitably fall into vicious habits. It was my fortune last summer to pass through a town close to certain great mines where the men were out. There was a charming park in the town, and here all day long scores upon scores of men sat for the most part silent, brooding, heads hanging. The idleness offended their manhood. Lucky enough for them and their families, where was no liquor to be had, so that

Western
The following is a list of the names of the men who were out on strike in the town of ...
The names of the men who were out on strike in the town of ...
The names of the men who were out on strike in the town of ...
The names of the men who were out on strike in the town of ...
The names of the men who were out on strike in the town of ...

Digitized Image, 2011. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pellerier Library.

you a strike is an awful thing for the women. Government ought not to allow it."

My talkative friend touched here on a side of the strike that is worse than all the material waste and physical suffering, the steady undermining of men's character that the idleness brings. In war it is only by continued action or promise of action that morale is saved. The soldier will often rise to supreme heights of

that
when he goes out. The result is an irritation, frequently drives the man away and makes the home an unbearable place for children. This does not mean that these same women may not in the long run become violent supporters of their husbands in his struggle, indeed it often turns them into the mad sort of maenads that headed the charge of which I spoke at the opening of this paper. It does not deny either that where women are convinced of the justice of the struggle, they will not from the start stand nobly by their husbands, suffering cheerfully all that seems to be necessary.

But these things are not all of it. There are few strikes indeed, big or little, short or long, that do not breed more or less permanent division and bitterness in at least a few of the actors on both sides; ugly feelings that last after one has forgotten all about the pangs of hunger, the loss of savings, the demoralization of family and community. It is this disastrous sowing of hate between men and women that by all the laws of human civilization ought to be working in friendly co-operation that is the most dreadful result of strikes.

There are always those who do not get over it. The memory hangs over a community like some fatal miasma, breaking out every now and then in ugly epidemics. Can anyone doubt that the memory of the strike in the steel industry in 1902 has not had much to do with the course of the present strike? The bitterness of that struggle has remained all these years with both sides, a dull suppressed resentment among certain workers, an active suspicion of organized labor on the part of certain managers. What more fatal hindrance to that friendly co-operation which we must have if we are to develop our industries along the lines of peace and mutual advantage!

that
when he goes out. The result is an irritation, frequently drives the man away and makes the home an unbearable place for children. This does not mean that these same women may not in the long run become violent supporters of their husbands in his struggle, indeed it often turns them into the mad sort of maenads that headed the charge of which I spoke at the opening of this paper. It does not deny either that where women are convinced of the justice of the struggle, they will not from the start stand nobly by their husbands, suffering cheerfully all that seems to be necessary.

But these things are not all of it. There are few strikes indeed, big or little, short or long, that do not breed more or less permanent division and bitterness in at least a few of the actors on both sides; ugly feelings that last after one has forgotten all about the pangs of hunger, the loss of savings, the demoralization of family and community. It is this disastrous sowing of hate between men and women that by all the laws of human civilization ought to be working in friendly co-operation that is the most dreadful result of strikes.

There are always those who do not get over it. The memory hangs over a community like some fatal miasma, breaking out every now and then in ugly epidemics. Can anyone doubt that the memory of the strike in the steel industry in 1902 has not had much to do with the course of the present strike? The bitterness of that struggle has remained all these years with both sides, a dull suppressed resentment among certain workers, an active suspicion of organized labor on the part of certain managers. What more fatal hindrance to that friendly co-operation which we must have if we are to develop our industries along the lines of peace and mutual advantage!

No man can tell how or when the bitterness bred in the past will crop out. In one of our Northwestern states last winter this occurred: A man had been held by a district attorney for I.W.W. activities, clearly in violation of the statutes of the state. The testimony was in and the judge had made his charge to the jury, which retired early in the evening. An hour or so later the people in the street near where they were closeted, heard long and violent discussion. It went on for hours, growing more and more threatening more and more noisy.

The next morning when court was convened, the jury came promptly in. Its spokesman arose and said, "Your Honor, we ask to be excused We could come to no decision." The explanation afterwards made of what seemed to everybody an astonishing proceeding was that at the beginning of their session, one of the jurors had recalled an incident of a strike which over 20 years ago had torn up this community, a long continued violent wage war.

Although the jurors had been chosen from men supposed to be on the outside of industrial life, the mere mention of this old trouble had so immediately aroused their passions, that they had spent the entire night in violent quarreling over its merits. Before morning it had become evident to them all that they never would be able to take up the case which they were called to judge, that they were incapacitated for it by the bitterness of the disagreement between them on a strike more than a score of years old! It is by no means irrelevant to say that before another jury could be made up and the case re-tried, the prisoner had escaped!

If this spent treasure, this dissipated industry, these broken families and destroyed communities always brought the things the striker seeks! ----- just wages and hours, proper conditions, the recognition of his right to have his say about the work he

Digital Images, 2011. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library.

No man can tell how or when the bitterness bred in the past will crop out. In one of our Northwestern states last winter this occurred: A man had been held by a district attorney for I.W.W. activities, clearly in violation of the statutes of the state. The testimony was in and the judge had made his charge to the jury, which retired early in the evening. An hour or so later the people in the street near where they were closeted, heard long and violent discussion. It went on for hours, growing more and more threatening more and more noisy.

The next morning when court was convened, the jury came promptly in. Its spokesman arose and said, "Your Honor, we ask to be excused. We could come to no decision." The explanation afterwards made of what seemed to everybody an astonishing proceeding was that at the beginning of their session, one of the jurors had recalled an incident of a strike which over 20 years ago had torn up this community, a long continued violent wage war.

Although the jurors had been chosen from men supposed to be on the outside of industrial life, the mere mention of this old trouble had so immediately aroused their passions, that they had spent the entire night in violent quarreling over its merits. Before morning it had become evident to them all that they never would be able to take up the case which they were called to judge, that they were incapacitated for it by the bitterness of the disagreement between them on a strike more than a score of years old! It is by no means irrelevant to say that before another jury could be made up and the case re-tried, the prisoner had escaped!

If this spent treasure, this dissipated industry, these broken families and destroyed communities always brought the things the striker seeks! ----- just wages and hours, proper conditions, the recognition of his right to have his say about the work he

has to do, there would be more hope in the situation. If we can win justice through war and war alone, why then let us have war!

But cast up the gains of our recent disturbances, and what is the balance? What did the longshoremen gain by their continued idleness last year that they could not have won through an energetic and intelligent appeal to the arbitral machine their unions commanded, ^{aided} gained by the public opinion which certainly would have been behind them if they could have shown that their cause was a just one? Was it because they doubted their cause, or because they have not yet learned to believe in arbitration as a method juster -- and cheaper -- in its long-run than striking?

You can ask that question of many a recent appeal to the strike.

Is there no way out of this high cost of striking? Is it inevitable? Is there no means but force to settle the dissensions which always have and probably always will arise in industrial life, as in every other human relation? Must this enormously expensive method be taken, a method so full of suffering to women and children, so destructive to communities, so undermining to the judgment, the good will, the better nature of men. Is there no other way?

The world has never been willing entirely to consent that the adjustment of its private and public difficulties must be turned over to force. Little by little it has built up for the settlement of its private affairs a machinery of justice which, whatever mistakes it may occasionally make, yet on the whole handles the enormous amount of troubles turned over to it with remarkable success

has to do, there would be more hope in the situation. If we can win justice through war and war alone, why then let us have war!

But cast up the gains of our recent disturbances, and what is the balance? What did the longshoremen gain by their continued idleness last year that they could not have won through an energetic and intelligent appeal to the arbitral machine their unions commanded, gained by the public opinion which certainly would have been behind them if they could have shown that their cause was a just one? Was it because they doubted their cause, or because they have not yet learned to believe in arbitration as a method juster -- and cheaper -- in its long-run than striking?

You can ask that question of many a recent appeal to the strike.

Is there no way out of this high cost of striking? Is it inevitable? Is there no means but force to settle the dissensions which always have and probably always will arise in industrial life, as in every other human relation? Must this enormously expensive method be taken, a method so full of suffering to women and children, so destructive to communities, so undermining to the judgment, the good will, the better nature of men. Is there no other way?

The world has never been willing entirely to consent that the adjustment of its private and public difficulties must be turned over to force. Little by little it has built up for the settlement of its private affairs a machinery of justice which, whatever mistakes it may occasionally make, yet on the whole handles the enormous amount of troubles turned over to it with remarkable success

Moreover this machinery is constantly corrected, as experience proves that it is ineffective. It has come to a point where public opinion will no longer allow the adjustment of many of its difficulties by appeal to mob law, to the white cap, to the vigilance committee.

We are struggling to build up in the adjustment of ^{interests} industrial national relations a similar machinery. Shall we admit that there is one of the units of our social body, made up of perhaps four million people out of our one hundred and ten ^{million}, which must employ force in order to secure its rights and satisfy its aspirations? No man of sense will agree that society will submit that this must be so. Moreover, experience is piling up the civilized world over to show that it need not be so. In this country particularly in the last dozen years we have been able to build up a machinery which if we go ahead with it intelligently and with good intention bids fair to make striking as difficult and unnecessary as war will be if the League of Nations is ever allowed freely to operate.

Six years ago our Congress created a Board of Mediation and Conciliation for taking care of labor disputes on the railroads. When this board came to cast up its accounts, at the end of its four and a half years of operation, it found that it had handled 71 different cases, and that in every case this handling had done away with the need and the desire of striking. 52 of these cases were settled entirely by mediation, the others through a combination of arbitration and mediation.

The experience of our Department of Labor in settling difficulties is most hopeful. The Secretary has the right to offer his

Moreover this machinery is constantly corrected, as experience proves that it is ineffective. It has come to a point where public opinion will no longer allow the adjustment of many of its difficulties by appeal to mob law, to the white cap, to the vigilance committee.

We are struggling to build up in the adjustment of industrial national relations a similar machinery. Shall we admit that there is one of the units of our social body, made up of perhaps four million people out of our one hundred and ten, which must employ force in order to secure its rights and satisfy its aspirations? No man of sense will agree that society will submit that this must be so. Moreover, experience is piling up the civilized world over to show that it need not be so. In this country particularly in the last dozen years we have been able to build up a machinery which if we go ahead with it intelligently and with good intention bids fair to make striking as difficult and unnecessary as war will be if the League of Nations is ever allowed freely to operate.

Six years ago our Congress created a Board of Mediation and Conciliation for taking care of labor disputes on the railroads. When this board came to cast up its accounts, at the end of its four and a half years of operation, it found that it had handled 71 different cases, and that in every case this handling had done away with the need and the desire of striking. 52 of these cases were settled entirely by mediation, the others through a combination of arbitration and mediation.

The experience of our Department of Labor in settling difficulties is most hopeful. The Secretary has the right to offer his

services wherever a controversy springs up.

The practice is to send to the troubled district a person called a Commissioner of Conciliation. The business of this Commissioner is at the start to find out all about the trouble. As a representative of the government he can go freely to both sides. He can satisfy himself about the temper of the contestants, find out where the grievances are, and whether they are real or fancied; bring together the opposition leaders and talk the matter over with them; employ all of those sensible methods of straightening out a quarrel that men and women employ in their families in their social affairs, in schools and churches and business. Of course the Commissioner is not always successful, far from it. That may be his fault, that is, he may not be the tactful, wise intelligent person that it takes to handle such difficulties; but the percentage of good results is large. Take the period so fruitful in strikes to which I have already referred, the second quarter of 1919. It was a very busy one for the Commissioners of Conciliation. Their offices were asked in 310 different disputes. In one of these three months 94 cases were considered. 31 of these were adjusted within the period, and 12 more of them in the month following. This left 51 of the 94 unsettled, but the great majority of these were classed under the head of "Pending." In only 5 of the whole 94 cases did the Commissioner report back to the Department that he was unable to adjust.

Certainly this is a fine showing for the principle of conciliation. Perhaps the finest thing about it is the proof that it gave to the persons involved that there were other ways than fighting to get what you wanted, if you had justice on your side.

services wherever a controversy springs up.

The practice is to send to the troubled district a person called a Commissioner of Conciliation. The business of this Commissioner is at the start to find out all about the trouble. As a representative of the government he can go freely to both sides. He can satisfy himself about the temper of the contestants, find out where the grievances are, and whether they are real or fancied; bring together the opposition leaders and talk the matter over with them; employ all of those sensible methods of straightening out a quarrel that men and women employ in their families in their social affairs, in schools and churches and business. Of course the Commissioner is not always successful, far from it. That may be his fault, that is, he may not be the tactful, wise intelligent person that it takes to handle such difficulties; but the percentage of good results is large. Take the period so fruitful in strikes to which I have already referred, the second quarter of 1919. It was a very busy one for the Commissioners of Conciliation. Their offices were asked in 310 different disputes. In one of these three months 94 cases were considered. 31 of these were adjusted within the period, and 12 more of them in the month following. This left 51 of the 94 unsettled, but the great majority of these were classed under the head of "Pending." In only 5 of the whole 94 cases did the Commissioner report back to the Department that he was unable to adjust.

Certainly this is a fine showing for the principle of conciliation. Perhaps the finest thing about it is the proof that it gave to the persons involved that there were other ways than fighting to get what you wanted, if you had justice on your side.

The most brilliant example that we have so far had of the possibility of handling these difficulties by reason rather than by force has undoubtedly been the work of our War Labor Board. This Board lasted a little over a year, but in that time it handled nearly 250 separate controversies. The part it played was remarkable. Dispute after dispute was settled with an effectiveness and thoroughness that never before had been achieved in the country. It developed into something which it is fair to call a supreme court of industry, a court where men of ability went to the bottom of the trouble and demanded if it were necessary, even complete reorganization of the industry itself. Again and again in the months since the War Labor Board was dissolved by the ending of active hostilities it has been a most frequent thing to hear both employers and employees sigh for its return. Its experience offers an admirable example of what can be done.

These recent experiences have certainly convinced the present administration that it is possible to develop what has already been achieved into a nation-wide systematic machinery for taking care of these difficulties, building up something which we may very well compare to our civil courts. The feeling that this is possible is wide-spread in the country. One of the earliest resolutions to come before the first Industrial Conference was a plan for labor adjustment founded on the government's recent experience. This plan originated with the Secretary of Labor. It was a thoughtful crystalizing of his own large experience in this field. It looked to the creation in every plant or series of plants of an International Local Board, made up of employers and employees, which

Our most brilliant example that we have so far had of the possibility of handling these difficulties by reason rather than by force has undoubtedly been the work of our War Labor Board. This Board lasted a little over a year, but in that time it handled nearly 250 separate controversies. The part it played was remarkable. Dispute after dispute was settled with an effectiveness and thoroughness that never before had been achieved in the country. It developed into something which it is fair to call a supreme court of industry, a court where men of ability went to the bottom of the trouble and demanded if it were necessary, even complete re-organization of the industry itself. Again and again in the months since the War Labor Board was dissolved by the ending of active hostilities it has been a most frequent thing to hear both employers and employees sigh for its return. Its experience offers an admirable example of what can be done.

These recent experiences have certainly convinced the present administration that it is possible to develop what has already been achieved into a nation-wide systematic machinery for taking care of these difficulties, building up something which we may very well compare to our civil courts. The feeling that this is possible is wide-spread in the country. One of the earliest resolutions to come before the first Industrial Conference was a plan for labor adjustment founded on the government's recent experience. This plan originated with the Secretary of Labor. It was a thoughtful crystalizing of his own large experience in this field. It looked to the creation in every plant or series of plants of an Industrial Local Board, made up of employers and employees, which

should take care of any kind of dispute that came up. If it was found that this local board could not settle the matter, it was passed up to a higher, ~~General Board~~ appointed by the President of the United States. This Board was to be made up of an equal number of representatives of labor, representatives of employers, and of representatives of the public. In case of failure of the General Board to come to a unanimous conclusion over the matter, the whole thing was to be turned over to an umpire. Whenever an agreement was unanimously reached by the Local Board or by the General Board or by the decision of the umpire, the conclusion was to have all the force and effect of a trade agreement, which employer and employee would be morally bound to accept and abide by.

This excellent plan, so in harmony with the purpose for which the Industrial Conference was called was never allowed to come to discussion. The past captured that conference. Its downfall will have to be charged up to the high cost of strikes, for it was the intrusion of the strike that killed it!

It is interesting to see that the first act of its successor, the second Industrial Conference is at once to take up this matter of arbitration and conciliation. The ability and intelligence of this body guided by our recent experience and by so well considered a plan as this of President Wilson ought to provide the country with something that we could all get behind. If a well-considered plan should come out of this industrial conference there can be no question of the duty of men and women whether they class themselves as workers or employers to get behind it, with ~~all their force~~. It should be made a matter of discussion

should take care of any kind of dispute that came up. If it was found that this local board could not settle the matter, it was passed up to a higher, General Board appointed by the President of the United States. This Board was to be made up of an equal number of representatives of labor, representatives of employers, and of representatives of the public. In case of failure of the General Board to come to a unanimous conclusion over the matter, the whole thing was to be turned over to an umpire. Whenever an agreement was unanimously reached by the Local Board or by the General Board or by the decision of the umpire, the conclusion was to have all the force and effect of a trade agreement, which employer and employee would be morally bound to accept and abide by.

This excellent plan, so in harmony with the purpose for which the Industrial Conference was called was never allowed to come to discussion. The past captured that conference. Its downfall will have to be charged up to the high cost of strikes, for it was the intrusion of the strike that killed it!

It is interesting to see that the first act of its successor, the second Industrial Conference ~~was~~ ^{was} at once to take up this matter of arbitration and conciliation. The ability and intelligence of this body guided by our recent experience and by so well ~~con-~~ ^{good} sidered a plan as that ^{Secretary} of President Wilson ought to provide the country with something that we could all get behind. If a well-considered plan should come out of this industrial conference there can be no question of the duty of men and women whether they class themselves ~~as~~ workers or employers to get behind it, with all their force. It should be made a matter of discussion

in every woman's club, in every church, in every community house, in every school. Let us understand what it means, how it operates, and, above all, understand the great need for it. It is peace, a stable peace, in industry that is at stake. What we seek is the opportunity of men and women who work, whether with hand or brain, to carry on their enterprises free from the threat of force, free from the necessity to appeal to force in order to achieve what they believe to be just and right.

in every woman's club, in every church, in every community house, in every school. Let us understand what it means, how it operates, and, above all, understand the great need for it. It is peace, a stable peace, in industry that is at stake. What we seek is the opportunity of men and women who work, whether with hand or brain, to carry on their enterprises free from the threat of force, free from the necessity to appeal to force in order to achieve what they believe to be just and right.