

# THE WAGEWORKER



VOL. 4

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, SEPTEMBER 27, 1907

NO. 26

## Two Political Platforms Frankly Compared

It is interesting to compare the platforms adopted by the two party conventions in Lincoln last Tuesday. Not less interesting is the comparison between the two gentlemen who officiated as chairmen of the resolution committees. William H. Thompson, an attorney of Grand Island, was chairman of the committee in the democratic convention. Ross L. Hammond, editor of the Fremont Tribune and a member of the Hammond Printing company, was chairman of the republican committee.

The republican platform is absolutely silent on many questions of vital concern to workingmen.

It is silent on the question of the shorter day work.

It is silent on the question of injunctions, save as it relates to federal judges enjoining states.

It is silent on the question of arbitration.

The chairman of the republican committee, Mr. Hammond, not only refuses to put the eight hour day into effect in his printing establishment, but he refuses to unionize the plant, or to recognize the unions in any way.

The republican platform objects to the issuing of injunctions by federal judges restraining states from putting statute laws into force and operation. It is as mum as an oyster on the issuing of injunctions against organized labor whereby men are restrained from exercising their constitutional rights and thrown into jail without trial if they stand upon those constitutional rights.

Is it possible that the republican platform is silent on these momentous questions out of deference to Mr. Hammond, the union hating, long work day employer, who, by the way, is a candidate for appointment to the position of collector of internal revenue with the backing of Senator E. J. Burkett?

The democratic platform is clear cut and explicit in its references to these questions.

It comes out fairly and squarely for the eight hour day.

It comes out fairly and squarely for arbitration of disputes between corporate employers and employees.

It comes out fairly and squarely against the abuse of the writ of injunction whereby workingmen are denied the right of trial by jury and arbitrarily imprisoned for maintaining their constitutional rights in defiance of the mandates of a federal judge.

The democratic platform says: "We favor the eight-hour day."

"We are opposed to government by injunction" the system under which the writ of injunction is used to deny to laboring men the protection of trial by jury."

Then, wishing to make this declaration more emphatic, the democratic convention adopted this supplementary resolution:

"Believing that the writ of injunction has been prostituted from its original purpose until it is now, to all intents and purposes, a weapon in the hands of capitalistic combines for the terrorizing and enslavement of organized workingmen, we pledge our best efforts for the enactment of a law that will safeguard the rights of the wage earners by providing for trial by jury in all cases of contempt not arising in open court."

In his address to the democratic convention Judge Loomis, the candidate of the fusion forces for supreme judge, clearly expressed himself as opposed to the abuse of the writ of injunction and planted himself squarely on the platform declaration. In his address to the republican convention Judge Reese, the candidate of the republican party for supreme judge, was as silent on this question as his platform.

Was Judge Reese silent on this question out of deference to Mr. Hammond, or because he did not think the matter of enough importance to merit his attention?

The abuse of the writ of injunction has grown up since Judge Reese was a member of the supreme court. He may not be aware of how this writ has been, and is being, used as a club to beat workingmen. When it is called to his attention he may be just as much opposed to it as Judge Loomis. But is it not reasonable to insist

that a man who is aspiring to the supreme bench of Nebraska should be posted on a matter that is of supreme importance to ten thousand wage earners and heads of families?

Judge Loomis has watched the development of this evil, and he has set his face against it.

In 1901 Judge Loomis represented Dodge county in the lower house of the legislature. At that session, as at former sessions, a garnishee bill was introduced. Largely to Judge Loomis's efforts the bill was prevented from getting out of the committee room. In 1903 he was again a member of the house, and again the garnishee bill came up. He opposed it with all his might and main, but despite his efforts the bill passed the house and was soon after passed by the senate. This is the garnishee bill that Governor Mickey vetoed. In 1904 Mr. Cunningham, representing an association of retail dealers went to Fremont and urged the retail dealers not to return Judge Loomis to the legislature, but advocated the return of his colleague, who had voted for the bill. Judge Loomis had no intention

of being a candidate for re-election, but immediately after Mr. Cunningham's address he did write an article for the Fremont Herald in which he stated his reasons for working and voting against the garnishee law, and praising Governor Mickey for vetoing it. Governor Mickey, who was a candidate for re-election, used that article widely and it contributed much to his re-election.

Judge Loomis was not a member of the 1907 legislature. That session enacted the present garnishee law, which was signed by Governor Sheldon, who was chairman of the republican convention last Tuesday.

The plain and simple statements of facts are given to the readers of The Wageworker, and they are invited to act upon them as they think best.

The Wageworker will not oppose the candidacy of Judge Reese. Neither will it advocate the election of Judge Loomis. It will content itself with giving to its readers the platforms upon which they stand, the official acts of both, and the records of the two parties in this state as it relates to the questions which are of chief concern to the wage earners in a state election.

### SURPRISED THE FOLKS.

Friday evening, September 20, some ninety friends of Mr. and Mrs. S. A. Swanson surprised them by going in a body to the home of their son, Gus Swanson, 1786 E, who was acting as a host for his parents on that occasion. The event was in honor of Mrs. S. A. Swanson's seventy-eighth birthday. The evening was delightfully spent by the friends and neighbors, one of the chief pleasures being a musical program. A poem composed for the occasion by Mrs. McDonald, was read by the author and given much praise. Refreshments were served, and at a late hour the guests departed, wishing Mrs. Swanson many happy returns of the day.

### STILL PROGRESSING.

The Citizens Street Railway company has opened up its Vine street line for business, and is now preparing to extend its line from Twelfth to South street to Twenty-seventh. The survey has been completed and the work of construction will begin in a short time. To the surprise of the stockholders the Twelfth street line has developed into the best paying line, all things considered, that the company has. When extended east on South street it will open up a good field and will be more profitable than ever.

Queensland sugar planters report a scarcity of labor.

## Temple Committee Ready To File Incorporation

The Labor Temple committee has practically completed the work of drawing up the articles of incorporation for the "Labor Temple Building Association of Lincoln, Nebraska." Everything will be in readiness for filing next Tuesday morning, the only thing remaining to be done being the signing of the articles, and making the requisite number of copies. The articles will have to be filled with the secretary of state and with the clerk of Lancaster county.

Briefly stated the incorporation papers call for the following:

An association with a capital stock of \$50,000.

Limitation of stock to \$1,000 to any one individual, subject to the statutes relative to inheritance.

Limitation of stock to \$5,000 to any trades or labor union, only unions affiliating with the American Federation of Labor to be allowed to hold stock as organizations.

Each union holding \$100 or more of the stock of the association to be allowed one director. Six directors

to be elected at large by individual stockholders.

The board of directors to elect a board of seven trustees, five of whom shall be members in good standing of unions affiliating with the American Federation of Labor, and no two trustees to belong to the same organization. The president, secretary, treasurer and vice president to be members of the board of trustees.

Treasurer and secretary to be bonded.

The association to have power to retire the stock of the association as it sees fit, upon payment of the current market price.

No stockholder to act as a proxy to other stockholders when the stock represented by proxy added to the stock held by the representative exceeds 1,000 shares.

The cumulative system of voting to obtain at all elections.

Every possible safeguard for the small stockholder has been provided, and under the terms of the articles of incorporation it will be impossible to divert any property accumulated by the association from its original purpose.

This in brief is what the committee has accomplished, and the way has now been prepared for the actual work of raising the funds for the erection of a Labor Temple in Lincoln. The committee, after the filing of the articles, will devote its attention to preparing and carrying out a financial campaign in which every loyal union man and woman is expected to take part.

The committee met last Monday evening at the home of Fred Ibringer, 1538 D street. The following committeemen were present:

- J. W. Dickson, Carpenters.
- T. C. Kelsey, Leatherworkers.
- A. B. Woelhoff, Painters.
- T. W. Evans, Cigarmakers.
- Alex Weckesser, Presamers.
- Fred Ibringer, Typographical.
- A. V. White, Plumbers.
- Fred Ress, Bookbinders.

Anderson, the electrical workers' delegate, has not yet reported for duty. Walker, the barbers' delegate, has also failed to report. The lathers and bricklayers have not yet elected delegates. None of the railroad brotherhoods has as yet shown any sign of interest in the project.

At the meeting the articles of incorporation as prepared were formally approved as read, and the secretary instructed to again submit them to the committee's attorney. Arrangements for the raising of the filing fees were made. The members were instructed to file with the secretary a list of all local secretaries of their international unions, and the secretary instructed to correspond with the Whitehead-Hoag company with the view of securing a "Labor Temple Badge" for use in the financial campaign.

An "order of business" for future meetings of the committee was adopted.

It is understood that S. L. Chaplin, who has heretofore represented the barbers, will be compelled to draw from the committee on account of becoming an employer, which necessitates his taking a withdrawal card from his local. The committee is in hopes that the barbers will find some way of permitting Mr. Chaplin to legally represent the union on the committee. He has taken a deep interest in the project and shown by his actions that he can be depended upon for a full share of the work.

The committee will meet again next Monday night at the home of A. V. White, delegate from the plumbers, 923 F street. Committeemen are requested to meet promptly at 8 o'clock.

Unions not yet represented, and especially those whose delegates have been remiss, are requested to take the proper action. This is the crucial point in the project, and it is imperative that every union do its full share to start the thing along.

### ENTERTAINED FRIENDS.

Miss Faye Swanson entertained eight of her little friends on September 17, the occasion being her eleventh birthday. The hostess served watermelons in plenty, and the occasion was greatly enjoyed.

## FROM THE WORKINGMAN'S VIEWPOINT

The continuation of this article will be found on Page 4.

In a recent number of The Public, Louis F. Post's paper, a striking article written by Thornton West was published. The Commoner reproduces this article in full: It follows:

### AS WORKINGMEN MUST SEE IT

Are there two kinds of law in the United States—one for the rich man and one for the poor man? Are the petty thief and the poor criminal to be promptly and adequately punished, while the rich thief and the powerful criminal go unpunished, save for an occasional fine during the stress of aroused public opinion? Are members of organized labor to be prosecuted for capital crimes on dubious testimony, while the rich and powerful mine-owners can bribe legislatures, can appoint governors and state supreme court judges, can openly, defiantly, and violently trample under foot state and federal laws, and with the aid of governor and militia—the latter confessedly in the pay of the mine owners—suspend the writ of habeas corpus, nullify all civil law, depose civil officers, deport citizens, suppress newspapers, destroy property, and create "lawful" anarchy—with absolute impunity and without even a pretense of prosecution by state or federal authority?

From the viewpoint of organized labor and its sympathizers, these questions constitute the real issue in the Boise trial. This fact explains the deep and widespread suspicion and the expressed bitterness against "the state"—that is, the prosecution—in the Boise trial, and the denunciation of President Roosevelt for his untimely and unfortunate classification of the three accused men as "undesirable citizens."

It is "dangerous" and "unpatriotic" to minimize the revelations of the trial at Boise. Yet the labor troubles in Colorado and in Idaho are different only in degree from what happened in the street railway strike at San Francisco, from what happened in the Homestead tragedy, in the anthracite coal mining strikes, in the railway union strike at Chicago, and in a hundred other strikes of less impression on the public memory.

On the part of organized labor, what is the meaning of this unmistakable lack of faith in law and government, of this too ready resort to primitive and barbaric methods to obtain justice—as its members see it? On the part of organized capital, what is the meaning of this generally insidious, but when necessary, flagrant and defiant violation and usurpation of law and government? Surely, it is not merely a contention between employers and employees as to whether or not wages shall be temporarily increased or reduced?

Is not the present attitude of organized capital and of organized labor the outgrowth of a different method of doing business on a large scale, of a different spirit in industrial and in commercial enterprises—the different method and the different spirit being the product of the marvelous growth of corporations, especially of trusts?

Professedly, a trust is formed to reduce the cost of production and to establish and to maintain prices that will be just and fair to consumer and to producer alike. In reality, a trust is formed to crush out competition, to control the supply of the raw material and of the finished product, to reduce wages, to make the price of the product as high as the public will stand, and to limit the disbursement of profits to as few persons as is practicable—in short, to prey on the necessities of the people, to subordinate humanity to money.

Are not the violence of labor troubles in the last twenty-five years, and the almost universal and unanimous condemnation of the high-handed methods of railroads and all other monopolistic corporations—are not these an expression of a profound popular discontent caused by the glaring injustice of special privilege on the one side, and of constantly lessening industrial opportunity on the other?

Is not President Roosevelt's wonderful popularity due to the fact that he has called a halt on the abuse of corporate power, and has demanded at least the regulation of a few special privileges?

Are not the bitterness of organized labor and the strong popular feeling against monopolistic corporations potent proof that the world-old struggle is now being waged in this country more openly and more fiercely than ever before—the struggle between those who earn without getting and those who get without earning?

Do not the masses of the American people plainly see that now, as never before in our history, all men are not equal before the law?

It is universal knowledge that the officers of three of the largest insurance companies in the world used trust-funds for speculative purposes, opened their treasuries to the devotees of "high finance," to the Wall Street sheep shearers—all for greed, for private gain. Not even one offender has been punished.

The few men that autocratically control the railroads of the country have brazenly violated law and equity, have treated the public with defiant insolence, and have maintained lobbies to corrupt state legislatures and congress. Yet the railroads owe their very existence to special privileges granted by the people; and every dollar used to build, to equip, and to operate the roads has been furnished by the people, directly or indirectly.

These same railroad autocrats have "won" hundreds of millions of dollars by juggling railroad stock in Wall Street, while the service and the equipment of the roads were not capable of handling the freight offered them. There is no record of any stock manipulator or railroad president being punished.

"Watering stock" is a favorite pastime of "high finance." Watering stock is but another name for stealing; it is taking money and giving nothing for it. Yet it places a heavy secret tax on the American people and their posterity. All of these hundreds of millions of fat stock must pay dividends, and the American people will do the paying in the name of legitimate earnings but in fact for extortionate charges. A small group of men, dealing in public utilities and domestic necessities, have made hundreds of millions by watering stock. No stock-waterer, no dealer in fictitious property, has yet seen the inside of a prison, by operation of law.

The prices of nearly all the necessities and the commodities of life are arbitrarily fixed by trusts. As a trust means no competition—absolute control of the supply—the American people have no other course open to them than to submit to being "lawfully" robbed. Notwithstanding his hold-up methods of money making, the trust magnate continues to be an eminently respectable and exemplary citizen.

The American people have been plucked of hundreds of millions of dollars by means of the "Dingley bill," a protective tariff law passed by a pre-election bribed congress, in consideration of the munificent contributions in the first McKinley-Bryan campaign—a bargain and sale that has no parallel in history for its audacity in deliberately taxing all the people for the benefit of the few.

After "swollen fortunes" had been taken from the pockets of the people, the "Dingley bill" promoters and beneficiaries formed trusts, created monopolies, and wound up by issuing hundreds of millions of stock without adding a dollar to the actual value of the plants.

By the judicious use of a small percentage of this special privilege tax, the "protective" tariff beneficiaries have been successful, up to date, in keeping congress in a "stand pat" attitude, and the special taxation of all the people for the benefit of the few still goes industriously and merrily on.

There is no more bitter sarcasm nor mocking humor than the tariff beneficiaries' plea that the "protective" tariff is for the protection of the American workingman. It is true that the American workingman has wrested from employers higher wages than ever before; but this is through the efforts and the sacrifices of organized labor. It is true that he is better fed, better clothed, and better housed than those of his own class and occupation in other countries; but he is a much more competent and valuable workman than the foreign wage laborer.

Nevertheless the American workingman is worried, and he has been led to do some thinking and investigating; first, because 14,000,000 girls and women in the United States find it necessary to labor; second, because his share of "unprecedented prosperity" does not abide with him, but is taken from him by the greatly increased cost of living—the tariff-protected trusts being the largest beneficiaries of this increased cost.

He sees that there are two distinct classes of citizens; the producing class and the exploiting class. He sees the shining lights of "high finance," of stock-watering, of public franchise huckstering, of special privilege, and of graft

of all kinds and degrees, lined up in the front ranks of the exploiting class—the class that has added nothing to the nation's happiness or to its material welfare, but that has debauched private and public morals at home and has disgraced the nation abroad.

He sees the stock-jugglers, the stock-waterers, the trust magnates, the tariff-tax beneficiaries, the special privilege recipients, parading their evidence of unlimited wealth. He sees them contributing with princely liberality to churches, to libraries, to colleges—to popularize and to perpetuate the present system of protective tariff, trusts, and "high finance." He sees them with their villas and their castles at home and abroad, their public postoffices within their private grounds, their private cars, their yachts, their banks, their railroads, their newspapers, their lobbies in and out of the legislatures and of congress. He sees them on intimate terms with law makers and federal judges, even hobnobbing with royalty. He sees all this, and he feels that he pays a large part of the toll, very much against his will.

He is not envious of the so-called plutocrats because they have "lots of money"; but he is convinced that lots of their money is other people's money, for which they gave no value and to which they have no moral right.

He has learned that if he steals \$50, he goes to the penitentiary; but that the man who steals millions is admitted into "high finance" and is heralded as a foremost American. He has found that if he violates the injunction of a court, he goes to jail, and his home is sold to pay the court's costs; but that when the corporation magnate violates an injunction, he gives bond and goes free.

He has learned that when a corporation is the complainant, federal judges are not only prompt to assume jurisdiction, but only too often they assume also the spirit of the prosecutor.

He sees the leading business men of the country placing pride of self above pride of self. He sees them proclaiming and exemplifying the heresy that the dollar is the standard of success, and that this success is the standard of character, of worth.

He hears himself patronizingly asked to accept a "full dinner pail" in lieu of a full share of civic rights and full opportunities in life.

He has discovered that the devotees of "high finance" have two systems of arithmetic. When they buy, they estimate the cost of labor, material, and machinery, by the formula of 2 and 2 make 4; but when they capitalize to sell stocks and bonds, it is 2 and 2 make 22.

He is told by the railroads that the rails made and sold by the steel trust at exorbitant, protective tariff prices—are defective, and are continually breaking, thus causing railroad wrecks, and daily and hourly endangering the lives of thousands of people; and he is told by the railroads that the tariff-protected steel trust monopoly turns out these defective rails so as to save money—the money going to pay dividends on hundreds of millions of watered stock. But no one in authority has even suggested that the steel trust rail makers are criminally responsible.

The government itself tells him the railroads, congressmen, senators, and men of large wealth have conspired to defraud the people of thousands of acres of valuable mining and timber lands, but he sees one of these very senators at the head of the prosecution of the mine union leaders of Colorado.

He sees corporation lawyers appointed to federal judgeships. He sees corporation lawyers in the federal cabinet. He sees cabinet officers go direct from the administration to become intimately associated with Wall Street leaders of "high finance."

He has been given ample evidence that even the United States senate, the highest law making body of the nation—and the body that confirms the appointments of all federal judges—is controlled, when necessary, by senators elected to represent railroad trusts, tariff-beneficiaries, and other special privilege recipients.

Then, too, he has learned that newspapers are selling their columns, even their editorial columns, to those who fatten on special privileges, and who rob and oppress the people—"lawfully."

Seeing and knowing these things, he feels that there is something radically wrong in the system of economy that brings forth, and in the