LABOR AND PHILANTHROPY 1885-1917

BY

ROBERT C. MILLER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

(History)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1962

Chapter I:

Philanthropy as a Cure for Poverty

America at the turn of the century was the scene of many fundamental conflicts. Society was changing rapidly. Production and population were increasing by leaps and bounds, cities bulged with their rapidly growing numbers. The old established values gave way reluctantly. The people were faced with a whole new series of social and psychological problems.

Three factors proved especially interesting as reflections and causes of the changes afoot. The private accumulation of wealth rose to almost undreamed of heights. Never before in America had there been men so obviously rich as the Vanderbilts, the Carnegies, the Morgans and the Rockefellers. The multimillionaire became a new fixture in the social picture. With this came the problem of what to do with the money. Conspicuous consumption, extravagant as it was, could account for only so much.

Alongside this new wealth, personal poverty increased rapidly. Poverty had always existed in America, but never on such a widespread scale. Slums became a common and considerable part of most communities. For great numbers mere existence itself was on a hand to mouth basis and for many of these this condition was all but permanent with no real hope for any substantial improvement. Here, as the people came increasingly to

see, was a situation that demanded attention.

These two elements, extensive wealth and depressing poverty, helped to spur on the philanthropic impulse which had always existed. The rich now had sufficient money to be generous on a large scale and the plight of the poor provided an outlet for their activity. Some chose to attack the problem directly by giving to the poor themselves or through one of the growing number of charitable agencies. Others felt they could do more good by providing positive programs of recreation, education and edification. In either case they had a long-standing tradition to rely on.[1]

While this was going on, the labor movement in America finally got a firm and permanent foothold in the social complex. Theworkers found that they were unable to cope with the many new problems in the industrial field. As individuals they were powerless against the large and impersonal corporations. Hours, wages and working conditions were determined unilaterally by their employers, and usually in a fashion decidedly unfavorable to them. In order to improve this situation, increasing numbers came to the conclusion that organization was necessary. Even before many of their new unions became settled, the leadership undertook the publication of various journals to spread their gospel among the uninitiated and to keep their members informed. It is not surprising that these men in their writing should take notice of the great wealth and widespread poverty exisiting side by side and of the philanthropy which attempted to remedy the situation. These views of the labor press on philanthropy reflected one of the more significant conflicts of the day, namely the different approaches to the social

1. See Robert Bremner, American Philanthropy, Chicago, 1960, for a brief but adequate summary of this tradition.

uses of surplus riches.

The philanthropist who attempted to cope with the immediate problem of widespread poverty undoubtedly subscribed to the ideas about poverty prevalent in his day. Despite some differences in opinion, most persons who thought about poverty viewed it as a malady "caused by weakness of character, body, or intellect, and curable by reform of the individual."[2] Moreover, they shared a fear that "the wrong kind" of charity pauperized the individual, making him a chronic dependent. As Mary Richmond, a prominent professional social worker explained, "Even for the struggling poor, charitable relief is a dangerous kindness...." The great danger, she felt, lay in "meddling with a man's wholesome struggle to win the bare necessities of life."[3]

The literature available to charity workers in the late nineteenth century strengthened this long-standing view. One of the pioneering studies of its day, Amos G. Warner's American Charities, devoted a full chapter to personal factors in poverty, such as drunkenness, laziness and physical infirmity. Warner paid scant attention to extrinsic social factors bearing on poverty.[4]

Leaders of the labor movement shared the general public concern with poverty as a social problem. Indeed they had a special interest in the matter since men in the ranks of organized labor were generally poor. For them poverty was not an abstract question: they lived with it, and felt its blighting effects first hand. Because they lived with poverty, their approach to it differed significantly from that of men in the donor class.

---

2. Ibid., 100.
3. Mary Richmond, "Notes of an Idle Philanthropist" in the Long View, Papers and Addresses, edited by Joanna C. Colcor, New York, 1930, p. 151-2.
4. Amos G. Warner, American Charities, New York, 1894.

Labor's spokesmen generally repudiated the individualistic assumptions on which so much contemporary thinking was founded. They argued that the causes of poverty lay not with the individuals but with society. Hence a reform of society would bring an end to the need for poor relief.[5] Some writers in the labor movement placed the blame for poverty on industrialism.[6] This view, although most frequently expressed in socialist circles, had its adherents in conservative ranks.[7]

Labor's social approach to poverty produced frequent demands for reform. One critic complained of the contemporary charity workers, "It is the great error of the reformers, and philanthropists of our time that they nibble at the consequences of unjust power, instead of redressing the injustice itself."[8] In simpler, more direct words, labor wanted "Justice not charity."

This slogan appeared frequently and in many forms. Sometimes labor journals used it as the lead for a column of supporting quotations. Sometimes it served as a comment on an instance of industrial strife, a conclusion to a review of a particular charitable scheme, or the theme of an extended treatment of the problem of poverty in general.[9]

---

5. Industrial Worker (Seattle) 1 (July 8, 1916) 2; Industrial Worker (Spokane) 2 (July 16, 1910); Woodworker 5 (June 1897) 283, 6 (May 1898) 129; Boilermakers' Journal 9 (December, 1897) 362; Social Democratic Herald, July 15, 1911, 2.
6. People, November 21, 1897, 2; Workers Call, December 23, 1899, 1.
7. Journal of the Metal Polishers Union 6 (June, 1898) 460.
8. Machine Woodworker 2 (December 1892) 163.
9. Typographical Journal 6 (October 1, 1894) 4; Journal of the Metal Polishers Union 7 (January, 1899) 596; Machinists' Monthly Journal 23 (December, 1911) p. 1215; American Federationist 5 (April, 1898), 26.

However used, it usually called for the finest or at least more florid rhetoric of partisan writers. Shortly after the Pullman strike of 1894, an A. F. of L. journalist commented that:

> The time had come when, all over the civilized world, wretched, gaunt and despairing poverty was pleading with outstretched hands, not for charity but for justice, and for that which it had a right to expect from the well-filled vaults and granaries of the proud, fat, overgrown, 'capital', whose flesh, bones, muscles, nerves and purple and fine linens represented the cornered products, the stolen lands, the exploited labor and vanished life-blood of weary millions of human beings. [10]

Another observer wrote that if he were attempting to end strife in the world, he would not:

> Affect suffering humanity with any further endowments; I would not cast just a few corks on the sea of life for some odd sinking souls to grasp at. I would endow no charity officialism, I would bequeath no dying soup to a hungry world. Rather I would leave behind ideas based on justice. [11]

In attempting to define justice, labor stressed the central values of its special economic outlook. To conservative trade unionists justice meant above all, "a living wage, below which the wage-earners should not permit themselves to be driven." [12] Demands for the right to organize, higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions were all related. Underlying this pragmatic program was belief in the right of all ment to the opportunity for gainful employment. This was especially in an era of widespread unemployment and frequent lay-offs.

Relating opportunity to the problem of charity, labor leaders often

10. American Federationist, 1 (October, 1894) 167.
11. Boilermakers' Journal, 11 (July 1899) 194.
12. Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 13 (April, 1889)355.

argued that workers would not need relief if there were a proper distribution of opportunities. If laborers "received, or could receive, employment and a fair proportion of the results of their labor, they would be self-supporting wealth creators, instead of a burdensome menace to society or forced to seek the shelter of some elemosynary establishment and subject themselves to the jeers and sneers of quasi-economists."[13] A. F. of L. spokesmen believed that the goal of full employment and adequate compensation could best be attained through collective bargaining.

Spokesmen for socialism also talked of justice instead of charity, but their definition of justice involved more than improved working conditions or increased opportunities for employment. It meant public ownership and management of the principal means of production and distirbution. The extreme left stressed this goal most directly. Moreover the goal was to be attained through political activity and the use of the ballot by class-conscious workers, not through mere economic bargaining.[14] The radical I.W.W. proclaimed that "We want no charity. We want only what we can take by our own might. And we are mighty enough to take all of what we produce and keep it... We want no charity. We want the earth."[15] At times the radicals hurled defiance at justice itself. An I.W.W. union in pursuing its objectives "would spit on charity and not even ask for justice. Such a class union would simply paralyze industry until they (sic) got what they wanted."[16] The radicals

13. Woodworkers 5 (May, 1897) 273; cf. also American Federationist 5 (April, 1898) 26; Retail Clerks International Advocate, 23 (May, 1916), 5-7.
14. Workers Call, September 9, 1899, 1-3; Cleveland Citizen, June 2, 1894, 2; Social Democratic Herald, July 11, 1903, 1.
15. Industrial Worker, 2 (July 16, 1910), 2.
16. Solidarity, (October 29, 1910), 3.

proposed to use violence as well as economic coercion to attain their objectives.[17]

Despite repeated use of the slogan "Justice. not charity", some representatives of organized labor saw no necessary incompatibility between the two. One journal reprinted observations of the English social thinker John Ruskin, to the effect that charity was far greater than justice, qualified by Ruskin's comment that charity "is the summit of justice, it is the temple of which jutice is the foundation. But you can't have the top without the bottom; you can't depend upon charity. You must build upon justice, for this main reason, that you have not, at first charity to build with."[18]

Indeed, some trade unionists were willing to concede that philanthropy had important if secondary tasks to perform in society. However, this work, involving the investigation and alleviation of social problems, had to be followed by an honest search for justice, and could not be considered sufficient in itself.[19] Even moderate socialists were not completely averse to charity. Speaking before a labor rally in Milwaukee, the socialist lecturer Rose Pastor Stokes declared her opposition only to that type of charity "which robs us of our self-respect."[20] On another occasion, a writer in the Social Democratic Herald reviewed the activities of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections

17. On the ideology of the I.W.W., cf. Paul F. Brissenden, The I.W.W., A Study of American Syndicalism, New York, 1920.
18. Reprinted in Straight Tips, January, 1891,22.
19. Iron Molders Journal, 32 (December, 1896) 493.
20. Speech quoted in Social Democratic Herald, December 28, 1907, 4.

and commented that private charities "have their own field, and have done and will continue to do valuable work in it."[21]

However, socialists were usually unwilling to concede anything to charity. Victor Berger said that "as to the alleviation of poverty through charity, even the mere attempt is ridiculous hypocrisy."[22] John M. Work, in an article published along with Berger's statement, declared that

> The pity and sympathy which actuate charity workers are admirable, and insofar as they help individuals to a better life they are to be commended. But in the larger sense their work is utterly hopeles..... It would be too bad to neglect the individuals whom they are helping. But in addition to that work, they should use their first-hand knowledge of conditions to scourge the system which produces these conditions.[23]

As hard-hearted realists, conservative trade union leaders understood that an immediate need existed for some type of program to alleviate the plight of the poor. The editor of the Machine Woodworker observed quite bluntly, "the employed do not wish to be the recipients of charity, but they must have bread if they cannot get work."[24] Such men accepted the fact that without private and public charity, many people would starve to death, or at least have a much harder life. One labor editor referred to charity workers as "angels of mercy to suffering need", and during the Panic of 1893, the A. F. of L. convention urged its members to "applaud the humane efforts of private individuals to relieve the terrible distress of the unemployed."[25]

21. Social Democratic Herald, May 1, 1909, 2.
22. Social Democratic Herald, July 15, 1911, 2.
23. Social Democratic Herald, July 15, 1911, 2.
24. Machine Woodworker, 2 (August-September, 1893), 69.
25. Woodworker, 6 (December, 1897), 63; A. F. of L., Report of the Proceedings of the Annual Conference, 13 (1893), 37; for other expressions of qualified approval, cf. Western Laborer, January 5, 1895, 4; April 9, 1898, 3; Tailor, 12 (August, 1898), 7; Metal Polishers Journal, 6 (June, 1899) 928; Iron Molders Journal, 32 (February, 1896), 62.

Occasionally, especially during times of recession or depression, union leaders urged their followers to practice charity: "But so long as the present conditions exist, let no man turn from a door a human being whose only crime, so far as we know, is that he is hungry. It won't hurt you to give him a piece of bread. You may be entertaining an angel unawares."[26] Less commonly, even the rich were asked, if a bit sarcastically, to do their part, as when the Social Democratic Herald observed that the wealthy "are responsible for the misery and destitution of the very poor and ought to do a little at least to relieve the trouble they produce."[27]

In accepting charitable programs, labor usually made it quite clear that certain methods were definitely preferred. Starting with the idea of self-help trade unionists made it clear that the best way to help the poor was "to enable them to help themselves."[28] The editor of the Tobacco Worker declared that the more a plan for poor relief departed from the ideal of self-help, "the more impractical and even pernicious" it was.[29] In practical terms this meant that "if we must have charity, let us have the kind which will lend its energies to abolish class legislation and give all men equal opportunities to pursue prosperity and

26. Woodworker, October, 1897, 39; cf. also American Federationist, 1 (March, 1894), 7; 8 (October, 1900) 306; Carpenter, 15 (March, 1895), 8; Iron Molders Journal, 32 (February, 1896), 62; Tailor, 7 (December, 1893), 3.
27. Social Democratic Herald, October 10, 1903, 1.
28. Locomotive and Firemen's Magazine, 13 (April, 1889), 355.
29. Tobacco Worker, 2 (April, 1898), 7.

overtake it."[30] To labor's way of thinking "the best way to dispense charity is to secure employment for those who are willing to earn an honest living."[31]

Few existing programs apparently corresponded to the ideal, for labor habitually viewed all charity with distrust. Timing was a factor in the expression of negative attitude. During a local charity scandal in St. Louis, the Labor Compendium urged its readers "to use the X-rays occasionally on all charitable.....concerns, and a good deal of rascality will be found under the cloak of charity and reform."[32] Years later, the controversy over a national charter for the Rockefeller charities provided the setting for the American Federationist's remark that "the wisest among reformers have grown accustomed to look closely at propositions by the wealthy."[33]

In criticizing various charitable endeavors, labor spokesmen regardless of their ideological commitments, followed the same general line of arguments. Differences existed, but they tended to be differences in emphasis rather than in ideas. Generally workers criticized charity for being insufficient, debasing, and hypocritical.

Charity's gravest shortcoming was its inadequacy as a remedy for poverty. The Metal Polishers Journal spoke for all of labor in observing that: "In spite of the number of these organizations and the large amount that is annually spent in charity, the need seems rather to increase than diminish."[34] Time and ideology had little bearing on this

30. Western Laborer, January 26, 1895, 4.
31. Appeared in Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 13 (April, 1889), 355; cf. also Typographical Journal, 9 (August 14, 1896), 154. The original of this could not be located.
32. Labor Compendium, November 29, 1896, 4.
33. American Federationist, 17 (May, 1911), 374-5.
34. Metal Polishers Journal, 6 (January, 1899), 597.

charge. In 1896, the conservative International Woodworker noted cynically that "a little more of the present kind of prosperity will necessitate the erection of more .... poor houses." Fifteen years later during a milder recession the more radical Miners' Magazine reported that half a million people in New York city received charity during the previous year, and commented sarcastically, "Hats off to Prosperity."[35]

Even worse than the inadequacy of poor relief, although in part related to it, was the pauperizing effort it had on recipients. In accepting this idea, labor spokesmen voiced the common assumption that "Men who once accept charity .... are likely to become accustomed to depend upon that charity, and make no great effort to work out of the ruts."[36] Hence, according to the theory, there arose a class of men who did not "want to work, and in most cases would not take it if it was offered to them." Labor spokesmen explained that such men "are the progeny of unjust social conditions and an ill-advised system of relief from those conditions commonly called charity."[37] If the theory of pauperization was sound then charity "is not a cure for the evil (of poverty) but on the contrary .... it but aggravates it. The more they relieve the more there is requiring relief."[38]

Charity did more than make a man a chronic dependent. The mere

35. International Woodworker, 56 (December, 1896), 212; Miners' Magazine, 11 (January 19, 1911), 1; cf. also Miners' Magazine, 6 (January 9, 1905), 1; and many others.
36. The American Federationist, 6 (June, 1899), 77-82.
37. Iron Molders Journal, 32 (June, 1896), 62; cf. also American Bookbinder, 10 (February, 1890), 12; Western Laborer, December 23, 1899, 3.
38. Iron Molders Journal, 32 (February, 1896), 62.

acceptance of charity debased the recipient. Samuel Gompers in a speech "On the attitude of organized labor toward organized charity", declared that charities "rob the individual of a good deal of what goes to make up a man."[39] Joseph Buchanan, another conservative labor organizer, contended that almsgiving and the like sowed "the seeds of poison in our social system by crushing the spirit of independence in its workers and making them chronic mendicants who must have only courage enough to go down on their marrow bones and beg, and then lick the hand that gives them alms."[40] Josephine Shaw Lowell, long time friend of organized labor, complained that charity represented an "insult" to the "injury" done to the masses of labor by insufficient payment for work.[41] Eugene Debs, before his conversion to socialism, considered the acceptance of charity "a most humiliating confession of abasement."[42] Charitable institutions struck another labor editor as especially degrading because they furnished "philanthropists more 'slumming' and charitable amusement...."[43]

Socialist critics also devoted considerable attention to the charge of debasement. Charitable institutions came under fire "for the doling out of humiliating charity."[44] The I.W.W. boldly stated that "charity

39. The American Federationist, 6 (June, 1899), 77-62.
40. Tailor, 7 (December, 1893), 3.
41. Tailor, 5 (September, 1891), 5.
42. Carpenter, 11 (October, 1891), 1.
43. Western Laborer, January 26, 1895, 5; cf. also Western Laborer, February 24, 1904, 1.
44. Social Democratic Herald, July 13, 1907, 1; Chicago Socialist, January 3, 1903, 1; similar charges can be found in Cleveland Citizen, November 26, 1898, 1; January 7, 1899, 1; Social Democratic Herald, November 14, 1908, 1; July 15, 1911, 2; December 28, 1907, 4.

is in its very essence degrading and beneath the dignity of the working classes."[45]

Degradation sometimes operated in two directions. Charitable giving, in the view of some commentators, not only "humiliates and unmans the receiver, but demoralizes and spoils the giver." This was because a psychological barrier grew up between donor and recipient.[46] In the words of the socialist John M. Work, charity, "always degrades its recipient.... and it does well if it does not degrade the giver also. For the giver is placed in a patronizing position which is morally unwholesome."[47] Because of the patronizing attitude of the upper classes, labor believed that "there is no trace of democracy in prevalent philanthropy."[48]

The alleged hypocrisy involved in most poor relief was another central point in labor's criticism. Some union spokesmen looked upon charity not as the fruit of generosity, but merely as a means of appeasing the donor's conscience. Pseudo-charity was without value. Victor Berger observed that poor relief "helps the digestion of the giver a good deal more than the stomach of the receiver. It affords the giver that god-like feeling of having again saved someone from starvation."[49] Another Socialist labor leader observed that "men who rob from on year's end to the other sometimes make an effort to square themselves with their conscience by contributing a sop to charity.... "[50] The I.W.W. similarly

45. Industrial Worker (Seattle) 1 (July 8, 1916) 2; 11 (December 16, 1916) 2; Industrial Union Bulletin (Chicago) 1 (December 21, 1907; see also Cleveland Citizen, May 5, 1894, 3.
46. The American Federationist, 1 (March, 1894), 11-12.
47. Social Democratic Herald, July 15, 1911, 2; cf. also Workers Call, December 23, 1899, 1.
48. Cleveland Citizen, March 24, 1900, 2 quoting Jane Addams.
49. Social Democratic Herald, December 5, 1908, 1; cf. also November 7, 1903, 1.
50. Cleveland Citizen, January 2, 1897, 2; cf. also Social Democratic Herald, July 8, 1901, 3.

denounced the "smug hypocrite who would salve a remnant of conscience by 'charity'" and the rich who were "at best given to the distribution of alms as a means of stilling their own labor-robbing conscience."[51]

Others maintained that charity was hypocritical because it was often grounded in publicity-seeking. As one critic put it, the charity that "seeks the admiration of the world and rubs itself complacently on the back and looks around with a gaze that says 'see what a good fellow I am', T'is worth two cents less than nothing.... "[52] In 1897 the editor of the conservative Boilermakers Journal alleged that many rich philanthropists "give money for charity and advertize it all over the country."[53] Several years later the Cigarmakers denounced an unnamed Chicago retailer who gave a widely publicized Thanksgiving dinner to a group of poor children: "The merchant simply gave the dinner (?) as a means to advertize himself."[54] Socialists complained that "the well-fed, well-clothed and well-housed gentlemen and ladies of the middle and upper classes are at once filled with a righteous desire to relieve suffering and incidentally to advertize their business by contributing to the charity funds."[55] An article on the popular charity balls of the

51. Solidarity, 2 (April 9, 1910), 3; 1 (December 25, 1909), 2; cf. Industrial Worker (Seattle) 1 (December 16, 1916), 2; Industrial Worker (Spokane) 3 (December 21, 1911), 1; Solidarity, 8 (April 22, 1916), 3.
52. Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 22 (April, 1897), 220-1.
53. Boilermakers Journal, 9 (December, 1897), 362; Bookbinder, 15 (April, 1895), 377-8; Tailor, 7 (December, 1893), 3.
54. Cigarmakers Journal, 24 (December, 1899), 8. Conversely a railroad union editor defended a Jewish merchant on a similar charge by commenting, "What a pity this world does not have more such Jews and less such Christians." Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 24 (January, 1898), 65.
55. Solidarity, 4 (January 20, 1912), 2; cf. also 8 (April 22, 1916), 3; Industrial Union Bulletin, 2 (August 8, 1908), 3; Social Democratic Herald (July 8, 1911), 3.

day began by asking, "If the poor were not with us, what could some people do to get cheap advertising."[56]

Many critics within labor's ranks contended that charity programs were merely profit-making schemes. This was the supreme hypocrisy: "Of all the grafts in this world, the charity graft takes the palm."[57] In support of this charge critics pointed to the proliferation of clerical personnel within charitable agencies. The editor of the Miners' Magazine observed that "the system under which we live has bred thousands of professional solicitors, who under the guise of 'charity' beg alms for the unfortunate who have fallen by the wayside."[58] An I.W.W. journalist claimed that "charity workers have fattened (themselves) from the misery of others."[59] Charles Danforth, a conservative labor leader, writing in the Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, observed that "in more than one instance it has been shown that when rents, salaries, postage, etc., had been paid, precious little of the contributions was left for the poor...."[60]

Questionable allocation of charity funds accounted for labor's suspicion that charity was a racket. The I.W.W. represented that the poor got only seven cents on every dollar given to the Salvation Army.[61] The Cleveland Citizen quoted an estimate by a banker, E. S. Dreyer of Chicago, that "not more than twenty cents of every dollar subscribed

56. Cleveland Citizen, January 2, 1897, 2; cf. also Social Democratic Herald, January 25, 1903, 1; May 9, 1903, 1; Railway Times, January 15, 1894, 2.
57. Miners' Magazine, 11 (May 11, 1911), 8; cf. also Solidarity, 8 (December 16, 1916), 2.
58. Miners' Magazine, 10 (May 27, 1909), 6.
59. Industrial Worker, 3 (December 7, 1911), 2.
60. Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 15 (July, 1891), 598.
61. Solidarity, 4 (December 7, 1912), 4; cf. also 8, (December 16, 1916, 2.

for the poor by the charitable people of the city reaches those for whom it was intended."[62] An editorial by J. Rosett in the Social Democratic Herald declared that "the present proportions of waste involved in charity vary...; for every dollar wasted in false charity among humanity at large the charities of New York bestow upon the charities workers the sum of $1.36, while in Baltimore with the same amount of waste, the charity worker is the beneficiary to the extent of only eighty-five cents."[63] Another labor critic declared that "out of every four dollars contributed to sweet charity, about one dollar on the average, reaches the victims of capitalism." He examined in detail a quarterly report of a charity organization and found that it cost $606.91 to distribute $460.75 to the poor.[64]

The charity racket charge stemmed in part from the assumption that relief agencies were a vested interest dedicated to their own perpetuation. The editor of Chicago Socialist suggested that the Salvation Army opposed the abolition of poverty because it would thereby be put out of business.[65] Labor attacked charity organizations that claimed that a program providing pensions for mothers was socialism. Allegedly, the real motive behind the opposition to such welfare was a desire to see that "all the alms for the poor and unfortunate should go into the hands of the promoters of charity, who see to it that the greater portion of

62. Cleveland Citizen, February 20, 1892, 3.
63. Social Democratic Herald, October 7, 1911, 3.
64. Miners Magazine, 11 (May 11, 1911), 8. The generalization and the specific figures do not of course, quite match. The article went on to urge that relief for workers be channeled through their unions where there would not be graft and wastefulness. cf. also 13 (May 15, 1913), 1; 11 (August 17, 1911), 1.
65. Chicago Socialist, January 3, 1903, 2.

charity funds are paid out in salaries to those who are so fortunate as to be identified with organized charity." To many in labor the professional greed was characteristic of organized relief work.[66] According to labor "The essence of success lies in the promoters making such tenderlings work hard for a 'cause', while profiting hugely at their expense and of the public."[67]

What made the hypocrisy in charity so intolerable was the fact that it was the generosity of the workers and the poor, and not the agencies, that really helped those in need. Rose Pastor Stokes insisted that "the only real charity is the charity of the poor toward the poor."[68] Similarly, Conservative labor spokesmen insisted that "the poor of our country.....are the real almsgivers." The American Federationist quoted Dr. Edward Deane of the New York City Charity Organization Society to the effect that "the main burden of what poverty exists is borne by the poor and not by the rich."[69]

While labor journalists tended, regardless of their ideological commitments, to make the same charges against ameliorative philanthropy, certain arguments were especially characteristic of one group or another.

---

66. Miners Magazine, 13 (May 15, 1913), 1; for the general attitude cf. also Social Democratic Herald, December 5, 1903; October 7, 1911, 3; Solidarity, 8 (April 22, 1916), 3; Industrial Worker, 1 (December 16, 1916, 2.
67. International Musician, 11 (January, 1911), 14.
68. Social Democratic Herald, December 28, 1907, 4.
69. Metal Polishers Journal, 6 (April, 1898), 348; The American Federationist, 19 (June, 1912), 471; cf. also 11 (February, 1904) 121; 17 (August, 1910), 665-6.

The socialists gave special prominence to the idea that money used in relief programs was stolen from the workers. In one instance, an I.W.W. journalist defined charity as "the act of giving a very small portion of the stolen goods back to the robbed."[70] He also complained that philanthropists were "supported entirely by the sweat and blood of the very people whom they make the objects of their 'charity'."[71] Another editor referred to the United States Steel Corporation as a "benevolent parasite" because it gave charity to workers with money wrung from them.[72] If rich donors continued to keep their own workers in poverty, charity could be truly termed a "tragic-comic farce." The editor of the Chicago Socialist, reporting that high society sponsored an auto race for the benefit of charity, asked, "Is there any connection between their money and the people who need their charity? Oh, well, what has that got to do with the question?"[73] Max Hayes, a moderate socialist and long-time labor editor, referred to "men who rob from one year's end to the other ... contributing a sop to charity and affording some wretched victim in the submerged class a brief glimpse of what is good."[74] Ten years later the Social Democratic Herald explained that if "the Ryans and the rest of the fleecers (would) get down off the backs of labor ... they wouldn't have to engage in charitable activities!"[75] The entire socialist argument with regard to charity centered on this theme.[76]

70. Industrial Worker, 3 (December 21, 1911), 1.
71. Industrial Worker, 2 (July 16, 1910), 2; cf. also 3 (December 7, 1911), 1.
72. Solidarity, 2 (December 24, 1910), 2; cf. also People, March 14, 1894, 2; Solidarity, 1 (December 29, 1909), 2,
73. Chicago Socialist, April 19, 1902, 1; cf. also Miners Magazine, 10 (November 18, 1909), 2, for a similar charge.
74. Cleveland Citizen, January 2, 1897, 2.
75. Social Democratic Herald, July 13, 1907, 1.
76. International Musician, 11 (January, 1911), 14.

Socialists assumed a casual relationship between poverty and capitalism. For the left-wing elements in labor, with their Marxist economic analysis, capitalism was but a passing stage in the development of society. By its very nature, capitalism involved the continuing exploitation of the working classes and the consequent spread of poverty. One radical labor spokesman characterized poverty as "part of his (capitalists's) method of having worker fight worker for the bone from which he takes all the meat - the job."[77] To partially alleviate the inevitable social distress charitable programs were necessary. As an I.W.W. editor explained, "charity is the natural offspring of capitalism. It could not be otherwise under a system that breeds millionaires at the one end and tramps at the other."[78]

The elimination of charity required the abolition of poverty, and the abolition of poverty required the destruction of capitalism.[79] Charity was anathema because it did not seek the end of capitalism. Indeed, "the effect of capitalist philanthropy is to produce on an average a more contented and efficient slave. That means strengthening the chain that binds the worker to his master."[80] This strengthening occurred in several ways. In some instances charity was a "sort of blackmail levied by the most indigent upon the most wealthy", "a cloak that covers capitalist crimes", "the anestheis that would hide from us the facts of life", or "an attempt to pull the wool over (the workers eyes...."[81]

77. Industrial Worker, 1 (June 3, 1916), 2.
78. Industrial Worker, 3 (December 21, 1911), 1.
79. People, November 21, 1897, 2.
80. Solidarity, 2 (December 17, 1910), 2.
81. Cleveland Citizen, May 5, 1894, 3; Solidarity, 8 (April 22, 1916), 3; Miners Magazine, 6 (August 31, 1905), 2; Social Democratic Herald, December 5, 1901, 1.

Socialists agreed that charity was a capitalist trick, and for the workers a dangerous one, for "what they receive as direct gifts from the enemy, tends to put them to sleep and place them more completely under the control of the masters."[82]

What especially angered the socialists was the suspicion that "this charity is supposed to act as a gag for the agitators and socialists."[83] Thus, in the long run, charity amounted to "a scheme to prolong misery", since by preventing true reform through socialism the system compelled the workers to remain in economic chains.[84] Victor L. Berger observed that "charity is the name of the only glittering jewel in the diadem of capitalism. But to the close observer, this jewel very soon proves to be an imitation; common everyday, colored glass, and trust made at that."[85]

Conservative trade unionists gave much less attention to the sources of charity funds, and even to alleged causal relationship between poverty, charity and capitalism. Instead, they examined charity programs and the effects they had on organized labor. They concluded that the principal danger in charity lay in its anti-labor character. There were repeated instances, or so the trade unionist alleged, of philanthropic organizations furnishing scab labor to employers. In 1895 the garment workers denounced the United Hebrew Charities of New York City because they had "again come to the front in open antagonism to the unions of the clothing trade in particular." The antagonism arose in part, the editor explained, because the agencies acted as "a recruiting

82. Solidarity, 2 (December 17, 1910), 2.
83. Social Democratic Herald, December 5, 1908, 1.
84. Industrial Worker, 3 (December 7, 1911), 2; Workers Call, December 23, 1899, 1.
85. Social Democratic Herald, December 5, 1908, 1.

office for furnishing help to the ....manufacturers in time of emergency.... " The situation had become so bad that many of the labor contracts of the United Garment Workers of America provided that no labor could be obtained from charitable societies.[86] The Salvation Army, mission societies and the Y.M.C.A. came in for attack on similar grounds.[87]

In March of 1899 Samuel Gompers declared that in their efforts to find work for the unemployed charity workers often provided scab labor, with no regard to the effects this might have on other, unionized workers.[88] In the abstract, union spokesmen did not object to providing jobs for those out of work. Most of their positive suggestions for the alleviation of poverty stressed the need of providing full employment. At the same time they resented employment schemes that might harm union members or the cause of unionization in general. In an article on the Cooper Union Free Labor Bureau of New York City a writer for the American Federationist praised its services on the ground that none of its patrons had been "so disposed of as to damage the wages of those in trade unions."[89]

Conservative spokesmen also denounced company welfare programs as schemes to instill a sense of company loyalty in the workers and thus wean them away from trade unions. Company programs were "the spurious kind of welfare work, intended only to rob the workers of independence of action.... "[90] More frequently attacked were the railroad relief

86. Garment Worker, 2 (February, 1895), 3.
87. Railway Clerk, 14 (December, 1915), 389-91; The American Federationist, 18 (February, 1911), 121; Miners' Magazine, 8 (June 13, 1907), 1; Solidarity, 8 (April 22, 1916), 3; Miners' Magazine, 8 (December 19, 1907), 4; Cleveland Citizen, May 30, 1896, 1.
88. The American Federationist, 6 (June, 1899), 77-82.
89. The American Federationist, 4 (January, 1897), 241.
90. The American Federationist, 20 (December, 1913), 1043.

associations which sprang up in the last decades of the nineteenth century. These societies, supposedly created to provide old age and disability pensions, struck union writers as "chiefly a device to disorganize the men and break up their organizations."[91] Railroad unions agreed that "the relief fund is a delusion and a snare and is calculated to bring the employes (sic) composing it into a state of meek submission to the caprice of the management."[92]

Conservative labor also argued that charity had an adverse effect on the general standard of living. According to Samuel Gompers, the charity agencies, by providing aid to those who received substandard wages, placed fair-minded employers in an unfavorable competitive position. Such employers had to lower wages in order to remain in business. As Gompers saw it, employment was no sure solution to the problem of poverty. When charity forced wage reductions, the employed as well as the unemployed tended to become objects of charity.[93]

The work program sponsored by philanthropic agencies did not provide workers with wages sufficient for an adequate standard of living. The editor of the Seamen's Journal was especially vociferous on this point. On one occasion he accused the "Sailor's Home" of San Francisco of evicting all seamen who refused to ship out at substandard rates, while elsewhere he denounced another charitable society for not paying sailors

91. Railroad Brakemen's Journal, 1 (June, 1884), 268-9.
92. Railroad Brakemen's Journal, 6 (September, 1889), 415; cf. also 6 (October, 1889), 464 Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 19 (September, 1895), 811; 26 (April, 1899), 410.
93. The American Federationist, 19 (September, 1912), 721-2; cf. also similar article by Jane Addams in American Federationist, 17 (August, 1910), 673.

enough so they could get married.[94] Other journalists cited figures to back up their charges. The Western Labor pointed out that the Associated Charities of Omaha paid its relief help only forty cents per thousand for cleaning bricks that survived a large fire.[95] George Allen England, writing in the International Musician, claimed that through similar tactics the Salvation Army "under the specious name of Christian Charity, has really helped drive down the wage rates, aggravate unemployment, and render the whole situation more acute."[96] Since "the organized charities ... offer the labor of their unfortunate applicants at a rate which tends to lower the economic, moral and social conditions of all those who are employed", it was understandable that organized labor denied that such agencies really cared for or helped the workers.[97]

Many early leaders in charity movement, while undoubtedly concerned with the worker as an individual, failed to understand the nature of and need for labor unions. Mary Richmond, one of the brightest lights of the pioneer Charities Organization Society movement, admitted quite frankly that charitable agencies were at times out of sympathy with labor's just claims, but she insisted that union leaders had no one but themselves to blame. Instead of showing "sympathetic and intelligent interest" in the problems of poverty, they expressed only negative

94. Seamen's Journal, 9 (April 10, 1895) 7; 10 (July 17, 1896), 1; similar charges can be found in almost every issue of this publication.
95. International Musician, 11 (January, 1911), 14-15.
96. Western Laborer, January 5, 1895, 4.
97. The American Federationist, 3 (March, 1896), 15.

criticism.[98] Unfortunately the tone of Mary Richmond's words implied that labor's interests were peripheral to her own. This attitude in itself was one of labor's major complaints.

The A. F. of L. took the position that poverty could be eliminated only through advances in the worker's conditions of labor. Since organization was essential to any progress in this field, unions are basic in any meaningful program of poor relief.[99] Thus, according to Gompers, "the charitable inclined people, and particularly the workers in the movement for organized charity should cooperate with the movement for organized labor in its every effort to uplift the worker, raise wages, reduce the hours of labor and modify the awful conditions of factory and shop life...."[100] Conservative unionists respected organized charity only so far as the latter accepted labor's economic views. On the basis of this criterion the Salvation Army, the Y.M.C.A., and church missions came in for considerable union criticism. Among other things labor attacked the religious charities concern with the workers' spiritual condition, at the expense of concern for labor organization.[101]

On the other hand the settlement house movement received virtually no comment, favorable or unfavorable, from labor journalists. In

98. Mary E. Richmond, The Long View, Papers and Addresses, ed. by Joanna C. Colcord, New York, 1930, "Reforms in Charity", 45-6.
99. The American Federationist, 5 (April, 1898), 26.
100. The American Federationist, 6 (June, 1899), 81.
101. The American Federationist, 5 (April, 1898), 26; Seamen's Journal, 9 (December 11, 1895), 6; 13 (May 13, 1899), 6; 19 (January 18, 1905), 3; Straight Tips, (September, 1890), 28.

light of the almost completely critical character of labor's remarks toward other charitable agencies, absence of adverse comment betrayed an almost favorable attitude. Moreover, when Jane Addams, social reformer founder of Hull House in Chicago, and a general leader of the settlement movement, received personal mention in labor periodicals, her notices were laudatory. One editor described her as "one of labor's sincerest and staunchest friends."[102]

The friendly disposition toward unions that labor detected in Miss Addams also characterized much of settlement movement as a whole. Workers in this field, living among the poor as they did, developed a genuine understanding of their problems. As a result they placed greater emphasis on social reform as opposed to pure charity.[103] Many of them considered unions the best way to meet the problem of poverty, and encouraged unionization whenever possible. Pro-labor settlement workers distributed union literature, helped train leaders, and often provided "substantial assistance" to striking unions.[104]

The response of conservative unions toward ameliorative philanthropy was determined largely by the social outlook of those engaged in such activity. The slowly changing viewpoint of charity organizations eventually affected labor's attitudes. The reception that the Charity Organization Society Movement received in the conservative labor press

102. The American Federationist, 11 (October, 1904), 910; cf. also Tailor, 6 (October, 1892), 4; 11 (July, 1897), 1; Samuel Gompers, Seventy Years of Life and Labor, 2 vol., New York, 1925, 1, 481.
103. Robert Bremner, From the Depths, New York, 1956, 62; Wagner, American Charities.
104. Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, The Settlement Horizon, A National Estimate, New York, 1922, 170.

was revealing. Before the turn of the nineteenth century, while still governed by the individualistic approach toward poverty, the Charity Organization Society fared quite poorly at the hands of conservative journalists. In 1891, Charles Danforth, in an article in the Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, reported on the annual meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections and summed up the attitude of labor toward most such groups.[105] He complained that the conference revealed a lack of understanding of the problems of the poor. It "was not investigating for fundamental causes of poverty that demanded relief. It did not delve for bed-rock facts." To succeed, such groups would have to change their tactics, "find more efficient remedies than soothing syrup (and)..... go to the roots of the diseases they professedly deplore." In other words, they would have to seek "simple justice to workingmen and women" which could best be achieved through unions. Danforth charged that the charitable associations hypocritically accepted funds from the very men who created the conditions they were trying to remedy.

During the thirty years prior to World War I the attitude of professional charity workers toward poverty underwent some fundamental changes. Social workers "ceased to be exclusively preceptors of the poor and advisors and became, instead teachers of a more wholesome way of life to the entire community."[106] Their interests shifted from the individual to the society in which he lived. As a consequence, econ-

105. Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 15 (July, 1891), 597-99.
106. Bremner, From the Depths, 202; this work sums up quite well the shifting ideas of those in charitable work and the factors affecting this shift.

omic and social reforms came to play a leading role in their programs. In time, professionals quit distinguishing between the "worthy" and the "unworthy" poor. As charitable agencies changed their outlook, labor, or at least conservative elements in the union movement, modified their criticisms. By 1904 many New York unions were cooperating with the local Charity Organization Society in a tuberculosis prevention program.[107] More significantly, in 1909 the American Federationist referred to the Survey published by the New York Charity Organization Society as "a journal of constructive philanthropy."[108] The next year Gompers defended the magazine against the charge that it was overly friendly to labor. On the contrary, he suggested that at times it "refrained from putting labor's case as strongly as circumstances justified", confused the workers with the pauper class, and assumed that the rich were the greatest benefactors.[109]

In 1911, the American Federationist noted that some union leaders thought that the philosophy of the Charity Organization Society remained what it had been twenty years earlier. The Federationist denied that assumption and urged union leaders to read the literature of the charity movement to see "the advanced stage at which the most active promoters of charity organizations have arrived... (they have) moved onward through a suggestion of discrimination as to the causes of poverty until they are within sight of the fundamental social problems of the day in all their breadth." "Today, the advanced point of view of the supporters of the movement is in the main that of the conservative-radical (practical) trade unionist. They are prepared not only to make

107. The American Federationist, 11 (October, 1904), 908-9.
108. The American Federationist, 11 (September, 1909), 772.
109. The American Federationist, 17 (August, 1910), 665-6.

the best of society as it is, but to follow sound bottom economic principles in making society better, even until social justice shall at length be established."[110] In 1912, the American Federationist summarized the presidential address delivered to the National Conference of Charities and Correction, again noting the changed philosophy of philanthropy. The editor observed that the National Conference became "good" in labor's view when "it adopted trade union politics and sought lasting social welfare and uplift." At last the charity organizations were calling "not for alms, not for charity, but for justice."[111]

This modified attitude on the part of the A. F. of L. did not, of course, grant a carte blanche to charity workers. Editors continued to file their standard complaints against various agencies. No doubt many workers in the charity field remained unaffected by the newer currents of thought, and even some progressives assumed what appeared to be a condescending attitude toward the poor and labor in general. An incident involving the appointment of a member to the United States Commission on Industrial Relations brought out union feeling on this point. In 1912, spokesmen for organized charity had criticized the appointment of two A. F. of L. officials, James O'Connell and John B. Lennon, to the commission on the ground that they were not well-trained. Gompers angrily answered by pointing out that wisdom did not belong to "intellectuals" alone, and that real progress came "through democratic cooperation."[112] He went on to disclaim any attempt to "discredit the work

110. The American Federationist, 17 (August, 1910), 665-6.
111. The American Federationist, 19 (September, 1912), 721-2; cf. also similar article by Jane Addams in American Federationist, 17 (August, 1910), 673.
112. The American Federationist, 20 (February, 1913), 128-32.

of colleges, universities, or social workers, nor to undervalue the constructive work done by these agencies in helping to establish a more sympathetic democratic understanding of social and industrial problems."

The shift of opinion that occurred among conservative trade unionists did not occur among Socialists. Only one Socialist report on the Charity Organization Society noted certain changes in the guiding philosophy of the organization similar to that found in the conservative press.[113] Far more representative, however, was The People's characterization of Charity Organization as "sickly sentimentality".[114] Later, in an extended article on the Charity Organization Society, John M. Work observed that "such luxuries come high, in the larger sense their work is utterly hopeless."[115] As late as 1916 an I.W.W. commentator described the National Conference as "a make-'em-good-on-soup organization."[116]

Regardless of political orientation, labor looked with disfavor on ameliorative philanthropy as an answer to the problem of poverty. Almost all labor leaders were pragmatic enough to accept such aid in time of need. Nevertheless, they remained idealistic enough to recognize such assistance as only a stop-gap measure, and not a substitute for justice. They felt that social justice, unlike charity, would not debase its beneficiaries or prop up an antiquated social system. Only justice could solve the problem of poverty.

113. Cleveland Citizen, February 20, 1897, 2.
114. People, September 12, 1897, 2.
115. Social Democratic Herald, July 15, 1911, 2.
116. Industrial Worker, 1 (June 10, 1916), 2.

Chapter 2:

Constructive Philanthropy as a Social Institution

Many philanthropists had a broader view of their tasks than merely alleviating the conditions of the poor. As a rule they also felt responsible for building a new society according to their own image. So at least their actions would seem to indicate, for they devoted considerable attention and money to various programs that promised to benefit society. The direction that this activity took varied according to the whims of the individual donor. Religion continued to be a major recipient of surplus capital, as figures on church wealth indicate.[1] Education represented another area in which the wealthy demonstrated their generosity through large gifts. Especially noteworthy was the rise of the heavily endowed private university; as exemplified by Johns Hopkins, The University of Chicago and Stanford. Others contributed to the cause of technical education, on both the secondary and higher levels.

After the turn of the century, some of the rich began to endow private foundations to administer their philanthropic programs. Examples of this were Edwin Ginn's World Peace Foundation, The Carnegie

1. In the period between 1890 and 1916, the total valuation of church property rose 146.8%, while the number of communicants rose 93.2%. U.S. Bureau of Census, Religious Bodies, 1916, Washington 1919, 1, 45 and 29.

Foundation for the Advancement of Education, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Of these and many other similar institutions, the most famous proved to be the Rockefeller Foundation, endowed by the oil king for "the promotion of any and all elements of human progress."

Finally, many of the wealthy took an interest in the advancement of the arts, endowing public art galleries, museums, concert halls and libraries. In this area the work of Andrew Carnegie was especially notable; beginning his campaign for the extension of public library facilities as early as 1881, in the years between 1906 and 1916, he personally underwrote the erection of over one thousand such institutions.

Organized labor meantime continued its struggle for recognition and for the improvement of the economic position of the working class. Few of the many and varied programs of constructive philanthropy took much interest in the worker and his union. Churches tended to be hostile to unions, even those of the conservative A. F. of L. Colleges, especially private ones, were beyond the reach of the average worker and instilled an outlook alien to that of labor. Moreover, the worker had little time or occasion to take advantage of the various facilities for the enjoyment of the arts. Even the free libraries were often inaccesible to him because of his long hours of labor and consequent fatigue.

Partially because these institutions seemed so remote from the workers, organized labor showed relatively little interest in them. What comment did appear revealed some rather definite attitudes on the subject. Labor spokesmen especially objected to the use of "tainted" money in constructive philanthropy. These funds were allegedly stolen from the workers by greedy businessmen. In considering religious benefactions the socialists laid great emphasis on this factor. Max S.

Hayes, long-time socialist and member of the A. F. of L., contrasted John D. Rockefeller's generosity in religion with the way he "earned" his wealth by describing him as "this modern Croesus (who) builds churches and despoils labor, teaches Sundah School and robs consumers, contributes large sums to convert the heathen of foreign lands and crushes competition as he would an eggshell."[2] The Social Democratic Herald explained that this contrast could be attributed to the modern business ethic which called for cheating the public on week-days and giving to the Lord on Sundays.[3] Even conservative publications were not averse using similar arguments. After considering religious contributions in general, one such journal claimed that in 1899, most gifts of this type consisted of profits wrung out of the underpaid workers.[4] In 1916, a labor writer commenting on John D. Rockefeller Jr.'s policy of endowing churches of different denominations observed cynically, "He will give to a Mohammedan church, if necessary; he will do anything except pay decent wages."[5]

In 1905 an incident occurred which highlighted this general criticism. The Social Gospel minister Washington Gladden lodged a formal protest with the American Board of Foreign Missions against its acceptance of a gift of Rockefeller's "tainted money." Reaction to this

2. Cleveland Citizen, June 9, 1894, 1.
3. Social Democratic Herald, June 17, 1905, 1; cf. also Railway Times, July 1, 1896, 1.
4. Metal Polishers Journal, 7 (April, 1899), 785; cf. also Seamen's Journal, 9 (April 19, 1905, 6.
5. American Federationist, 23 (May, 1916), 355; cf. also Metal Polishers Journal, 7 (April, 1899), 785; Western Laborer, August 5, 1892, 2.

affair pointed up the varying approaches within labor on religious philanthropy. The editor of the Seamen's Journal, a conservative organ, reported that this was a hopeful sign that the churches might free themselves from dependence on the very wealthy. Socialist journalists tended to adopt a more readical position: one claimed that all capitalist money, not just that of the wealthy, was "tainted"; the only solution lay in the adoption of socialism.[6]

The labor press similarly attacked educational benefactions for being based on money stolen from the workers. On the one occasion when private aid to southern education came in for consideration, the editor of a Chicago Socialist weekly suggested that in reality it was the worker who was making the contribution. Only his low wages made possible the various foundations operating in this area. "Perhaps," he added cynically, "this sort of self-denial may have something to do with their (the workers') inability to buy meat when the price rises."[7] A few labor writers also raised this same general objection in considering gifts to technical education. The Social Democratic Herald similarly complained that Charles Schwab opened a trade school "out of a few drops of the money he and his kind bled out of the industrious citizens who work for wages."[8]

College endowments came under frequent direct attack from the labor

6. On conservative position, cf. Seamen's Journal, 19 (April 19, 1905), 6; Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 44 (January, 1908), 87; for representative socialist view, cf. Social Democratic Herald, June 10, 1905, 8,
7. Chicago Socialist, April 26, 1902, 2.
8. Social Democratic Herald, May 23, 1903, 1.

press for being "tainted money". In 1897, the editor of the Woodworker, alluding to John D. Rockefeller's gift to the University of Chicago, complained that "an oil king.... can rob a few million from the poor to endow a university."[9] According to the Miners' Magazine, the money used in endowing the University of Chicago did not belong to Rockefeller since "This vast sum of money was not earned by Rockefeller but by the millions of slaves who receive for their labor a wage that barely keeps them from the danger line of starvation."[10] When Carnegie set up the Carnegie Institution in Washington in 1902 a radical journal claimed that "although Congress would thank Carnegie for his offer of $10 million dollars for a national university, he refused to do the same to his workers who had 'handed' him all his money in the first place."[11]

The foundations established by Rockefeller and Carnegie also came under indictment because of the sources of their endowment. The radical Miners' Magazine criticized the Carnegie peace endowment on the grounds that the steel maker had obtained his wealth through maltreatment of his employees. Moreover, he made and continued to make much of his money through the production of arms. In a succeeding article, the editor concluded that "Carnegie has a greater interest in armour plate for battleships than international peace."[12] No other journal attacked this

9. Woodworker, 6 (August, 1897), 16; Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 44 (January, 1908), 86, 7; Railway Trainmen's Journal, 24 (April, 1907), 368.
10. Miners' Magazine, 11 (December 29, 1910), 1.
11. Chicago Socialist, January 4, 1902, 2; cf. also Railway Times, July 1, 1896, 1; Miners' Magazine, 8 (January 10, 1907), 1.
12. Miners' Magazine, 11 (December 29, 1910) 1-2; 11 (January 5, 1911), 1; cf. also 11 (February 9, 1911), 1; 11 (April 6, 1911), 1. This remark overlooks Carnegie's retirement from business in 1901.

particular philanthropy: few people could attack anything which sought world peace.

Both conservative and radical labor editors criticized the Rockefeller Foundation because the workers had been made "involuntary partners" in the project inasmuch as the endowment had been stolen from them.[13] Victor Berger described the Foundation as an attempt to "bribe the people with some of their own money." If the people had not been robbed in the first place, there would have been no fund to establish the Foundation.[14] According to a more conservative viewpoint, since the Foundation operated with Rockefeller money, there was no way for it to escape at least indirect responsibility for the methods by which the money had been obtained. To illustrate this, Edward Costigan, an attorney for the United Mine Workers, pointed out that ten per cent of the capital assets of the Foundation involved securities of companies doing business in Colorado where labor was engaged in a bitter struggle with several belligerently anti-labor organizations.[15]

In its consideration of other miscellaneous types of constructive philanthropy the labor press stressed the source of the money involved. This was especially true in the reception given to Carnegie's library program. Indeed, he seems to have been the major figure in labor's

13. The American Federationist, 17 (April, 1910), 337; Railway Clerk, 6 (January, 1907), 25-6 (Letter to editor).
14. Social Democratic Herald, March 12, 1910, 1.
15. Costigan testimony, Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations (Washington, 1915), 8, 8114; cf. also Gompers testimony, Ibid., 7, 7646; American Federationist, 21 (November, 1914), 985-6; 22 (January, 1915, 41-2; 22 (April, 1915), 281.

consideration of constructive philanthropy as a whole. Ideological factionalism within the press made little difference in this particular argument. For every socialist who charged that "On Carnegie's money there is blood...." for he obtained it by "killing off thousands of our people",[15] there were conservatives who contrasted the steel magnate's alleged philanthropy with the conduct of his plant at Homestead and elsewhere.[16] The socialist Max S. Hayes summed up the views of labor generally on this question when he wrote that: "It occurs to us that this return of that which the people have been robbed of is not a gift."[17]

The fact that labor stressed this argument as much as it did is quite significant. For the most part it seemed not to attack the philanthropy itself but rather the men behind the philanthropy. This proved especially true as regards Andrew Carnegie's benefactions. Here discussion of his libraries, endowment funds or other gifts merely served as an opening for attacks on the man. It is also significant that labor seldom had anything to say about the philanthropies of men other than Rockefeller and Carnegie, who were notorious for their business methods and allegedly hostile to organized labor. It is worth noting that the labor press made no mention of Edwin Ginn's establishment of the World Peace Fund, an endowment that attracted considerable notice in other quarters.

15. Social Democratic Herald, August 1, 1903, 1; July 6, 1907, 1; Cleveland Citizen, July 20, 1912, 1.
16. International Woodworker, 8 (October, 1899), 113; Patternmakers Journal, 8 (November, 1899), 4; cf. also Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 15 (July, 1891), 591; Railway Clerk, 6 (January, 1907), 25-6.
17. Cleveland Citizen, July 25, 1896, 2; cf. also Social Democratic Herald, October 19, 1907, 1; March 4, 1911, 3.

Approaching constructive philanthropy from another angle, the labor press stressed the idea that the wealthy through their philanthropy were attempting to control public opinion. Philanthropists sought to ward off criticism. Hence they sought to control the leading opinion-forming agencies. Gifts to religion struck most labor spokesmen, radical and conservative alike, as attempts to "capture the clergy." Through control of finances the wealthy obliged ministers to say "only what they are supposed to, to uphold the system."[18] Solidarity defined Rockefeller's support of church construction in Colorado as "another Bulwark" of John D. Rockefeller. Elsewhere the same journal published a satire in which a manufacturer urged his son to hire a revivalist to put workers in the proper mood of servility.[19] In a similar vein, a story published in the American Federationist in 1904 portrayed an industrialist urging the endowment of churches so that ministers could teach the workers "that their imaginations are in vain, and that they must abjectly obey us, having no opinions or desires of their own."[20] Summing up labor's general attitude at the turn of the century, an editorial published in 1901 in the Miner's Magazine concluded, "it is useless to deny the fact that the church of today like the courts, is too often a plaything of the millionaire."[21]

Behind labor's opposition to religious philanthropy lay a strong distrust of the church's social role. It is not difficult to understand appearances of distrust by organized labor for organized religion.

18. American Federationist, 12 (April, 1905), 208-9; Journal of the Metal Polishers Union, 7 (April, 1899), 779; Railway Clerk, 6 (January, 1907), 25-6.
19. Solidarity, 8 (April 15, 1916), 3; 3 (April 8, 1911), 3.
20. American Federationist, 2 (November, 1901).
21. Miner's Magazine, 2 (November, 1901).

Most churches were quite open in their hostility to unions. There were labor journals which printed articles written by ministers of various faiths; even much of the socialist press tried to demonstrate that socialism was not opposed to any religion, with clerical statements to support their position.[22] But this backing was difficult to obtain, even for the conservative segments of labor, especially prior to 1900. In two of the major strikes of the last decade of the nineteenth century, those at Homestead, Pennsylvania and Pullman, Illinois, almost all the clerical press supported suppression of the strikers. Even the clergy involved in the Social Gospel movement prior to 1900, while conceding the theoretical right of the workers to organize, tended to be skeptical about strikes and in general condemned all labor violence as excessive and unnecessary.[23]

In 1896, Gompers presented labor's general attitude toward religion: "My associates have come to look upon the church and the ministry as the apologists and defenders of the wrongs committed against the interests of the people, simply because the perpetrators are possessors of wealth." Because men of wealth controlled the churches, labor's necessary methods of action were "frowned down upon with contempt; treated indifferently or openly antagonized."[24]

22. Henry F. May, The Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York, 1949), 105, 109.
23. Charles H. Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven, 1940, 94.
24. American Federationist, 3 (August, 1896), 119-20; on general question of labor and churches before 1900, cf. Aaron Abell, The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900 (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), chapter 3 .

In its criticism of the church, organized labor assumed that the church's anti-labor bias was due largely to the influence of the wealthy. Labor spokesmen felt that religious philanthropy either blinded the clergy to the faults of business, or bought the services of the unscrupulous for its defense. Moreover, they assumed that Rockefeller and others made their contributions with this in mind. No doubt there was some truth in these charges, but this explanation of religious philanthropy is too simple, and it does an injustice to many sincerely religious men. The labor press never considered that churches might have been unsympathetic without the help of capitalist philanthropy. From one point of view, the conservatism of the religion of the times can be attributed to its general ideological foundation. This followed naturally from clerical laissez-faire social theory based on a highly individualistic protestant theology. Moreover, the mere weight of tradition operated against the interest of labor within the churches. Some industrialists may have consciously supported conservatism in religion, but this does not mean that they caused it. Indeed, the recognition of labor's demands required a rethinking of much that the churches held as true; such a process required time, and organized labor failed to understand this.

Many spokesmen for organized labor similarly argued against philanthropy in the field of education on the grounds that it was used as a means of social control: the rich gave to schools because they could thereby control what was taught and could prevent scholars from pursuing work that threatened the interests of the business community. Labor writers based this criticism on a philosophy of education which gave little room for philanthropic support. Almost all unions subscribed

to the traditional American belief in the efficacy and necessity of popular and general education.[25]

Most of the labor press could undoubtedly have agreed with an early resolution of A. F.of L. which recognized the education of the people as "the fundamental principle on which the success of every proposed plan of social reform depends."[26] The specific function of this education was "to develop personal powers and to give the individual control over himself so that he may have confidence in himself and may use his ability to the best advantage." This ideal "new education" would appeal to the child and arouse his curiosity. Stikingly similar to the views expounded by John Dewey at the University of Chicago and Columbia, it would in labor's view lay the foundation for "a democracy in whic each individual will have equal opportunity."[27]

Many labor leaders apparently felt that with philanthropic support, the specific programs of education tended to adjust to the whims of the donors instead of to the needs of the student, as they would have under labor's ideal.

At the 29th A. F. of L. Annual Convention, Gompers spelled out the implication of this theory for philanthropy: "Education in America must be free, democratic, conducted by, of, and for the people, and...

25. Philip R. V. Curoe, Educational Attitudes and Policies of Organized Labor in the U. S. (Columbia University contributions to Education, No. 201 (New York, 1926). The I.W.W. which probably represented the least educated level of American workers, had very little to say on philanthropy in education. Nor did its press reflect the usual confidence in the powers of education.
26. A. F. of L. Report of the Proceedings, 8 (1888), 27.
27. A. F. of L. Report of the Proceedings, 29 (1909), 136.

it must never be consigned to, or permitted to remain in the power of private interests, where there is sure to be the danger of exploitation for private property and wilful rapacity."[28] Later, he amplified this by stating that private education would be acceptable to labor only when the teaching remained wholly independent of any endowment.[29]

Labor generally feared the effects of philanthropy on academic freedom. It was difficult enough for unions to find friends in academic circles. Through the period up to the first World War, and particularly before 1900 college professors tended to be defenders of the status quo and hence antagonistic or at least apathetic to the needs of the workers. Samuel Gompers undoubtedly spoke for many in labor when he admitted that some men held their anti-labor views of their own accord. This was not the real problem for he felt they would in time come around to the right position through their own study.[30]

This chance, however, was retarded because men of wealth controlled the schools. Through their influence on boards of trustees these men made teachers say and teach only what the wealthy wanted. Donors to colleges demanded and too often received "exception of their interests from unsympathetic discussions or from anything that would in any degree interfere with existing business conditions."[31] They thus

28. American Federationist, 16 (December, 1909), 1075.
29. Final Report, 8, 1746.
30. American Federationist, 10 (December, 1903), 1290 (Reprint of Gomper's address to annual convention. The implicit trust in the powers of education is significant.
31. Quote from the American Federationist, 21 (February, 1914), 120; cf. also Railway Trainmen's Journal, 24 (April, 1907), 368; Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 44 (January, 1908), 86-7; Electrical Worker, 6 (May, 1905), 40 (unsigned letter).

actually dictated all instruction in private schools, using "their abundance as a means to direct the teaching of those to whom the people look for guidance."[32]

Socialist criticism stressed this same point. Frank Finsterbach, a writer in the Chicago Socialist, claimed that the wealthy endowed private schools primarily to suppress new and dangerous knowledge. An unsigned letter to another socialist labor organ explained that the rich expected its schools to pander to moneyed interests.[33]

Writers for all types of unions attacked John D. Rockefeller as an example of this sort of educational philanthropist. The socialist-oriented Railway Times claimed that the administration in Rockefeller's schools," knowing where their salaries come from and on which side their bread is buttered, with trained legs and boots made to order, kick insubordinate professors into the street, while they shout: 'Great Rockefeller, the oil king'"[34] The editor of the American Federationist similarly charged that the oil millionaire "endows a college with a million to suborn the brains of the teachers, and discharges a professor who refuses to prostitute his mind."[35] This accusation referred specifically to the dismissal of E. H. Bemis by the University of Chicago. According to another conservative labor editor, the liberal-minded Bemis lost his position because he stepped on the corns of some rich patrons."[36]

32. Iron Molders Journal, 33 (December, 1897), 370-1.
33. Chicago Socialist, February 8, 1902, 2; Social Democratic Herald, October 7, 1905, 3.
34. Railway Times, July 1, 1896, 1.
35. American Federationist, 5 (June, 1898), 75.
36. Cigarmaker, 23 (August, 1897), 8. Bemis himself at first held Rockefeller to blame for his dismissal, but later shifted the responsibility to the Gas Trust. cf. Walter P. Metzger's "The Age of the University" in Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States, New York, 1955, 429.

A similar incident took place during this period when professor E. Benjamin Andrews lost his position at Brown University, because the labor press claimed, "his radicalism prevented rich men from donating liberally to the university funds."[37]

All segments of the labor press reacted in much the same fashion to such violations of academic freedom. The conservative Woodworker remarked that under this kind of persecution, "truth may suffer and the education of students may suffer, but small things like these are nothing compared to the friendship of an oil king...."[38] In a more blunt vein, the socialist Max S. Hayes observed, "Have we then, arrived at a stage where higher education and better social conditions depend upon the whim of a vulgar oil peddlar, a pig sticker or an ex-convict? T'is well that we know these things."[39]

Despite its recent invocation, academic freedom does not seem to have been the real issue for most labor journalists. The subject arose only when a friend of labor was silenced. The real concern was the hostility of the Academic World to labor's viewpoint. Private control through philanthropy, it was felt, merely reinforced this attitude.[40]

The sobriquets applied by labor to philanthropically-created institu-

37. Woodworker, 6 (August, 1897), 16.
38. Ibid., df. also Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, March, 1899, 317; American Federationist, 11 (November, 1904), 977.
39. Cleveland Citizen, March 16, 1895, 2.
40. Metzger, op. cit. provides a thorough analysis of the various factors in the relation between the big business and Academic Freedom and quite rightly judges it far more complex than the simple class conflict approach used in the labor press.

tions reinforce its hostility. At various times the press referred to the faculty of the University of Chicago as "Rockefeller's hired men" and to the school itself as having been "standardized", or as a "Standard Oil Annex."[41]

Even the Carnegie Endowment for the Advancement of Teaching, which provided pensions for retired college professors, came under attack from certain segments of the labor press as "wholesale bribery." According to one socialist critic, by accepting these grants, "the educators of the country will be less liable to criticize the trusts and their high-handed robber methods....It is doubtful whether any individual ever struck a more surreptitious and dangerous blow at American liberty."[42] Opinion on this point was not unanimous, however. The editor of the Machinist's Monthly Journal, rated it a"magnificent gift." "All lovers of learning will not only appreciate but rejoice in what Mr. Carnegie has done for education, and his latest benefactors will arouse their greatest enthusiasm.....could any gift be productive of more good than this? Scarcely."[43]

Certain moderate socialists took a totally different approach to college philanthropies. These individuals, most ably represented by the writer Algie Simons, took what could be considered a far-sighted

41. Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 26 (June, 1899), 624; Social Democratic Herald, October 7, 1905, 3 (unsigned letter); International Woodworker, 5 (May 15, 1895), 5.
42. Cleveland Citizen, (May 5, 1905), 1.
43. Machinist's Monthly Journal, 17 (June, 1905), 487-8. Unfortuantely, these were the only two comments on the endowment fund in the labor press, so it was impossible to evaluate their relative importance. Significantly, the latter editorial concludes with the remark: "Mr. Carnegie's torch burns brighter as he becomes older and he is better understood."

view and urged workers to take full advantage of such gifts. According to his view, the rejection of these facilities for fear that they might corrupt the workers was "simply rot."[44] The success of socialism depended on the development of an "intellectual proletariat", and higher education, even in private schools, would facilitate this process. As an example, Simons pointed to the University of Chicago, supposedly the most notable illustration of the evil effects of private contributions to education, as a center of socialism among both faculty and students. There, he continued, one could find dialectical materialism and the theory of the class struggle fairly presented.

The author of these views was careful to point out, however, that this favorable situation did not arise because business did not try to control schools. On the contrary, it resulted from a reaction to these attempts.[45] Moreover, the intellectual proletariat would arise in part through the operation of certain basic economic laws, which the growth of even private schools facilitated: rising number of college garduates would force down their average wages. This would bring them to discontent with their status, and they would then see that their salvation lay in revolt, in cooperation with working-class socialists. All in all, private schools, far from being a stone around the workers' necks, could help to bring about the triumph of socialism.[46]

44. Chicago Socialist, January 4, 1902, 3, editorial by Simons
45. Ibid.,
46. Ibid.; cf. also Miners' Magazine, 11 (December 29, 1910), 1. This argument also applied to the Carnegie libraries. The only instance of similar reasoning in the conservative press appeared in an editorial expressing the belief that if certain pro-labor works were in libraries, they might be "blessings in disguise"; cf. Machinist Monthly Journal, 14 (November, 1902), 754-6.

Throughout its discussion of education and philanthropy, the labor press reflected its belief in public control of education on all levels. Rather surprisingly, not even the most radical journal ever opposed all private education, although this was certainly implicit to a certain extent. Practice, and not principle seems to have been the guid in this as in most questions. Labor was not concerned with the academic question of public versus private education but with what was taught and who controlled this. Private schools were bad because of their social outlook. Labor wanted free and equal educational opportunities for all, but if this could be obtained with some private schools, there was no objection as long as labor or those of its viewpoint could be in control and change this outlook. This control was of course, easier to obtain in public schools, and hence the emphasis on this type of education.

Closely related to education was the work of the Rockefeller Foundation, founded in 1910. In their rather limited consideration of this institution and its associated agencies, labor spokesmen placed great stress on the idea that it had assumed a public function by controlling important sources of information. Thus, at one point Samuel Gompers bluntly asked why "should one of the most powerful research institutions in the world be financed by private moneys?"[47] According to Gompers, the Foundation in its investigations and its dissemination of information, was attempting to form the opinion and judgment of the public. This, he claimed, amounted to teaching, which was a public task and the people would not "surrender the function of teaching to

47. American Federationist, 22 (January, 1915), 41.

private institutions such as the Rockefeller Foundation."[48] Similarly the socialist Victor L. Berger viewed the work of the Foundation as essentially public, and considered its being in private hands "a slap at society as constituted at present."[49]

The labor press especially resented the foundation's policy of supplying research personnel to government agencies at a dollar a year. It was felt insulting to the people of the United States and to their government to have private groups subsidize public work. Moreover, this provided public prestige to the work of individuals. Most important, however, through this activity the Foundation could "control the sources of information and thus determine the lives and hopes of many."[50] On other occasions labor spokesmen accused the Foundation of attempting to control teachers and dictate public school policy. When in 1917 the Foundation announced the launching of a study of American education, the American Federationist complained: "it (education) is a matter of concern to our whole nation. Is there any reason why the nation's business should be delegated to private enterprise?"[51] In addition, the Foundation, like all of Rockefeller's other activities, suffered in the eyes of labor from an "undermining autocracy" entirely out of place in democratic America. It seemed quite fitting to labor in light of this that Congress turn down, as it did, the Foundation's request for a National charter.[52]

48. Final Report, 8, 7646, Gomper's Testimony.
49. Social Democratic Herald, March 12, 1910, 1.
50. American Federationist, 21 (May, 1914), 401-2; 24 (March, 1917), 206.
51. Ibid. 24 (March, 1917), 207; 231 (October, 1916), 955; cf. also New York State Federation of Labor Resolution in Curoe, Educational Attitudes and Policy, 154.
52. Final Report, Costigan testimony, 9, 8119; cf. also American Federationist, 23 (October, 1916), 955; 21 (November 2, 1914), 985.

Even in the limited praise which some conservative labor spokesmen had for the work of the Foundation, various reservations appeared. Thus, although "in the investigation of the hookworm in the South, the vice districts in Chicago and New York, and in his generous donations to the Belgium Fund, Mr. Rockefeller has shown the splendid side and possibilities of charity.....these philanthropies may obscure the sordid practice of big business in Colorado and elsewhere."[53] Gompers himself conceded that "in so far as these foundations would devote their activities to the sciences, medical and surgical; to the laboratory, to the contributions toward history; for the arts, the sciences, they would be helpful. But the effort to undertake to be an all pervading machinery for the molding of the minds of the people in their relations between each other in the constant industrial struggle for human betterment, in so far s they should be prohibited from exercising their functions....."[54] Later, he modified this concession by maintaining that even medical surveys, intrinsically of great value, could be used to control public opinion.[55] In 1917, he summed up his position on the foundation in rather strong words: "If freedom is to be maintained in this and other lands, private enterprise must not be permitted to control sources of information."[56] To many in and out of labor who saw much evil in the American industrial system, the work of the Foundation tended to blind the public to the faults of business. They cut off criticism which would otherwise be "formidable or inevitable", criticism essential to the correction of existing evils.[57]

53. Final Report, Costigan testimony, 9, 8119; cf. also 8116.
54. Final Report, 8, 7647; Garment Worker, 14 (January 29, 1915), 4.
55. American Federationist, 24 (March, 1917), 206-8.
56. American Federationist, 24 (March, 1917), 208.
57. Final Report, Costigan testimony, 9, 8119, cf. also 8114-8122 generally.

Another reason for the hostility to the Rockefeller Foundation lay in the belief that its work could not be impartial. In testimony before the Commission on Industrial Relations in 1915, Gompers, as President of the A. F. of L. openly stated that he could not assume as others had that an institution like the Rockefeller Foundation could conduct an impartial investigation. "The pervading influence of Rockefeller and his tainted money would be such, that the investigators would not possess the necessary objectivity."[58] Several years earlier, Victor Berger expressed the belief that "the dependence of such a foundation on the means of one person must influence unfavorable its activity and its success."[59] Even though particular contributions might be made to the advancement of science, freedom in the long run would suffer.

Indeed, according to critics in the labor press, objectivity and truth were not part of the Foundation's purpose. Rockefeller endowed the institutions because he could "hear the mutterings of discontent in almost every state of this union." Under his plans, the foundation would "be controlled absolutely by Rockefeller, and the faithful henchmen who will obey the orders of the oil king and his son."[60] Since it was intended primarily to stop criticism of the "Standard Oil Napoleon" and his business methods, once it attained a position of influence, the Foundation tended to spread falsehoods, increase suffering and bring about a general lapse in just standards of civilization.[61]

Thus, the most important charge leveled by labor writers against

58. Final Report, Gompers testimony, 7446.
59. Social Democratic Herald, March 12, 1910, 1.
60. Miners' Magazine, 11 (April, 1910), 7.
61. Final Report, Costigan testimony, 9, 8114.

the Rockefeller Foundation was that it attempted to control public opinion. The argument that the influencing of public opinion was a public function, sounded strange, coming from labor leaders who attempted to influence public opinion just as much, if not as successfully, as the foundations. By the very nature of American society, almost any group is a pressure group which tries to influence the public. This is true whether it be the A. F. of L. trying to bring about public sympathy for the eight-hour day, or the Socialist party trying to win converts to its ideology. What the labor press actually attacked was the direction in which the Foundation tried to lead public opinion. If that institution had been directed by and for organized labor, and had pursued the same general activity, it would not have aroused labor hostility.

Labor journalists also criticized constructive philanthropy for the alleged business motives behind it. Although they used this argument against all types of constructive programs, it was especially important in their consideration of private trade schools. Here, the labor press alleged that the wealthy endowed and ran these institutions to provide a cheap non-union working force. This attitude strengthened as time went on. Before 1900, several articles appeared which revealed limited praise for trade schools. In 1889, the editor of the conservative Locomotive Firemen's Magazine commented on J. W. Williamson's $12 million dollar endowment for an industrial school and home for boys in Philadelphia: "Unless the Stanford University in California should prove an exception, this is the most important gift to humanity on the part of any individual in the history of the country, not to say of the world. It is doubtful if a better direction

could be discovered for the benevolence than the one chosen."[62] The author endorsed the trade school, and expressed no fear of its producing an oversupply of workers, or of its offering anti-union training to its students. In all, he considered the gift philanthropic in the best sense of the word.

As early as 1892, this friendly attitude began to be modified. Although the assembled delegates to the A. F. of L. convention in 1892 conceded the good intentions of the philanthropists involved, they passed several resolutions condemning the trade schools run by the United Hebrew Charities of New York, for their very personalized training and for casting their students into an already overcrowded labor market.[63] In 1897, the editor of a conservative railroad journal qualified his praise of Lydia Moss Bradley of Peoria, Illinois, for her endowment of Bradley Polytechnic, by expressing concern lest William Harper of the University of Chicago, named president of the new school, bring in his "plutocratic" friends and pervert this basically honorable philanthropy into an instrument of big industrialists.[64]

Richard Caverly in 1899 developed this moderate criticism to its fullest in the article "Technical Education", which dealt with the Cogswell Polytechnic College of San Fransico.[65] He began by praising the noble character of the donor: Dr. Henry D. Cogswell was "one of God's best representatives. He is a man of remarkable power, of broad and strong intellectual grasp and best of all, of deep and true

62. Locomotives Firemen's Magazine, (April, 1889), 355.
63. A. F. of L., Report of the Proceedings, 12 (1892), 35-6; the Garment Worker, 2 (February, 1895), 3, accused the entire United Hebrew Charities of being a device of manufacturers for securing and controlling cheap labor.
64. Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 23 (November, 1897), 374-6.
65. Boilermaker's Journal, 11 (March, 1899), 71-2.

patriotism." Moreover, the gift itself was worthy of acclaim: "What greater monument could any man have than such as he built." Nevertheless while such institutions did help to increase the efficiency of the producer, they also enabled "the idle millionaires to reap the benefits." Gifts such as these, originally intended "to elevate the producing classes" actually meant nothing more for the workers; they only provided more profit for the capitalists. "This is one reason why an institution (Sic) like the Cogswell College will not attain that grand success that the founder hopes for."

In 1905, Samuel Gompers voiced an extreme criticism of trade schools when he asserted that they amounted to "nurseries for slop-job workmen .... The principle of trade schools is like applying a knowledge of algebra to the multiplication of two times one. The only school in which to learn a trade is the school of experience."[66]

This article notwithstanding both Gompers and the A. F. of L. came to accept the necessity of industrial education but it was to be public. The Federation now insisted that such training be regarded "as a common right to be open to all children on equal terms to be provided by general taxation and kept under the control of the whole people."[67] Indeed, opposition to private vocational education became a cardinal feature of the A. F. of L. policy.[68]

Now even the motives of donors to private schools came under the attack. There were two groups advocating industrial education: non-union employers who wanted private schools for the training of scab

66. Speech to a labor meeting in Lawrence, Massacusetts, printed in The American Federationist, 12 (June, 1905), 372.
67. The American Federationist, 16 (January, 1909), 59.
68. Curoe, Educational Attitudes and Policies, 165.

labor and strikebreakers; and "great educators, enlightened representatives of organized labor and persons engaged in genuine social service" who demanded public trade schools.[69] Moreover, organized labor did more than merely speak out against private trade schools. Wherever possible its representatives also actively lobbied against state aid to such institutions as was the case in New York State in 1909.[70]

With the violently anti-labor National Association of Manufacturers giving strong support to technical education, there seems to have been some basis for the charge that private trade schools were anti-union and run for the benefit of business. The 1908 A. F. of L. Convention established a committee "to investigate the methods and means of industrial education in this country and abroad." This group reported to the 1909 convention meeting in Toronto; its report illustrates labor's antagonism to private industrial education.[71] "The committee felt that there was justification in condemning any system of public institutions privately controlled, or any scheme of private selection of pupils." There was a trend toward the training of students who earned in good times half the union scale and in bad times were "exploited in the interests of unfair employers." Often there were "injustices of narrow and prescribed training in select trades.... and the flooding of the labor market with half-trained mechanics for the purposes of exploitation." Any system of education not subject to public control "leaves unsolved the fundamental democratic problem of giving

69. The American Federationist, 16 (January, 1909), 59.
70. Curoe, Educational Attitudes, 165.
71. A. F. of L., Report of the Proceedings, 29 (1909), 135 cf; some of this criticism applied in a lesser degree to some public trade schools, but the report seems aimed primarily at private schools.

the boys of the country an equal opportunity."

Gompers in his presidential address of the same year emphasized these points, and summed them up by saying, "Under the pretense of industrial education, private agencies for personal profit have perverted the term, resulted (sic) in a narrowing and specialized training to the detriment of the pupils, the workers, and people generally."[72]

Several years later, Frank Duffy in an article, "The Relation of Industrial Education to the Laboring People", invoked this same argument.[73] Private trade schools turned out mechanics, but they were "misfits and failures in all instances", and ended up scabbing. He concluded by restating labor's opposition to private vocational training, based on the fact that "as a rule, these schools are run in the interests of employers and in opposition to organized labor."

Interestingly enough, despite this opposition to private schools, some unions apparently accepted their existence as a temporary necessity. After a discussion of industrial education the 1918 convention of the A. F. of L. officially declared in favor of "the expansion of both state and federal educational facilities, so that we will be decreasingly dependent on private endowments in the educational field."[74]

In sum, between 1885 and 1918 organized labor shifted its position on technical education somewhat. At the outset the conservative press had general praise for such programs as objects of philanthropy; with time there came a growing caution, and by 1908, unions completely re-

72. The American Federationist, 15 (December, 1909), 1075.
73. The American Federationist, 26 (March, 1913), 222-4; cf. also Final Report, 1, 255-61.
74. Quoted in A. F. of L., History Encyclopedia Reference Book (Washington, 1919), 214.

jected all private vocational education, at least in theory. This they did largely on the grounds that such institutions served as scab agencies for business. How can this shift be explained?

The initially small number of these schools, and their benevolent character, seemed quite harmless to the unions. Later the growing number of these schools and the emergence of many trained students undoubtedly represented a threat to the jobs of unionized workers. It is significant that almost all the concern about private technical education came from the conservative labor press. The socialists, and especially the I.W.W. had almost nothing to say on this subject. Finally, some of the trade schools undoubtedly did tend to be hostile towards organized labor, as their strong support by the anti-union National Association of Manufacturers after 1900 suggests.

The labor press also claimed that business motives lay behind other types of constructive philanthropy. Sometimes, it claimed that men like Rockefeller gave money to various causes because they knew that they could then safely raise the price of their products without public protests.[75] This specifically applied to gifts to religion and education. Labor writers implied that a religious gift was a "business proposition" in that it helped to fortify the "commercial position" of the donor.[76] Religious mission work provided commercial openings for business into new areas of the world, it was at times claimed.

75. Railway Trainmen's Journal, 24 (April, 1907), 368; 24 (March, 1907), 264-5; Machine Woodworker, 2 (December, 1892), 167.
76. Social Democratic Herald, June 17, 1905, 3.
77. Solidarity, 8 (May 20, 1916), 3.

Since labor often considered both private colleges and the Rockefeller Foundation as devices to control or silence public opinion, some labor journalists felt it appropriate to consider them (such institutions) as business adjuncts. Commenting on a Rockefeller gift to education, the editor of the conservative Railway Trainmen's Journal, said, "It is an insurance on the business affairs with which he is identified and taken as a straight business proposition it promises to be as good an investment as Mr. Rockefeller usually makes."[78] Similarly, Edward Costigan, an attorney for the United Mine Workers, accused the Foundation of being "primarily an asset of the Rockefeller industrial system, and only secondly a public charity."[79] Samuel Gompers even attacked medical missions sent by the Foundation since they enabled the oil king to exploit the resources of the countries.[80] The editor of the radical Miners' Magazine also maintained that Rockefeller sey up the Foundation and its related agencies as a business device, to obtain tax exemption for his great wealth.[81]

The philanthropies of Andrew Carnegie, widely criticized for the way he made his money, also came under attack for the manner in which they were set up. Many labor journalists, especially among the socialists, considered the steel magnate's policy of endowing institutions with corporation stocks and bonds as a device to make "all sorts of learned institutions and city corporations joint owners and joint creditors of the steel trust."[82]

78. Railway Trainmen's Journal, 24 (March, 1907), 264-5.
79. Final Report, Costigan testimony, 9, 8112.
80. American Federationist, 24 (March, 1917), 206-8.
81. Miners' Magazine, 11 (April, 1910), 7.
82. Social Democratic Herald, August 1, 1903, 1; May 12, 1906, 2; Solidarity, 2 (November 21, 1910), 21.

Despite the foregoing, the claim that constructive philanthropy was some type of business device played a minor role in labor's criticism of all but technical education, where it was the most important factor involved.

Spokesmen for organized labor also argued that the great philanthropists usually acted out of a desire for personal satisfaction. On a few occasions, socialist editors claimed that many so-called philanthropists gave to ease their consciences.[83] Other writers asserted that the rich tried to buy their way into heaven through gifts to religion.[84] The Social Democratic Herald claimed that A. H. Rogers, one of Rockefeller's associates, tried to buy eternal forgivness for his sins committed in the name of business.[85]

A similar charge was that the rich gave for self-glorification. The Western Laborer, a weekly published in Omaha, Nebraska, stressed the benefits resulting from this trait: "The ambition to live in the esteem of posterity has probably done more for the diffusion of a knowledge of literature, art, and science than any other cause. To this honorable impulse we owe most of our colleges and academies, libraries, art galleries and museums, as well as hospitals and charitable institutions of all kinds."[86] Another conservative commentator, N. E. Badgley, took a more critical position and complained that the workers starved so that industrialist "may get renown by planting a library here, erecting a palace there, a music hall yonder, a temple

83. Solidarity, 8 (May 20, 1916), 3; Social Democratic Herald, March 4, 1911, 3; August 1, 1903, 1.
84. Machine Woodworker, 2 (June, 1892), 84.
85. Social Democratic Herald, January 25, 1908, 1.
86. Western Laborer, January 13, 1894, 2.

of worship wherever (they) like."[87] Socialist elements of the labor press made the same point. The Social Democratic Herald coined the word Carnegieism, which meant a device for the glorification of a philanthropist's name.[88] Elsewhere, that same paper referred to "this money that Carnegie is giving away - no, not giving away; rather he is buying his way into immortality."[89] Similarly, the radical Miners' Magazine, quoted with approval the remarks of John Burns, a noted British labor leader, on Carnegie's gifts to public libraries: "What are all these libraries, but so many monuments to Mr. Carnegie, which the public is pledged to maintain at large and permanent expense as a condition of the gifts.... ?"[90] As early as 1894, the Cleveland Citizen accused Rockefeller of supporting churches "all for the glory of God and Rockefeller."[91]

The labor press invoked one other major argument against programs of constructive philanthropy. The workers could seldom enjoy the benefits of the institutions endowed by the wealthy. In the case of education, private colleges to which the rich gave so lavishly, lay beyond the means of the working class. One conservative editor sarcastically suggested that the workers praise Rockefeller for giving sp widely to schools which they could never hope to enjoy.[92] Elsewhere, the Railway Conductor expressed the hope that millionaires could find better things

87. American Federationist, 1 (June, 1894), 70-71; cf. also Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 16 (September, 1892), 783-5; Typographical Journal, 6 (May 15, 1895, 5.
88. Social Democratic Herald, July 6, 1907, 1.
89. Ibid., August 6, 1903, 1.
90. Miners' Magazine, 2 (August, 1901), 3; cf. also Social Democratic Herald, August 1, 1903, 1.
91. Cleveland Citizen, June, 1894, 1.
92. Railway Trainmen's Journal, 24 (April, 1907), 368.

to do with their money than to endow "universities where millions are annually expended in teaching the sons of the wealthy some new brutality in football."[93] Socialists also entered their remarks: the motto of the capitalists should be, one writer suggested, "Millions for colleges and a few stray pennies for common school."[94] In light of the widespread opposition of the property holder to the extension of public education this criticism appears quite valid.[95]

According to the labor press, music halls, art institutes, libraries and the like were also beyond the reach of workers. In 1894, a writer for the American Federationist complained that such institutions "can be chiefly enjoyed by the few rich."[96] The editor of the Railway Trainmen's Journal likewise complained that the "sons of the masses" couldn't benefit from this kind of benevolence.[97] With tongue in cheek, Max S. Hayes of the Cleveland Citizen commented on a gift of Marshall Field to the Chicago Art Institute: "No doubt the beggared workingmen of Chicago are anxiously waiting to feast their eyes on art and forget their empty stomachs."[98] The labor press used this argument especially against the libraries endowed by Carnegie. According to Samuel Gompers, free libraries were good only for book publishers; the workers, laboring long hours each day, had no opportunity to use them.[99] This criticism would have been especially disturbing to Carnegie as he intended the libraries especially for the masses.

A reader of the Railway Clerk judged the value of the "luxury" of

93. Railway Conductor, 12 (November, 1895), 613.
94. Chicago Socialist, February 22, 1902, 2.
95. cf. R. Freeman Butts, and L. A. Cremin, History of Education in American Culture, (New York, 1956).
96. "Our Equitable Unions" by N. E. Badgley, The American Federationist, 1 (June, 1894), 704.
97. Railway Trainmen's Journal, 13 (January, 1896), 61.
98. Cleveland Citizen, January 6, 1894, 1.
99. The American Federationist, 9 (October, 1902), 690.

constructive philanthropy in the face of widespread poverty in particularly stirring words: one sweet-faced Sister of Charity struggling in the slums of one of our large cities, plying her silent vocation most earnestly and fervently with no expectation of any return for labor performed except the salvation of the needy, is doing more real good for the uplifting of humanity in a single hour, than all the Carnegies and Rockefellers ever did....."[100]

Thus, in the years between 1885 and 1917, labor's journalistic critics of constructive philanthropy used several general types of argument. These they applied with varied emphasis to all the different types of programs. When considering religion, education and research foundations, they concentrated on the alleged control exercised through philanthropic support. In the case of trade schools, they felt them to be primarily attempts to supplement the businessmen's supply of trained workers. Throughout all their discussions, they questioned the source of the money used in such work, and pointed out that many philanthropists were generous for personal gratification alone. From any approach, constructive philanthropy did not sit well with the labor press.

---

100. Railway Clerk, 6 (January, 1907), 25-6, unsigned letter to editor.

CONCLUSION

The labor press throughout the period from 1885 to 1917 attacked philanthropy on a variety of grounds: it was inadequate, debasing and hypocritical; it involved money originally stolen from those it claimed to help; it served as an instrument of social control by the wealthy. The various ideological elements in labor - conservative, socialist and radical - used the same arguments, but with different stresses: the socialists and radicals analyzed the source of the money, while the conservatives paid more attention to the anti-union implications of such giving. Time had a gradually mollifying effect on the sharpness of labor's attack, especially among conservative journals. Throughout the period, in considering any kind of philanthropy, however, the cry of the press remained, "Justice not charity."

How valid were these charges against philanthropy as a moral virtue, a social institution and a personal pastime? Viewing it as a virtue, union journalists insisted that men who spoke much of charity seldom had the time or inclination to devote equal attention to the demands of social justice. These labor leaders demanded that charity augment and not substitute for justice. They also contended that philanthropy served as a cover for the faults of existing society, or as a bond between the rich and the poor, thus keeping the latter content.

While some individuals undoubtedly used their philanthropies for these purposes, there is no evidence that the majority of them acted on such motives. When philanthropists saw suffering, they wanted to help, and did so through charity. They may have acted blindly, ignoring what appeared to labor as widespread injustice, but for the middle and upper classes to have seen the socio-economic picture in labor's light would have required more detachment than could reasonably be expected.

Nor was it true, as labor alleged, that philanthropy merely served as a pastime for the wealthy. No doubt some men engaged in charity because of a troubled conscience, but even when they did they probably concealed their motives from themselves. Andrew Carnegie, a man who in labor's eyes should have had a very heavy conscience, seldom if ever revealed such symptoms in his voluminous correspondence. No doubt the same held true of most other well-known donors.

More demonstrable was labor's assumption that the desire for personal esteem motivated many philanthropists. No doubt Carnegie, Rockefeller and the man who gave ten dollars to the New York Times One Hundred Neediest Cases enjoyed seeing their names attached to public gifts. Actually, unions took advantage of this basic human trait, and always listed contributors to their fund-raising campaigns. In most cases, generosity probably involved more than the mere desire for publicity. Labor's criticisms of philanthropy had some basis in fact, but they were usually exaggerated.

What factors entered into the formation of labor's attitudes? Three elements were important: ideology, time, and the character of the philanthropist. Because labor's views were polemic in nature, ideology was critically significant. There was a direct relationship

between the degree of radicalism in the outlook of a union and the severity of its criticism of philanthropy. The railroad unions were the least hostile, the I.W.W. the most hostile. The American Federation of Labor was dominated by the pure and simple unionism of Samuel Gompers and was moderate, though far from favorable. The conservative unions probable had to accept philanthropy albeit begrudgingly, if they wanted to adhere to the basic institutions of capitalism. The moderate socialists had to make a few concessions to charity, since they agreed to work within the capitalist system while working for its eventual displacement. The radicals, on the other hand, professed to have no stake in society, and so rejected charity along with the rest of the system.

Time was another important factor in determining the outlook of labor toward philanthropy. In 1886 unions were in a very weak position, partly as a result of the Haymarket riot. Total membership numbered only about 888,000, most of it hastily and poorly organized. The following thirty years saw a steady rise in labor's position. Membership increased and the economic strength of individual unions improved. By 1917 unions had succeeded in organizing nearly three million workers of whom eighty percent were in the A. F. of L. Union bargaining power also improved. Thanks to large union strike funds and generally good leadership and discipline, strikes could be managed effectively if not always successfully. The most important consequence of this charge was the new social position of unions. The National Civic Federation displayed at least a publically friendly attitude toward organized labor. The Federation tried to bring together in a congenial atmosphere the leading elements of both business and labor in order to promote social harmony. Although not representative of the whole public, and vigor-

orously opposed by National Association of Manufacturers as well as by the Socialists, the Federation nevertheless had an appreciable influence in the country.[1] The hearings and reports of the Industrial Commission and the Commission on Industrial Relations, the efforts of President Roosevelt in the coal strike of 1902 and finally the passage of the Clayton Act in 1913 also revealed changing public sentiment on worker organization. Even the rise of company unions after 1910 suggested that employers had adopted the motto, "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em."[2] No doubt labor's enhanced social position was a significant factor in the improved relations with organized philanthropy, as reflected in at least the conservative press.[3]

A third element in the formation of labor's attitudes was the character of the philanthropists of the period. The most famous philanthropists of the day were Andrew Carnegie and J. D. Rockefeller. Much of labor's criticism focused on them. Out of approximately one hundred sixty discussions of constructive philanthropy in the labor press, more than one hundred involved Rockefeller, Carnegie, or both. Other references dealt with other equally well-known and despised enemies of labor such as Henry Clay Frick, Charles Schwab and Marshall Field. In almost every case labor alleged that the philanthropist had obtained his wealth at the expense of consumers and workers, or had

1. Henry Pelling, American Labor, Chicago, 1960, 101; Philip Taft, in his book The A. F. of L. in the Time of Gompers, New York, 1957, gives a brief summary of relations between the A. F. of L. and the National Civic Federation,
2. Selig Perlman and Philip Taft, History of Labor in the United States, 1896-1923, New York, 1935, 164,
3. Richard A. Lester, As Unions Mature, Princeton, 1958, 157. This book is an attempt to study the social effects of the maturation of unions,

been unfair to organized labor. Carnegie's name was almost always linked with Homestead, and in later years, Rockefeller was associated with violence in the Colorado coal fields of 1913-14. When such men gave money for public purposes labor attacked their persons as well as their gifts. This was especially true in the case of Andrew Carnegie. Seldom did his libraries or his peace fund come in for direct attack. Instead labor insisted that these benefices bore the taint of bad money, which concealed only good features they might have had. This tendency to relate a philanthropist's gift to his person was characteristic of labor's reaction. Thus, libraries, schools or relief programs which might be acceptable in themselves to unionists, were rejected if endowed by the "wrong" man.

One final question remains: What were the effects of the labor press's critical views on philanthropy? This problem, perhaps the most important, must unfortunately be left to speculation. The evidence available does not permit the Historian to answer it, at least at this time.

A Note on Sources

Several different approaches are necessary in studying the attitudes of the labor press toward philanthropy. For the general economic conditions of the times Harold W. Faulkner's The Decline of Laissez-Faire (New York, 1951) should prove adequate. Selig Perlman's and Philip Taft's volume, The History of Labor in the United States, 1896-1932 (New York, 1935), the final volume of the Commons series, gives a good detailed picture of the labor movement during the period, while Henry Pelling's American Labor (Chicago, 1960) provides a good overall framework. These should be supplemented by several works which are important for specific topics. In Paul F. Brissenden's The I. W. W., A Study of American Syndicalism (New York, 1919) one can find the necessary ideological and historical background on the foremost radical union of the day. The second volume of Philip S. Foner's History of the Labor Movement in the United States (New York, 1955) is valuable for its detailed account of radicalism and the anti-Gompers element in the A. F. of L. Philip Taft's recent work, The A. F. of L. in the Time of Gompers (New York, 1957), is especially useful for its discussion of the relations between the A. F. of L. and the National Civic Federation. In interpreting the labor movement and its press three other works provide additional insights: Mark Perlman's Labor Union Theories in America (Evanston, 1958), with its appendix on the Commission on Industrial Relations; The House of Labor, edited by Jacob B. S.

Hardman (New York, 1951) which has several stimulating chapters on the labor press, and Richard Lester's As Unions Mature (Princeton, 1958) for its interdisciplinary approach to a complex problem. Lloyd G. Reynold's Trade Union Publications, 1850-1944 (Baltimore, 1944-5) in three volumes furnishes information on labor periodicals and their orientation, as well as a very useful selective index to articles in the press.

Background on the socialist elements in labor can be founds in two overlapping works: Ira Kipnis's The American Socialist Movement, 1897-1912 (New York, 1952) with its institutional approach, and Howard H. Quint's The Forging of American Socialism (Columbia, S. C., 1953) which stresses ideological elements.

To obtain ideas on the best approaches to the study of philanthropy it is well to read the Report of the Princeton Conference on the History of Philanthropy in the United States (1956), sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation and Merle Curti's article, "The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research", American Historical Review, 61 (January, 1957) 352-63. Robert Bremner's American Philanthropy (Chicago, 1960) provides the necessary historical frame.

Another volume by Mr. Bremner, From the Depths (New York, 1956) documents the shifting ideas on the problems of poverty and its cure. Frank D. Watson's The Charity Organization Movement in the United States (New York, 1922) studies in detail one of the most prominent relief schemes in the period before World War I. Amos D. Warner's American Charities (New York, 1894) and Charles Henderson's Modern Methods of Charity (New York, 1904) can serve as two typical contemporary approaches to the problems, as do the various writings of

Jane Addams and those of Mary Richmond collected in The Long View (New York, 1930). Robert Woods and Albert J. Kennedy in The Settlement Horizon, a National Estimate (New York, 1932) provide information on the activities and ideas of another important segment of ameleorative philanthropy.

In the field of educational philanthropy two works are especially useful. Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger in their book The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York, 1955) consider in some detail the effect of philanthropy in higher education, while Philip R. V. Curoe's Educational Attitudes and Policies of Organized Labor in the United States (New York, 1926) deals especially with the question of vocational education. To obtain another view of the work of Carnegie and Rockefeller one should consult Burton Hendrick's The Life of Andrew Carnegie (New York, 1932) and Allan Nevin's two works, John D. Rockefeller, the Heroic Age of American Enterprise (New York, 1940) and Study in Power (New York, 1953), each in two volumes.

From the many volumes on religion in America, several are especially significant for the study of labor and philanthropy: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies, 1916 (Washington, 1919) furnishes comparative data on church growth and support throughout the period. Three other works complement each other in providing information on the relations between churches and organized labor: Henry F. May, The Protestant Churches and Industrial America (New York, 1949), Charles H. Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven, 1940) and Aaron Abell, The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1943).

The labor journals and newspapers themselves must, of course, pro-

vide the main materials for a paper such as this. It is important that the various types of publications be covered, and for a reasonably long period of time. For this paper, several national publications were read in their entirety for the period: the American Federationist, 1-24 (1894-1917); Labor Compendium (organ of the International Building Trades Council of America), 1896-1911; the Locomotive Firemen's Magazine, 9-63 (1885-1917); and the various I.W.W. publications including the central Industrial Union Bulletin, 1-2 (1907-1909), Industrial Solidarity, 1-9 (1909-1917) and the west coast journals, Industrial Worker, published in Spokane, v. 1-5 (1909-1913) and Seattle, 1-3 (1916-17).

The local labor newspapers used for this paper were also covered completely, since they are not indexed in the Reynolds' volumes. These were the Cleveland Citizen, 1891-1917, Social Democratic Herald (Milwaukee), 1898-1913 (preceded by the Railway Times, 1894-1898, published in Chicago), Western Laborer (Omaha, Nebraska), 1893-1917, and the Chicago Socialist (at first published as the Workers' Call), 1899-1901.

All the other journals used for this paper were read in their entirety for the years before 1900 and selectively with the aid of the Reynolds' index for the period 1901-1917. Those so used, with the period of individual coverage were:

Boilermakers Journal	7-29	(1895-1917)
Bookbinder	1-18	(1900-1917)
Bricklayer, Mason and Plasterer	1-20	(1898-1917)
Carpenter	5-37	(1885-1917)
Cigarmakers' Official Journal	11-41	(1885-1917)
Electrical Workers' Journal	2-17	(1896-1917)

Garment Worker	1- 5 n.s. 1-17	(1893-1900) (1901-1917)
International Musician	5-17	(1905-1917)
Iron Molders' Monthly Journal	32-53	(1896-1917)
Journal of the Metal Polishers Union	4-26	(1897-1917)
Machine Woodworker (title varies)	2-17	(1892-1907)
Machinists' Monthly Journal	4-29	(1892-1917)
Miners' Magazine	1-18	(1900-1917)
Pattern Makers' Journal	1-28	(1891-1917)
Railroad Trainman (Railroad Brakemen's Journal)	1-34	(1884-1917)
Railway Clerk	6-16	(1907-1917)
Retail Clerks' International Advocate	7-24	(1900-1917)
Seamen's Journal	8-31	(1894-1917)
Tailor	1-29	(1887-1917)
Tobacco Worker	1-21	(1897-1917)
Typographical Journal	1-50	(1889-1917)

It must be borne in mind that there were title variations in most of these publications.

An attempt must also be made in research such as this to represent the various ideological viewpoints within labor. Among the papers used here, the I.W.W. magazines, People, and the Miners' Magazine expressed a generally radical approach; the reformist socialist Social Democratic Herald, the Cleveland Citizen, and the Chicago Socialist were somewhat more moderate, while the American Federationist and all other publications were relatively conservative.

To supplement these papers there are several other sources that are valuable in providing explicit statements of labor's views. The

Report of the Proceedings of the A. F. of L. v.6, (1886) furnishes official resolutions on various aspects of philanthropy, with references in the A. F. of L. History Encyclopedia Reference Book (Washington, 1919) serving as a partial index to them. Samuel Gompers' Seventy Years of Life and Labor (New York, 1925) 2 vols. provides additional views of the important labor leader and journalist. A mine of information on all aspects of philanthropy can be found in The Final Report and Testimony Submitted to Congress by the Commission on Industrial Relations, 11 vols. (Washington, 1916).

APPROVED Merle Curti
January 26, 1962