

to defend ourselves, in order to put an end to oppressions, in order to maintain our existence, it is highly desirable, it is necessary, it is right, that we disregard the shock to our feelings and fix our attention on the apparent and indeed profound paradox that the German is not a human being; and this is not alone due to his murderous arms, but also to the philosophy of Tamerlane which for a century academic lackeys have been distilling in the service of the king of Prussia."

---

### STRIKES AND THE PUBLIC: THREE STAGES.

The great and short-lived Chicago strike in the field of intramural transportation came unexpectedly, in spite of weeks of talk and futile negotiations. It came unexpectedly and as a shock, not because the people of the United States have not suffered from tie-ups of elevated and street railroads; not because the paralysis, the losses, the hardships and inconveniences caused by such industrial conflicts have not been endured many times, but because the average man had somehow formed the flattering and comforting idea that such things belonged to a closed era, and that in our own more enlightened day they were practically impossible. Would either of the direct parties—the employees and the representatives of the capital invested in the public utilities—dare to defy or even ignore the great "third party," the innocent public? Have we not had a moral awakening in this country? Have we not had industrial investigations without number, commissions, new legislation, arbitration machinery, tremendous campaigns of education with reference to the wastes and the criminal folly of labor wars, and the duty of prompt and earnest resort to conciliation and arbitration? Why, then, neither capital nor labor, at least in the field of public utilities, would venture to offend the moral sentiment and the common sense of the great public. Needless and causeless strikes must therefore be regarded as impossible!

The Chicago strike of over 14,000 motormen and conductors caught the city and the public mentally unprepared; for the strike talk had not been taken seriously. When the order to walk out was issued few outsiders actually knew what the trouble was about. The cheerful assumption that everything would end happily after more or less strategic jockeying and bargaining, had rendered study and inquiry of the question altogether unnecessary.

But the ugly and unpleasant fact shattered the public illusions. Here was a great and needless strike; here was deliberate disregard of the rights and interests of the great public; here was confusion worse confounded. Aldermen, members of the state legislature, official arbitrators, utility commissioners, editors, civic reformers, were severally willing and anxious to help, but the calling of the strike found them bewildered and impotent. They had to work in the dark.

Is there any lesson in the episode? There is. The developments of the short and sharp Chicago strike, when properly analyzed and interpreted, attested very considerable advance in social and public sentiment. The strike was unfortunate—but it had new features, features that had not characterized former strikes. The attitude of the public was changed; the comments of the average man as he ran—or walked—or pathetically tried to get into a jammed "jitney bus"—were different from the old, conventional comment.

The strikers and the managers of the utilities, even while ignoring the public in their warlike actions, tacitly recognized in their proclamations and explanations and disclaimers that the old order had given place to a new one. They accepted arbitration after 48 hours because of this change. These significant signs and symptoms presage a series of important practical readjustments and changes.

There are thoughtful observers of social-economic phenomena who, if they should write a history of "Strikes and Public Rights," would divide the evolutionary process in the premises into three distinct stages, somewhat as follows:

First Stage: No distinction between strikes or lockouts in the field of public utilities and similar disorders in other fields of industry. The right to strike and to lockout generally admitted. The public does not assert its interests at all; rather believes in the "freedom" to strike and dismiss without consulting any outside interest. The powerful corporations "have nothing to arbitrate" when strikes occur. The organized strikers ask arbitration and occasionally get it as a favor. The public mildly approves of arbitration and conciliation, but admires the manager who stands up for "his right to do as he pleases," especially when he claims to champion the "free laborer" and his "right to work."

Second Stage: Distinction drawn between public utilities and private industry. The interests of the public asserted more or less vigorously. Conciliation and arbitration in favor, but the stronger labor unions have lost their former enthusiasm for it. Sometimes the men even reject arbitration, having found it unsatisfactory because the average arbitral body "splits the difference" and adheres to no definite set of principles. The great public sees no virtue or beauty in "the right to strike" or the correlative right to discharge, and takes utilitarian views. Does not really see why it should suffer, lose money and run other serious risks, private and municipal, simply because industrial disputants lack common sense or regard for the common welfare.

We are living and moving to-day in this second stage, but we are slowly passing into the third one. The public is becoming conscious of the fact that its rights and interests *are* paramount and ought to be frankly and deliberately treated as such. It is also beginning to realize that its interests will not be properly and sufficiently respected by industrial belligerents if it does not itself take steps to insure such protection and does not establish the appropriate machinery. Appeals in the name of the innocent public are better, of course, than silence and indifference, or than open, bold declaration that the public has no rights entitled to consideration when belligerents choose "to fight it out" or to starve one another out. Still, appeals and protests, the more intelligent representatives of the public now see, are too often ineffective. The public must think out and work out ways and means of preventing strikes and lockouts, at least in the sphere of public utilities. It must set up efficient and adequate machinery for investigation, conciliation and arbitration. It must find a way of reaching and enforcing an impartial award, and of preventing any suspension of service pending investigation and arbitration. It must assert its interests in all charters and franchises that are granted in its name to corporations or labor organizations. It must not rely on the good will and benevolence of the other parties, but must itself, through legislation and fit, expert, "non-political" administration, adapt means to the end in view—the

prevention of industrial warfare where such warfare is unjustifiable and needless.

Now, there are differences of opinion as to the kind and amount of machinery that will have to be set up. Some will advocate public ownership and operation of utilities. Others will insist on semi-compulsory or compulsory arbitration, on trying better regulation and control first. But few will defend the policy of aimless drifting, of unpreparedness, of suffering great, disastrous strikes to happen first and of casting about wildly and hysterically for "ways out" afterward.

In the short-lived Chicago strike, to repeat, we have some rather vague evidence of considerable moral and theoretical advance, but the method, the machinery was not there, the public interest had no assured championship or protection. Both sides made serious mistakes and blunders. Both sides rendered lip service to the public interest without actually yielding to it and recognizing its primacy. Even if they had wished to yield, the public had no authoritative agent and representative to take control of the situation, and avert the break and the tie-up.

These lessons of the strike should and will be taken to heart. If they are, the encouraging moral advance we have made in the last several years will be embodied in concrete and practical measures—in potent safeguards and preventives.

VICTOR S. YARROS.

HULL HOUSE, CHICAGO.

---

#### BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

HISTORY OF GERMAN CIVILIZATION. By *Ernst Richard, Ph.D.* New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. 531. Price \$2.00 net.

Dr. Richard, lecturer on the history of German civilization at Columbia University, here gives a general survey of Teutonic culture from the dawn of history down to the present day. It is a clear and comprehensive sketch, laying down the historical development in its successive phases from pre-Roman ages through the time of Roman influence, the rise of German cities, the first great efflorescence before the time of the Reformation, and at the age of Luther and its complete breakdown during the war of 30 years, during which Germany was reduced from a population of 17,000,000 to 4,000,000. After the peace of Westphalia the French influence began. Science and industry began to rise and the German spirit is incarnated in Frederick the Great, king of Prussia. The age of Frederick the Great brings on Germany's greatest literary development in Lessing, Herder, Kant, Schiller and Goethe. The fifth book is devoted to the nineteenth century, portraying the misfortunes that came through Napoleon I, and the slow regeneration of Germany culminating in the restoration of the German empire in 1871, and ends with a general description of the reign of William II before the present war. The volume is written with spirit and is based on a thorough knowledge of the historical facts in question. If there is a criticism to be made, it seems that the author should have indicated more precisely the historical sources which he has utilized for his interpretation of history.