

Gompers' governor "friend" went to greater tyrannical extremes than his republican predecessor, the now dead, but unlamented, James H. Peabody, in the strike of 1903 and 1904. In fact, Gompers' "unprecedented victory" was such a miserable failure that at the very next election the state went back to the republican fold, although ex-United States Senator Patterson, who had befriended labor during the strike, was the democratic candidate for governor. The interesting feature in connection with Gompers' policy is, that the very man who was chiefly responsible for the tragedies of the Colorado strike, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., walked arm in arm with Gompers into a meeting in Washington at the outbreak of the war. They paid the highest tributes to each other. And it is perfectly proper that they should, for their minds run in the same direction—both are opposed to Socialism.

It may not be amiss to mention the fact that at no time during the Colorado strike, where every civil right was banished and where every public agency was in the control of his friend Rockefeller, did Gompers show his face in the state and say a word in defense of the miners who pay more than any other organization into the treasury of the A. F. of L. The same is true of the West Virginia strike in 1912 and the Alabama strike in 1908. True, he or some one in the pay of the A. F. of L. wrote articles in his monthly "Federationist" and he called on officials in Washington asking for a congressional investigation. The investigation asked for took place. The committee was made up of a majority of democrats. I met one member of the committee afterwards and asked him what he thought of Colorado. I may not quote him verbatim, but as nearly as I can recall, this was his answer: "I have heard and read of Colorado and thought I knew the conditions, but I must confess, my trip there was a startling revelation to me. I did not believe that any government would tolerate the violations of law committed by those coal companies."

The committee took 2,940 pages of testimony, but up to this day Gompers' official friends in Washington have failed to act and bring the industrial highbinders to terms. This is likewise

true with respect to the strikes in Michigan and West Virginia.

In the Michigan strike, Gompers sent several of his "organizers" (it cost the A. F. of L. from \$10,000 to \$100,000 per year for "organizers.") to "help" the strikers. Most of their time was consumed in attacking the Socialists. This in spite of the fact that the Socialist Party sent thousands of dollars to aid the victims of the copper trust.

Another instance that shows up the fallacy of Gompers' policy is the Danbury Hatters case. The reader, if not fully informed, knows that the Loewe Hat Company received judgment against the hatters. It seemed for a while as if the members of the Danbury Local of the Hatters' Union would be robbed of everything they had. But funds were collected from all over the country to meet the judgment and save the Union from disaster.

I happened to be in Washington shortly afterwards and a labor official told me that "there will be no more Danbury Hatters cases." I asked him on what he based his assurances and he pulled out the Clayton Amendment to the anti-trust law. "This settles such cases," he said, and I wished him good luck.

The Clayton Amendment became a law. But the Bache-Demmon Coal Company in the Federal Court in Fort Smith, Arkansas, entered suit against the United Mine Workers of America, and secured a judgment of \$220,000. Of course, the case will be appealed and it may be that on account of the political and economic power represented by the Miners' Union, the judgment of the lower court will be reversed. I sincerely hope it will, but, it is perfectly obvious that the much-lauded Clayton Amendment has not ended the costly litigations. If the miners win out in the Supreme Court, the case will nevertheless cost them thousands of dollars in lawyers' fees and other expenses. Why didn't Gompers' friends that he helped to elect to Congress, introduce and pass a law making it clearly unlawful to start suits that have for their purposes first, to rob the unions of their funds, and second, to crush the spirit of the workers involved?