

SECOND EDITION.

# MILLION AGAINST ONE.

A CONSPIRACY TO CRUSH  
THE "OPEN SHOP."



Published by the American Anti-Boycott Association  
in the cause of  
INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY.



## CONTENTS:

1. Tyranny and Abuse of D. E. Loewe & Co.
2. Trade Unionism in Danbury.

# President Eliot of Harvard University on the Boycott and Anti-Boycott Association.

A Quotation from His Last Address on the Industrial Conflict.

## CONCERNING THE BOYCOTT.

The boycott is a method of combat which is eminently a method of ill-will, being an attempt to ruin the business of a person or corporation that will not conform to the regulations of the unions in the manufacture or distribution of its product. It is a gross interference with a just industrial liberty, and it is often extremely cruel in purpose if not in achievement. So far as it goes, it makes good-will between the employing class and the laboring class impossible. It is a combative method and nothing else. Although seldom an effective weapon, except in places where the unions control a clear majority of the population, it is a weapon much dreaded not only by manufacturers but by merchants and other distributors of goods.

## CONCERNING THE AMERICAN ANTI-BOYCOTT ASSOCIATION.

In the interests of good-will between employers and employed, the strong Anti-Boycott Association, which was organized last year, is to be welcomed in spite of the fact that its membership is secret. It has already proved to be an effective combatant, and all people of good-will may wisely wish it success in defeating and ultimately eliminating the boycott as conducted by the American Federation of Labor or other numerous bands of unionists.

## TYRANNY AND ABUSE OF D. E. LOEWE & CO., OF DANBURY.

Citizens throughout the length and breadth of this land should read this story of organized oppression practiced against the firm of D. E. Loewe & Company, of Danbury. On one side is a conspicuous example of the unreasoning tyranny and abuse on the part of organized labor, and on the other a self-sacrificing devotion to principle in the face of what was known to be immediate self-interest. Yet it must be remembered that this story of boycotting does not represent one of the excesses of trade unions for which the leaders disclaim responsibility, but rather it is one of the systems and deliberate policies for which Mr. Gompers, Mr. Mitchell, Henry White of the Garment Makers, and all of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor and the heads of the national unions, absolutely stand. It is a national issue, which is not only going to the highest court of this land by the action of the American Anti-Boycott Association, but which must also go to the still more potent and almost omnipotent tribunal—public opinion. It is the judgment of this tribunal which we invoke.

### ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE HATTING INDUSTRY.

The hat manufacturers of Danbury had a working agreement with the hatters' union from 1886–1893 whereby they used the union label and employed only union men. In 1893, after many patient but futile



efforts to obtain concessions from the unions a lockout was declared because the employers found that the union restrictions and the resulting increase in the cost of production was driving the trade to other localities. Danbury has suffered just as England has suffered and was being transformed from a prosperous and progressive city to a poor and stagnant city. The final outcome of this lockout was that all but six employers decided to run open shops where either union or non-union men could secure employment according to their individual ability.

It was after the lockout when six manufacturers decided to run union factories, that the long story of tyranny and abuse, not only in Danbury, but elsewhere in the hatting trade, began. There did not seem to be backbone or foresight enough among many of the employers to stand together against the strength of the United Hatters of North America, and this organization cleverly profited by this want of concerted action. They attacked the hat manufacturers one by one and first by a strike and then by boycotting their product reduced them to submission. Some seventy concerns have in this way been obliged to yield to the organized oppression of the Hatters' Union within the past few years. Each concern that yielded swelled the union's strength, and made them more powerful for the next attack. Each manufacturer, who submitted, used the union label, and became a tool in the furtherance of the infamous boycott.

The terms forced on each of these manufacturers by the union were outrageous. When a factory was unionized the union dictated which men in the employ



of the manufacturer should be allowed to remain and be admitted to the union. Those who had belonged to the union and were behind in payment of dues were not allowed to work until the payment of these dues was arranged for. Heavy fines were imposed on the union men who had been obnoxious to the leaders, one individual fine reaching one thousand dollars. In order to secure the services of these men, many of whom were essential to the good conduct of the business, the employers made payments in checks or notes for large amounts, and afterwards reimbursed themselves by deductions, extending over a considerable period of time, from the wages. Some manufacturers bore the expense of the entrance fee to the union for independent men who were reluctant to join the union and did so on the request of the employer and because they saw no other way of obtaining a livelihood. Some of the men who had been loyal to the employer during the strike and boycott were, of course, "leperous scabs," to be rejected and forced to walk the streets in search of work, no fine or penalty being deemed sufficient to condone or expiate their offences.

The removal or granting of this union label is subject to the arbitrary orders of four national officers, and owing to the fact that its removal from a factory will work havoc to the trade of that factory, the manufacturer submits to tyranny and dictation, and forces his employees to do likewise. The arbitration agreement originally operative and now theoretically in existence is utterly disregarded and the manufacturer simply receives orders from the local union leaders. No substantial point has been won by any of them

since their surrender. Fines unjustly levied by the unions on the foremen are paid per force by the employer in order to retain the foremen. Hours are shortened without consultation and the amount of work to be performed by each employee is so limited that the more skillful workers sit on their benches idle part of the afternoon, and are deprived of the opportunity of increasing their earning capacity. One employer was told that he must join the union if he wanted to examine his own hats. "You will call me out on strike in my own factory," he replied.

Of course it is a powerful rack and wheels that will make men submit to such conditions, but when we recall that it is the American Federation of Labor with over one and a half million members and all their sympathizers and unwilling tools that are carrying on this work, the effectiveness is not so astonishing. A case is reported by the United Hatters of North America to the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, composed of Mr. Gompers, John Mitchell, and other leaders; if they decide in favor of a boycott, the work is taken up by all the affiliated unions, and the name of the unfortunate concern is advertised as unfair to labor in a large number of labor periodicals of which there are several hundred in this country. Special agents are sent all over the country to follow the salesmen of the unfortunate concern, and frighten its customers by threats so they will not use its goods. If the customers are refractory the agent settles down in their locality to boycott them until they come to terms. The American Federation of Labor has about one thousand agents occupied in prosecuting



boycotts and many of these agents follow the practice of asserting that the manufacturer they oppose is unfair to organized labor, employs child labor, does not pay fair wages, etc., etc., without any regard to the truth. Where Mr. Loewe resides the absurdity of such statements is recognized but where he is not known the villification is liable to be accepted for truth. All this produces disastrous results and is a great power for making employers run "closed shops" and coercing workmen to join the union.

Henry H. Roelofs & Company, of Philadelphia, and F. Berg & Company, of Orange, N. J., were two of the large concerns most recently unionized. Both attempted to resist, and both were finally beaten and are now bound hand and foot by the union rules. Henry H. Roelofs started suit against the union for libel, so scurrilous was the language used in attacking him, but at last, after having suffered disastrous losses from the boycott like the beleaguered city that sees no hope, he called Mr. Gompers to his office and capitulated with a result that the suit was discontinued and his factory was unionized. In these cases, as in others, the unions made special rates of wages lower than the prevailing rates of union competitors to allure manufacturers into submission but when the period of the special agreement expired, and their trade had become dependent on the union label, the iron hand relentlessly forced the wages up to the common level.

The union ridden people of Danbury who have seen the growth of their town checked and actually forced back by organized labor, have been looking for a man who would have the courage and self-sacrifice to

oppose this power, and both union and independent hat manufacturers have been looking for a power sufficient to break the boycott, deliver them from their danger and put an end to the uninterrupted series of victories that the boycott has achieved through the United Hatters of North America.

## THE MAN OF THE HOUR.

Mr. Loewe has proved the man of the hour. Years ago he came to Danbury and for a long time worked as a journeyman at the bench. With other journeymen he invested his savings in a business of his own, and has by the excellence of his product and his upright and liberal business methods built up a valuable trade throughout the country. He is a public-spirited citizen of high standing and with an excellent record in the community. The undisputed testimony of the town is that no employer was better liked by the working class, or treated his men more like equals. There were notices published throughout his factory that if any one had a grievance he would receive respectful attention at the office, yet there were no complaints or dissatisfaction at the time of the attack which we are to describe. The whole disturbance was the result of the agitation of outside "delegates" who coerced satisfied employes, both union and non-union to leave their positions under threat of not being able to secure employment in the future if they refused.

In the Groveland Hotel, Prest. Moffitt, and other union officers, most of whom are not citizens of Danbury, met Mr. Loewe, and told him that they had made



up their minds to make his factory "fair," but preferred to do it in a peaceable way. "However," they continued, "If you should think otherwise, we shall use our usual or well-known methods to bring this about."

Mr. Loewe replied, "Do you mean to say that if I am not willing to have our factory unionized you will use force?"

"Yes," Prest. Moffitt replied, "To be frank we will use force,—that is, we will create such a market for the union label that you will be obliged to adopt it in order to find a market for your goods."

Sometime later Mr. Loewe sent them his formal reply in writing in which he said, "We find, therefore, the unionizing of our factory would mean:

1. The abandoning of men and boys who are entitled to employment. (He was under contract with some.)
2. A large increase in the cost of production.
3. Our surrender of the right to manage our own business.

Firmly believing that we are acting for the best interest of our firm; for the best interest of those whom we employ and for the best interest of Danbury in operating an independent or open factory, we hereby notify you that we decline to have our factory unionized and if attacked shall use all lawful means to protect our business interests."

The first attack following the reply from Mr. Loewe was made June, 1901, when a portion of the finishers were called out, ostensibly to supply the demand of "Fair Shops" but primarily to cripple the Loewe shop. The union was obliged to suspend

operations, however, in order to concentrate its strength in the attack that was pending against H. H. Roelofs & Co. In the meanwhile the union men that had been obliged to leave Mr. Loewe's employ, managed to work back again in the course of a few months, thus showing their preference for that factory. In September of the same year a second and similar attack was made.

In the meanwhile boycotting had won further victories in the case of F. Berg & Co., of Orange, and Henry H. Roelofs & Co., of Philadelphia, and the unions returned with increased confidence to subdue Mr. Loewe. The most vicious attack was begun on July 25, 1902, by calling out all the men who worked for Mr. Loewe. The men were convened at a hall on Ives Street and were told by Treasurer Maher that they would make short work of Mr. Loewe, and if they wanted to have employment they must stand by the Union. It would be vain to put faith in any promise of Mr. Loewe to give them work, he told them. Berg and Roelofs were larger and wealthier concerns, and they were obliged to go back on the "scabs" and so would Mr. Loewe.

As a result of the talk most of the men, union and non-union, left Mr. Loewe's employ, feeling it was their only hope of obtaining a livelihood in the future.

Shortly after the final calling out of Mr. Loewe's employees Mr. Moffitt, President of the United Hatters of North America, called at the Loewe office in order to effect a settlement and unionize the factory.

Mr. Moffitt said "I understand you blame the officers of the National Union for this trouble, and I want to tell you that it is not they who have done this, but your



own men, who have not told you the truth. I have a half-dozen affidavits in my pocket to prove this.”

Mr. Loewe demanded to see them but Mr. Moffitt said he wished to keep them till he had a dozen.

“Do you mean to tell me,” Mr. Loewe demanded, “That you have affidavits which show that I failed to adjust any grievance in the past six months or a year?”

To this Mr. Moffitt made no reply and it is needless to say that no such affidavits have ever been forthcoming.

“What do you mean by coming here and creating this disturbance?” Mr. Loewe continued. “I challenge you to show a pay-roll of any union factory making similar goods that will be as high as ours.”

This challenge has never been accepted, though quoted in the public press.

Moffitt stated that the United Hatters had spent twenty-three thousand dollars to unionize Roelofs’s factory. Mr. Loewe replied that they could spend more than that and not obtain his.

In time Mr. Loewe got new men to work for him, and everything was going well when the outrageous sequel of the strike followed,—the boycott. Agents were sent through the length and breadth of this country to visit all hat dealers that patronized the concern of D. E. Loewe and Co. In California, St. Joseph, Mo.; Omaha, Neb.; Atlanta, Ga.; Cincinnati, O.; Chicago, Ill.; Philadelphia, Pa.; New York; Richmond, Va., and other trade centers this great conspiracy of nearly two million men was operating to ruin the business of this one man whose only crime was that he

refused to be disloyal to the men in his employ or to discriminate against independent workingmen.

It was at this time that Mr. Loewe first thought of seeking redress in the courts, and we all remember how he said that he did not care to take the money of the workingmen, if he could otherwise prevail on them to cease their boycotting. It was at his suggestion that the following notice was mailed to all the union hatters and published in the local papers:

### WARNING.

TO THE MEMBERS OF ALL LABOR UNIONS.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned will hold each and all the members of all Labor Unions, individually and collectively responsible for all damages which we may sustain in our property or business by reason of the unlawful acts of such Labor Unions or any of the officers or agents thereof.

D. E. LOEWE & Co

Dated at Danbury, Conn., August 23, 1902.

The foregoing notice is issued in order that all members of Unions may be informed as to their individual liability for the unlawful acts of the Unions or officers or agents of the Unions, whether said acts meet with the approval or disapproval of the individual members of the Unions.

D. E. LOEWE & Co.

At this same time a copy of an injunction issued by a court to cover acts similar to those practiced against D. E. Loewe & Co., was mailed to these men in order to show them what the law was on this question.

Time went on, however, and it did not take long to discover that something more than a warning was necessary to make the United Hatters cease their



depredations. Notices came in from one customer after another, in the most distant parts of the country saying that they had been threatened by agents of labor organizations because they purchased goods from the firm of D. E. Loewe & Co. Men were employed to remain at the railroad station in Danbury and take down the address of any hat cases delivered there by the Loewe Co.

In this way the unions became acquainted with the names and addresses of all customers using Loewe hats and immediately arranged, by telegram or letter, to have a walking delegate demand the cancellation of that order or at least to exact a promise that there would be no further dealings with the boycotted concern.

One of the first firms to be attacked was Thomas D. Stokes & Co., Richmond, Va., which had been accustomed for many years to buy goods of D. E. Loewe & Co. The following clipping from a Richmond paper shows the nature of the work being pursued in that locality:

#### THE HATTERS FIGHT HERE.

Much of the time of the Trade and Labor Council last night was taken up with the fight of the United Hatters of America against the product of a factory handled by T. D. Stokes & Co., of this city.

Two of the official representatives of the United Hatters, F. J. O'Haire and C. J. Lee, have been here since Sept. 26th and Oct. 26th, respectively, pushing the fight against Mr. Stokes for having his hats made in a factory on their unfair list. As the result of their work, resolutions were unanimously adopted placing the firm of T. D. Stokes & Co. on the unfair list. Copies of the resolution were ordered sent to all the central labor unions of the State.

The representatives of the hatters in their resolutions say that the hats manufactured for this firm are made in a factory that discriminates against organized labor, and employs unskilled, foreign and child labor to make the hats.

It would be mere repetition to take up a detailed account of the operations carried on by the United Hatters in the various trade centers throughout the country in order to ruin the trade of D. E. Loewe & Co., but it will pay us to look for a moment at the work pursued on the Pacific Coast.

The firm of Triest & Company in San Francisco was one of Mr. Loewe's best patrons, and it was against this firm that the unions made one of their attacks. This concern persisted in buying goods of D. E. Loewe & Company because they were hats which they could dispose of to advantage. They were told that they could patronize any other non-union concern, but must desert the Danbury manufacturer. As a result of their resistance the following circulars were sent out:

Affiliated with the American  
Federation of Labor.

Meets Every Friday at  
1159 Mission St.

## SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL

— SECRETARY'S OFFICE —  
927 Market Street, (Rooms 405,  
406, 407 Emma Spreckels Bldg.)

Address all Communications to 927 Market St.  
Telephone, South 447.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 3, 1903.

*To Whom It May Concern:*

At a meeting of the San Francisco Labor Council held on the above date, the Hat Jobbing Concern known as Triest & Co., 116 Sansome Street, San Francisco, was declared unfair for persistently patronizing the unfair hat manufacturing concern of D. E. Loewe & Co., of Danbury, Conn., where the Union Hatters have been on strike for Union conditions since August 20,



1902. Triest & Co. will be retained on the unfair list as long as they handle the products of this unfair hat manufacturing company. Union men do not usually patronize retail stores who buy from unfair jobbing houses or manufacturers. Under these circumstances all friends of organized labor, and those desiring the patronage of organized workers, will not buy goods from Triest & Co., 116 Sansome Street, San Francisco.

Yours respectfully,

G. B. BENHAM,

President S. F. Labor Council.

T. E. ZANT,  
Secretary S. F. Labor Council.

W. C. HENNELLY, } Representing United Hatters  
D. P. KELLY, } of North America.

On July 10th, Triest & Company sent out the following letter to some of their customers in reply to the labor circular:

DEAR SIR: In answering the circular letter of the San Francisco Labor Council, dated July 3, 1903, beg to state that Mr. Zant, their Secretary, called on us some months ago and requested us to throw out the hats manufactured by Messrs. D. E. Loewe & Co., of Danbury, Conn., as they were "non-union."

In reply thereto our answer was as follows: "D. E. Loewe & Co. are making certain goods for us which we have been unable to duplicate from any other manufacturer in the United States." We also informed him that certain goods which were manufactured by Messrs. Loewe & Co. were not made by any Union factory. Mr. Zant then informed us that we could buy from any *non-union* factory we chose except Loewe & Co., as the boycott was on this concern only.

We could not see the justice of such proceedings and positively refused to be a party to such an unbusinesslike proposition. Our aim at all times has been to give our customers *the very best value possible*, and having special arrangements with Messrs. Loewe & Co., we have been able to give our trade such values as to defy competition. Under the circumstances, in justice to ourselves

and our many customers, we have been obliged to take the stand we have.

We carry a full line of Union goods in all grades manufactured so as to supply the trade where Union goods are desired.

The fact that they could not disturb the Loewe factory proves conclusively that the men there are fairly treated and are satisfied with their condition. One of our firm lately visited the factory and found such to be the case.

In view of the above facts we hope our many patrons and friends will refuse to be a party to this uncalled for boycott. Thanking you for past favors and soliciting a continuance of our pleasant business relations, we remain,

Yours very truly,

TRIST & Co.

Affiliated with the American  
Federation of Labor.

Meets Every Friday at  
1159 Mission St.

## SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL

— SECRETARY'S OFFICE —

927 Market Street, (Rooms 405,  
406, 407 Emma Spreckels Bldg.)

Address all Communications to 927 Market St.  
Telephone, South 447.

SAN FRANCISCO, July 14, 1903.

Messrs. \_\_\_\_\_

GENTLEMEN: We beg leave to call your attention to the following products which are on the unfair list of the American Federation of Labor.

We do this in order that you refrain from handling these goods, as the patronage of the firms named below is taken by the organized workers as an evidence of a desire to patronize those who are opposed to the interests of organized labor. The declaration of unfairness regarding the firms mentioned is fully sanctioned and will be supported to the fullest degree by the San Francisco Labor Council. Trusting you will be able to avoid the handling of these goods in the future, we are,

Yours respectfully,

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL.

T. E. ZANT,  
Secretary.

G. B. BENHAM, [L. S.]  
President.



## UNFAIR LIST.

Loewe & Co., Danbury, Conn., and Triest & Co., 116 Sansome St., San Francisco, Hat Manufacturers.

Cluett, Peabody & Co., Shirts and Collars, Troy, N. Y., and 582 Mission St., San Francisco, Cal.

United Shirt & Collar Co., Troy, N. Y., and 25 Sansome St., San Francisco, Cal.

Van Zandt, Jacobs & Co., Troy, N. Y., Greenbaum, Weil & Michaels, Selling Agents, 17 Sansome St., San Francisco, Cal.

Here is also a circular sent out by Washington State Federation of Labor:

WASHINGTON STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.

JAS. MENZIES, SECRETARY.

TACOMA, WASH., Sept. 17, 1903.

*To Whom It May Concern:*

Both the California State Federation of Labor and the San Francisco Council of Labor have declared unfair the hat jobbing house of Triest & Co., 116 Sansome St., San Francisco, Cal., and 71 First St., Portland, Ore., on account of that firm persisting in handling the product of D. E. Loewe & Co., hat manufacturers of Danbury, Conn., where the United Hatters of North America have been on a strike for fair conditions since August, 1902.

At a meeting of the officers and members of the Executive Committee of the Washington State Federation of Labor held at Tacoma, Sept. 13, 1903, the action of the San Francisco Council of Labor and the California State Federation of Labor declaring Triest & Co. unfair was endorsed.

We therefore beg to inform you that it is the desire of the Union men and women in your locality and in the state, that you do not patronize Triest & Co., as long as such firm continues to handle the hats made unfair by the D. E. Loewe & Co. concern

Trusting you will withhold your patronage from Triest & Co. until the existing conditions are adjusted, we are,

Very respectfully,

JAMES MENZIES,

WILLIAM BLACKMAN,

Secretary.

President.

Also endorsed by Tacoma Trades Council, Sept. 14, 1903, and the Western Central Labor Union of Seattle, Sept. 16, 1903.

Here is a letter addressed to Triest & Company, from Oregon:

ASTORIA CENTRAL LABOR UNION,

Affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

P. O. Box 138.

ASTORIA, OREGON, Sept. 20, 1903.

*Messrs. Triest & Co., San Francisco, Cal.*

GENTLEMEN: At the last meeting of the Central Labor Council of this city we were informed by letter from San Francisco that your firm had been placed on the unfair list for handling unfair goods made by D. E. Loewe & Co., Danbury, Conn.

I am instructed to inform you that we will use all honorable means to prevent our friends from buying or selling any goods coming from your firm, until such time as your firm handles only union made goods, bearing *genuine* union labels.

Hoping you will find it to your interest to stop the sale of D. E. Loewe & Co. scab goods and place yourselves on the list of fair people who only ask for a fair day's pay, for a fair day's work, and a fair made Hat for a fair price.

Yours respectfully,

H. KNOBEL, Sec'y.

Malicious lies were told to the effect that Mr. Loewe had thrown all union men out of his factory. The boycott levied against Triest & Company was also carried on with contemptible falsehood. It was reported and published in papers along the Pacific



Coast that the union goods sold by Triest & Company contained "bogus labels." Letters were addressed to the customers of Triest & Company to make them discontinue their patronage of that concern. Here follows a copy of such a letter:

Affiliated with the American  
Federation of Labor.

Meets Every Friday at  
1159 Mission St.

## SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL

— SECRETARY'S OFFICE —

927 Market Street, (Rooms 405,  
406, 407 Emma Spreckels Bldg.)

Address all Communications to 927 Market St.  
Telephone, South 447.

SAN FRANCISCO, October 12, 1903.

GENTLEMEN: For some time past the San Francisco Labor Council has had the firm of Triest & Co., jobbers in hats of this city, on its unfair list and have requested the friends of organized labor to transfer their patronage to some other concern, until matters can be adjusted. We have been informed that you have purchased some hats from Triest & Co., lately, and we request a transference of your patronage to some other concern in order that we may not have to class you in opposition to the movement in this city.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) R. I. WISLER,

Sec. San Francisco Labor Council.

## AMERICAN ANTI-BOYCOTT ASSOCIATION BRINGS SUIT.

It was not until the summer of 1903 that Mr. Loewe finally decided to seek the protection of the law, and being a member of the American Anti-Boycott Association he first laid his case before them. This organization found the evidence most complete and determined to bring suit through their attorney, Daniel Davenport.

The work of preparation for the case was done quietly and expeditiously. A list of the principal property holders belonging to the union was obtained and the titles and description of their property were carefully investigated in the Town Clerks' offices of Danbury, Bethel and Norwalk. Some two hundred and fifty (250) attachments were then prepared for a suit in the State Court under the common law of conspiracy and two hundred and fifty (250) more for a separate and distinct suit in the United States Court, on the ground that the boycotting in question interfered with interstate commerce and came under the prohibition of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law.

On the morning of the 12th day of September, 1903, over a year after the warning referred to on page 10, had been mailed to the union men, the Sheriff for the State Court, and the Federal Marshal for the United States Court, both appeared in town with the attachment papers and after filing the list with the Town Clerk, and duly notifying the Banks that all funds in their possession, belonging to these individuals were thereby attached, they proceeded to serve the men individually or to leave the papers at their homes. It took them several days to complete the work.

The amount of money called for in the two suits was three hundred and forty thousand dollars (\$340,000), the suit in the Federal Court calling for treble damages, pursuant to the terms of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. The value of the real estate attached was approximately one hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$130,000), and the amount of money reached in the Savings Banks exceeded fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000). Samuel

Gompers, John Mitchell, and other officers of the American Federation of Labor were made defendants.

On the same day on which this blow was struck, Mr. Loewe published in the *Danbury News* a copy of his original reply to the union officers, sent April 22, 1901, which they had never seen fit to make public, and also the following letter, stating his principles on the questions involved.

*To the Citizens of Danbury:*

"In another column of this paper will be found the reply of our firm to the demand made by the United Hatters of North America that we should unionize our shop. This reply was made April 22, 1901, and will fully explain the conditions existing up to that time. It has never been published by the National officers to whom it was forwarded, and we hope it will have the careful reading of all parties interested. By this communication it will be seen if the demands were granted:

1 That it would be impossible for us to continue to manufacture the grades of hats we had established a trade on.

2. That in justice to our contracts and obligations to our employees we could not undertake to assent to deprive any of them of their rights and opportunities.

3. That the interests of Danbury and the community would be best served by the conduct of the business as heretofore.

In order to anticipate all false and unfounded rumors and to acquaint the public with what has hap-



pened since this reply was made is the object of this letter.

Having for a long time worked as an employee, like the men with whom we now differ, we have never lost sympathy and aim to have a good understanding with them. Actuated by a desire to deal honestly, fairly and generously with all who work in our shop, bearing in mind that they were free and independent American citizens, with a pride in their manhood deserving of respect, there is abundance of evidence of our good treatment of our employees and after the men were called out from our factory in 1901 many found their way back again. We have ever been ready to lend an ear to the grievances of any one in our employ and there were notices to that effect posted throughout the factory. In fact, the frank testimony of many men is that the conditions in our factory were satisfactory at the time of the outbreak of this trouble.

We now find ourselves attacked by an organization of over eight thousand (8,000) men, who viciously and outrageously scheme to ruin us and destroy the trade which we have spent many years in building up. Agents have been actively engaged in boycotting our goods throughout this country, terrorizing dealers, as far as was within their power, not to patronize our concern or any concern that persisted in handling hats of our manufacture. Such a crushing and tyrannical attack is conspicuously contrary to the American sense of fair play.

In our desire to avoid such measures we gave notice through the *Danbury News* and by mail that all members of the Hatters' Union will be held liable,

individually and collectively, for any damages inflicted to our property or business by reason of the unlawful acts of the unions or any of its Officers or Agents. The notice was ineffective. The conspiracy to oppress and ruin us has been continued. We necessarily seek protection from such an unequal fight in the law, the guardian of those most precious and inviolable rights with which we were endowed by the Declaration of Independence.

With an abiding faith in the justice and fairness of the citizens of Danbury, we feel that in this trouble the Union Hatters have been misguided by the arguments and dictation of a few vicious and lawless leaders, and that they have acquiesced thoughtlessly in that which more independent and careful thought would have told them was wrong.

This is a country of individual liberty, some are Protestants, some Catholics, some believe in unionism and some do not, but whatever their creed or belief all must be treated with fairness and permitted to earn a livelihood. We are unwilling to blacklist the citizens and youth who do not belong or cannot obtain entrance into the unions. We believe with our honored President, Theodore Roosevelt, that the principle of the open shop is the only true and correct basis for individual liberty. Loyalty to our principles of freedom and in consideration of our own interests and the best interests of Danbury, we are obliged to protect ourselves against the unwarranted and illegal assaults of unprincipled leaders in this conspiracy.

We are seeking to arouse our intelligent citizens to actively participate in improving the conditions in



Danbury to make Labor Unions more conservative and reasonable, acting within their legal rights, and to fix the responsibility upon all their members for the violations of the law by their leaders and to have them join in fearless criticism of their wrong acts."

(Signed) D. E. LOEWE & Co.

The long-suffering townsmen heard of these two suits with a sense of relief, and there was no demonstration. The unions put in appearance for their men through several Connecticut attorneys. There have already been several hearings as to the validity of the attachments, and attempts have been made to substitute a Bond. In all these hearings, however, the attachments have been upheld by the Court, and the right to bring action in both courts at once, has been confirmed. As the unions have not been able to secure a sufficient Bond the attachments are still on, and will, in all probability, remain so, pending the decision of the Courts.

### NATIONAL ISSUE.

Now herein lies the great importance of these suits. They are the largest of their kind ever brought in this country and one of them will go before the Supreme Court of the United States. The present leaders of the union movement believe in boycotting and contend that, it is in this policy of destruction, and organized oppression, that the strength of the union movement lies.

Mr. Gompers was before the Congressional Committee on the Anti-Injunction Bill, and after hearing



Mr. Daniel Davenport give an account of this outrageous attack on D. E. Loewe & Co., he said: "I assure you that I have no tears to shed."

Mr. Ralston, Attorney for American Federation of Labor, speaking in favor of the Anti-Injunction Bill said it would prevent the issuing of an injunction in the case of boycotts "Even though it starved a man to death."

Mr. Mitchell, in his recent book on organized labor says: "The legal right of workingmen to boycott should not be called into question.—There are many cases where a secondary boycott is absolutely necessary. When a union is engaged in a contest with a newspaper, especially as is usually the case with a newspaper not largely read by the working class, a secondary boycott is far more effective than a direct boycott. A newspaper can better do without two hundred (200) two cent subscribers than without a few thousand dollar advertisements, and a man who continues to pay large sums in advertising to a newspaper that is maltreating its employees may not unfairly be considered the ally of the journal and as aiding and abetting it in its contest with labor."

Thus it will be seen that unions contend for the right to destroy the most perishable and precious of all the assets of a man's business—his good will. The representative leaders of the American Federation of Labor feel privileged to attack a man's business by systematically misrepresenting and libeling him through their papers, by threatening his customers with great damage and loss if they do not desert him, and by fining or expelling members who patronize his goods.

Fortunately the law has always been a jealous guardian of a man's good-will, and if it will not permit a competitor in any way to copy a man's trade mark or otherwise compete unfairly, in order that men may be encouraged to build up a business, it surely will not permit trade unions who are not competitors to arrogate to themselves the right to decide whether a man has acted in such a way as to entitle him to pursue his business and enjoy the fruits of his good-will. If the laws of this country do not sufficiently protect the workingmen we must change them, but organized labor cannot be both judge and jury as to whether a man shall be allowed to continue business, and whether that which he has spent years of his time and thought, to establish, shall be permitted to stand or be completely demolished.

The foregoing history demonstrates clearly that if the law did permit such vicious attacks, independent workingmen would be helpless to secure employment without joining a union and paying union assessments and fines. Every manufacturer would be obliged to obey their demands and run a "closed shop." If this policy of organized destruction of a man's business should be legalized by decision of the Courts, and upheld by public opinion, it would soon become well nigh irresistible, and all other government would be impotent compared with the strength of the union government. Mr. Mitchell and others acknowledge that the boycott is sometimes practiced on the wrong person in the wrong way, but who made the unions arbiters of men's fortunes, to operate a great machine for destruction according to the dictates of their own

fallible judgment or prejudice? There can be no doubt of the Court's decision on this question, and we feel confident that American public opinion, with its love of individual liberty, can but condemn this practice of boycotting, and insist that Mr. Gompers and its other advocates change their policy or abdicate their office of labor leaders.



## TRADE UNIONISM IN DANBURY.

Prior to 1886 the old time hatting town of Danbury had operated both independent or open shops, and trade shops, though among the latter there were none that had union organizations in all departments. At this time the growth, vigor and earning capacity of the independent shops, as compared with the restricted trade shops, was phenomenal. Owing to the wave of organization that was sweeping over the country under the directions of the Knights of Labor in the year 1885, the hat manufacturers of Danbury entered into a trade agreement with the Hatters' Unions in order to preserve the autonomy of their trade. The following were the essential provisions in this agreement:

1. All differences to be decided by a joint Committee of Arbitration; shop calls to be prohibited and the men to remain at work pending the arbitration of any difficulty.

2. Manufacturers to employ only union men.

3. Prices to be made at the beginning of each season for the season; each individual shop to regulate its own prices by adjustment between employer and employees.

This arrangement worked well in the prevention of prolonged strikes, but there were many sharp debates which lasted until the small hours of the morning. In 1893, however, we find the manufacturers making a statement to the unions, from which it appears

that owing to the union restrictions and the resulting increase in the cost of production, their trade was drifting to other quarters, to the impoverishment of Danbury.

The trade agreement was imperfect in many respects. Changes were necessary in order to improve the methods of arbitration and there were many unreasonable restrictions as to prices and the employment of men, that were obviously unjust and detrimental to the trade and the community. Patient efforts were made on the part of the manufacturers to secure more liberal terms, and there were negotiations covering a period of some sixteen (16) weeks. The unions were obstinate and unreasonable, however, and the employers felt compelled to close down their factories in order to cease operating them at a loss.

At the end of the lockout, which lasted some nine (9) weeks, all but six (6) factories re-opened as independent shops, employing union and non-union men without discrimination. Since that time, however, the Hatters' Unions with the help of the American Federation of Labor have attacked independent hat manufacturers in Danbury and elsewhere, just as they attacked D. E. Loewe & Company, and have forced all but three of the Danbury hat manufacturers to unionize their shops.

In the union factories the arbitration agreement of 1885 should still be operative as it was promised to the six union factories after the lockout. Owing to the great strength of the unions, however, through the use of the boycott, all essential terms, except prices above the minimum scale, are dictated to the employer without adjustment or agreement with him. The man-



ufacturers have no voice in the establishment of hours of labor or the minimum scale of wages or the amount of work performed by individuals in some departments.

Those factories accustomed to use the label depend entirely on customers who desire the union label for the sale of their product. The label is controlled by four National officers of the Hatters' Union who dictate their terms to the manufacturer, and in case of his proving refractory take away the label, thus completely stopping the "outlet" of the factory and destroying the business. Such an action, though much more disastrous than an ordinary strike, is frequently taken without the knowledge of the public. The employer, and sometimes his associates pay the expense of the struggle. It is this fear of being ruined that makes many of the manufacturers conspirators in the use of the union label in the attack against the independent concerns and forces them to submit to union tyranny and dictation.

The town of Danbury has been unionized from head to foot. With the exception of one tobacco store, it has proved hopeless for anyone who refuses to comply with union dictation to successfully run a retail store, barber shop or any business of that nature. In order to obtain certain brands of tobacco, which are sold by the non-union store only, union men secretly delegate boys to make the purchase for them. Committees from the union inspect the stock of goods kept by the retailers, and woe to the man who keeps goods without the union label. Great was the consternation of the beer drinkers when a visit to the cellar of a saloon disclosed the fact that the pump was in a barrel of non-



union beer while the union card was suspended from the saloon above. Fines are imposed on union men for patronizing refractory merchants or purchasing non-union articles. The wagons of a certain bakery were followed about the town and their customers told not to patronize them. During the boycott of the New York Sun a copy of that paper could not be purchased in Danbury. The town government voted to appropriate money to support the union men during the lock-out of 1893. Politicians feel that all candidates for election must be known as favorable to organized labor. It is impossible for one who has not lived in it to understand the atmosphere of tyranny that pervades the whole town.

And what is the result of all this in Danbury? Prior to 1886 it was one of the most prosperous, growing communities in the country. The population leaped forward with enormous strides. Buildings went up rapidly in all parts of the town, and many working men owned comfortable homes. Moreover, the whole town was pre-eminently democratic in its customs and there was no class antagonism. At least three-fourths of the employers have risen from the ranks.

This is a pleasing picture of a happy, prosperous community, but a picture of the same place to-day is unrecognizable. Building activity has ceased and the cost of building has risen thirty-five per cent. (35%). There have been scarcely ten dwellings erected in the past four years, and where buildings were freshly painted and well repaired, many now are unoccupied and shabby. The enormous strides in population have given place to a condition of actual decrease. Thus, what

has seemed like increased wages in this locality has resulted in a smaller earning capacity, and the working man has been injured rather than benefited. There is not enough work to be done, as business has left the town, and even in the City of Danbury people curtail their consumption because of the increased cost. No one is ready to build when the cost of building has increased thirty-five per cent., and most people refrain from making customary repairs. Real estate is a drug in the market.

So Danbury has suffered just as England has suffered. The experiments that have been tried in many localities under the title of Trade Agreements have been practically tested in Danbury. In 1886 the unions and employees conspired against the public, and attempted to blot out all competition. If they had been able to include all the hatting trade, the attempt to get inflated prices for their services would have been successful, and the non-producing public and toilers, in other industries than hatting, would have borne the burden. They did not gain a monopoly, and failing in this it should have been plain to the unions that they must work for as low prices in Danbury as men did elsewhere or the work would leave the town. Buyers want their work performed where it can be done most economically. It ought to be small satisfaction to have the privilege of charging \$5 a day for your services if you cannot secure work but for a small portion of the year. The whole community of Danbury has suffered simply because of the refusal of its hatters to work for the same remuneration as men in other communities.

For a while the full effects of these shortsighted methods have been postponed by means of the boycott, forcing union label hats on the market at inflated prices. Now that public opinion is being aroused to the iniquity of boycotting, however, and intimidation is being enjoined and punished by the Courts, this unnatural condition will rapidly yield to the law of supply and demand. It cannot then be expected that Danbury hats will find a ready market until the cost of production there is as low as elsewhere.

3.







1904.  
DANBURY MEDICAL PRINTING CO.  
DANBURY, CONN.





