

THE EFFECTS OF RADICAL GROUPS ON THE LABOR MOVEMENT

BY HUGH G. CLELAND*

THIS paper is, in a sense, a response to what was a most important presidential address by Dr. Philip S. Klein at our meeting last year in Philadelphia. One of the striking points that Dr. Klein made at that time was that our journal, *PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY*, has devoted only one half of one per cent of its articles to Pennsylvania history since 1865. "Pennsylvania historians," said Dr. Klein, "know almost nothing about their state since the end of the Civil War, and do not seem to be doing very much about it."¹

Dr. Klein noted that we have also been somewhat unbalanced in our treatment of ethnic groups in the Commonwealth. The Scotch-Irish, the German church people and the Plain Sects, whose history has been treated quite extensively, today make up only about ten per cent of our population. The history of ethnic or cultural groups who have arrived more recently is still largely unwritten. One could not help but be struck by Dr. Klein's statement that there are now 200 Catholics in Pennsylvania for every Quaker and 200 people of Jewish faith for every Amishman. Dr. Klein believes that the study of the period since the Civil War and of the contributions of newer ethnic and religious groups is "the primary challenge of the next 25 years for the Pennsylvania Historical Association."

This paper is an attempt to contribute in a very small way to filling the void. Primarily it is an attempt to indicate some of the areas where research would seem to be indicated for graduate students or more mature investigators in the next few years. In dealing with the labor movement, we are dealing with one of the forces which has been of steadily increasing importance since the Civil War. At the same time we deal also with the newer ethnic

*Dr. Cleland is an Instructor in the History Department at the University of Pittsburgh, and a former officer of a local union of the United Automobile Workers. This paper was read at the Annual Convention of the Pennsylvania Historical Association in Pittsburgh, October 11, 1958.

¹See *Pennsylvania History*, XXV (Jan., 1958), 1-8.

groups who—like their earlier counterparts—usually began as laborers and, to a considerable extent, still make up the labor force of the Commonwealth.

Certainly no cities in the United States have seen more labor history than Philadelphia, birthplace of the organized labor movement in the United States, and Pittsburgh, where the AFL was formed. Certainly no state has produced such an impressive list of labor leaders as Pennsylvania. William H. Sylvis, Uriah Stephens, Terence V. Powderly, Philip Murray, James Carey and David J. McDonald are among those who have risen to high places in the labor movement from Pennsylvania.

The aspect of labor with which this paper deals is the effect of radicals on the Pennsylvania labor movement. It is as hard to define a term like "radical" with any great precision as it is to define such related words as "liberal" or "conservative" or "progressive." Perhaps we can best indicate what we mean by listing the radical groups who will be treated, namely: the Jacksonians, the Utopian reformers, the Socialists, the Industrial Workers of the World, and the Communists.

The question might perhaps be asked: why has the labor movement been so influenced by radical ideologies—ideologies which, as often as not, arose quite outside the labor movement originally? The answer is, I believe, that as compared to agriculturists or businessmen, the modern industrial working class has appeared quite recently—about a century and a quarter ago. It has hardly had time to work out, develop, and perfect much of a philosophy of its own which would compare with physiocracy or with *laissez faire*. Therefore, the labor movement has borrowed—sometimes from strange sources.

The labor movement has felt a continuing need to somehow acquire a comprehensive view of society. Since its beginnings, the modern labor movement has been buffeted by panics, depressions, inflation and deflation, restrictive legislation, immigration, and accelerating technological change. The labor movement has sought—and still seeks—to somehow understand and impose some sort of intellectual order on these tumultuous experiences. This paper is a partial chronicle of these attempts.

Most labor historians consider the foundation of the Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations in Philadelphia in 1827 as the

emergence of the modern American labor movement. A year later appeared the Working Men's Party of Philadelphia, the first labor party in the United States. These years, of course, coincide with the rise of Jacksonian democracy.

The relation between Jacksonian democracy and the labor movement is, despite the volume of literature on this period, still unsettled. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Jr., believes that the interaction between the two movements was considerable. He believes that the key issue in winning laboring men to Jackson was the war on the bank, and that the link between the two groups on the bank question was the hard money theory.² The man who Schlesinger believes was the key link between the Jacksonians and the Philadelphia labor movement, as well as the financial theorist of the Jacksonian movement, was William M. Gouge, a Philadelphia editor and economist. So far as the author of this paper knows, there is not a single scholarly monograph on this once influential Pennsylvanian. In 1829 Gouge was one of a committee chosen by a "meeting of workingmen" in Philadelphia to draw up a report on the banking system. The report, an erudite one, was critical of banking corporations. Gouge went on to publish in 1833 *A Short History of Paper Money and Banking in the United States* which became, we are told, the most widely read economic treatise in America down to that time and was reprinted in Britain and Belgium. Gouge was later to publish a number of other works on banking. He became a clerk in the Treasury Department under Jackson in 1834 and remained in the department to suggest the Independent Treasury System to Van Buren and to advise him on economic matters during the panic of 1837. Gouge's memos on these matters are in the Van Buren papers—perhaps all that remains of manuscript material by him, although other collections may also have letters.³

A recent publication of our own Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission disputes the Schlesinger theory that labor joined Jackson because of the bank question. The work in question is William A. Sullivan's *The Industrial Worker in Pennsylvania*,

² Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson* (Boston, 1948), 143.

³ On Gouge see: Davis Rich Dewey, *Financial History of the United States* (New York, 1931), 235; Bray Hammond, *Banks and Politics in America from the Revolution to the Civil War* (Princeton, 1957), *passim*; Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization, 1606-1865* (New York, 1946), II, *passim*; and Schlesinger, *Jackson*, 79, 117-118, 222.

1800-1840.⁴ Sullivan did the kind of thorough local research so often wrongly condemned; he made a study of the voting statistics in Philadelphia during the Jackson period on a ward by ward basis. By an examination of tax records for the same period, he was able to learn with some accuracy the income brackets of the inhabitants of the various wards. He discovered that in the Jackson period the Philadelphia workers generally supported Whigs, and that the ward which gave the greatest number of votes to the Working Men's Party for local offices voted against Jackson at the national level.⁵ Other Working Men's parties which sprang up briefly in such places as Pittsburgh and Harrisburg were even more anti-Jackson than the Philadelphia party.

Further research shows that of one hundred candidates nominated by the Philadelphia Working Men's Party, only ten were workingmen while fifty-three were merchants or manufacturers. Working Men's Parties outside of Philadelphia were even more remote from the actual labor movement.⁶

Were the Working Men's parties completely fraudulent, then? Not at all. The Working Men's Party of Philadelphia, at least, was certainly *started* by the mechanics. The key to the puzzle of its later composition lies, probably, in semantics. Who was a "working man" in the 1830's? (Let it be remembered that this was still a time when an employer often was a master workman employing journeyman workmen or apprentices; that is, when the line between employer and employee was often quite hazy.) *The Mechanic's Free Press* of Philadelphia, voice of the Philadelphia unions, addressed itself in 1829 to the question of who was and who was not a workman. It defined a workingman as "one engaged in productive labor." Did this specifically include employers? While not admitting this in so many words, the editor suggested that it did.⁷ Here we have an important key to understanding the Working Men's Party movement.

Even though the Working Men's parties were not all they appeared to be, did they really oppose the Bank of the United States, or all banks? Did members of the labor movement generally feel

⁴ William A. Sullivan, *The Industrial Worker in Pennsylvania, 1800-1840*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1955.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 193-194; 199-200.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 178, 190.

⁷ *Mechanic's Free Press*, Sept. 12, 1829, as quoted in Sullivan, *op. cit.*, 186.

this way? Bray Hammond, whose *Banks and Politics in America from the Revolution to the Civil War* won the Pulitzer Prize for history last year, believes that often workingmen were influenced to oppose chartering of new banks by political agents of existing banks who wished to avoid competition.⁸ John R. Commons has advanced a different theory for labor opposition to the banks. In the 1820's and '30's, reasons Commons, trade was expanding in geographical scope and therefore required credit. The merchant capitalist could usually get credit; the master mechanic or journeyman mechanic—who, from a banker's point of view was not qualified or organized to do business on a large scale—could not get credit. Therefore the small handicraft producer was being squeezed out—and blamed the banks.⁹ But this is only a plausible theory. No one—so far as the author of this paper knows—has looked at the records.

Does all this destroy Schlesinger's notion of William Gouge as a link between labor and the Jacksonians? It would be a brave man who says so. We will not know until someone has studied Gouge more thoroughly. Whoever does may answer some of the other questions still unanswered about this period.

The second group of radicals whose influence, or attempted influence, on the labor movement we might consider are the Utopians. The 1840's and 1850's saw an effusion of Utopian thought in America. In part this was introduced from Europe. The influence of *émigré* British Chartists and German Forty-eighters on the American labor movement is a suggestive, and as yet untapped, field. These ideas flourished especially in America where an open society, a tolerant government, and the availability of large tracts of cheap land encouraged social experiments. The panaceas of the Utopians were bewilderingly numerous. There were land reform schemes, money reform plans of all sorts, model communities, projected national workshops, co-operatives, labor-time banks, social credit schemes, and what have you.

One of the schemes which influenced many Americans, including many of the leading intellectuals of the day, was Associationism, or Fourierism. The first Fourierist phalanx in the United States, as the co-operative communities were to be called, was

⁸ Hammond, *op. cit.*, 575-576.

⁹ John R. Commons, *et al.*, *History of Labour in the United States* (New York, 1918), I, 218-219.

named the Sylvania Phalanx and was launched in western Pennsylvania in 1842.¹⁰ If there is a study or monograph on this pioneer forerunner of Brook Farm, the author of this paper does not know of it.

The most interesting and influential of the Utopian labor leaders in Pennsylvania was John Campbell of Philadelphia. Campbell was one of the many British Chartists who fled the old world for the new and thus constituted a living bridge between the British and American labor movements. While still in Britain Campbell rose to become the national secretary and treasurer of the National Charter Association and was also a pamphleteer for that movement. In 1843, along with Feargus O'Connor and other Chartist leaders, Campbell was tried and convicted of sedition. When the conviction was set aside on a technicality, Campbell left Britain for Philadelphia.

In the new world, Campbell became a bookseller and publisher. He also immediately plunged into social reform schemes within the labor movement. In Philadelphia in the 1840's he helped to organize the Philadelphia Reform Society and the Social Improvement Society; he became Philadelphia correspondent for and a frequent contributor to Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune*; we are told that he spoke at most mass meetings of workers in this period. He found time to author a book dedicated to the French Revolution of 1848 and another, incongruously enough, attacking abolitionists as seditious, the charge for which he had recently been tried himself.

In addition to his reform schemes, Campbell was active in the Democratic Party. Some of his letters are in the Buchanan papers and perhaps in other collections. These, together with his books published here and in Britain, his newspaper articles, and various British sources, suggest that a fuller appraisal of his life and ideas could be made.¹¹

The actual leader of the trade unions in Philadelphia in the mid-1830's, and a nationally known leader as well, was John Ferral (also sometimes appearing as Ferrel or Ferrell). Ferral, a weaver by trade, was chairman of the central body of trade unions in Philadelphia and a leader in attempts to establish a national trade

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 505.

¹¹ For Campbell, see Dorfman, *op. cit.*, II, 689-693; and Commons, *op. cit.*, I, 516.

union organization. Under his militant leadership, the city employees of Philadelphia were the first in the nation to win the ten-hour day. Many trades in private employment also won this reduction in hours. Besides his union leadership, Ferral was involved in the Associationist movement and also took part in Philadelphia city politics. The panic of 1837 virtually destroyed the union movement for a period, but in 1844 Ferral turned up in Pittsburgh where he organized a branch of the National Reform Association, an organization of trade unionists and reformers who were agitating for a Homestead Act.¹² Ferral, apparently, has never been honored by a monograph.

In every period there are men who swim against the current. Such a man in the Pennsylvania labor movement of the Civil War period was Jonathan G. Fincher, who rejected all Utopian schemes. Fincher was for years a close associate of William Sylvis, the Pennsylvanian who led the first national labor organization in the United States. Fincher was a machinist who rose to become national secretary of the Blacksmith's Union. He made his mark in the labor movement, however, as an editor, first of a machinists' union paper and later, in the 1860's, as the editor of four successive labor newspapers of his own. John R. Commons calls his *Fincher's Trades Review*, published during the Civil War years, one of the best labor papers ever published in the United States. (By the way, perhaps the only Lincoln book not yet written is one on Lincoln and the labor movement. If other books on Lincoln are criteria, it would probably enjoy a large sale.)

Fincher attended most of the national labor meetings in the 1860's and 1870's and steadfastly opposed third-partyism, money reform schemes, and the like. He preached instead working through the existing political parties, building unions which were economically strong, and fighting for the eight-hour day.¹³ This approach clearly foreshadows the philosophy of the AFL. Would it be too much to say that Jonathan Fincher, hitherto largely neglected by historians, was the intellectual ancestor of the AFL?

Let us turn our attention to that radical group which has had the most effect on the labor movement over the long haul, the

¹² For Ferral, see Commons, *op. cit.*, I, *passim*.

¹³ For Fincher, see Edgar B. Cale, *The Organization of Labor in Philadelphia, 1850-1870* (Philadelphia, 1940), 96-100; and Commons, *op. cit.*, II, 128 and *passim*.

Socialists. A few years ago, during the height of the McCarthy era, the story was told of the little boy who was asked what he wanted to be and replied that he wanted to grow up to be an ex-communist, a type of citizen both numerous and much in the spotlight at that time. In the labor movement it would seem that the thing to be is an ex-socialist. Samuel Gompers, founder of the modern American labor movement, was an ex-socialist, and Walter Reuther, heir apparent to the leadership of the present AFL-CIO, is also an ex-socialist, although some people are a little dubious about the "ex." In the period between Gompers and Reuther literally thousands of former, or actual, socialists have served in union office, and still do.

Why has Marxian socialism had such an impact on labor? One answer is obvious—the socialists have always consciously oriented themselves towards the working class. Probably another explanation is that socialism gave laboring men confidence in themselves. From the Civil War onward, industrialists were buoyed up psychologically by the doctrine of Social Darwinism which told them that their competitive and acquisitive behavior was really in tune with the laws of nature, and actually led to progress. Probably the same psychological search for reassurance led many laboring men to turn to Marxian socialism, which told them that *their* class was the most progressive force in society, that a strike was not anti-social behavior but honorable class struggle, and that *their* behavior was in tune with the laws of nature and led to human progress.

Needless to say, Pennsylvania labor has felt the impact of socialism. The last two congresses of the first socialist international, the International Workingmen's Association, were held not in London or Brussels or Basle, but in Philadelphia.¹⁴ It was the Socialist Party of the Second International, however, the party of Eugene Debs and Norman Thomas, which has had the most effect on Pennsylvania labor. When the Socialist Party was at its high point of membership in 1912, it was not New York or Wisconsin which had the most party members in a single state, but Pennsylvania.¹⁵ Pennsylvania probably still has the largest

¹⁴ Howard S. Quint, *The Forging of American Socialism: Origins of the Modern Movement* (Columbia, S. C., 1953), 3.

¹⁵ Ira Kipnis, *The American Socialist Movement, 1897-1912* (New York, 1952), 364.

Socialist Party membership of any state and is the home of the present titular leader of the party and its presidential candidate in 1952 and 1956, Darlington Hoopes. The only part of the country where there is still a local socialist newspaper is Berks County, Pennsylvania, where the *Reading Labor Advocate* is published.

To return to the past, I would like to say a word or two about a giant of the socialist and labor movement in Pennsylvania who has been so neglected by historians that his name cannot be found in the recently published *Bibliography of Pennsylvania History*. Yet he was the most important Pennsylvania labor leader of his day. His most formidable achievement was his election and re-election, time after time, to the presidency of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor. He served continuously from 1912 to 1928 as a known socialist, despite the fact that the national leadership of the AFL at the time was in ultra-conservative hands. Like his friend Gene Debs, this man vigorously opposed American participation in World War I. For that reason Samuel Gompers tried to block his re-election in 1918 and a Department of Justice agent sat in the convention with a warrant for his arrest if he were defeated for re-election. He was returned to office by a margin of 3 to 1. He finally retired undefeated at the age of 64 in 1928 to take office as a socialist councilman in his native city of Reading. He was twice a candidate for vice-president on the Socialist Party ticket, and three times elected to the Pennsylvania legislature. In the legislature he was the father of Pennsylvania's workman's compensation law and an early fighter for old age assistance, mothers' assistance, and pensions for the blind. A number of Republican governors appointed him to important state commissions. The name of this Pennsylvania Dutch pipefitter who had only three months of formal schooling and went to work at the age of six was James Hudson Maurer. His autobiography and his extensive writings in magazines and newspapers are an invaluable source for the history of the Commonwealth in the twentieth century. It is time someone blew the dust off of them.¹⁶

¹⁶ On Maurer, see James H. Maurer, *It Can Be Done: The Autobiography of James Hudson Maurer* (New York, 1938); David A. Shannon, *The Socialist Party of America: A History* (New York, 1955), 118; Kipnis, *op. cit.*, 238; Henry G. Hodges, "Four Years of Socialism in Reading, Pa.," *National Municipal Review*, XX (May, 1931), 282; and Socialist Party of America, *A Plan for America: Official 1932 Campaign Handbook of the Socialist Party* (Chicago, 1932), 23-26.

Ordinarily historians think of the Industrial Workers of the World as a western movement, despite the fact that it led great textile strikes in the East at Lawrence, Massachusetts, in 1912, and at Paterson, New Jersey, in 1913. Actually, the I.W.W. had more locals in Pennsylvania than in any other state in the Union. The eastern office of the I.W.W. was at New Castle, Pennsylvania, and it was here that the eastern organ of the union, *Solidarity*, was published.¹⁷

Probably the most important activity of the I.W.W. in Pennsylvania was the Pressed Steel Car Company strike in McKee's Rocks in 1909. The company fabricated railway and street railway cars on an assembly line basis using mostly semi-skilled, foreign-born labor. The strike was spectacular, even for that day—there were pitched battles with hastily sworn-in deputies, attempts to break strikers' morale by evicting them from company houses, and a naval battle of sorts when the company tried to bring in strike-breakers by river steamer. During one encounter, strikers were tied behind horses and dragged through the streets. Before the strike was over thirteen men had been killed, and the strike had become an international incident when the Austrian government protested to the United States about the treatment of some Austrian nationals who were involved. The strike received a great deal of support from public opinion in Pittsburgh and was eventually won, the only instance before the coming of the CIO where unskilled steelworkers won a victory.¹⁸

The I.W.W. in Pittsburgh also succeeded in organizing the stockyards of Pittsburgh and the cigar-making industry, the latter employing mostly girls.¹⁹ In 1914 and again in 1916 the I.W.W. led unsuccessful strikes, each of more than a month's duration, at Westinghouse Electric in East Pittsburgh. In 1916 the Westinghouse strike was almost turned into a general strike on May Day; three men were killed when Coal and Iron Police fired on strikers trying to call out the workers in neighboring steel mills.²⁰ For

¹⁷ Fred Thompson, *The I.W.W.: Its First Fifty Years* (Chicago, 1955), 41-42. The figures are for 1910.

¹⁸ Commons, *op. cit.*, IV, 263-265; William D. Haywood, *Bill Haywood's Book* (New York, 1929), 241; Paul U. Kellogg, "The McKee's Rocks Strike," *The Survey*, Aug. 7, 1909, 664-665.

¹⁹ Thompson, *op. cit.*, 47, 69-70.

²⁰ Hugh G. Cleland, "The CIO Electrical Workers: A Political History," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1956, 7-16.

many years—from 1913 to 1925, to be precise—the Philadelphia longshoremen were organized in the I.W.W., which completely controlled the waterfront. This movement was of special interest because it was one of the earliest successful unions with a predominantly Negro membership.²¹

Probably the most important activity of the I.W.W. in Pennsylvania in which it anticipated the CIO. In many places where the I.W.W. had once been strong the CIO later organized very easily. Often there was an actual continuity of local leadership; this was true of the Westinghouse plant, for example. Both the I.W.W. and the CIO came into being because the AFL ignored the needs of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers. A contemporary journalist in 1909 reporting the McKee's Rocks strike summed up the situation which helped to swell the ranks of the I.W.W. and later of the CIO. Of the I.W.W. he wrote: "It is the protest of the half-assimilated, the half-Americanized, the half-skilled against the very industrial policies which have brought them here and which, by the deploying of fresh migrations tend to keep them down."²² A search of bibliographies and indexes reveals not a single article on the I.W.W. in Pennsylvania.

The influence of Communists on the labor movement could easily fill a paper by itself. It would be a little difficult to describe that influence at the state level because, the closer we get to the present, the more state lines tend to become blurred. Also, since the Communists have never been an electoral organization in any serious sense, they have never maintained more than a token state organization. It is probably more meaningful to talk of Communist influence in metropolitan areas within the state.

The significant story about the relationship between the Communists and the unions—particularly the CIO—is, first, the way in which the Communists used the union movement to build the Communist Party and, second, the major role which the unions played later in destroying the Communist Party by driving it out of the union movement. It is well known that the Communists got in on the ground floor of the upsurge of the CIO in the 'thirties. At one time they controlled probably forty-five per cent of the CIO. They dominated some of the constituent CIO unions com-

²¹ John S. Gambs, *The Decline of the I.W.W.* (New York, 1932), 135-136.

²² Kellogg, *op. cit.*, 656.

pletely and were influential in most others. For a long period both the attorney and the director of publications of the national CIO were Communists.

The Communists got into the CIO in the first place because they were invited in by John L. Lewis. Once they had a foothold, however, they built their party machine by time-honored methods, especially the dispensation of patronage. The party had at its command in the various unions it controlled, at the national, district, or local levels, hundreds of jobs as organizers, editors, researchers, publicists, business agents, secretaries, and the like, as well as millions of dollars in union income. In the Communist-dominated unions, the way to get out of the shop and on to the staff was to join the Party. Furthermore, the various front organizations of the Party, as well as its press, were to a large extent financed by contributions from Communist-dominated unions to such organizations as the Civil Rights Congress, the National Negro Congress, the American Youth Congress, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the American Labor Party, the Progressive Party, and many others. There is really only one place where this Communist use of funds and patronage can be studied in its detailed day-to-day workings—that is at the local level.

Pennsylvania historians have at their disposal voluminous records of this process in the printed hearings of a number of Congressional committees and governmental agencies. The Senate Labor Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the House Labor Committee, the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Subversive Activities Control Board are the chief sources. Here one finds thousands of pages of testimony about Communists in the labor unions of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Erie, Bethlehem, Allentown, and many smaller industrial cities. Some of the testimony is worthless and all of it presents a real challenge in historical criticism, but nevertheless it is a rich vein. In addition to testimony before the various committees, the hearings often include other valuable source material read into the record—the proceedings of union conventions, answers to questionnaires sent out by committee staff employees, and extensive records of every conceivable sort.

In the end the labor movement purged itself of this essentially alien and hostile element. Today the influence of the Communist

Party in the labor movement is almost non-existent; indeed, the Party itself has almost disappeared. Latest estimates of its national strength indicate that membership is probably below three thousand members in the entire country. The chief blow to the Party was its loss of funds, patronage, and influence when it was driven from the labor movement. While there was some pressure for the expulsion of the Communists by government, public opinion, and the press, the chief impetus for the struggle to oust the Party came from within the union movement itself. All in all, the struggle of the labor movement to regain control of its own destiny was a fascinating and important part of the history of Pennsylvania.

It is time we gave more serious thought to collecting and preserving the records of the labor movement in Pennsylvania. Anyone who is looking for fresh source material for graduate students to work with will find it here in abundance. With the active and even enthusiastic co-operation of the university librarian, we hope to build a collection of source material on labor history here at Pitt. We have recently acquired the private library of one of the leading socialists in the state and have also recently microfilmed the very extensive private papers of Father Charles Owen Rice, Pittsburgh's noted "labor priest" and an active figure in the labor movement for many years. We have also been tape recording interviews with local labor figures, some of whom were once affiliated with the Communist Party or even the I.W.W. We will need such sources to write the history of labor in Pennsylvania, just as we will need increasingly to utilize tools from other disciplines—anthropology, social psychology, and economics, for example.

In summing up, I would speculate that radicals will have very little influence on the labor movement in the future, not because the labor movement has become conservative but because it is definitely developing an ideology of its own, and therefore no longer needs to borrow. Of course, many would consider the evolving indigenous ideology of labor to be itself radical, and perhaps they are right. But at any rate, it is something new, although there are, of course, elements of older ideologies.

What are some of the elements of contemporary labor ideology? For one thing, labor is in politics to stay, not out of choice but out of necessity. Labor must seek to win or at least neutralize a

majority of voters; otherwise hostile legislation will cripple the labor movement. The permanent entry of the unions into politics has vast implications which even the unions themselves do not yet comprehend.

In a related area, the unions are firmly committed to integration of the Negro—a sharp change from the traditional hostility which the white wage earner felt toward the Negro in the 19th and early 20th century.

In economics the unions depend heavily upon Keynesian thought, but interpreted to their own needs. Not much of Marxian economics is accepted any more, but a good deal of Marxian sociology still is, if only tacitly. David J. McDonald, for example, seems to prefer to think of union leaders as trustees, with management, of industry, but he apparently believes that management rejects this and wages a relentless class struggle against the union. Of course, he would not use this term.

Of this we may be sure: the implications of automation, the electronic brain, and atomic energy will keep industry and therefore labor in a state of flux for years to come. This will give rise to many problems; the way they are solved will have momentous implications for Pennsylvanians. Which is to say that the study of the labor movement should increasingly concern us in the second half of the 20th century.