

The Deseret Weekly.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY,
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, . . . \$2.50.
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, . . . 1.50.
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, - - - EDITOR.

Saturday, - - September 7, 1889.

ORGANIZED TYRANNY.

THE strike that occurred recently on the building now being erected for Zion's Savings Bank gives rise to serious reflections: On general principles we are opposed to "strikes," because they usually result in much more harm than good to all parties affected and are often started on incorrect principles. There may be occasions when they offer the only remedy at hand for a great wrong, and resort to them may then be justifiable. But, generally, they are injurious to both workmen and employers and originate in a spirit of antagonism and coercion.

The strike to which we now refer was not a voluntary movement on the part of the men who left their work, but was ordered by a society of which they are members. It was not commanded on account of any dispute as to wages or the hours of labor. There was no disaffection of the workmen towards the contractor. The sole ground of complaint, taking the statements of both sides in the disagreement, was the employment of men who did not belong to the Union or would not subscribe to its dictates. Mr. Watson was required to discharge the non-Union men in his employment; this he would not do; thereupon the Union men were ordered by a committee to quit work; some of them did so under protest, as they considered it wrong and unjustifiable, but yielded for fear of the consequences of disobedience.

Now, we ask all fair men to look at the situation as it is, without prejudice, and say if this proceeding on the part of the Federated Trades Union was right or justifiable. The non-Union men were requested by the representatives of that body to join the Union. This they declined to do. Force was then resorted to in the shape of a demand for their discharge. And this failing, the strike was ordered—a further resort to force, in order to compel Mr. Watson

to concede to the demands of the Union or suffer from the hindrance of the fulfilment of his contract. Mr. Watson has neither said nor done anything against the Union. He has employed Union men as freely as others. The Union has attempted to dictate to him as to whom he shall or shall not employ, and he declines to submit. Is he not right in his decision?

The rights of employers must be kept in view as well as the rights of workmen. Both classes are necessary. Their interests are interdependent. Regard should be had by each for the welfare of the other, if for no higher reason than this fact of mutual dependence. A contractor has both a legal and a moral right to employ such workmen as suit his purpose, and there is no principle of justice or law, human or divine, that requires him to submit to the demands of any combination as to the class he shall engage. Such dictation is tyranny in one of its worst forms.

Working people have the right to combine for mutual protection and support, the maintenance of their individual and society rights. But they have not the right to combine against their fellows to the injury of persons who do not choose to join them and comply with their regulations. By doing this they invade the rights of others, and violate the spirit and the letter of the law, and place themselves on the plane of oppression, and rank themselves with the despots of the world.

The men against whom the Federated Trades Union conspired have just as much right to stay out of that society as its members had to go in. The compulsion sought to be used against them was improper in every sense of the word. It was not manly. It was exercising the power of the strong against the weak. It endeavored to deprive them of the means of support for themselves and families, because they dared to differ from the Union men and did not wish to bow to their behests. Such tyranny should be enough to make every freeman rise in his independence and determine that he will not be brought into such bondage.

Is this the kind of "liberty" that these Unions seek to establish? It is a desecration of the sacred word. It is an attempted invasion of the common rights of man. We are not opposed to unions, if by the term is meant associations for mutual help, the bettering of workmen's condition financially, socially or in any other sense. But we think every

thoughtful man and consistent public journal should be opposed to combinations which would compel men to become members thereof under any consideration, or attempt to injure employers who dare to give labor to non-members. They are dangerous to society. We regard them as unlawful associations. Courts in the States have ruled that such conduct is conspiracy, under the criminal laws. They conspire against the rights and liberties of non-Union workmen. They conspire against the rights and liberties and property of employers.

Suppose the capitalists, contractors and business men of this City and Territory were to combine and refuse to employ any man who belonged to one of these unions. How would the members like the turn of the tables? We heard some prominent employers of workmen discussing that question last evening. We opposed the idea because we believe in the freedom of men to join or abstain from joining a society of this description, and we would not infringe upon that liberty. But a combination of employers against Unions would be just as proper as such societies as seek to dictate employers in the choice of their workmen. And we think all Union men will see this point if they look at it without the glasses of their would-be leaders.

We feel ashamed to know that many of these men who have combined this improper manner are "Mormons." It would seem that they ought to understand that such proceedings are in violation of the sacred principles of human freedom which their creed seeks to establish. That men should "not be in bondage, one to another," God Almighty has declared. He raised up wise and valiant men to establish the Constitution of the United States, and anything more or less than this, He says, "cometh of evil."

They have made a mistake. It is a serious one. It strikes at the very foundation of human liberty. It is detrimental to society. It tends to break down instead of build up. It creates a power that should not be exercised over the souls of men. It is tyrannous both to the members and non-members of the organization. It would force men against their free choice to join a society with which they are not in accord, and compel its members to a course which is revolting to their sense of justice and propriety. This is not