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7. Richard Barry Freeman and Joel Rogers, What Workers Want (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), introduction and table 3.5 on 76–77. The original survey was conducted in 1994–95; in the updated edition, the authors argue that other surveys show that their results on what workers want still largely hold, though it seems that workers had also become more convinced that what they had was not what they wanted.


9. Freeman and Rogers, What Workers Want, 139–41. The authors note that employee involvement (EI) does reduce worker desire for a union, but, on the other hand, EI programs are more popular and deemed to work better at unionized workplaces, where they also increase workers’ satisfaction with the union.


13. Against characterizations of business unionism as cold or opportunistic, Philip Taft defends it as “no late nineteenth-century import, but the first type of cooperative activity carried on by workers in the United States,” the basic model on which workers had organized since the late eighteenth century. “On the Origins of Business Unionism,” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 17, no. 1 (October 1963): 20–38, quote on 37. Whatever the case may be, the term came into widespread use in the first years of the twentieth century specifically in the context of the AFL’s more streamlined and bureaucratic organization.

14. All quotes are from a brief item in the NAM’s trade publication: “One Uses Politics, the Other Direct Coercion: The Only Difference between Socialism and Unionism,” *American Industries*, February 15, 1904, 11. See also the speech of John Kirby (later to become NAM president) at the 1904 NAM convention, in which he repeatedly used “socialism” and “unions” more or less interchangeably and explicitly argued that the labor movement “has fallen a complete victim to your foreign socialist. Some of the labor leaders deny they are socialists, but while saying they are not socialists they are at the same time constantly preaching socialism.” National Association of Manufacturers, *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Convention*, Pittsburgh, PA, May 17–19, 1904 (New York: Issued from the Secretary’s Office), 108.
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23. As William G. Roy has pointed out with regard to understanding the rise of the corporation, we are often strangely obsessed with evaluating the morality and motivations of famous individual businessmen. Was Andrew Carnegie’s philanthropy genuinely meant? Was John D. Rockefeller a true Christian? Yet as Roy argues, whether industrial magnates “were motivated by greed, order, or charity is less important” than “the economic resources they could draw on, the economic relationships that states enforced, and the institutional forms they could adopt to achieve wealth, order, or charity.” *Socializing Capital: The Rise of the Large Industrial Corporation in America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 262.


29. Jennifer Delton, *The Industrialists: How the National Association of Manufacturers Shaped American Capitalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020). Before Delton’s work, the only monograph explicitly on the NAM was Albert K. Steigerwalt, *The National Association of Manufacturers: A Study in Business Leadership, 1895–1914* (Ann Arbor: Bureau of Business Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, 1964), which, besides being rather dated, has a somewhat hagiographic tone. Steigerwalt was involved in the NAM’s abortive history project in the 1940s and 1950s; he was allowed access to the association’s files after the NAM determined that although he could not be expected to “suppress any information on the Association,” he did have “a free-enterprise mind.” Vada Horsch to Earl Bunting, July 20, 1949, series I, box 43, National Association of Manufacturers Records, accession number 1411, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, DE. Hereafter cited as NAM Records.


Chapter 1. The Invention of the Closed Shop

1. *Daily Picayune*, April 15, 1903, 4. About the epigraph: The translation is “Remember the old police maxim: Who profits from the crime?” The English-language version of the album (Land of Black Gold) was translated by Leslie Lonsdale-Cooper and Michael Turner.

2. For more on the rise of the modern labor movement, see chapters 2 and 3. See also David Montgomery, *Workers’ Control in America: Studies in the History of Work, Technology and Labor Struggles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), especially chapters 1 and 4; and William E. Forbath, *Law and the Shaping of the American Labor Movement* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991). The boycott was an especially powerful weapon locally or with products mainly bought by workers. For example, NAM president James Van Cleave found that his business was severely endangered by a boycott resulting from a fight he had picked with the molders’ union. His company, Buck’s Stove and Range, was put on the AFL’s unfair list in 1907, and order cancellations flowed in from all parts of the country. As a union member had warned Van Cleave, “Your class of people are not buying your stoves. . . . They have steam heat and the working men are using the Stoves.” Quoted in Daniel R. Ernst, *Lawyers against Labor: From Individual Rights to Corporate Liberalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 128–29.

3. On precirculation, see, for example, “National Association of Manufacturers Will Meet,” *American Artisan and Hardware Record*, April 11, 1903, 21; and *Daily Picayune*, April 15, 1903, 4.


5. Chapter 2 delves deeper into the history of the membership requirement.


10. On AABA, see Ernst, *Lawyers against Labor*, 50. The NAM’s foreign department, which included translation and credit report services, was the largest item in its budget in 1905; see “Treasurer’s Annual Report,” in National Association of Manufacturers, *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Convention*, Atlanta, GA, May 16–18, 1905 (New York: Issued from the Secretary’s Office), 102–6. On NFA, see “Pink Bulletin,” May 19, 1908, box 1, folder 3, National Founders’ Association Records, accession number LR001292, Walter P. Reuther Library, Detroit, MI; extracts from the report of the commissioner (O. P. Briggs) at the NFA annual convention in the *Iron Age*, November 23, 1905, 1382–84.

11. Beyond Mulhall’s own report, there is evidence in the correspondence that he did in fact send money to be delivered to labor leaders in Portsmouth, and the strike was originally called off everywhere but at one company on the same date as the checks reached Portsmouth. See unsigned [Mulhall] to Ferdinand [Schwedtman], April 21, 1909; unsigned [Mulhall] to Mitchell Jordan, April 21, 1909; unsigned [Mulhall] to J. P. Bird, April 28, 1909; H. T. Bannon to M. M. Mulhall, April 29, 1909; M. M. Mulhall to Ferdinand [Schwedtman], May 5, 1909; George D. Selby to Martin M. Mulhall, May 6, 1909, all in *Maintenance Appendix*, 2818–23, 2825, 2837–38, 2841, 2856, 2857. See also “Selby Shoe Company” in State of Ohio, Board of Arbitration, *Seventeenth Annual Report to the Governor of the State of Ohio for the Year Ending December 31, 1909* (Columbus, OH: F. J. Heer Printing Company, 1911), 8–21. One of the Knights of Labor leaders later denied that the strike had been called off because of Mulhall’s activities but confirmed that Mulhall had strewn bribes about him and had claimed that the NAM would pay a $1,000 “donation” to the shoe workers’ relief fund if the strike was called off. C. A. Ackley to Senator [William] Hughes, n.d. [ca. July 1913], 63A-F15, box 98, Records of the United States Senate, Record Group 46, 57th–63rd Congresses, National Archives, Washington, DC. Hereafter cited as Senate Records, RG 46.


14. James Emery, the NAM’s chief counsel, spoke in twenty-four major cities in 1910, while President Kirby spoke in ten; a large portion of the venues were business organizations. Sarah Lyons Watts, *Order against Chaos: Business Culture and Labor Ideology in America, 1880–1915* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 146. For the term “revival meetings” (which Watts quotes as well), see J. Kirby Jr. to Ferdinand Schwedtman, April 23, 1909, *Maintenance Appendix*, 2829: “Am glad to hear of your successful revival meetings, which of course means converts.”

15. *American Industries*, October 1, 1903, 1; for a similar account of successful and united employer resistance, this one against the type founders, see *American Industries*, March 1, 1904, 3. For a story about a national organization, see the letter to the editor by Berkley R. Merwin, president of the National Association of Merchant Tailors, *American Industries*, September 1, 1903, 4.


18. See, for example, Pearson, *Reform or Repression*, 161–63. NAM annual meetings were also, of course, accompanied by the usual receptions and outings; for example, the
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20. *American Industries*, April 1, 1903, 3; *American Industries*, October 1, 1903, 1–2.


23. For instance, William McCarroll (a New York leather manufacturer and NAM vice president for New York from 1902 through 1905) emphasized that David Parry and his successor James Van Cleave had practically given their lives to the movement for the open shop. Seconding the views of McCarroll, John Kirby (NAM president from 1909 through 1913) underlined that he had never been interested in the NAM’s work at all until David Parry had turned the organization toward organized labor. Remarks of Mr. William McCarroll and remarks of Mr. John Kirby Jr., both in National Association of Manufacturers, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Convention*, New York City, May 17–19, 1920 (New York: Issued from the Secretary’s Office), 44–53.


31. Address by Mr. John Kirby Jr. at a meeting of the Citizens’ Industrial Association of St. Louis, printed in *The Exponent* 3, no. 2 (February 1906): 16.


35. Any issue of the NAM’s *American Industries* in the early twentieth century, especially between roughly 1903 and 1908, furnishes ample examples. There is some variation in the specifics. Some articles rejected all union demands as violations of the rights of the employer; see, for example, Thomas Shaw, “Fundamentals in Regard to Labor,” *American Industries*, March 1, 1904, 9. Others implied that workers had the right to form organizations to demand higher wages; see, for example, W. B. Flickinger, “How the Community Organization Restores the Industrial Equilibrium,” *American Industries*, November 1, 1904, 13, which stated that “if capital demands the right to combine and organize for the purpose of fixing the selling price of its product, then labor has the same right.” However, Flickinger thought that mostly unions should focus on such projects as “general moral uplifting by lecturers” and “encouragement of industry, of thrift, of sobriety.”

36. For a few examples, see the *American Industries* issues of March 15, 1903, October 15, 1903, and May 15, 1906. For funeral-related news items, see *American Industries*, March 2, 1903, 15; *American Industries*, August 1, 1903, 16; and *American Industries*, January 1, 1904, 16.


40. Examples abound in *American Industries*; for one article making this point along with many of the other standard ones, see H. T. Newcomb, “Some Recent Phases of the Labor Problem,” eight-page supplement, *American Industries*, October 1, 1904, 1.


42. President Parry’s annual address, NAM, *Proceedings* (1905), 46.

43. On southern white victimization narratives, see Ted Tunnell, “Creating ‘the Propaganda of History’: Southern Editors and the Origins of ‘Carpetbagger and Scalawag,’”


45. American Federationist 10, no. 3 (March 1903): 173; American Federationist 10, no. 4 (April 1903): 266–68; American Federationist 10, no. 5 (May 1903): 365. Although the dismissive attitude was likely partly posturing, the AFL’s initial unconcern is perhaps underlined by the fact that only after the 1903 convention did the Federationist get Parry’s initials right; the first two articles referred to him as “I. M. Parry.”


47. William English Walling, “Open Shops Mean the Destruction of the Unions” (reprinted from The Independent), American Industries, open-shop supplement, September 1, 1904, 7.


levels in other industries was not a simple question; indeed, the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission’s final report bleakly concluded that “it is impossible to be accurate in this matter.” Report to the President on the Anthracite Coal Strike, May–October 1902, S. Doc. No. 6, 58th Cong., special session, 1902, 49.


Chapter 2. The Deep History of the Closed or Union Shop


4. William Clerkin to John J. Kirby Jr., March 7, 1912, reprinted in “Two Actual Instances of the Failure of the Closed Shop,” Square Deal 10 (May 1912): 329–33. The sentiment was echoed by employers affiliated with the National Civic Federation, which was attempting to promote negotiations between organized labor and employers. For example, Charles L. Eidlitz of the Building Trades Employer Association of New York, who was involved in the NCF, used almost identical language to enshrine individual rights and condemn
union coercion: he insisted that it was no more right for the employer to ask about union membership than about “whether he is a Catholic or Protestant or a Republican or a Democrat or a Mason.” Eidlitz quoted in the New York Times, December 20, 1903, 5.

5. J. Maddison to R. M. Easley, September 23, 1903, box 6, folder 3, NCF Records.

6. See, for example, Shaw, “Fundamentals.”


9. Wilentz, Chants Democratic, 30–32, 50, 56–60. For an overview of the transition from artisan to wage work and the development of the labor movement in the nineteenth-century United States, see Laurie, Artisans into Workers.


17. For example, rather than imposing a universal closed-shop rule, Maryland cigarmakers in the 1850s required men who had worked in cities where an organization existed to be members of such organizations, while the 1858 annual convention of the glassblowers adopted a resolution forbidding members to work with anyone working below union scale. Stockton, The Closed Shop, 27–29.

18. For a discussion of the strength of such practices of secrecy, as well as of the depth of craft identity even in the late nineteenth century, see, for example, Bensman, The Practice of Solidarity, 44–45. Bensman notes that “the hatters’ exclusive fellowship was bounded by a wall of silence; hatters were sticklers for secrecy.”

20. The traditional powerful unit among hatters was the local, which attempted to control work practices in shops within a particular town. In the 1850s, in response to increasing interregional competition in the hat industry, the hatters created a national organization, the Hat Finishers’ National Trade Association. The new organization established by the silk hatters in the late 1860s was the Silk and Fur Hat Finishers’ National Association. Bensman, *The Practice of Solidarity*, 22–25.


28. Novak, *The People’s Welfare*, chapter 3, quote on 90; R. H. Britnell, “Forstall, Forestalling and the Statute of Forestallers,” *English Historical Review* 102, no. 402 (January 1987): 89–102. The assize of bread had deep roots in early medieval times and was a serious matter: the assize was adjusted (sometimes as often as weekly) according to the price of wheat, bailiffs regularly checked that it was being followed, and “infractions were
Note to Chapter 2

severely punished, offenders being fined, exposed upon the pillory, thrust into prison, or suspended from their occupation.” Alan S. C. Ross, “The Assize of Bread,” *Economic History Review* 9, no. 2 (1956): 334.


33. Forbath, “The Ambiguities of Free Labor.” I have used the formulation “his labor” since, though many women did in fact work for pay, the discourse of free labor definitely imagined the canonical free worker as male, and the freedom of contract was one badge of his difference from dependents like women or slaves.


35. William Graham Sumner, for instance, argued in this vein in his 1883 *What the Social Classes Owe Each Other*, equating subjection and claims to sustenance and insisting that “in escaping from subjection they [the former slaves] have lost their claims” but obviously are the better off for it. Quoted in Jonathan Levy, *Freaks of Fortune: The Emerging World of Capitalism and Risk in America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 193.
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94. As Van Cleave explained to John Kirby, Cushing was not suitable for work with multiple organizations, because he had a tendency to “consider his judgment superior to the judgment” of everyone else combined. Kirby agreed, replying that “I feel just as you do about Mr. Cushing and am awful sorry that he possesses such a strong disposition to over-ride everybody but Marshall Cushing.” President [Van Cleave] to John Kirby Jr., June 22, 1907; J. Kirby Jr. to James W. Van Cleave, June 25, 1907 (emphasis in original), both in Maintenance Appendix, 982–85, 990–91. On support for Cushing within the NAM and the broader open-shop movement, see Unsigned [D. A. Tompkins] to Marshall Cushing, September 13, 1907; Marshall Cushing to D. A. Tompkins, September 17, 1907; Richard C. Jenkinson to D. A. Tompkins, September 20, 1907; all in reel 8, Tompkins Papers. See also O. P. Briggs to J. Kirby Jr., June 15, 1907, Maintenance Appendix, 972–973. See also Wiebe, Businessmen and Reform, 26, 28–29.

95. As one NAM officer put it, Emery was an excellent lobbyist for the new multior- ganization Council, since “he is a splendid mixer; can always get an audience with the biggest of men; is thoroughly posted on the labor situation; can make a splendid address at any time and place, and above all I believe he is absolutely sincere and loyal to the cause in which he is engaged.” Unsigned [Schwedtman?] to O. P. Briggs, June 19, 1907. Maintenance Appendix, 977–78. On Emery’s appointment and the NAM’s resources being places at his disposal, see President [Van Cleave] to E. Lawrence Fell, November 28, 1907; Ferd. C. Schwedtman to James A. Emery, December 2, 1907; J. W. Van Cleave to F. C. Schwedtman, December 19, 1907; all in Maintenance Appendix, 1166–67, 1179, 1224–25. On Emery and Davenport, see Ernst, Lawyers against Labor, 53.

96. J. P. Bird to Henry B. Joy, April 2, 1910, Maintenance Appendix, 3525. The usual subscription amount was $500 or $1,000 ($100 in 1910 is equivalent to about $2,800 in 2020 dollars). It is not clear how many organizations or companies contributed. In mid-1908, when the council had been semioperative for a year, NAM officials still complained that “most of these organizations are paying nothing toward the maintenance of the Association’s funds” by making council contributions. Secretary to the President [Schwedtman] to J. M. McKinley, June 13, 1908, Maintenance Appendix, 1719–21; Williamson, “Seven Ways.”

98. See, for example, testimony of J. P. Bird and testimony of Martin M. Mulhall, and in particular testimony of James A. Emery, which is almost in its entirety taken up with the senators’ efforts to get a handle on the various organizations and the relationships between them; after some fifty pages, Senator Reed bursts out: “Who was the dominating figure [at the council meetings]? Who really ran the thing? Whose was the final word?” All in *Maintenance Hearings*, 2736–43, 3265–66, 3707–69, Reed quoted on 3760.


102. H.R. Committee of Labor (table); H.R. Committee on the Judiciary (table); “Rough suggestions for candidates and campaign managers” (memo), n.d. (1906?), all in *Maintenance Appendix*, 563–65.


107. State legislatures chose senators before the ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment in 1913. It may be that the NAM’s campaign against prolabor Republicans in Mary-
land had contributed to delivering the state election to Democrats in 1903, but that was probably not the NAM’s aim; it had apparently hoped to strengthen the opponents of the pro-McComas and prolabor factions of the Republican Party. The documentary record on the NAM involvement in the 1903 campaign is not as strong as it might be; overall, the documentation from the first couple of years of the NAM’s campaigning is sparser than for later periods. The strongest evidence indicating NAM involvement in the primaries is an unsigned letter dated September 2, 1903, to “My Dear C” (probably Cushing) whose writer reports a conversation with “our friend D, the assistant to Senator McComas,” in which “D” lamented that “a lot of the manufacturers in [McComas’s] district are fighting him tooth and nail all on account of the 8-hour bill” and that “Parry, the president of the National Association of Manufacturers, is putting both time and money into the fight.” Maintenance Appendix, 105. Also, Mulhall’s testimony in Congress indicates that he supported the anti-McComas faction of the Maryland Republicans in the 1903 primaries, and he later boasted that his Workingmen’s Protective Association had been involved in that fight; Cushing’s close correspondent James A. Gary was instrumental in opposing the McComas organization in those elections. In addition, Daniel A. Tompkins, who sat on the NAM board of directors and was an active member, later stated that he thought “the association had some influence in electing McComas to stay at home.” Tompkins to Van Cleave, February 19, 1908, Maintenance Appendix, 1378. However, there are also some holes and contradictions in the evidence: there are no letters between Cushing and Mulhall clearly verifying any activity by Mulhall in the primaries, for instance, while there is a letter by officials of the Workingmen’s Protective Association dated in the summer of 1903 and supporting McComas. See testimony of Martin Michael Mulhall, Maintenance Hearings, 2451; New York Times, May 30, 1903, 1; Edwin T. Booth and Louis T. Parsano, Workingmen’s Protective Association, to the officers and members of the Iron Molders’ Union of North America, Local 409, July 12, 1903; and Martin M. Mulhall to Ferdinand C. Schwedtman, February 23, 1908, both in Maintenance Appendix, 102–3, 1384–86.

108. Greene, “Dinner-Pail Politics.”

109. The NAM’s campaign for Littlefield took most of the summer of 1906, beginning with a week-long visit from NAM secretary Marshall Cushing to ensure Littlefield’s selection in the June primaries and concluding with Mulhall’s efforts on location in August and September, which included recruiting a couple of dozen workingmen to organize political support in Rockland and in the countryside and sowing discord among union workers in Maine. Some of the details of the efforts are recounted in the testimony not only of Mulhall but also of Samuel Gompers, who was in the area campaigning against Littlefield (e.g., the distribution of free whiskey, though it is unclear in Gompers’s testimony if the whiskey was supposed to be an enticement to vote for Littlefield or a hindrance to voting). The money for the pro-Littlefield efforts came, it seems, mainly from the NAM, which in turn raised it from New England manufacturers. How much was spent is impossible to ascertain; Mulhall later claimed that the manufacturers spent some $40,000 for Littlefield (nearly $1.2 million in 2020 dollars), but he was always prone to exaggeration. Still, even if the sum spent was only half that, it would have been impressive: for example, the AFL’s political budget for the whole election season totaled less than $10,000 (even if its member unions carried some costs independently), and according to Samuel Gompers, the AFL spent a total of only $1,500 on the Littlefield campaign. Testimony of Martin Michael Mulhall,
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Maintenance Hearings, 2586, 2590; Greene, Pure and Simple Politics, 115–17; testimony of Mr. Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, US Congress, House, Select Committee Appointed under H. Res. 98, Hearings on the Charges against Members of the House and Lobby Activities of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States and Others, 63rd Cong., 1st sess., July 12–August 18, 1913, 2505, 2414; Williamson, “Seven Ways.” Other electoral campaigns in these years in which the NAM was involved included supporting House Judiciary committee chairman John Jenkins, first supporting and then opposing House Labor Committee chairman John Gardner, and a failed bid to elect the longtime NAM ally James E. Watson as governor of Indiana; on the last especially, see Greene, Pure and Simple Politics, 202–10; and Greene, “Dinner-Pail Politics.”

110. Unsigned to Herman S. Hastings, March 29, 1911; M. M. M. [Mulhall] to J. P. Bird, April 4, 1911; James Emery to John Kirby Jr., April 26, 1912, all in Maintenance Appendix, 3826–27, 3830–31, 4059–62. On the NAM’s explicit recruiting in the South, see also the remarks of John Temple Graves urging the NAM to make Atlanta the location of its 1905 national convention: “The Association needs to enlarge its membership, to increase its influence throughout the Republic. . . . The North is already splendidly organized, and through the work of this Association northern Congressmen are brought into harmony with the wishes of the Association. The South is yet unorganized, or incomplete in its organization, and southern Congress men have been found standing sometimes as an obstacle to the industrial legislation which you desire.” NAM, Proceedings (1904), 245–46. (The next year’s annual meeting was indeed held in Atlanta.)

111. Chairman [Schwedtman] to J. P. Bird, April 7, 1913, Maintenance Appendix, 4150–51.


115. Philip Burch reports that the NAM “placed no representatives in high federal posts” during the administrations of Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft. Elites in American History, 200n158. See also, for example, the NAM’s plan to get James Watson, a close ally in Congress, appointed in Taft’s cabinet and its abandoning of that effort as hopeless: Ferdinand C. Schwedtman to M. M. Mulhall, December 26, 1908; unsigned to Ferdinand C. Schwedtman, December 31, 1908; unsigned to Ferdinand C. Schwedtman, January 12, 1909; and Ferdinand C. Schwedtman to M. M. Mulhall, January 16, 1909, all in Maintenance Appendix, 2477, 2480–81, 2503–5, 2524–27.


Chapter 7. The Battle over Public Opinion

1. The Wageworker, November 24, 1905, 1. On the epigraph: This quip is attributed to Yogi Berra (the famous baseball commentator Lawrence Peter Berra) in several online quote collections and newspaper articles discussing his famous quotes; I have not seen it attributed to anyone else, but neither does a reliable source for the quotation seem to

2. The Wageworker, October 20, 1905, 5. The Wageworker, whose tagline was "A Newspaper with a Mission and without a Muzzle that is published in the interests of Wageworkers Everywhere," was run by Will M. Maupin, a member of the International Typographical Union, the union of the striking printers. "About The Wageworker," Chroniling America, accessed December 7, 2020, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn86063459/. Holdom was infamously antunion, and in the elections of the previous year, the Chicago unions had tried to oust him from his position. See the Chicago Daily Tribune, May 16, 1904, 5. The printers' strike is discussed more extensively in chapter 5.


4. Los Angeles Times, November 6, 1905, 1.

5. The quote is from Holdom's decision. As was common at the time, many newspapers did not identify the AP as the source of the story; one that did was the Los Angeles Herald, October 18, 1905, 1.


7. This continued to be the case long into the twentieth century, as, for example, Jack Metzgar points out in his discussion of the 1959 steel strike and the ways in which steel industry towns rallied around the workers, who of course were the indispensable patrons of all the local businesses. Striking Steel: Solidarity Remembered (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000).

8. The source for numbers of papers is metadata compiled from the OCLC (Online Computer Library Center) WorldCat database, accessed through the US Newspaper Directory at https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/search/titles/. For the early 2000s, see Penelope Muse Abernathy, "The Expanding News Desert," Center for Innovation and Sustainability in Local Media, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2018, https://www.cisml.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/The-Expanding-News-Desert-10_14-Web.pdf. On capital requirements: in one issue of the Western Publisher, a trade paper serving country weeklies, the classified section contained advertisements ranging from a Minnesota paper and job office for $500, to a North Dakota paper and job plant for $1,200, and "one of the best equipped and best paying newspapers in central Texas" for $7,500. Western Publisher 3 (June 1904): 56. In 2020 dollars, $500 in 1904 would be about $15,000, and $7,500 would be about $225,000. Williamson, "Seven Ways."


10. The Taney County Republican and the Ripley County Democrat were both published in Missouri; more information about them is available at "About the Taney County Republican," Chroniciling America, accessed August 15, 2020, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn89067390/; “About the Ripley County Democrat,” Chroniciling America,
cover of the Forest City Press with the motto, see, for example, the November 12, 1903 issue,

11. See “Labor and Radical Press History and Geography,” Mapping American Social
tro.shtml for visualizations of data on socialist, anarchist, and different kinds of labor
publications.

Criticism: New Perspectives in U.S. Communication History, ed. William S. Solomon and
Robert W. McChesney (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 151–75.

13. Labor temples and union halls were, of course, also in themselves public messages,
conveying the “substance and solidarity” of unions. Stephen McFarland, “‘With the Class-
Conscious Workers under One Roof’: Union Halls and Labor Temples in American
Working-Class Formation, 1880–1970” (PhD diss., City University of New York, 2014),
49, 56.

14. Jon Bekken, “‘This Paper Is Owned by Many Thousands of Workingmen and
Women’: Contradictions of a Socialist Daily,” American Journalism 10, no. 1/2 (Winter–

15. Sometimes these were centrally distributed and appeared in identical form in mul-
tiple papers; at other times the paper itself gathered them from several sources for printing
in its own paper. For some examples, see, for example, the Indianapolis Journal, November
29, 1903, part 3, 10; San Francisco Call, November 15, 1906, 9; Palestine Daily Herald, June
18, 1904, 3 (and the identical Labor and Industry column printed in the Kansas Agitator,
June 10, 1903, 2—this was probably distributed through readyprint; see below).

16. See, for example, “Perverting and Suppressing Union News,” editorial, American
Federationist 18, no. 7 (July 1911): 538–40. See also Bekken, “The Working-Class Press.”

17. For consistency, the mainstream papers were selected to represent the same states
as the labor papers (unfortunately, limitations posed by what has been digitized made it
impossible to select papers from the same towns).

18. This is a very bare-bones explanation, of course. For a more detailed examination
of the methodology, see https://github.com/vhulden/bossesunion/, which contains all the
data and scripts along with an extensive discussion of word embeddings and tables of the
similarity measures and context and similar words for a set of key terms like “socialism,”
“strikers,” and so on. The analysis here uses the SVD PPMI method, which draws on ideas
first introduced in Hinrich Schütze, “Dimensions of Meaning,” in Proceedings of Super-
computing’ 92 (Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press, 1992), 787–96. See also Omer Levy, Yoav
Goldberg, and Ido Dagan, “Improving Distributional Similarity with Lessons Learned
from Word Embeddings,” Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics
3 (2015): 211–25; and Omer Levy and Yoav Goldberg, “Neural Word Embedding as Im-
plicit Matrix Factorization,” in Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural
2177–85.

19. New York Times, September 9, 1910, 9. Since the text is not preprocessed to join
multiword expressions like “New York City,” the context words do not contain “New
York City” as such but rather the individual components; still, it seems clear enough that
“New York” and/or “New York City” appear frequently. The list of main context words is “banker, york, city, new, prominent, business, chicago, dead, man, died, estate, george, home, known, real, son, john, late.”


21. That is, the basic idea is that words that occur in the same texts repeatedly (say, *ball* and *pitcher* and *bat* and *diamond*) are likely to end up forming a topic. A topic is then represented by a list of words particularly characteristic of that topic. Note that texts are not classified into topics; each text contains multiple topics of different weights. Topic modeling was here performed with MALLET: Andrew Kachites McCallum, “MALLET: A Machine Learning for Language Toolkit,” 2002, http://mallet.cs.umass.edu. The topic model selected has 150 topics. For reader-friendly explanations of topic modeling, see, for example, Matthew Jockers, “The LDA Buffet Is Now Open; or, Latent Dirichlet Allocation for English Majors,” September 29, 2011, http://www.matthewjockers.net/2011/09/29/the-lda-buffet-is-now-open-or-latent-dirichlet-allocation-for-english-majors/; Shawn Graham, Scott Weingart, and Ian Milligan, “Getting Started with Topic Modeling and MALLET,” Programming Historian, September 2, 2012, https://programminghistorian.org/en/lessons/topic-modeling-and-mallet. For a fuller discussion of how the method was used here, see https://github.com/vhulden/bossesunion.

22. As is always the case in examining topics produced by a topic modeling algorithm, one needs to go back and forth between the stories in which the topic is prominent and the topic modeler’s output to make sense of the meaning of the topic. The list of words most prominently associated with this analysis and principles topic is “people men man great country life good public law power world government american time true things fact human free political.”


25. The figure showing the least prominent topics is simply the reverse of the most prominent ones, that is, the topics whose average “weight” in the labor material was lowest. The figure showing the least characteristic topics shows the labor topics that get the lowest score when the average weight of a topic in the nonlabor material is subtracted from the labor material. Thus, topics that are prominent in labor material but not in mainstream material would have a significantly higher number than those that were prominent in both the labor material and the mainstream material. Technically, this could mean that a topic that does not form a very large volume of labor material would emerge as nevertheless fairly characteristic of that material if it almost never appears in the mainstream material. However, looking at only nonprominent topics may skew the analysis by showing only topics that overall happened to be very small in any kind of material, which may be due more to the algorithm than to the topic. I have calculated both versions for top topics as well, but the results of the characteristic-topics analysis are similar enough to the prominent-topics one that I have only included the simpler analysis.


28. On labor’s later publicity efforts, see Fones-Wolf, *Selling Free Enterprise*.


30. The campaign was to “cover the labor problem, tariff revision, merchant marine and such kindred subjects as may be made a part of the policy of the association.” Atherton Brownell to J. W. Van Cleave, May 25, 1907, *Maintenance Appendix*, 957–60.

31. Readyprint also went by the name of “patent insides,” though in fact it was apparently equally common for the outside of the printing paper to be reprinted as for the inside.

32. See, for example, the query from the *Glenville Progress* of Minnesota about content: “Would you print a goodly sprinkling of Minnesota news and of the Northwest . . . and will your insides be free of whisky ads. I want a clean sheet.” A. G. Morgan to Publishers’ Newspaper Union, June 12, 1906, reprinted in US Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, *Trust Legislation, Hearings, Parts 1–3*, Western Newspaper Union, 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., June 11, July 8, 10, 12, 1912, serial no. 8, 1912, 271.


36. The price for reading notices in the 1900 Kellogg’s list was about 1.7 times the price of display ads. *Kellogg’s Lists: 1919 Family Newspapers of the Better Class* (Chicago: A. N. Kellogg Newspaper Company, 1900).

37. The Kellogg’s list for 1900, for instance, was divided into nine different lists, mainly covering the Midwest and South. The price for display advertising in the full list of 1,919 papers was $1.25 per agate line (basically one line of ordinary type of the width of one column), or the advertiser could choose individual lists, ranging from the smallest at fifty cents per line to the largest at two dollars per line—though “liberal discounts graded according to amount of order” were available; see *Kellogg’s Lists*. For reference, $1.00 in 1900 equals $31.80 in 2020 dollars using the consumer price index (Williamson, “Seven Ways”). Historians of journalism note that reading notices were “ubiquitous” in the late nineteenth century; see Linda Lawson, “Advertisements Masquerading as News in Turn-of-the-Century American Periodicals,” *American Journalism* 5, no. 2 (April 1988): 81–96. In 1917, however, Courtland Smith of the American Press Association (a readyprint and boilerplate supplier) claimed that “there are not many reading notices run” (US Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, *Trust Legislation, Hearings*, Western Newspaper Union, 23).


39. William Kittle, “The Making of Public Opinion,” The Arena 41, no. 232 (July 1909): 433 ff. The quote, according to the article, is from a letter written by a Mr. Grant of the bureau to the president of the Oconee Telephone Company.


41. American Industries, March 16, 1903; American Industries, May 15, 1906; American Industries, October 15, 1903. The short items were often reprinted from regional newspapers; one wonders if the same strategy applied here as in the case of Hendrick’s magazine article, below, that is, whether some of these news items had originally been placed in the newspapers by the NAM itself.

42. Atherton Brownell to Ferdinand C. Schwedtman, October 10, 1907, Maintenance Appendix, 1071; Williamson, “Seven Ways.”

43. Henry Harrison Lewis, “The Peril of Anti-injunction Legislation,” North American Review 188, no. 635 (October 1908): 577–83. Author searches using the names of the major Century Syndicate employees and partners were run through the Readers’ Guide Retrospective database (EBSCOHost), which indexes a significant number of major magazines from the early twentieth century, as well as through the ProQuest databases American Periodicals Series Online and American Periodicals from the Center of Research Libraries; these index both general-interest periodicals and trade and labor publications. The names of the syndicate personnel are from Atherton Brownell to James W. Van Cleave, August 22, 1907; President [Van Cleave] to Charles A. Becker, November 29, 1907; H. H. Lewis to Ferdinand C. Schwedtman, August 19, 1908, all in Maintenance Appendix, 1034–35, 1169–72, 1909. Note that the original searches were done in about 2010; however, test searches in November 2021 show that results for Readers’ Guide Retrospective remain the same. The two ProQuest databases have since been combined into a single American Periodicals database (see https://www.proquest.com/americanperiodicals/productfulldescdetail/advanced), but its contents do not appear to have changed, as indicated by test searches in 2021.

44. The article in question was Burton J. Hendrick, “Battle against the Sherman Law,” McClure’s Magazine 31 (October 1908): 665–80, for which the association’s offices and allies had, according to the NAM’s Ferdinand Schwedtman, supplied “much of the information.” A similar article on the tariff question was considered though apparently not published. Secretary to the President [Ferdinand C. Schwedtman] to H. H. Lewis, October 7, 1908; and Secretary to the President [Schwedtman] to H. E. Miles, October 20, 1908, both in Maintenance Appendix, 2153–54, 2245–46.

45. The quote is from Secretary [George S. Boudinot] to Charles M. Harvey, September 30, 1909, Maintenance Appendix, 3177. According to Marshall Cushing, Sleicher was “a great friend” of David M. Parry, the association’s president from 1903 to 1905, while Ferdinand Schwedtman noted that Sleicher “has always had a warm regard for Mr. Van Cleave,” NAM president from 1906 to 1908. See Secretary [Cushing] to F. C. Nunemacher, September 21, 1905; Secretary to the President [Schwedtman] to James A. Emery, October 29, 1908, Maintenance Appendix, 511, 2303–5. On the probability of Van Cleave having written the NAM-praising editorial, see the same letter from Schwedtman to Emery; for the editorial itself, see “Editorial from Leslie’s Weekly of October 29, [1908],” reprinted in
Maintenance Appendix, 2410. On a different editorial apparently being written or edited by the NAM, see John A. Sleicher to [Charles M.] Harvey, July 28, 1909, Maintenance Appendix, 3039–40. Regarding Van Cleave’s article, see Leslie’s Weekly to James W. Van Cleave, July 2, 1908, Maintenance Appendix, 1794. Other magazines that are mentioned in the NAM correspondence as favorably (though not necessarily uncritically) inclined toward the association included Van Norden’s and Success; see Ferdinand C. Schwedtman to James W. Van Cleave, November 20, 1907; H. E. Miles to H. H. Lewis, April 3, 1908; Secretary to the President [Schwedtman] to Charles M. Harvey, August 18, 1908, all in Maintenance Appendix, 1151–53, 1506–7, 1904–5.

46. Jack R. Hart, “Horatio Alger in the Newsroom: Social Origins of American Editors,” Journalism Quarterly 53 (March 1976): 16. Daniel A. Tompkins, a longtime member of the NAM’s board of directors, was publisher of the Daily Charlotte Observer, the Charlotte Evening Chronicle, and the Greenville News. Stephen Goldfarb, “Tompkins, Daniel Augustus,” American National Biography Online (Oxford University Press, February 2000), http://www.anb.org/articles/10/10-01655.html. In addition to Sleicher, Van Cleave was also friends with his hometown editor, Charles M. Harvey of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat (the largest daily in St. Louis and, despite its name, Republican in affiliation). Harvey routinely received payment from the NAM for writing speeches and articles for Van Cleave, as well as editorials for American Industries, but the NAM adamantly denied that it had ever paid Harvey for an article published in the general press over Harvey’s name. See, for example, Secretary to the President [Schwedtman] to Charles M. Harvey, April 8, 1908, and June 14, 1909, Maintenance Appendix, 1530–31, 2920. For the denial of any stealth in Harvey’s writings, see testimony of Ferdinand C. Schwedtman, Maintenance Hearings, 4426–29. Although the statements of Marshall Cushing and Atherton Brownell, cited above, clearly show that the NAM had few scruples in general about leaving the reader in ignorance of the source of news and magazine stories, there is no evidence that Harvey ever wrote anything in magazines on the NAM’s behalf. Nor does a search of the Readers’ Guide Retrospective database reveal any articles by Harvey on industrial topics; he published extensively, but mostly on topics related to westward expansion and the development of the American West. The data on the Globe’s circulation and political affiliation are from Edward P. Remington, Edward P. Remington’s Annual Newspaper Directory: A List of All Newspapers and Other Periodical Publications in the United States and Canada, 20th issue (Pittsburgh, PA: Edward P. Remington, Newspaper Advertising, 1907), 156.

47. Los Angeles Times, December 20, 1907.

48. Although the correspondence does not mention this incident, its timing during the fall of 1907 would imply that it was designed by the Century Syndicate. In any case, placing this story would not have been difficult: Harrison Gray Otis, the owner of the Los Angeles Times, was a vehement antiunion employer and an NAM ally. On Otis, see, for example, Grace H. Stimson, Rise of the Labor Movement in Los Angeles (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955).

Schwedtman is nearly certainly referring to this incident when he writes, “If it had not been for Mr. Van Cleave’s presence of mind we would have at one time last year given the American Federation of Labor and the sensational press opportunity for a full page headline which would have been anything but creditable to the National Association of Manufacturers.”

50. On strikebreaking, see Pearson, Reform or Repression, 77; for similar organizations in Great Britain, see Saluppo, “Strikebreaking.”

51. The quotes are from the Warren Sheaf, November 27, 1902, 2, reporting on circulars sent out by a James W. Bellinger of New York, identified as a clerk secretary of a proposed association called the National Association of Independent Workmen of America. The headline of the story is “An Anti-Union Union.”


53. The organization’s practical handling was done by one Charles Harriman, a former unionist now in charge of the labor portion of the pro-Littlefield campaign. Testimony of Martin M. Mulhall, September 3, 1913, Hearings on the Charges against Members of the House and Lobby Activities of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States and Others, 1856, 1860. The Labor League later sent Mulhall a letter of thanks for “your time and money that you have spent so lavishly on our behalf.” C. A. Harriman, J. W. McDonald, and K. K. Ward to M. M. Mulhall, September 11, 1906, reprinted in Hearings on the Charges, 1953.


55. See, for example, H. E. Miles to F. C. Schwedtman, December 31, 1907; J. P. Bird to F. C. Schwedtman, August 14, 1908; George S. Boudinot to F. C. Schwedtman, September 18, 1908, all in Maintenance Appendix, 1244, 1883–84, 2067–68.


58. American Industries, January 15, 1903, 8, emphasis in original. The NAM also made its wishes known to newspaper editors centrally on occasion, such as sending a circular that aimed to highlight the viewpoints of employing printers in the 1906 Typographical Union strike, in which it pointed out that the employing printers were supported by “the manufacturers of the country, many of them advertisers and friends of yours.” Secretary [Marshall Cushing] to Dear Mr.—, September 23, 1905 (form letter noting that it was sent to 225 members of the American Newspaper Publishers’ Association), reel 2, Tompkins Papers. The same letter was also sent to 2,500 daily newspapers, dated October 7.


62. Unsigned [F. G. R. Gordon] to C. C. Lula, April 22, 1915. For responses, see, for example, Lee Tire & Rubber Company to F. G. R. Gordon, April 29, 1915 (stating that the magazine was read by people who bought cars, and its circulation was growing) and Vice President of Chalmers Motor Company to F. G. R. Gordon, April 30, 1915 (stating that no “advertiser has the right to dictate to a magazine anything in connection with their editorial policy”—and the magazine’s readers could afford cars). All in box 187, folder 5, NCF Records.

63. On responses more inclined to use advertising power, see, for example, Beech Nut Packing Company to F. G. R. Gordon, April 29, 1915, box 187, folder 5, NCF Records.


66. A search for the names of presidents David M. Parry, James W. Van Cleave, and John Kirby, as well as the names of Marshall Cushing (NAM secretary 1903–6) and George S. Boudinot (NAM secretary after 1907) in the Readers’ Guide Retrospective for 1900–1915 yields a total of only eight articles: seven were published in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* and one in the *Engineering Record*; none were published in the popular press proper. A search with the keyword “national association of manufacturers” yielded only eight hits, seven of which had to do with the rather inglorious topic of a major congressional investigation into whether the association had engaged in illicit lobbying practices.


69. Professional ad men, in fact, used phrases very similar to Emery’s: as one noted, “It is not by his own taste, but rather by the taste of the fish, that the angler determines his
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