The bodies are now being brought to Trinidad."

And in the succeding days, always on an inside page and never as much as a column in length, "The Boston Post" unfolded the story of the Ludlow Massacre and its immediate aftermath while devoting the majority of its news space to the "glorious" vindication of Mexico's insult to the American flag. In fact "The Boston Post" editor seemed upset at Colorado state officials for appealing to President Wilson for federal troops. "A Great Pity," he cried in an editorial on April 24. "Can't Colorado handle the situation without calling on Federal forces who are busy with Mexico?"

BACKGROUND TO MASSACRE

The strike against the Rockefeller-dominated Colorado Fuel and Iron Co. was instituted on September 23, 1913, by the United Mine Workers which had been recruiting members among the mountain tent colonies for some time past. Nine thousand men left the mines and on October 13, they left the Company houses and established tent colonies. The issue was primarily one of Union recognition — a union shop — which the Company insisted meant a closed shop and vowed to resist at all costs. There were other demands, such as the eight-hour day, monthly pay checks, weighmen selected by the workers, regulation of company stores, the right to trade at non-company stores, and a ten per cent wage increase.* The Company refused flatly to recognize the existence of the relatively mild-mannered United Mine Workers Union and a bitter and sporadic war developed between miners, armed by the Union, and units of the Colorado state militia, much of which was actually a Rockefeller private army. In the words of State Senator Mrs. Helen Ring Robinson of Colorado:

"Two companies of 'militia' were 'recruited exclusively from mine guards, gunmen in the pay of the Companies and others of the same ilk.'" ("The Independent," Monday, May 11, 1914.)

The Rockefeller gunmen, unlike the armed union miners, operated under the cloak of State authority and the Rockefeller management stoutly insisted that, aside from a relative handful of trouble makers, the miners were loyal to the Company and had no grievances.

On April 21st, shooting took place between militia and miners at the Ludlow tent colony, militiamen set fire to the tents, and the wives and children of striking miners who had burrowed into a pit to escape the bullets were roasted alive.

THE PLAN

After the horror of Ludlow, the strikers were not disposed to seek peace and, on April 30, President Wilson finally sent six troops of cavalry to the scene, declaring a "State of Insurrection." By this time a wave of anti-Rockefeller sentiment was sweeping the country and the Government in Washington set up a Commission on Industrial Relations

* For the record: One of the most important factors contributing to miner unrest and dissatisfaction was the more-or-less disregard by the companies of safety rules and devices. The accident rate was high and when investigations did take place the rulings were invariably favorable to the companies. In an article by Henry A. Atkinson entitled "Why The Miners Struck" in Harpers Weekly for May 23, 1914, the following assertions are made:

"When men are injured in the mines it is very rare that they receive any substantial help, and if they are killed their families are left destitute."

The same article quoted Judge Ben Lindsey (a liberal Colorado judge) as stating that he had found 622 children had been left orphans in the years since 1910 because of mine accidents.

Another interesting point made by Mr. Atkinson in his Harpers article was his description of the hiring policies of the mining companies. They preferred the workers newly arrived from southern Europe and were charged by the Labor Department with this preference "because they can be handled and abused with impunity."

which took testimony from prominent executives including John D. Rockefeller, Jr., himself. Not that the great man was without feelings for his workers. The Ludlow Massacre seemed to arouse in him a desire to investigate and do something about the situation that was bringing such terrible violence and such a reaction against the Rockefellers. And so he persuaded his good friend Mr. William Lyon MacKenzie King of Canada to go to the front, research the problem, and suggest a solution. Mr. King proved to be the answer to a tycoon's prayer.

Having served as Minister of Labor in the Canadian Government, W.L.M. King was in a position to understand labor problems — particularly as they related to preserving harmony with the exploiters. So Labor's champion, Mr. King, went to Colorado to analyze the situation. Shortly afterward his solution was offered in a six-page letter to his friend and employer, the gist being the establishment of "a Board on which both employers and employed are represented, and before which at stated intervals questions affecting conditions of employment can be discussed and grievances examined." In plain English, Mr. King advocated a Company Union, a logical answer in an industry where there already existed Company towns, Company stores, Company churches and Company reverends. The thought that employees might feel free to bargain without fear with representatives of the employers could possibly not have occurred to Mr. King though it is unlikely that such a vagrant thought would have influenced him. The King plan was ultimately instituted in the Rockefeller industries under the name of the Colorado Plan or the "Rockefeller Plan," and company unions, in fact, spread to some extent throughout America in the ensuing years.

In December, 1914, the miners voted to end the strike against the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., subsequently voted overwhelmingly for Mr. Rockefeller's Company Union, and it can be said that Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. King (destined to become Prime Minister of Canada for a record number of years) lived happily ever after, even if the miners didn't.

HARMO

ANSWER TO CRITIC

ARMS vs. FRANCHISE

In a treatise running to some 1000 words, S.A.K., of Cambridge, Mass., takes us to task for advocating that "the proletariat vote itself into power simply by amassing a numerical majority at the polling places of bourgeoisie democracy..., entirely through the instrument of universal suffrage without any recourse to armed defense squads of workers or other agents of the soon-to-be-victorious proletariat." He begins his refutation with passing references to Daniel DeLeon and to V. I. Lenin in assertions which flatly contradict our viewpoint on socialist revolution. He follows these references with quotations from F. Engels in his *Origin Of The Family, Private Property And The State,* statements which have to do with the origin of the state, its function, and the role of universal suffrage. Finally, S.A.K. cites historical instances such as the Paris Commune (1871), the Bolshevik Revolution (1917), the Fascist rise to power in Italy (1922), the Nazi triumph in Germany (1933) and the Spanish Civil War (1936-40) as living illustrations of the inadequacy of the WSP position on socialist revolution.

(1). The works of Lenin and DeLeon will not be found advertised in our literature list. This is not because of their disagreement with the attitude of the World Socialist Party and its Companion Parties; we do offer certain works by Karl Kautsky, by Peter Kropotkin, and by others who cannot be regarded as in sympathy