

adilly tube. In the restaurants a similar development has been going on. Recently a couple of lunchrooms were opened on Fifth Avenue whose scheme of decoration has retained the fine congruity with the machinery of cooking and service that marks a genuine style, and at the same time has a mellowness and a refinement which brings a grateful relief from the jangling whiteness of the earlier regime. These new restaurants are as good, on their scale, as the trainhall of the Pennsylvania Station in New York, and they are good in the same way—they perform a necessary purpose with urbanity, distinction and grace. In them the modern style has reached a mature development through which the logic of the machine is reconciled with the decent aesthetic requirements of humanity.

How is it that the modern style has been so slow to realize itself—is still so timid, so partial, so inadequate? Is its crudity not due to the fact that our architects have thought that true art lay elsewhere, in Greek temples and Roman baths and Adam residences and what not, and so they have not given the lunchroom and the subway station the degree of passionate attention which would make them perfect in design as well as in execution? This "division in the records of the mind" accounts, I believe, for the peculiar barrenness and frigidity of the early machine style: its vices were due not to the presence of machine work but to the absence of a vivifying human imagination.

Up to the present the machine style has fallen short of its possibilities largely for two reasons. In the early part of the industrial period the designer attempted to qualify the mechanical rigidity of his materials by introducing forms which were antipathetic to the functions which they performed. The iron cornucopias and flowers that Ruskin railed at, for example, typify this weak attempt to mollify the machine; and the flowery decorations that one can still see on some old model of the typewriter arose out of the same pathetic fallacy. The second reason for its frustration was that when the designer paid due attention to mechanical efficiency, he neglected to carry out those final developments of form and material which—so far from being vague excrescences, like ferrous foliage—were essential to their human enjoyment beyond the mean requirements of use.

To create designs which will respect the logic of the machine and at the same time have regard for the vagaries of human psychology is the problem whose solution will give us a satisfactory, genuine modern style. We have yet to see what humane fulfillments the machine may bring about when we finally come to grips with it, and neither allow ourselves to be overridden by a crude and boisterous utilitarianism nor turn a repugnant, ineffectual face completely away from the instrument which promises—at least promises!—to liberate the community.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

Women Workers and the A. F. of L.

THE woman question appeared at the 1921 convention of the American Federation of Labor in a resolution to amend the constitution of the Federation to secure to women opportunity for union membership on the same terms as men. The convention answered the question by a substitute resolution which leaves the women's case where it was before, in the hands of the national and international unions. Last February a conference of representatives of the A. F. of L. and of these unions put at the top of a list of rights which it called on the public to recognize and support, "the right of the working-people of the United States to organize into trade unions," and appended their names to it with the statement: "To the above declaration and appeal we pledge ourselves and those whom we represent."

Among those who made this appeal and pledge are the President and another representative of the

International Molders' Union, and the President and the Secretary-Treasurer of the Journeymen Barbers' International Union, both of which unions expressly exclude women from membership. The names of Samuel Gompers and all the other members of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. appear as representing the Federation and pledging it to "the right of the working-people of the United States to organize into trade unions." Yet, a few weeks later Secretary Frank Morrison wrote in answer to an inquiry: "The American Federation of Labor would have authority to issue charters to women members of a trade only where such course would be authorized by the international organization having jurisdiction."

An example of how this works is that when the women barbers of Seattle, denied membership in the Barbers' Union, asked the A. F. of L. for a

separate charter, it was refused, because the Barbers' Union objected.

Either the A. F. of L. and its affiliated organizations do not recognize and support the right of the working people of the United States to organize, or they do not recognize women as people. The second assertion contains the most truth. The stock defence of the A. F. of L. for not living up to its "stand," and its "declarations" in favor of "organizing all the workers, regardless of sex," is, "The A. F. of L. cannot dictate to the internationals." In this matter, "the autonomy of the internationals" is stretched into a dictatorship of a single international over the A. F. of L. But the real trouble is that union men, too many of them, believe in men's right of dictatorship over women.

The fact that only five internationals explicitly exclude women, and also the fact that discrimination of various sorts against women occurs in organizations that are most firmly on record as favoring equality for women, have been considered reasons for not demanding action by the A. F. of L. in convention. But women who believed that a step toward industrial equality for women would be taken by forcing the question upon the attention of the Denver Convention, formed the Women's Committee for Industrial Equality and drafted the following amendment, which was introduced in the form of a resolution by Delegate Ethel Hague:

Nothing in this constitution shall be construed as recognition of any right on the part of the American Federation of Labor, or of any affiliated union, or of any officer or officers of such union, to deny or abridge the right of workers to membership and to all the privileges of membership in the union of their trade or industry on account of sex; and women in a trade under the jurisdiction of a union which does not admit women to membership on the same terms as men shall not be denied a separate and direct charter from the American Federation of Labor for lack of the consent of that union.

This amendment made the principle of industrial equality paramount. It provided that if one door of entrance to the A. F. of L. was closed to a group of women, another should be open. But it avoided direct interference with "autonomy" by not being mandatory on the internationals.

The substitute resolution which was adopted reads: "Resolved, that those international and national organizations that do not admit women workers give early consideration for such admission." This is even more meaningless than it sounds, because two of these organizations, the Barbers' Union and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, will not hold conventions until 1924; another, the Molders' Union, has not

yet set the date for its next convention; and each of the three Presidents of these organizations admits that no consideration will be given the subject by his union until its convention is held. As President Hutcheson of the Carpenters was a member of the Committee on Law, which reported the substitute resolution, the committee certainly knew just how "early" the consideration of the women-carpenters' case would be.

In the June number of Life and Labor, Mabel W. Taylor, organizer for the Women's Trade Union League, reports from Grand Rapids, Michigan, where many women are employed in furniture making, a branch of carpentry, that efforts to organize women there have failed. In giving reasons for this, she says:

The men in the shops are to blame for not taking the girls into their organizations when they first entered the shops. In many instances they have antagonized the girls by trying to have them discharged, by belittling the amount and quality of the work they do, and by making the girls feel that they are interlopers. . . . In most of the organizations of men, where women are in competition with them in their various crafts and trades, you will find men who declare that they will never admit women into their union. These men, in my opinion, have the interests neither of the working man nor of the working woman at heart. The employers know only too well that once the men and women unite, by their combined strength they can get anything they wish. If only the men, now that most of them realize their mistake, would put their shoulders to the wheel to rectify that mistake, what a wonderful amount of progress could be made for the good of humanity!

Things seem, from this account, to be reaching a pass at which the A. F. of L., instead of leaving the internationals to their own destruction, will have to take a hand. It will have to teach the short-sightedness of trying to keep women out of a trade by keeping them out of a union, a lesson unions have been learning, one by one, painfully, for sixty years. Women are excluded, ostensibly, for their own good. "It isn't a woman's trade." But it is dollars to doughnuts that when a man talks of protecting a woman from an unsuitable job that he is trying to protect *his* job from the woman.

Pages of the Proceedings of the Barbers' Convention in 1919 are filled with speeches to the effect that a woman cannot cut a man's hair and remain respectable. Carpenters hint darkly of untellable things in plants where men and women wood-workers are employed. President Valentine of the Molders' Union, to show the dire effect upon a woman's modesty of working in a foundry, told of seeing a woman (she happened to be the owner of the foundry) tuck her skirt between her knees

when she stooped to look into a furnace. But the risks to women involved in turning them clean out of their jobs do not worry him at all. He told members of the Committee for Industrial Equality how he got every woman core-maker in a plant discharged by notifying the employer that union men would not use the cores they made. "Because they were made by non-union workers, or because they were made by women?" Mr. Valentine was asked. He replied, "Because they were made by *women*." Running a wood-working machine in a furniture factory is highly unwomanly, to the mind of President Hutcheson, of the Carpenters' Union; but he was surprised that barbers should object to women in their trade. "Barbering,"—he said, "now, that's a nice, light trade for women. They can do that without losing their *femininity*."

Secretary-Treasurer Fischer of the Barbers' Union was frank enough to say, "Immorality isn't the real reason for excluding women barbers." A molder, not a delegate, declared, "They can't get away with that bunk about work in foundries being too heavy for a woman. It's dirty, but women, like the men, have helpers to do the heavy work, like shovelling sand. Women are better than men at making small cores." This man was strong for the amendment for the reason that women were "running the union molders and core-makers out and breaking up the unions" in foundries in Massachusetts which he named. He said the rank and file wanted the women organized, but the officers were opposed. "These men here," he added, "don't represent the rank and file."

Perhaps it is because they have nothing at stake that when called on to act in accord with A. F. of L. declarations about "organizing all the workers," they are content to make a gesture of impotence. But it is encouraging that the rank and file are, as Miss Taylor says, "finding out their mistake."

The industrial equality amendment proved in a measure a touchstone to test the live elements in the convention. The numbers of delegates and delegations who readily pledged their support to it surprised the Industrial Equality Committee. Although only a small fraction of the delegates were interviewed, over 12,000 votes out of the 38,294 cast by the 523 voting delegates were pledged in favor of it. The women who worked for it hoped for a record vote, but the reporting of a substitute resolution and the impossibility of getting a roll-call at half-past five from a convention facing an evening session, prevented. The amendment made hundreds of men think and talk of women's relation to the labor movement. It brought speakers to its support, and there were

more of these ready than time allowed to be heard. After its defeat, the Committee for Industrial Equality continued its propaganda and increased its membership. It has changed its name to the National Woman's Union and plans to secure the adoption of the same or an even stronger resolution at Cincinnati in 1922.

KATHARINE FISHER.

The Man Who Wanted to Help Himself

MY maid comes into my living room where I am at work, and says: "There's a man here who says he come about the water pipes—somthin' about the fassits. He says Mr. Matheson sent him."

Mr. Matheson is the superintendent of the apartment house, and those whom he sends are not to be disregarded. I stop my work, and go out to the door that leads from the back elevator.

There stands a little man, with round brown eyes, and too red checks, fictitiously plump. He is shorter than I am and looks up at me with that curiously unexpressive, unexpectant gaze that those who live on charity so soon acquire. He has a clean collar, a warm, though shabby overcoat. He is not quite clean, though, beyond the collar—that is evident.

In a quiet voice he begins to speak, and at the same time holds out something toward me—two little rubber faucet tips, a scrap of copper mesh in their open centres.

Then I recall him. He came some months ago, in my absence, and my maid, an African matron of tender sensibilities, heard his story, took seventy-five cents of the housekeeping money and purchased similar tips from him. They would keep the water from splashing, she said, and the man was sick. She used them about a week, and they clogged up and were discarded. I had not been particularly appreciative of the purchase, though I had said little, for she is a good maid and has served me long.

But the man is speaking:

"Mr. Matheson said a good many people in the house had inquired about getting more of these things—and as you got some the last time I was around I thought I'd come in to see you—maybe you was one that wanted some more." He holds the tips further toward me. They are worth, at the most, retail, ten cents each. I daresay he buys them in the five and ten cent store.

"No, I didn't ask for you. I don't need any