

“Race, Radicalism, and Regional Working-Class Political Action”

John P. Enyeart
Bucknell University

Please do not cite without author’s permission

This paper posits that as workers moved away from their desire to live by the labor theory of value in a producers’ republic they, especially those workers living in the Rocky Mountain West, became committed to securing living wages in a capitalist nation that they believed was verging on social democracy. As a result of this shift in outlook, from republicanism to social democracy, these workers were forced to grapple with their racist and ethnocentric practices (such as exclusion of certain groups from unions). Some white workers even went a step further by challenging racism and demanding that all who labored had to battle collectively for economic justice, workplace safety, and the like.

In asking that we think more seriously about the relationship between interracial unionism and workers, especially white workers, shifting political vision, I am adding my voice to the growing calls to move beyond the notion of whiteness that continues to possess a firm grip on our understanding of race and the working class.¹ As many recent scholars influenced by the whiteness model have pointed out: the free labor ideal that energized groups such as the Knights of Labor not only underpinned the notion that property ownership conveyed political freedom, but asserted that one also had to be “white” to be a full citizen. Nineteenth-century Americans understood race as the product of biologically determined differences, which created a natural hierarchy. As a result a “color” scale emerged where whiteness offered a psychological wage, a sense of privilege upon which whites claimed a right to have better jobs and higher wages. White

workers, therefore, played a central role in fashioning white supremacy, which ultimately meant that they helped, even if unintentionally, to support the dominant power structure.

Whiteness scholars further support their position by pointing to the efforts of various immigrant groups, especially Irish, Italians, and Jews, to claim their white privileges. The 1790 Naturalization Act declared that only “white people” could become American citizens, but the founders did not offer guidelines on how to determine whiteness. In fact from 1878, when Chinese immigrant Ah Yup sued to become a white citizen, until 1952, the year Congress ended racial restrictions on naturalization, the U.S. Supreme Court heard fifty-two cases that required the justices to define and redefine the meaning of “white people.” Rulings varied as judges changed the basis upon which they determined whiteness from what the pseudo-science eugenicists wrote to the “common knowledge” they had gathered throughout their lives. Of course the Fourteenth Amendment established “black” as a category upon which new arrivals could also seek citizenship, but immigrants coming to a Jim Crow society saw this option as less than appealing.

Among other critiques, a number of scholars have pointed out that whiteness offers little room to examine the disagreements individual union members had over race as it establishes a one dimensional process where European immigrant groups arrived without racist notions and then adopted a white supremacist attitude to better their social position. Some workers clearly did follow this trajectory, while others obviously did not. Whiteness also ignores the fact that most “white” immigrant laborers did not usually define themselves as white, but as Irish, Germans, and Cornish (see footnote one).

The critique I am adding is that the whiteness model remains predicated on the notion that white workers claimed their privileges based on the republicanism of the Revolutionary generation. That republicanism, specifically the meanings of the free labor ideal and the labor theory of value, were being rethought as immigrants poured into the nation and became part of a permanent wage workforce. Specifically, workers, especially in the Rocky Mountain West, were moving from republicanism to social democracy.

Social democracy, according to many turn-of-the-century Americans and Europeans, meant the socializing of markets, or public officials passing laws and promoting policies that redistributed wealth, made priorities of workplace safety and social insurance, increased leisure time, and, in general, attempted to mitigate the brutalities and inequalities that accompanied the rise of capitalism.² A formal transnational social democratic outlook developed at this time as intellectuals re-theorized socialism to meet the nuances of both corporate capitalism and liberal political practices that were unforeseen by Marx. In Europe, social democracy represented an ideology expressed in tracts written by the German Marxist revisionist Eduard Bernstein, English Fabians Beatrice and Sidney Webb, and the French editor and political activist Jean Jaurès. In the United States, at least in the Rocky Mountain West, social democracy was more of a culture.³ The type of social democracy that the region's workers promoted did not grow out of a well-articulated set of beliefs. Rather, it sprouted from individual workers realizing that they shared a sense of outrage with their fellow laborers. After collectively identifying the policies and practices of employers that they considered unfair, and the social conditions they deemed unjust, these workers then updated their

notions of how social reform, politics, and economic exchanges should function. Their critiques of poverty, employer authority, and free-market ideology were originally informed by the labor theory of value. Their realization of the permanence of a waged workforce and their general life experiences forced them to sharpen and alter their conceptions of work, value, fairness, and what they could accomplish in their lifetimes. As a result, they moved away from this nineteenth-century ideal of social relations. They formed study groups and called themselves students of social economy because they did not have all the answers they needed to remedy the injustices they faced. Their vision for a better world came in fragments, as they cobbled together political platforms that reflected their changing values and new understandings of law, public policy, economics, and power relations. Rocky Mountain workers who took the time to express their views did not envision themselves as part of an army of ideological warriors bent on building a socialist state. Instead, they identified themselves as a collection of hard-working people who believed they deserved a better fate.⁴

Before moving on to more concrete examples of how workers' shift from republicanism to social democracy forced them to grapple with their constructions of race and ethnicity, I do want to give a brief explanation as to why I am focusing on the Rocky Mountain West. Although the United States had its social democratic devotees, such as Milwaukee's Victor Berger, the making of American social democracy was centered in the Mountain West.⁵ This was largely because Rocky Mountain workers lived the class struggle differently than their fellow laborers east of the Mississippi River. By the late 1880s, differences in organizational practices combined with variations in regional political structures and power relations allowed Mountain West unionists to follow a

divergent path from workers elsewhere. Examples of these differences manifested themselves in a number of ways. For instance, between 1870 and 1920, Rocky Mountain unionists earned the highest real wages in the country, obtained the first constitutionally recognized eight-hour day measures for private employees, and rejected affiliation with the American Federation of Labor (AFL), instead creating their own regional labor federations: the Western Labor Union (WLU) and the American Labor Union (ALU).⁶ When these workers did decide to join the AFL, after 1906, they did so in order to maintain their social democratic project. These workers understood that the expansion of capitalism had forced a restructuring of craft unions--what Socialist William English Walling had in 1904 called a "new unionism." New machinery and the subdivision of labor, Walling contended, had led to the deskilling of craftsmen and thus to a "new importance of unskilled labor." He wrote that the dilution in skill level made it easier for employers to substitute one laborer for another. Some craftsmen started to recognize that they would benefit from organizing all workers even remotely connected to their trade. "New" unions resembled Knights of Labor mixed locals, which were organized bodies that contained skilled and unskilled workers.⁷

Importantly, Rocky Mountain workers continued to consider Samuel Gompers and the other top leaders of the AFL conservative. The region's workers, along with unionists throughout the nation, saw that Gompers had to accept new unionism, and they pushed the federation toward engaging in more frequent and broader political actions. In fact, socialists who belonged to the AFL started openly challenging Gompers' authority and encouraged other like-minded workers to join the federation so they could collectively "bore within." They wanted to turn the AFL into a progressive labor

organization. Those Rocky Mountain workers who decided to “bore within” not only played a key role in reshaping the AFL, but they continued to win broader public acceptance of their core values.

I am happy to go into greater detail on this point of regional differences and social democratic practices during the q and a period. At this point, however, I would like to provide you with a better sense of how workers’ (especially white workers) transition to a social democratic outlook altered their view of race and ethnic relations. To do so I am going to discuss the case of Rock Springs, Wyoming after the 1882 massacre of Chinese miners, then turn to the tensions and organizational changes within the Salt Lake City Building Laborers Protective Union, and then conclude by examining the role of Butte union organizer William Dunne in reconfiguring workers’ attitudes.

ROCK SPRINGS

Between 1852 and 1908 at least 153 attacks on Chinese immigrants, including arsons, property damage, beatings, and murder, occurred in the territories and states comprising the American West. These acts of intimidation and killing had to do with white workers fears of job competition and willingness to maintain their collective sense of racial hierarchy through bloodshed and destruction. The root of this violence can be traced to 1870s San Francisco where organized anti-Asian political activism started. Dennis Kearney, who helped create the Workingmen’s Party of California, claimed that “Judge Lynch is the judge wanted by the workingmen of California,” and argued that the “dignity of labor must be sustained, even if we have to kill every wretch that opposes it.” Kearney’s influence spread across the region.⁸

Political consciousness and policy objectives also underpinned Kearney's appeal. As historian Moon-Ho Jung points out: in order to grasp anti-Chinese sentiment, and the eventual passage of the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, we must recognize that members of Congress debated exclusion amidst their efforts to agree on the meaning of African American emancipation from slavery. Exclusionists used the "coolie," the Chinese immigrant contract laborer who arrived in the U.S. as a type of indentured servant, to link all Chinese people to slavery. Politicians promoted this racialized image, and suggested that all Chinese immigrants, and later all Asians, were "coolies." These elected officials also declared exclusion consistent with the goal of establishing free labor in all corners of the nation. Those opposed to exclusion, including some eastern unionists, accepted the stereotype of the "coolie," but they argued the issue was one of importation versus immigration, of separating the unfree immigrants from the free Chinese migrants who paid their own passage. Proponents of exclusion countered that unscrupulous labor agents and employers would immediately exploit any measure that outlawed "coolies" but allowed entry to the Chinese who came freely, and eventually a new form of slavery would emerge. Thus, all Chinese immigrants were deemed a race of unfree laborers and therefore a threat to the struggle for high wages.⁹ Rocky Mountain labor leaders, white workers, and their supporters not only embraced this argument, they attacked Chinese immigrants because of it.

Likely the Rock Springs Massacre in 1885 was the most tragic episode in this era of anti-Asian violence. As most of you know striking coal miners belonging to the Knights of Labor insisted that the Chinese leave the area. Although Chinese laborers outnumbered white miners 331 to 150, whites still surrounded Chinese homes with rifles

and revolvers. As night fell on September 2, white miners set fire to the local Chinatown and then shot at those exiting their burning homes. Twenty-eight Chinese died, fifteen were wounded. The fourteen white miners arrested for the murders were eventually acquitted.

What some of you might not know is that the descendents of these Knights, who in 1907 belonged to the United Mine Workers of America, opened the doors of the union to Japanese and Chinese miners. This local became the first American Federation of Labor (AFL) affiliate in the country to accept Asian workers. That year, the Union Pacific Railroad Company, which ran the Rock Springs mines, replaced striking union members with Japanese laborers. The strike succeeded, as the union-affiliated miners won a 20 percent wage increase and the eight-hour day. When the conflict ended, Japanese coal diggers still employed by the UP asked to join the union. After some deliberation, union members voted to accept Japanese, Chinese, and all other miners employed in the area into their ranks. This decision proved more than a token gesture. Harry W. Fox, editor of the *Wyoming Labor Journal*, used his paper to promote interethnic and interracial gatherings. Labor Day festivities and an annual celebration of winning the eight-hour day were two such efforts to promote a sense of solidarity that extended beyond the membership rolls. The *Labor Journal* also ran columns critiquing the AFL on its exclusionist practices and unfriendly attitude toward African Americans.¹⁰ Explaining the transformation in thinking on the part of these miners has ranged from one scholar asserting that this was a pragmatic response on the part of white workers to better control the local labor market, without of course providing a reason why white workers had not employed such pragmatism previously, to a recent dissertation detailing the ways

in which Rock Springs white unionists unlearned racism.¹¹ I contend that this new behavior on the part of white union workers in Rock Springs actually had something to do with a change in workers' political consciousness.

Between 1882 and 1907 workers throughout the Rocky Mountain region started to advocate socialism. Socialism to turn-of-the-century Rocky Mountain miners, factory operatives, domestics, service-industry laborers, and craftsmen included a belief that voting rights offered workers the best opportunity to usher in a new political and economic order. These unionists wanted to make markets more socially responsible. In other words, they wanted city and state lawmakers--people who were accountable to the electorate--to directly administer the markets that dealt with the goods and services, such as heat and water, which were essential to each individual's survival. Some of these workers went even further and wanted officeholders also to oversee labor markets in order to guarantee the payment of fair wages, mandate that laborers have more leisure time, and punish employers who maintained unsafe workplaces. Achieving these ends meant redistributing wealth through higher taxes on the wealthy, establishing binding arbitration as the dominant means of ending industrial conflicts, protecting the right to strike, passing shorter-hours laws, and enacting employer-liability measures.

Workers who favored socialism wanted the measures that local and state governments passed to reflect the wishes of the majority of citizens. They insisted that real justice only existed when the law promoted a humane society. According to the laborers who demanded public ownership of coal, for instance, municipal and state officeholders had a responsibility to not only make sure that people had heat in the winter, but that the larger citizenry had control of the fuel that drove the engines of the

industrial economy. Shorter workdays, old-age pensions, and education for all children also distinguished a just society from a world dominated only by profit seekers.¹² In other words, justice was no longer predicated their rights as citizen workers. Instead their claims on wealth were related to perceived rights as a working class. A true working class, at least to white unionists in Rock Springs in 1907, started to mean all who toiled for wages. Commitments to racism and ethnocentrism were not so universally abandoned in other Rocky Mountain communities.

BLPU

In 1902, the membership officer of the Salt Lake Building Laborer's Protective Union (BLPU) took the initiation fee of \$2.50 from an African-American construction worker. As the union membership stood ready to vote on "J. Draper's" candidacy, the credentials committee pointed out that the union's constitution refused to admit "Negroes." With some delegates protesting the decision and calling for a change in the constitution, "the colored question was then taken up" the next week. Those wanting to exclude African Americans won as the secretary explained that members "agreed the best thing to do was to keep them [African Americans] walking." Although the exclusionists won that day, the inclusionists did not have the final say. In July 1903, union members changed their constitution and granted working permits and union cards to black construction laborers.¹³ Racial tensions remained high within the BLPU for decades. Some white unionists continued to argue that a just society meant that all workers had to unite at the workplace and the ballot box in an effort to alter the larger social structure.

Others attempted to claim that their right to a good standard of living rested on a racial hierarchy rooted in white supremacy.

These tensions boiled over again in 1905. That year proponents of exclusion captured some of the union's leadership positions. The majority of workers, who favored inclusion, attempted to avoid another fight over this issue and voted to charter the union with the newly organized Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). The Wobbly constitution forbade affiliated locals from barring workers from membership because of race. On March 5, 1906, the old BLPU became IWW Local 262.¹⁴ On May 1, 1906 L. J. Trujillo, lead organizer and recording secretary, informed F. Wiseman that he was suspected of uttering racist views and that union officers were going to schedule a hearing to examine the matter. Such behavior under the IWW constitution could result in Wiseman's expulsion. A fellow union member reported to Trujillo that Wiseman, a former elected official in the old BLPU, had "made remarks that if we allow in, such members as Spaniards and Italians (Degos as [he] call[ed] them) the union will be ruined." Trujillo's fight against discrimination was not only predicated on his sense of right and wrong, but also informed by his personal experiences. The leadership of the BLPU had ignored a grievance he once filed. Although the union's minutes captured only vague details of Trujillo's case, they did convey his anger over his family being "deprived from their bread and butter" when "a discrimination was made on [him] under the charter of BLPU of A." Previous leaders appeared to have ignored Trujillo's appeal for action.¹⁵

The conflict within Local 262 further intensified when executive officer Gus Anderson, representing the union's racist element, attempted to appoint Wiseman

treasurer amid Trujillo's efforts to discipline Wiseman for violating the IWW's constitution. During a debate over whether Wiseman's utterances barred him from holding local office, Anderson exclaimed, if "the I.W.W. interferes with my rulings as to" Wiseman's holding the office of treasurer, "they can stick their charter up their ass." Trujillo responded to Anderson's outburst by filing charges against him for defaming the local charter.¹⁶ Affiliating with the IWW clearly did not mean that these construction laborers had resolved their disputes over race.

To further confuse our understanding of this struggle, Local 262 disaffiliated from the Wobblies the following year. So did that mean that the exclusionists won the battle? That would seem a reasonable assumption if the workers had based their decisions only on membership eligibility. But when we also include their desire to pass laws that would lead to state-administered markets, it becomes evident how difficult it was for these unionists to belong to an organization that represented both their political beliefs and their desire for an inclusive labor movement.

Some historians assume that immigrants and people of color favored the IWW over the AFL. This is a logical position considering that AFL leaders avoided, as best they could, organizing eastern and southern European immigrants, Asian Americans, Mexican Americans, and African Americans. Conversely, Wobblies proclaimed their unions open to all who wanted to join.¹⁷ Presenting workers' choices this starkly, however, obscures the context within which inclusionists had to decide their course of action. The concerns of these construction workers had less to do with national affiliation and more to do with building greater solidarity and advancing their legislative agenda and social democratic vision.

From 1905 through 1907, Rocky Mountain workers hotly debated whether boring within the AFL or attempting to create a new labor movement through the IWW offered the best means of redistributing wealth and reordering power relations. Unlike their fellow workers in Colorado and Montana, unionists belonging to Utah's State Federation of Labor voted to affiliate with the Wobblies. That relationship lasted only one year because Utah workers could not accept the IWW's official policy of refusing to sign contracts, leaders' opposition to union-label campaigns, and the general skepticism of engaging in political action. In the case of these building laborers, we do know that after disaffiliating from the IWW, they existed as an independent union until 1914, when they affiliated with the AFL. From 1906 through 1914, they worked with city and state federations of labor by participating in collective actions such as boycotts and union-label campaigns. Furthermore, they endorsed Socialist Party (SP) candidates throughout the Progressive Era. This behavior suggests that they continued to find political action viable.¹⁸ Therefore, the choice they faced, whether or not to remain part of the IWW, was not based solely on the Wobblies' policy of racial inclusion, but also on how well their political beliefs and electoral strategies would be welcomed.

Both inclusionists and exclusionists appear to have seen themselves as socialists or social democrats, and not as syndicalists or pure-and-simple unionists. Racists forced white advocates of a politically active, polyglot labor movement into the position of either supporting an organization that did not represent their political aims, the IWW, or agreeing to a limited, white-only version of social democracy. Those on the excluded list either had to accept banishment from the labor movement or fight to change racist views and pursue pro-labor laws through other organizations. Trujillo and the other nonwhites

in the BLPU, along with the Japanese coal miners at Rock Springs, attempted to deal with racists within the progressive union movement, as opposed to becoming syndicalists.

WILLIAM DUNNE

By the early 1920s key union leaders in the region understood that changes in political consciousness were altering rank-and-file union members notions of race and ethnicity. Butte organizer William Dunne provides one example of a local labor leader who grasped this development and attempted to further its advance. When a lack of money forced this part-time middleweight boxer and University of Minnesota football player to drop out of college, he took on various low-waged unskilled jobs to survive. Eventually, Dunne secured an apprenticeship as an electrician, and after working at his craft and organizing for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Vancouver, British Columbia, he moved to Butte in 1916. Although a member of the Socialist Party (SP), he joined the Non Partisan League--a group of farmers, middle-class reformers, and socialists hoping to facilitate immediate changes by supporting reform candidates regardless of party affiliation--and won a race for the Montana state legislature as a Democrat. He also served a term as vice president of the state federation of labor. Like his friend and mentor William Z. Foster, soon after World War I, Dunne became a member of the Communist Party (CP). He agreed with Foster and the majority of Rocky Mountain unionists that politically active workers committed to broad-based unionism should change the character of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) by boring within.¹⁹

Although Dunne would avidly support Joseph Stalin at the end of the 1930s, his outlook and actions during the early 1920s fit the mold of Rocky Mountain labor leaders and editors who sought to unify workers based on their shared social-democratic values. When he took over editorship of the *Butte Bulletin* in 1921, he published the writings and speeches of Eugene Debs and other socialists, provided updates on the murder trial of anarchists Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, and offered news of the actions taken by the IWW, all the while advertising and sponsoring talks by Communists. He also reported on and took charge of union meetings, strikes, boycotts, and social gatherings, and spearheaded efforts to reorganize Butte's hard-rock miners who fell victim to a powerful open-shop movement. Since the *Bulletin* served as the official paper of the Montana State Federation of Labor, the State Metal Trades Council, the Metal Trades Council of Butte, and the Silver Bow Trades and Labor Assembly, most workers likely had little problem with Dunne's sympathies for a communist revolution, despite their belief in building a socialist America through piecemeal reforms. Dunne's tenure with the paper ended in 1924, when he became the editor of the CP's main organ, the *Daily Worker*, and moved to Chicago.

Dunne succinctly summed up industrial conditions in the summer of 1921 by writing: "There is a war every day for the workers--there always has been."²⁰ He meant that although the labor movement had suffered setbacks locally, regionally, and nationally, workers remained in a constant battle for justice. In the past, success had allowed members of the labor movement to broaden their struggle to include cleaner and healthier neighborhoods, for example, as part of their larger project to reconstruct social relations. When employers gained the upper hand in the everyday war, however,

workers' aims had to change accordingly. "Power is relative," Dunne asserted, and then explained that "it varies inversely as the power opposed to it."²¹ Before 1914, Rocky Mountain unionists had not only advocated that public officials administer markets, but they successfully implemented laws that accomplished that end. Furthermore, they engaged in collective actions to uphold those measures. Employers attacked them because of their successes.

In the post-1914 period of union decline, Dunne advocated that workers continue calling for and carrying out efforts to reacquire justice. He and others also insisted that laborers assess their flaws and examine their own role in allowing owners to defeat strikes, to establish open shops, to create company unions, and to retard labor's political progress and weaken its political might. In recognizing their own weaknesses, Rocky Mountain social democrats, particularly Dunne, realized that they had to build a polyglot working-class movement.

His constant attacks on the KKK served as one example of how he attempted to foster greater working-class solidarity. He wanted his readers to realize that although corporate hegemony was primarily to blame for the assault on unions in the 1920s, white workers' commitment to racism and ethnocentrism had played a significant role. In various editorials, he argued that southern and eastern European immigrants, African Americans, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, and Asian immigrants had to be included in the labor movement, or else unionists would be accepting a vision of the nation constructed by the KKK, A. Mitchell Palmer, and the American Legion.²² In an August 31, 1923, editorial entitled "Sizing Up the Ku Klux Klan," for instance, Dunne explained that three Klansmen from Oklahoma who belonged to the working class had recently

been arrested for flogging a black farmer. Their actions revealed their “ignorance” and promoted the “actual degeneracy” of society. The sole point of the KKK, Dunne explained, was to “oppose all progress.”²³ The rise of the KKK provided advocates of a polyglot labor movement, especially William Dunne, the opportunity to emphasize exactly whose values the exclusionists mirrored. Examples of Dunne organizing polyglot unions and campaigning for political candidates who opposed the KKK also spoke to his commitment and understanding of social democracy.

CONCLUSION

Before concluding, I want to stress that my point is not to claim that the Rocky Mountain West was some type of polyglot utopia. It was not. For example, beginning in 1905, the Western Federation of Miners’s executive board declared that the federation would grant membership to all miners who wanted to join the organization regardless of race and ethnicity. The board also sanctioned ethnic working-class periodicals to serve as the official voices for the organization, and hired Italian, Finish, and Slovenian speaking organizers. This effort to build an inclusive union spanned the WFM’s affiliation with the IWW, 1905 to 1908, its status as an independent federation, 1908 through 1911, and its association with the AFL, 1911 to 1916. Throughout these years a number of local union leaders, based on the wishes of the men they represented, wrote letters to the board protesting this policy. Board members almost always replied with a sharp insistence that local leaders enforce inclusion.²⁴

Local unions more firmly committed to exclusion did not question or formally oppose the board’s directives. They simply ignored them. When organizers from

Trinidad, Colorado, for instance, met with their fellow unionists in Bingham, Utah, they discovered that the Bingham miners had adopted a policy of “unfair treatment of Italians.” They filed a formal complaint with WFM leaders.²⁵ Notions of race, ethnicity, and class unity obviously varied from mining camp to mining camp. The proponents of exclusion failed to grasp the fact that their opposition to a polyglot labor movement interfered with the expansion of the labor’s network, impeded the rise in living standards for the whole working class, and limited the effectiveness of strikes and boycotts by preventing potential allies from partaking in these collective actions.

I am, however, arguing that as a number of white unionists rejected republicanism and embraced social democracy, they were forced to deal with republicanism’s racist underpinnings. In some cases this awareness resulted in a push for a polyglot labor movement that demanded a fundamental transformation of capitalist social relations. In essence these workers prefigured the beginnings of what is now known as the long Civil Rights movement that emerged in the 1930s.

¹ I am building on the arguments of Barbara Fields, Eric Arnesen, and Daniel Letwin here. These scholars presented white racist and ethnocentric beliefs and actions as occurring along a spectrum. They have gotten beyond the older dichotomous view that a minority of egalitarian whites battled racist and nativist whites for the soul of the labor movement. See Fields, “Ideology and Race in American History,” in *Region, Race, and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward*, ed. J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 143–77; Arnesen, “‘Like Banquo’s Ghost, It will not Down’: The Race Question and the American Railroad Brotherhoods, 1880–1920,” *American Historical Review* 99 (December 1994): 1605–06;

and Letwin, *The Challenge of Interracial Unionism: Alabama Coal Miners, 1878–1921* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 1–7, 31–87. For critiques of whiteness, see Frank Towers, “Projecting Whiteness: Race and the Unconscious in the History of 19th-Century American Workers,” *Journal of American Culture* 21 (Summer 1998): 47–57; Eric Arnesen, “Whiteness and the Historians’ Imagination,” *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 60 (Fall 2001): 3–32; and Peter Kolchin, “Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America,” *Journal of American History* 89 (June 2002): 154–73.

²Morris Hillquit, *Socialism in Theory and Practice* (New York, 1909); John Spargo, *Socialism: A Summary and Interpretation of Socialist Principles* (New York, 1912), 75; Irving Howe, *Socialism and America* (New York, 1985), 3–48; Martin J. Sklar, *The United States as a Developing Country: Studies in U.S. History in the Progressive Era and the 1920s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 37–77; Mary O. Furner, “Knowing Capitalism: Public Investigation and the Labor Question in the Long Progressive Era,” in *The State and Economic Knowledge: The American and British Experiences*, ed., Mary O. Furner and Barry Supple (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990): 241–86; Richard Schneirov, “Editor’s Introduction: The Socialist Party Revisited,” *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 2 (July 2003): 245–52; and Schneirov, “Editor’s Introduction: Socialism and Capitalism Reconsidered,” *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 2 (October 2003): 351–60. On social democracy, see Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in the Progressive Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 10–32.

³ James T. Kloppenberg, *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870–1920* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 199–246. It should be noted that Kloppenberg also includes American Christian socialists among his list of architects of social democracy. The American thinkers he examines, such as Richard Ely. They ceased to advocate social democracy once their ideas received opposition. Thus, to see them as the bearers of American social democracy seems misplaced. Rocky Mountain workers, by contrast, not only came up with their own version of social democracy, they battled to make it a reality despite the rhetorical and physical attacks employers waged against them.

⁴ See Chapter 2 of Enyeart, “By Laws of Their Own Making.”

⁵ Although I agree with James T. Kloppenberg’s explanation of social democracy, I disagree with his view of how it developed in the United States. He credits intellectuals with formulating these ideas. I do not contest his claim that people such as Richard T. Ely did indeed offer social democratic visions. Ely and other academic socialists, however, had little success in implementing social democracy, whereas Rocky Mountain workers did claim key victories as will become clear later in this work.

⁶ For wages see: Philip R.P. Coelho and James F. Shepherd, “The Impact of Regional Differences in Prices and Wages on Economic Growth: The United States in 1890” *Journal of Economic History* 39 (March 1979): 69-85; Joshua L. Rosenbloom, *Looking For Work, Searching for Workers: American Labor Markets During Industrialization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 122-126; and Richard White, “*It’s Your Misfortune and None of My Own*”: *A New History of the American West* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), 277-280, xiv-xv, 3-20.

⁷William English Walling, “The New Unionism--The Problem of the Unskilled Worker,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 24 (September 1904): 12–13, 27.

⁸ John R. Wunder, “Anti-Chinese Violence in the American West, 1850-1910” in *Law for the Elephant, Law for the Beaver: Essays in the Legal History of the North American West*, eds. John McLaren, Hamar Foster, and Chet Orloff (Pasadena, CA: Ninth Judicial Circuit Historical Society, 1992); Arnolde De Leon, *Racial Frontiers: Africans, Chinese, and Mexicans in Western America, 1848-1890* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002); Liping Zhu, *A Chinaman’s Chance: The Chinese on the Rocky Mountain Mining Frontier* (Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 1997);

⁹Moon-Ho Jung, “Outlawing ‘Coolies’: Race, Nation, and Empire in the Age of Emancipation,” *American Quarterly* 57 (September 2005): 677-701; and Andrew Gyory, *Closing the Gate: Race, Politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 1-38 and 242-259.

¹⁰Ellen Schoening Aiken, “The United Mine Workers of America Moves West: Race, Working Class Formation, and the Discourse on Cultural Diversity in the Union Pacific Coal Towns of Southern Wyoming, 1870–1930” (PhD diss., University of Colorado, 2002), 70–134, see especially 121–25.

¹¹ Gunther Peck and Aiken “The United Mine Workers of America Moves West.”

¹² Enyeart, “By Laws of Their Own Making,” chapter 3.

¹³Building Laborers’ Protective Union, Salt Lake City, Minutes 12 May; 19 May, 1902; and 20 July, 1903. On the unlearning of racism see: Ellen Schoening Aiken, “The United Mine Workers of America Moves West: Race, Working Class Formation, and the

Discourse on Cultural Diversity in the Union Pacific Coal Towns of Southern Wyoming, 1870-1930” (Ph.D. diss, University of Colorado Boulder, 2002).

¹⁴Building Laborers’ Protective Union, Salt Lake City, Minutes, 27 April 1903, and 22 April 1906, Labor History Collection, University of Utah Archives.

¹⁵BLPU, Minute Book/Journal, 1 May 1906. As recording secretary, Trujillo included drafts of letters and minutes as well as the actual minutes and official correspondence.

¹⁶BLPU, Minutes, 22 May 1906. In his notes, Trujillo wrote “ass” and crossed it out. A blank line is substituted for the word in the official copy of the minutes.

¹⁷ The Wobblies’ promotion of racial harmony, once thought to be ubiquitous, has been called into question. See Phil Mellinger, “How the IWW Lost Its Western Heartland: Western Labor History Revisited,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 27 (Autumn 1996): 303–24.

¹⁸The BLPU’s minutes end in 1906 and start again in 1909, at which point the union is no longer an IWW local; in 1911 it affiliated with the AFL as a local of the International Hod Carriers’ Union.

¹⁹Jerry W. Calvert, *The Gibraltar: Socialism and Labor in Butte, Montana, 1895–1920* (Helena: Montana Historical Society Press, 1988), 34; and James R. Barrett, *William Z. Foster and the Tragedy of American Radicalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 102–17.

²⁰ *Butte Bulletin*, 15 July 1921, 2.

²¹ *Butte Bulletin*, 29 July 1921, 2.

²²*Butte Bulletin*, 29 July 1921, 1.

²³*Butte Bulletin*, 31 August 1923, 6.

²⁴For one example see: WFM Executive Board Minutes, 10 December 1907.

²⁵WFM Executive Board Minutes, 11 December 1907. For more on Bingham, which proved especially nativistic, see: Peck, *Reinventing Free Labor*, 210-223.

²⁵Peck, *Reinventing Free Labor*, 216-223; and Philip J. Mellinger, *Race and Labor in Western Copper: The Fight For Equality, 1896-1918* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1995), 91-105.