

2004

"Unlawfully and riotously assembled in the City of St. Louis:" The Workingmen's Party's Role During the Great Strike of 1877 in St. Louis

James Callahan
Western Oregon University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/his>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Callahan, James, "'Unlawfully and riotously assembled in the City of St. Louis:" The Workingmen's Party's Role During the Great Strike of 1877 in St. Louis" (2004). *Student Theses, Papers and Projects (History)*. 122.
<https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/his/122>

This Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of History at Digital Commons@WOU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Theses, Papers and Projects (History) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@WOU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@wou.edu.

“Unlawfully and riotously assembled in the City of St. Louis:”

The Workingmen’s Party’s Role During the Great Strike of 1877 in St. Louis

By James Callahan

History 499: Senior Seminar

Western Oregon University

June 2, 2004

Primary Reader: Dr. Max Geier

Secondary Reader: Dr. Narasingha Sil

Introduction

“What do you say to the workers of the United States,” Karl Marx asked in a letter to Friedrich Engels on July 25, 1877. “This first outbreak against the associated capitol oligarchy, that has arisen since the Civil War, will of course be smashed, but it could serve as the beginning of the establishment of a serious labor party.”¹ The cause of Marx’s optimism was the Great Strike, sometimes known as the Great Upheaval, of 1877. Coming off four years of recession following the panic of 1873, the Great Strike started as an isolated action by railroad workers in West Virginia which spread across the country like wildfire. By mid-summer, the strikes and work stoppages by laborers spread to numerous industrial areas, and not just among rail workers. Violence filled the streets with bloodshed as workers tried to stem the oppressive behavior of capitalists. It seemed as if workingmen were on the verge of a great epoch of social change. However, as quickly as the unrest started, it was suppressed. The Federal government struck back hard at the strikers, firmly aligning themselves with the capitalists.

For a fleeting moment, however, labor appeared poised for greatness. “It is wrong to call this a strike,” the *Missouri Republican* warned on July 25, in the midst of the strikes, “it is a labor revolution.”² The Great Strike reached St. Louis within a week of its flare-up. Unlike the other cities where it occurred, the working people of that town achieved something never before seen in this country: workers gained control of the city. This caused many people on both sides of the issue at the time to compare it to the Paris Commune of 1871.³ While never exactly true, it was the only such instance of workers effectively controlling a major city to occur in the United States during the Great Strike. Having gained control of the city, the workers of St. Louis placed their future in the hands of a small minority who were members of the Workingmen’s Party of the United States, a radical Marxist political party. Through their mismanagement of the strike, with a focus on broad political change over advancing trade unions and their cancellation of mass meetings, the St. Louis “Commune” faltered and was crushed by the government at the

urging of the capitalists.

Some analyses of the Great Strike of 1877 were published soon after the event. Allen Pinkerton's *Strikers, Communists, Tramps and Detectives*, published a year after the strike, dealt with the government and, to some extent, private interests involved in suppressing the workers. As apparent in the title, Pinkerton lumped the strikers in with communists and tramps. To a very limited extent, Marxist sympathizers, most notably the Workingmen's Party of the United States, did participate in the strike, but the inclusion of tramps in the title clearly illustrates the class bias of the author. Pinkerton was the leader of a detective agency (hence the inclusion of "detectives" in the title) that worked for railroad companies to break the strike. This role was not just limited to 1877, industrialists often employed the Pinkerton Detective Agency to combat the growing labor union movement in late 19th century America. Furthermore, Pinkerton's book was part of a series dramatizing the exploits of his agents. These were more sensational than impartial looks at the events contained within and advertised the success of his detectives. However, *Strikers, Communists, Tramps and Detectives* does offer insight into the pro-management perspective of the strike. In particular, Pinkerton emphasizes the role of government and non-government means of dealing with the striking laborers. Another contemporary account is provided by J.A. Dacus in *Annals of the Great Strike*, published in 1877. While Dacus claims that this work "possesses real historical value,"⁴ it does have an obvious anti-labor tone.

Much that was written in the decades following the Great Strike favored the business interests. Not until the mid-20th century did the strikers perspective emerged. This is due to the growth of labor unions in this country and the access to university educations by people of working class origins, particularly following the passing of the G.I. Bill. This pro-labor sentiment is evident in Louis Adamic's *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America* and Robert V. Bruce's *1877: Year of Violence*. Both works look at the organization of labor at the time and the hows and whys that lead to the strike,

concerning themselves with the interests of the workers. While Adamic, writing in 1935, focuses on class violence as a whole, Bruce's specific look, written in 1959, at 1877 shows that the strikers had their own goals that they hoped to accomplish. He also looks at how the strike was spread between cities based upon early labor organizations. Jeremy Brecher's *Strike!* is a look at various strikes in America's history, particularly the roles of class and organized labor. Of importance to Brecher in dealing with the Great Strike of 1877 is the role of class. While calling it a Marxist view may be going too far, there are certain classist elements that Brecher chooses to focus on that do strike a Marxist vain. In particular, he feels that the strikers were justified in their work stoppages and that government and business's overreaction to the situation was more of a result of the violence more so than anything the workers did. jei

In more recent decades, the focus of scholarly work on the Great Strike has been on the social origins of the event. This focus does not look at any single group as the "cause" of the strike, but rather what precipitated the event and on people's interest in either seeing it gain in strength or be destroyed. Glenn Stephen's applies psychologist James Tong's rational choice theory to the strikers of 1877 and thus tries to illustrate how so many people could be driven to act as the strikers did. Philip S. Foner has done extensive work on the Workingmen's Party during the period of the Great Strike. Foner's work is important in shedding new light on the role the Party had, particularly when it comes to St. Louis. The Great Strike as a subject fits in under the larger historiography of the Gilded Age and labor history. The distinctions between various sources on the Great Strike hold true for this broader historiographic scope.

Rather than looking at the success of the Workingmen's Party during the Great Strike in St. Louis, this paper intends to look at how the Party's actions lead to failure.

St. Louis in the Gilded Age

A good picture of St. Louis at the time of the Great Strike is provided David T. Burbank's *Reign of Rabble* (1966), which draws principally on the newspapers of St. Louis and, across the Mississippi River on the Illinois side, East St. Louis. Other sources used by Burbank include official records of the U.S. military and personal papers of national figures. On one hand, Burbank is regarded as the most authoritative source on the Great Strike in St. Louis.⁵ On the other hand, however, the nature of the sources makes his account, at worst, mainly speculative. In relying mostly on the local newspaper accounts, Burbank admittedly uses sources which oftentimes contradict one another or are generally confusing.⁶

St. Louis was founded roughly a century before 1877 as a French fur-trading settlement. The town came into the possession of the United States in 1803, with the Louisiana Purchase. The first official count of St. Louis' population, in 1804, was 9,373 inhabitants. The city grew due to its location along the Mississippi River. The city was centrally located along the river, close to where the Ohio and Missouri rivers join the Mississippi, so that it served as the hub of trade for the upper-Mississippi, the Ohio River valley to the east and down the Mississippi to New Orleans. Steamboats plied the river carrying the bulk of goods shipped along this route for most of the early part of the century.⁷

The steamboats still operated along the river by 1877, but had, however, been largely replaced by the north-south as well as the east-west traffic of the railroads.⁸ St. Louis was also a noted manufacturing center, which complemented its natural position as a distribution center. Along eighteen miles of the river's west bank, flour milling, meat packing, tobacco, iron and steel, and foundry and machine shop products served as the city's main industries. Alone, iron production was valued at roughly \$9 million, in 1870, and employed more than 2,300 workers. In the same year, a further 684 workers were employed in the 31 flour mills, 3,900 workers in 500 clothing manufacturing plants. The city also became known for its breweries, of which it had 50 that employed 761 workers.⁹

In 1873, the Anheuser Company was the first brewery in the nation to bottle beer for national distribution.¹⁰ By 1880, there were 2,924 manufacturing establishments with 41,625 workers, numbers which are slightly higher than they would have been in 1877.¹¹ The average annual wage that year was \$600.¹²

The citizens of the city proudly boasted that St. Louis was third in the nation, trailing New York and Philadelphia, in the number and value, about \$154,660,00, of manufacturing enterprises.¹³ While always under Chicago's shadow as the railway gate to the West, the opening of Eads Bridge across the Mississippi in 1874 helped St. Louis challenge that title, albeit to a limited degree. The city itself was typical of many Gilded Age urban centers: a business district surrounded by factories and growing slums. The city was gaining a reputation for "its tenements, filth, violence, and corruption."¹⁴ The coal smoke belching forth from the city's factories combined with the central districts brick and stone buildings to give St. Louis "a somewhat Londonesque appearance."¹⁵ Between the Censuses of 1850 and 1860, St. Louis grew from 104,978 to 190,524.¹⁶

The population of St. Louis was going through a dramatic change in the decade of the 1870's. By 1865, one out of five Missourians lived in St. Louis.¹⁷ The Census of 1870 lists the city's population as 310,864.¹⁸ By the next Census, 1880, the city had grown to 350,518, a growth of 39,654. Many of the country's cities experienced such growth, thanks largely to the influx of immigrants during this period. St. Louis was no exception. Many of the city's new inhabitants were from Germany. In the Census of 1880, 53,931, or 15.4%, of St. Louis residents were German-born, including the mayor of St. Louis in 1877, Henry Overstolz. This number was a decrease from the 65,936 German-born residents in the Census of 1870. Germans accounted for 51.4% of foreign born residents in the city in 1880. Of course, the Census data does not take into account the many first and second generations of American-born German ethnics already living in the city. This high number of Germans is also seen by the publication of a daily newspaper in German. Of the 29,332 German-born residents of St. Louis who were employed, their occupations

were: executives/proprietors (12.7 percent); supervisors/managers (0.5 percent); professional (3.2 percent); white collar (6.7 percent); craftsmen/tradesmen (33.2 percent); skilled workers (15.7 percent); peddlers/hucksters (1.3 percent); unskilled laborers (22.5 percent); unemployed (4 percent); and unknown (0.2 percent).¹⁹ While these numbers are for 1880, the percentages are probably relatively the same for 1877. The majority of working Germans were either craftsmen/tradesmen or skilled workers (48.9 percent). German immigrants were noted by employers as generally being more highly skilled compared to other nationalities.²⁰ Many immigrants lived in the crowded tenements north of Franklin Avenue and worked for, on average, \$1 or less a day.²¹ German immigrants also had a tradition of being more prone to socialism. Even before German Chancellor Otto von Bismark's Anti-Socialist Law of 1878 had the effect of driving many radical German labor leaders to the United States, many German socialists had immigrated to the United States to avoid military service.²² This characteristic of German radicalism can be seen in the disproportionately high German membership in the Workingmen's Party of the United States, roughly 600 of the Party's 1,000 members in St. Louis.²³

St. Louis had another characteristic that manifested itself during the course of the Great Strike. It was a former slave state. Two-thirds of African Americans in Missouri lived in St. Louis, 26,387 in 1870, most of whom were employed as either domestics or laborers, with a particularly heavy influence along the levees and on the steam ships along the river.²⁴ While slavery was abolished by 1877, elements of racism still persisted.²⁵ In 1875, Missouri schools became segregated and, in some parts of the state, after 1870 the Klu Klux Klan began lynching African Americans.²⁶ This racism was often adopted by immigrants, particularly since they were competing for many of the same jobs as African Americans. African American workers were often used as strikebreakers and purposely pitted against white workers by capitalists.²⁷ African American workers worked for less pay than whites and were thus often preferred when compared to unionized white

workers.²⁸ Not a lot of effort was put into organizing African American workers by established, white trade unions, but there were some. The National Labor Union invited African Americans into their organization, but then balked on accepting them as members for two years, after which the organization ceased to exist. The Knights of Labor, formed in 1869, also began to accept African American members, but, in the South, in different organizations than whites.²⁹ Still, by 1886, African Americans represented 10% of the Knights of Labor.³⁰ Isaac Meyers, an African American ship caulker from Baltimore, started the Colored National Labor Congress, but the various African American unions it represented soon dissolved or were taken over by politicians who turned away from trade unionism.³¹ These efforts to organize African Americans were the exceptions, not the norm, and, at the time of the Great Strike, there was little to no unionization of African American laborers in St. Louis.

Railroads and other industries overextended themselves following the Civil War, these ventures required large sums of capital with little initial returns. Industrial expansion in all corners of the economy had been supported only by speculation.³² The depression the United States experienced in 1873 was a result of the panic of September 17, 1873, when the country's largest bank, Jay Cooke and Company, shut its doors and went out of business. Cooke's extensive ventures proved too much for the company's assets to handle. This, combined with the shaky credit system, was enough to bring the entire economy of the United States down.³³ By September 29, 1873, five thousand banks declared bankruptcy and railroad stocks lost up to 50% of their value.³⁴ Immediately, hundreds of thousands of workers, up to one third of the labor force, lost their jobs as factories closed.³⁵ Approximately half of the railroads in the country plunged into receivership. Those who did keep their jobs endured severe wage cuts, work halts, and increased workload.³⁶ As 1873 ended, liabilities of 5,183 bankrupt companies was more than \$228,000,000.³⁷ By 1877, only one rail line in St. Louis was paying dividends.³⁸ Across the nation, railroads ran into financial difficulties as traffic declined from a fall in

industrial output.³⁹ The severe depression of 1873 would last until 1879. By 1880, real and nominal wages were half what they were before the depression.⁴⁰

The railroads tried to remain solvent by passing on lowered revenues to the workers by cutting wages and laying off workers. Railroad unions in 1877 were very weak, most were only fraternal insurance societies.⁴¹ News of stock watering, bribery and corruption among railroad executives and public officials, particularly the Crédit Mobilier scandal, further angered workers.⁴² The economic turmoil of the four years preceding 1877 slowly stoked the fire that ignited and spread across the nation that year.

The Workingmen's Party of the United States

Organized labor was hit particularly hard during the depression. Many labor unions collapsed, and those that did survive suffered reduced membership. In New York, trade-unions fell from 45,000 members to only 5,000.⁴³ In 1870 there were 30 national unions, by 1877 there was only 9.⁴⁴ While few saw anything positive about the country's economic condition in 1877, the Workingmen's Party of the United States must have seen their chance to unite the workers as the country's only Marxist political party. The Workingmen's Party was a socialist association made up largely of Germans, but also including Irish, Bohemian, French, and native-born Americans.⁴⁵ The Party was the creation of the merging of Marxists and Lassalleans, mostly middle-class reformers, who followed the teachings of Ferdinand Lassalle.⁴⁶ Lassalleans' primary demand was for state aid for co-operatives run by workers.⁴⁷ Lassalleans believed wages paid to workers would inevitably fall to subsistence levels-- a theory known as the "iron law of wages."⁴⁸ This theory led Lassalleans to prioritize politics over trade unionism, which differed from the Marxist's views and caused severe tension between the two groups.⁴⁹ Lassalleans wanted to turn trade unions into a labor party, while Marxists felt that political action was useless unless the workers were first organized.⁵⁰ This tension not only existed in the United

States, but was a larger problem within the International Workingmen's Association, the international Marxist organization.⁵¹ However, social unity was more important than minor ideological differences, and internationally, the Marxists and Lassalleans reconciled at the Gotha Congress, in Germany, in 1875.⁵²

The Workingmen's Party of the United States was created at a national congress in Philadelphia on July 19 through July 23, 1876. Seven socialist societies sent members, but only four of these societies were considered in good standing for having been at an earlier convention in Pittsburgh in April. The four societies in good standing, who had a total of seven delegates, represented around 3,000 socialists in the United States. The Social-Democratic Workingmen's Party of North America was the largest faction represented at the Congress, with 1,500 members nationally. The International represented 635 members, the Lassallean Workingmen's Party of Illinois represented 593 members, and the Social Political Workingmen's Society of Cincinnati represented 250 members.⁵³

Adopting the name of the Workingmen's Party of the United States, the Congress worked out a compromise merging Marxist trade unionism with Lassallean ideals to create a national, rather than international, organization.⁵⁴ The Congress adopted a constitution for the new party. The ruling body for the Party was called the Executive Committee, composed of seven members in charge of carrying out the running of the Party. This Executive Committee was to be monitored by a Board of Supervision, a five member panel that was to "watch over the action of the E[xecutive] C[ommittee] and that of the whole party. . .and to interfere in case of need."⁵⁵ The constitution also called for a national congress to meet at least every two years. It also outlined how sections could be formed. A section had to be of at least ten persons speaking the same language, three-fourths of whom must be wage-laborers. It also linked the question of women's rights to labor rights, saying "We acknowledge the perfect equality of rights of both sexes and. . . this equality of rights is a principle and is strictly observed." Perhaps of most interest, the

Constitution called for members to “turn their back on the ballot box.” Party members were to abstain from participation in elections, so that their “efforts will be directed far better towards the organization of the workingmen. . .”⁵⁶

In 1877, the Workingmen’s Party had about 4,500 members nationwide, quite a bit short of the 50,000 members the *New York Times* claimed they had after the Party organized the previous year.⁵⁷ The Party played no role in instigating the Great Strike and no role of great significance in any city other than Chicago and St. Louis. Party membership in St. Louis only numbered about 1,000, organized into branches based upon language. The German branch was the largest with 600 members.⁵⁸ The Workingmen’s Party in St. Louis made absolutely no effort in recruiting African Americans.⁵⁹ Prior to the Great Strike, the Workingmen’s Part had a very limited role in St. Louis, mainly it contented itself with infrequent leafleting and refusing to participate in the 4th of July parade in 1877.⁶⁰ However, that would change within several weeks as a series of strikes spread across the country, eventually reaching St. Louis.

The Great Strike

The events that occurred in St. Louis can not be understood without first looking at the origins and spread of the strikes throughout the country. The Great Strike was marked in almost every city with some kind of violent clash between workers and government forces. The reaction of state and local governments and the federal government showed which side they were supporting, the capitalists.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad planned a ten percent cut in wages scheduled to take effect on July 16. This was the second cut in eight months and the third in three years on wages that were hardly able to provide for a family before the cuts. A passenger brakeman only received \$1.33 a day before the proposed July cuts. The B&O president refused to meet with committees representing the workers. What's more, he then had the

members of the committee fired. It was the management's belief that the economic situation would keep the men from walking out and, if they did, there were many men out of work to replace them. As one general manager put it, "I have no fear of any trouble with our employees if it is done with a proper show of firmness on our part and they see that they must accept [the wage cut] cheerfully or leave."⁶¹

On the day the wage cuts were to take effect, July 16, the rail workers in Martinsburg, West Virginia began to gather. As evening approached, the crew on a cattle train refused to work and no one would replace them. The workers then uncoupled the engines and drove them into the roundhouse and refused passage of any train through the town till the wage cuts were repealed.⁶² A.P. Shutt, the mayor of Martinsburg with close ties to the B&O,⁶³ after a quick talk with railroad officials, tried to calm down the workers but was booed. Shutt ordered the police to arrest the ringleaders, but the workers laughed the mayor and his few policemen away. The first vice-president of the B&O, John King, Jr., telegraphed Governor Henry M. Mathews that a riot had broken out in Martinsburg.⁶⁴ Mathews, on only King's word, ordered the local militia, the Berkeley Light Guards, to Martinsburg to suppress the "riot." Before the militia even reached Martinsburg, the President of the B&O, John W. Garret, demanded Mathews wire President Hayes in Washington, DC to request Federal troops: "The loss of an hour would most seriously affect us and imperil vast interests," Garret forewarned.⁶⁵ al As the militia arrived, William Vandergriff, a striker, was killed when he tried to turn a switch and derail the militia's train. At Vandergriff's killing, the engineer and fireman aboard the militia's train quit and joined the strikers. Colonel Charles Faulkner, Jr. then dismissed the militia, many of whom were railroad men, and wired the Governor that the situation was out of control. Mathews then followed the demands of the B&O executives and called for federal troops. President Rutherford B. Hayes dispatched 300 troops to Martinsburg the next day, July 17.⁶⁶ That same day, a similar strike broke out in Baltimore. Ten strikers were killed and twenty wounded in a clash with the militia. The railroad strikers were joined by other

workers who had recently received a pay cut, and also by jobless workers and, according to the *Baltimore Evening Bulletin*, gangs of criminals.⁶⁷ Along the B&O line, similar strikes broke out and wherever they occurred state and federal officials responded by dispatching militia and Federal troops.⁶⁸

The strike soon spread to other railroads. Initially, the workers of the Pennsylvania Central Railroad, in Pittsburgh, were content to keep working. Then, inexplicably, the management ordered that all east-bound freights were to be "double-headers," two engines at the front to run twice the number of cars. This increased demand was due to the shutdown of the B&O. This also meant an increase in work and an increased possibility of injury for workers. When he heard the new order, Augustus Harris, a flagman, refused to work.⁶⁹ His insubordination soon spread to other rail workers and mobs formed throughout the city as news of the strike spread. These mobs were mostly composed of the unemployed. The local militias were sympathetic to the strikers. In one regiment not one man reported for duty.⁷⁰ A Philadelphia militia unit arrived and attempted to disperse the crowd surrounding the rail yard. Marching with fixed bayonets, the militia encountered a crowd of 6,000 strikers who pelted them with stones and bricks. The Philadelphia militia opened fire on the crowd, killing twenty and wounding over fifty.⁷¹ That night, someone set a fire at the railroad yards that burned \$5 million worth of cars and equipment.⁷² While it was reported the strikers started the fire in retaliation for the militia shootings, a conspiracy developed that the railroad might have started the fire. Most of the cars that burnt were old, so company had them burnt to collect damages from the state for the losses. Carroll D. Wright, the first U.S. Commissioner of Labor, supported this theory of company-sponsored arson in *The Battles of Labor* (1906).⁷³ The mob routed the militia from the city, possibly with the help of the Pittsburgh police.⁷⁴ The strike spread elsewhere in the state. The militia proved inept at handling the uprising, largely due to the sympathy of the militiamen for the strikers.⁷⁵

The battles between the militia and the mobs, comprising workingmen of all

occupations, made the strike more than simply a railroad strike. It became, rather, a struggle between workers and owners. As the strike spread along the railroads, from New York to Ohio and from Illinois to California, the striking rail workers were supported and joined by other members of the working-class. Violence escalated as more and more workers took to the streets. In Reading, Pennsylvania, thirteen strikers were killed and twenty wounded and in Cumberland, Maryland, ten strikers were killed and twice as many wounded.⁷⁶ That workers were taking to the street must have alarmed the middle and upper-classes that a veritable revolution was unfolding. So serious a perceived threat did the strikers pose that the United States and Mutual Life Insurance Companies went so far as to waive the sections in their policies that absolved the companies from payment for death due to military service: "At this time it is a matter of duty for the militia to protect the rights of citizens," proclaimed a message from the Companies in the *New York Times*.⁷⁷

In Chicago, the strikes began on Monday, July 23 with forty switchmen on the Michigan Central Railroad. The switchmen had recently had their wages cut from \$65 a month to \$55 and they were concerned that their wages would be cut yet again.⁷⁸ The Workingmen's Party played a limited role in the Chicago strike. The Party organized a series of rallies, the largest of which attracted over 6,000 people.⁷⁹ The switchmen soon attracted a crowd of 500 people, who then proceeded to shut down those railroads that were still operating.⁸⁰ The next day, Tuesday, July 24, strikers in the stockyards and packinghouses joined the railroad workers in sympathy strikes, which spread to many other industries throughout the city. That evening, the Workingmen's Party held a rally where Albert Parsons, a Party member and future anarchist, appealed to the gathered crowd to avoid violent action.⁸¹ This appeal went unheeded. Chicago became the site of some of the most violent clashes between the strikers and government forces. Throughout the days of July 25 and 26, skirmishes resulted in the death of at least eighteen strikers.⁸² While railroad workers initiated the strike in Chicago, their influence and numbers

subsided over the course of the strike.⁸³ The crowds were mostly organized along occupational or ethnic lines. Most were Irish, including a fair number of women and teenagers. Of those killed in Chicago, most had Irish surnames and 45% were under twenty years of age.⁸⁴

All railroads into St. Louis were channeled into East St. Louis, across the Mississippi River in Illinois, and across the river on the Eads Bridge. Since many railroads had lines connecting East St. Louis with Chicago, the railroad workers suffered the same wage-cuts in both cities. Events in St. Louis would unfold simultaneously as the strike in Chicago.

The Great Strike in St. Louis

St. Louis showed few signs of the nation's severe depression in the summer of 1877; beer gardens were crowded and the sound of Strauss waltzes filled the air, patrons thronged the city's sole park, Lafayette Park.⁸⁵ Bare-knuckle boxing, which had few rules and allowed for boot spikes no longer than three-eighths of an inch, also flourished, as Missouri was one of the few eastern states that allowed the sport.⁸⁶ The gaiety of these scenes only hid the truth. There was widespread unemployment and pauperism, evident by the opening of two municipal soup kitchens for the unemployed.⁸⁷ Adding to the problem of unemployment, the locally prominent National Bank of the State of Missouri closed its doors in the early summer. The closure of the supposedly strongest bank in St. Louis sparked a week long series of bank closures that ended around July 17.⁸⁸

Workers held the first strike meeting in the St. Louis area on Saturday, July 21. Meeting in East St. Louis, a large number of workers of several railroads struck work and met to show support of the striking rail workers in the eastern states.⁸⁹ During the afternoon of July 22, a second and larger meeting took place at Traubel's Hall.⁹⁰ George Kessenger, a brakeman from the Wabash Line presided over a meeting that included rail

workers from the Ohio & Mississippi Railroad, the Indianapolis & St. Louis Railroad, the Cairo Short Line Railroad, the Vandalia, Rockford & Rock Island Railroad, the Union Railway and Transit Company, and the Cairo & St. Louis Railroad.⁹¹

The meeting began somberly, but after a half hour the Brotherhood of Firemen marched into the hall and announced they had decided to strike. The crowd greeted this news with cheers, which continued when a messenger announced that 500 members of the Workingmen's Party of St. Louis were crossing the river to join the meeting.⁹² The assembled workers passed a motion to move the meeting outside, and the Hall emptied of men as they moved to the Relay Depot, their numbers swelling to 1,000 as workers from across the river in St. Louis came and joined them.⁹³ A railroad flatcar was pressed into service as a platform and a series of speakers addressed the crowd.

Most speakers were subdued. The most incendiary address came from the only elected official from East St. Louis to speak at the rally, Judge William G. Kase, a former member of the Illinois Legislature. Kase told the gathered workers he had prayed that morning in church for "not only property gained, but for property destroyed at the hands of the people!"⁹⁴ Luke H. Hite, who spoke at the rally was a former member of the Illinois legislature and a prominent lawyer in East St. Louis. He was far from what anyone would consider a member of the working-class; nonetheless, he took the stage and reportedly said that "the war just inaugurated was a war of the laboring men to gain what was their own."⁹⁵ The speeches of Kase and Hite showed that support for the strikes existed outside of the working-class. However, their conspicuous presence (they are the only speakers referred to by name in most sources) meant they were the exception and not the norm. Another speaker declared, "Yes, brother slaves, we are also serfs if we continue to work on the present reduction of wages, on which we can barely live. . ."⁹⁶ At this moment, the Workingmen's Party arrived from St. Louis with 500 voices singing "La Marseillaise," the anthem of Revolutionary France that had been used in 1871 by insurrectionists during the Paris Commune. In the wake of the French defeat during the

Franco-Prussian War and the subsequent collapse of Napoleon III's empire, Parisians took control of the city in fear that the new National Assembly in Versailles would restore the monarchy. ~~Between~~ The Parisians held the city from March 18 to May 28, 1871, before finally being crushed by French troops.⁹⁷

By the end of the Great Strike in St. Louis, the Workingmen's Party had more in common with the Paris Commune than just a song. Primary leaders of the Party in St. Louis included Peter Lofgreen (a Dane) and Henry Allen (a Welshman) who both headed the American section of the Workingmen's Party. The third prominent leader was Albert Currin, a recent immigrant, who headed the large German section of the Party. Lofgreen added social rhetoric to the strike: "All you have to do, gentlemen, for you have the numbers, is to unite on one idea: that the workingman shall rule the country."⁹⁸ The Workingmen's Party condemned the United States government for taking the side of capital in the strike by sending in Federal troops to break up the strikes around the country.⁹⁹ Workers from the various railroads then voted on whether there would be a strike. The answer was a resounding "Yes!" The strike was set to begin at midnight on July 23, when all freight trains would be stopped from leaving the yard, and the strike was to include all railroad workers, from engineers down. The strikers demanded the restoration of wages to the level they had been in 1873. As a final act, the workers established an executive committee composed of representatives from the striking railroad workers to manage and administer the strike.¹⁰⁰ This executive committee was not the same committee that would later be formed across the river in St. Louis. To alleviate any confusion, the St. Louis committee will be referred to as the Executive Committee, reference to the earlier East St. Louis committee will be as the executive committee.

The executive committee's order to blockade the rails was known as General Order No. 1, issued on Monday, July 23. This order represented the first official strike action by the newly established executive committee of East St. Louis.¹⁰¹ Moving to the railway depot, the 500 or so strikers stopped all freight cars, but allowed passenger cars to

move. Men from the car works and the stockyards joined the railroad workers in their strike. The committee's next action was to issue General Order No. 2 required that all negotiations had to be conducted through the executive committee and no freight would move until all the railroads had settled with their workers. The Mayor of East St. Louis, John Bowman, was in a peculiar situation. He needed the votes of the rail workers to stay in office.¹⁰² The dozen policemen of East St. Louis had only been paid sporadically for the past year, and, according to Bruce but unsubstantiated elsewhere, even their legal ability to arrest anyone had recently been challenged.¹⁰³ The Mayor was forced to acquiesce power to the striker's committee. The strikers selected a number of trusted men and Bowman appointed them as special police to protect the railroad property. Furthermore, the committee closed all saloons within six blocks of the rail depot.¹⁰⁴ Bowman volunteered himself as an ambassador to the railroad companies in St. Louis on the behalf of the strikers.¹⁰⁵ By the end of Monday, July 23, the strikers effectively controlled East St. Louis.

St. Louis' Mayor, Henry Overstolz, the first German-born mayor in city history, refused to take any preventative measures against the possibility of the strike hitting that city. On the evening of July 23, the Workingmen's Party held a mass meeting at Lucas Market, in the middle of the city. Some four to five thousand people came to hear different speakers on the workingman's condition. Albert Kordell harangued the crowd, "If we have any rights, now is the time to demand them and if it is to result in bloodshed, let it be so . . . No man can die a more heroic death than to die in the present cause."¹⁰⁶ John E. Cope, an English shoe-fitter and Workingmen's Party member, urged the crowd not to destroy railroad property, because it would soon be converted into public property, and, thus, the property of the workingmen. Albert Currlin, also of the Workingmen's Party, then addressed the crowd in German, warning them that they would have to fight if the Federal government sent the Army into the city. Joseph Glenn, a national officer in the Knights of Labor, compared their situation to that of the French in 1789. Harry Allen

asked the crowd, "We must fight or die. Which shall we do?" The overwhelming response was "We'll fight!"¹⁰⁷

At this meeting, Peter Lofgreen was elected by the assembled workers as chairman of a committee to visit the mayor. The other members of this special committee were Thomas Curtis, John E. Cope and James McCarthy, both shoe makers, and an African American known only as Wilson. Aside from Wilson, all the other committee members belonged to the Workingmen's Party. This committee advised the mayor not to send in Federal troops. Overstolz expressed sympathy, but declared he was unable to stop troops from entering the city. The next day, six companies of the 23rd U.S. Infantry arrived from Kansas supported by two Gatling guns. This had no effect on the strikers' spirit, according to the *New York Times*, who "continue to be as bold as ever in declaring their purpose to force the railroads to succumb."¹⁰⁸ At this point, the *New York Times* lumped the St. Louis strike in with that paper's general coverage of the nation-wide strike. The report on St. Louis came after a story about the strike in Ohio and before coverage for the strikes elsewhere in Missouri as well as in Kansas and Texas. Taking the *New York Times* as a barometer for the nation, the events of Tuesday, July 24 in St. Louis were seen only as part of a nation-wide series of strikes, without anything that would distinguish it too much. As the St. Louis strike progressed, however, it would receive more and more attention, eventually moving to the front page on July 27 and 28.¹⁰⁹

That same day, Tuesday, July 24, a general strike began to emerge. The Workingmen's Party, meeting at Party headquarters in Turner Hall, organized an Executive Committee to run the strike in St. Louis.¹¹⁰ Independent of the executive committee that railroad workers had formed in East St. Louis, the St. Louis Executive Committee was the creation largely of the Workingmen's Party. Membership of the Committee was vague, but Currin, Lofgreen and Adolph Fischer, all members of the Workingmen's Party, were reportedly on the Executive Committee. The best evidence indicates that there were roughly 47 known members of the Committee, but the actual

total numbers are not known. Morris Hillquit, a Russian immigrant and member of various socialist parties in the late 19th and early 20th century, said that the Committee, “seems to have been a rather loose body composed of whosoever chanced to come in and take part in its deliberations.”¹¹¹ What is known about the nine most prominent members of the Executive Committee, according to David R. Roediger, is that they differed significantly from the so-called “rank and file” of the working-class. Just two members were actually skilled workers: a shoemaker and a printer. The others consisted of two clerks (Including Lofgreen), a student/party organizer (Currin), a self-taught doctor (Allen), a drug and bleach maker, a newspaper seller, and a boot fitter.¹¹² Taken as a whole, the 47 members consisted of: skilled (40.43 percent) and unskilled (27.66 percent) workers; small proprietors (12.77 percent); white collar employees or professionals (14.59 percent); and other types of workers (4.26 percent). The professions of the members reflect the economic hardships of the period as a result of the depression of 1873. Five of the nine main leaders of the Executive Committee went from having a trade to being laborers in the two years previous to the strike, while another three moved from professional work to wage work or no work at all. Leadership of the strike also illustrates the wide ethnographic make up of the strikers, and the city as a whole. Of the 19 confirmed ethnic backgrounds of the Committee members: six were German; four Irish; four American born; two English or Welsh; two Swedish; and one listed simply as “European.”¹¹³

The Executive Committee sent delegations around to the different shops informing them to “stop work and join the other workingmen.”¹¹⁴ The coopers went on strike first, but were soon followed by the newsboys, the gasworkers, and the boatmen. Strikers from East St. Louis arrived to enforce General Order No. 1 in the St. Louis yards and to close a wire works. In reaction to these strike actions, prominent businessmen and professionals (the conservative forces of the city) met secretly with the Mayor and decided to organize a number of citizens with military experience in order to protect

private and public property.¹¹⁵ Command of this group was to be jointly held by two former Civil War generals: A.J Smith and John S. Marmaduke, the former from the Union and the latter the Confederacy.¹¹⁶ Reconstruction had only ended earlier that year when President Hayes withdrew the last federal troops from the old Confederacy. The wounds from the Civil War were still fresh on the minds of all who had endured it. These differences must have been exacerbated in the border states, where neighbors could have been on opposing sides. This is evident in the appointing of both a Union and a Confederate general as joint commanders.

On the evening of Monday, July 24, workers held another mass meeting at Lucas Market, this time drawing a crowd of ten thousand.¹¹⁷ It was located on 12th Street between St. Charles St. and Lucas Ave., right in the middle of the downtown area. Lucas Market was an open space normally reserved as a food market. Its central location in the city made it an ideal place for mass meetings. 1,500 molders and mechanics arrived to the sound of a fife and drum, marching four men wide, some carrying lathes and clubs.¹¹⁸ One speaker, according to the *New York Times*, said the strikers had 7,000 stands of arms, to which news the crowd cried, "Let us have them, and we will use them!"¹¹⁹ However, there are several things one must consider when looking at claims made by the *New York Times*. Firstly, given the distance separating the two cities, the *Times* had to rely on wire reports for what was happening in St. Louis. Secondly, that paper represented the perspective of business, so it was biased against the workers. It often reported exaggerated or even false information, as in its repeated references to the Workingmen's Party as the Society of the International and that the workers had 7,000 stands of arms.¹²⁰ Still, it is useful in looking at their perspective of the St. Louis strike to get an understanding of how the rest of the country was being told what was occurring.

Henry Allen then took the stage on behalf of the Executive Committee and the Workingmen's Party. He advised the strikers against using violence and then presented a series of resolutions the Committee had recommended the strikers to adopt. These were

gladly adopted by the strikers and, the next day, the resolutions were printed as a proclamation, in both English and German, which was distributed throughout the city: (Note: the original grammar and syntax has been kept as it appears.)

Proclamation

St. Louis, Mo., July 25th, 1877

Fellow Citizens: The daily press of the city- both English and German- persisting in misrepresentation of our movement in the present great struggle of our fellow-workingmen against the overbearing oppression of capitalists and monopolists,-we are compelled to issue the following in order to clear ourselves of the charges and abuses, which the daily press of St. Louis sees fit to throw upon us. Liberal thinking men may judge who is right and who is wrong.

As you well know, work is very scarce now in all branches, and the compensation of work done is so little, to make it almost impossible for married men to support their families. Where shall this end? If now, during the summer season, such is the case, what shall we do next winter? Has our government done anything for us workingmen? We say No! emphatically No! Therefore, fellow-workingmen, [w]e must act ourselves, unless we want starvation to stare to our faces the coming winter. There is only one way -**Help yourself!**

To this purpose a meeting was held last night at the Lucas Market, where the following resolutions were passed!

Resolved, that we, the authorized executive committee of the Workingmen's party of the United States, do not hold ourselves responsible for any act of violence which may be perpetrated during the present excitement; but that we will do all that lies in our power to aid authorities in keeping order and preventing acts of violence, and will do our utmost to detect and bring to punishment all guilty parties. We make an issue for our constitutional rights as American citizens-that is, the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Our motto is, "Death to thieves, incendiaries and murders."

Resolved, that, as every man willing to perform a use to society is entitled to a living, therefore, if our present system of production and distribution fails provide for our wants, it then becomes the duty of the government to enact such laws as will insure equal justice to all the people of the nation.

Resolved, that, as the condition of an immense number of people now in forced idleness, and the great suffering for the necessaries of life caused by the monopoly in the hands of capitalists, appeals strongly to the industrial classes for prompt action, therefore, to avoid bloodshed or violence, we recommend a general strike of all branches of industry for eight hours as a day's work, and we call on the legislature for the immediate enactment of an eight hour law, and the enforcement of a severe penalty for its violation, and that the employment of all children under fourteen years of age be prohibited.

Resolved, that it is our purpose never to give up the strike till these propositions are enforced.

The Executive Committee¹²¹

The "Proclamation" is notable for several reasons. First, and, perhaps, least impressively, it demonstrates the level of organization of the strike, with leadership wielded by the Executive Committee. Its distribution throughout the city shows that there

were the necessary resources for production, i.e. paper, press and ink, but also that there was sufficient manpower for its circulation. Secondly, the Committee was able to present the resolutions at the Lucas Market meeting and they were quickly adopted. These events demonstrate that the workers present recognized that the Committee had some authority to create such a document on their behalf. Thirdly, the call for restraining from acts of violence in the Executive Committee's "Proclamation" is consistent with what the Workingmen's Party was calling for in its own publication, *Labor Standard*, since the beginning of the General Strike. Finally, the language of the "Proclamation" shows the direct influence of the Workingmen's Party's Marxist ideology. This suggests that, while relatively few Party members were on the Executive Committee, the prominence and influence of those men (mainly, it is surmised, Allen, Lofgreen and Currilin) were at least partly, if not largely, responsible for the ideological language of the "Proclamation."

While words such as "capitalist" and "monopolist" were commonly used by many different labor movements at the time, their use is still in line with the language commonly used by the Workingmen's Party. An understanding of the political environment of the Gilded Age is important to grasp why the Workingmen's Party language so effectively struck a chord with workers who may have never even heard of Karl Marx. Many Americans felt that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats were effectively serving in their interests.¹²² In this environment, many alternate political parties were formed. These parties had various agendas, but were the outgrowth of the various state-wide granger movements started after 1867.¹²³ The National Independent Party was formed in 1874. Known more commonly as the Greenback party, its platform consisted of many pro-labor reforms, including free silver, a graduated income tax, reduced working hours, and the printing of greenbacks, which would mean a shift from the gold standard to a less deflationary system.¹²⁴ Third-party politics would undergo considerable growth after 1877, including the creation of Farmer Alliances, the growth of the Knights of Labor and the Populist movement. However, the vocabulary of progressive

reform against “capitalists” and “monopolists” was not foreign to the common worker at the time of the Great Strike.¹²⁵ In this context, the “Proclamation” is both a creation of the political ideology of the Workingmen’s Party and a reflection of contemporary political language familiar to Gilded Age workers.

Closing the meeting at Lucas Market, on the night of July 24, an African-American representative from the levee workers and roustabouts asked the crowd if the strikers would stand by the African Americans, regardless of color. With a shout of, “We will!” a force of strikers marched to the levee the next morning, July 25.¹²⁶ Accompanied by a fife and drum and with an American flag waving, they joined the striking levee workers and roustabouts there in forcing the boat captains to agree to a 50 percent wage-increase.¹²⁷ This initial support of African Americans is important to note in context of later developments, as we shall see, when inclusion of African Americans in the general strike was discouraged by the Executive Committee. The support for the levee workers is most likely a spontaneous result of the excitement of the crowd rather than an orchestrated event. Along with supporting the levee workers, workers at one cannery erected a banner declaring that they were striking until their wages were raised from 75 cents to \$1.75 a day.¹²⁸ This was part of a larger demonstration that was orchestrated by the Executive Committee that day. The Committee called for all laborers to gather once again at Lucas Market as a show of strength and solidarity.

The parade of workers began at 2 o’clock that afternoon. Stretching nearly four blocks long, they marched through the streets accompanied by a brass band. A large banner proclaimed “NO MONOPOLY - WORKINGMEN’S RIGHTS.”¹²⁹ The railroad strikers carried the tools of their craft, including the only red flags that were flown, and those because of their use by signalmen. Along the route, someone dashed into a bakery and came out with a loaf of bread. Placing it on a flagstaff, one worker yelled out, “That is what we are fighting for,” then another cried, “Let it be the symbol of our strike.”¹³⁰ The strike parade was preceded by members of the Workingmen’s Party who shouted for

other workers to join the general strike. Workers in foundries, mills, chemical plants, bakeries and other workplaces swelled the number of strikers to well over 5,000.¹³¹

The strikers marched for over three hours-- not even a rain shower dampened their spirits. The procession was rather orderly and peaceful, except in one instance. At a large bakery on 6th and Pine, after stopping work there, the strikers then proceeded to eat all the pies and cakes in the shop, in a rough parody of Marie Antoinette's advice to the revolutionaries of France in 1789.¹³² When the African American workers momentarily led the procession, Currlin and other Party leaders worried this would harm their cause in the eyes of the white workers.¹³³ They did not want the strike to be seen as an action of African Americans, because that might enrage residents of St. Louis. The *Missouri Republican* ~~noted~~ characterized the worker's march that day as, "terrified women, rudely handled by brutal negroes."¹³⁴ In 1877, while whites still felt superior to African Americans, in some way they feared what might happen if the former-slaves did rise up. Reconstruction left many whites uncertain about the role of African Americans in society.¹³⁵ Resentment still existed in the South about the role of African Americans as a result of Reconstruction. Northern Republicans used African American political power, created with the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, to suppress rebellious Southerners.¹³⁶ African Americans reached unprecedented levels of political and civil rights during Reconstruction, they received very little in terms of their social and economic circumstances.¹³⁷

Throughout the city, workers went on strike. In East St. Louis, women paraded to show support for the workers. The parade went by rather smoothly, and the *Missouri Republican* paid tribute to the "leadership and organizational qualities" of the Executive Committee.¹³⁸ The strikers also ran passenger and mail trains out of the city, collecting the fares themselves. At this point, the railroad officials worked to stop the trains. They hoped to inconvenience passengers and thereby shift the public attitude against the strikers.¹³⁹

The first clash between workers and police occurred the evening of Wednesday, July 26, in Carondelet, six miles south of the city center. Striking ironworkers called upon the workers in the Martindale Zinc Works to strike. When the strikers tried to stop the zinc works employees from working, the foreman of the Works struck one striker with a crowbar. The police tried to step in, but were met with a storm of rocks. The striking ironworkers then took control of the works and caused, according to the *New York Times*, \$3,000 worth of damage.¹⁴⁰ Also in Carondelet, strikers unfurled the red flags of the Internationals to cheers from the strikers.¹⁴¹ By the end of the day, according to J.A. Dacus, "there was not a single manufactory in operation, nor a single workingman pursuing his ordinary avocation in Carondelet."¹⁴²

That evening, July 26, the Executive Committee organized another meeting at Lucas Market. Lofgreen addressed the crowd, estimated at over 10,000-- the largest gathering of the strike. In his speech, he harangued the workers, arguing that the strike must not stop until they gained control of the government, cleaned it out, and sent to Washington representatives of the working-class. Perhaps most alarming to the railroad companies and capitalists, Lofgreen declared that if the railroads could not pay their bonds or expenses, the managers should resign and the railroads be given to the people.¹⁴³ Currilin then spoke along similar lines in German before handing the stage to the oldest of the strike leaders, Thomas Curtis. Curtis declared that they must take their demands all the way to the President, for this was "not a strike but a social revolution."¹⁴⁴ He then added three more demands, aside from the nationalizing of the railroads. First, a nationwide eight-hour workday law, which the Workingmen's Party had been working for prior to the strike. Second, the "recall of all charters of all national banks, together with their whole currency." This demand was part of the greenback movement towards inflationary policies that was thought would help the working-class. Third, a program of public works to provide jobs to all those left unemployed by the current economic depression.¹⁴⁵ This platform was later printed under the title "Vox Populi Vox Dei." Ending the evening's

meeting, a representative of the Executive Committee pronounced that another parade would take place the next day beginning at Lucas Market at 10 o'clock AM.¹⁴⁶

As the crowds dispersed, it was evident that the city was firmly in the hands of the Executive Committee. Sixty factories had been shut down by the strikers and an unknown number of additional factories and shops, from 5th St. down to the river in central St. Louis, had closed on their own accord. Business was at a standstill, and whatever economic activities continued were by the permission of the Executive Committee.¹⁴⁷ The following examples illustrate this point: a flour mill was allowed to reopen for the purpose of making bread. The owner of the Belcher Sugar Refinery was concerned that several tons of sugar stored in a warehouse would spoil. Belcher asked the U.S. Army commander to send troops to guard it, but the Army refused to send any. So, Belcher went to the Executive Committee and asked permission to open the refinery for 48 hours so. The Committee then persuaded the striking refinery workers to go back to work and it even sent 200 guards to protect the refinery, who promptly disappeared after receiving a free meal.¹⁴⁸ Currlin and two other Committee members met with Mayor Overstolz at his headquarters in the Four Courts. The Committee offered the city several hundred men to keep the peace. The Mayor thanked them and said he would call for them if he needed them.¹⁴⁹ These examples demonstrate the level of control the Executive Committee had over the city. That the mayor would meet with Committee members, and that the owner of one of the city's largest factory would come to them after being rebuked by a Federal authority *but* before going to city officials, all indicate that people in St. Louis recognized the Executive Committee as the defacto authority.

The next day, Thursday, July 26, was a pivotal day for the Committee. Forty more mills closed by day's end. The barbers went on strike. The wagon-makers, painters and blacksmiths met with representatives from the Workingmen's Party to discuss going on strike. These events were partially, if not entirely, due to the Committee sending delegates out to workplaces still in operation and trying to persuade them to join the strike. On the

wharves, cabin boys, taking advantage of the situation, negotiated salaries of a dollar a day. In Carondelet, Martin Becker, a Workingmen's Party member, organized eighteen metal workers into a special police force to maintain law and order. In East St. Louis, the railroad workers control of the city went unchecked. There, they held a large parade, complete with a brass band, including girls and young women, and banners with messages like, "We Want a Peaceful Revolution" and "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity."¹⁵⁰

With these gains came, in hindsight, a much larger loss. Having temporarily achieved control of the city, the Committee wavered, unsure what to do next. So far, they had only been declaring national agendas and not focusing on actually gaining any kind of recognition for organized labor in St. Louis. They issued proclamations, mostly quite conservative, and advised strikers against rash actions. On July 26, the Committee ordered a halt to large processions, which had been the source of their strength: "...in order to avoid riot, we have determined to have no large procession until our organization is so complete as to positively assure the citizens of St. Louis of a perfect maintenance of order and full protection of property."¹⁵¹ The Committee began to fear that such meetings would lead to greater violence. They feared what might happen with the mob more than with the civic authorities.¹⁵² Racism also played a role in the suspension of mass meetings. More and more African-Americans were appearing at the gatherings. This alarmed many members of the Executive Committee. Currin later recounted, in an interview with the *St. Louis Times*, "A gang of niggers. . .sent word that they wanted to join the [Workingmen's Party]. We replied that we wanted nothing to do with them."¹⁵³ This increased presence of African-Americans at Workingmen's Party meetings is a possible reason that the Executive Committee banned the meetings.¹⁵⁴ By stopping the meetings, the Committee effectively severed the possibility of African American and white workers from interacting. While nothing existed in the Constitution of the Workingmen's party concerning race, it is evident that the St. Louis section of the Party

was just as susceptible to the general air of racism in St. Louis .¹⁵⁵

Without any strong unions in town, the meetings were the primary way the Workingmen's Party had been able to communicate with the workers. As a result of canceling the meetings, the strike lost much of its organization. On the evening of July 26, only 2,000 people showed up at Lucas Market. There was much confusion and no official representatives of the Executive Committee were in attendance. After a few speeches from rank-and-file strikers, the strikers marched one mile to Schuler's Hall in an attempt to locate the Committee. The Committee had to move to Schuler's Hall after being evicted by the landlords of Turner Hall for their "radical" behavior.¹⁵⁶ Once the small crowd reached the Hall, they were told that representatives of the Committee had already left for Lucas Market. Discouraged, most of the crowd went home. Only about four hundred people attended. The only notable speech at Lucas Market that evening was passionately delivered by an unknown African American. Members of the Workingmen's Party quickly announced that the Party was not responsible for the man's violent speech. Henry Allen, Secretary of the Executive Committee nonetheless informed the police that there were "incendiary speeches" at Lucas Market and was given permission by the police to make arrests, but all the "agitators" had fled.¹⁵⁷ ~~The Committee was trying to distance itself from~~

While the Committee faltered, the conservative forces of St. Louis were preparing themselves.¹⁵⁸ The *New York Times* reported that merchants raised \$20,000 to arm the militia, the St. Louis Gun Club supplied shotguns, and 1,500 rifles and two cannon were sent by the governor from the state's arsenal. 11,000 volunteers were mustered into militia service, but there were only enough guns to arm about 600 of them.¹⁵⁹ Mayor Overstolz moved his office temporarily to the Four Courts building to be closer to the military commanders.¹⁶⁰ At the Armory, volunteers were being taught rudimentary lessons in arms. It was reported that General A. J. Smith of the National Guard was in command of three or four battalions of volunteers.¹⁶¹ It is believed that the numbers of the

volunteers and amount of arms might have been exaggerated in hopes of scaring the workers. The authorities may have also exaggerated the risk of the strikes turning into riots to frighten the propertied citizens into joining the militia or turning their support away from the workers. That night, July 26, mounted police began to patrol the city for the first time since the strike began.¹⁶²

The morning of July 27, John Phelps, Governor of Missouri, published a proclamation, which stated: "Whereas, a large number of men have for several days been unlawfully and riotously assembled in the City of St. Louis. . .Therefore, I, John B. Phelps, Governor of the state of Missouri, do hereby require said bands of men. . .to disband and return to their usual pursuits and avocations."¹⁶³ In response, the Executive Committee delivered their own message to the governor:

We request your speedy co-operation in convening the Legislature, and calling for the immediate passage of the eight-hour law, its stringent enforcement, and a penalty for all violations of the same; the non-employment of all children under 14 years of age in factories, shops, or other uses calculated to injure them. Your attention is respectfully called to the fact that a prompt compliance with our reasonable demands, and living wages paid to the railroad men, will at once bring peace and prosperity such as we have not seen in 15 years. Nothing short of a compliance to the above just demand. . .will arrest this tidal wave of revolution. Threats or organized armies will not turn the toilers of this nation from their earnest purpose, but rather serve to inflame the passions of the multitude. . Yours, in the nation's welfare,

Executive Committee
United Working Men of St. Louis¹⁶⁴

Of particular interest was the Executive Committee's reference to the strike as a "tidal wave of revolution." The strike in St. Louis was taking on a more socialist tone as the Workingmen's Party gained more and more control. The Executive Committee was trying to steer the strike from simply being about the economic situation towards a more political nature. This was the strong Lessalleian influence of the Workingmen's Party emerging. Rather than taking the Marxist approach to further trade unionism, the Party members on the Executive Committee were trying to broaden the political agenda of the Workingmen's Party. The St. Louis papers were now referring to the Committee as the "St. Louis Commune."¹⁶⁵

Workers gathered around Committee headquarters, now in Schuler's Hall, awaited orders. The only action taken was a written appeal for the workers to be patient. Time, however, was not on the side of the Committee. The authorities had decided on action.

At three o'clock, on Friday, July 27, municipal and federal forces arrived, the event reported in dramatic detail by a reporter for the *Missouri Republican*, who called it a "pretty scene." The police cavalry led the way, riding abreast so that they covered the width of the street. They were followed by foot police with rifles and two cannon. Behind these men were the Mayor and three prominent citizens. Half a block behind the city forces marched Federal troops with fixed bayonets. The cavalry ran into the workers standing outside the Hall. One of the police officers yelled to his officers, "Ride 'em down! Ride 'em down! They have no business here. Cut 'em down, if they do not go."¹⁶⁶ The mounted police drove the strikers outside away from the Hall with indiscriminate use of their clubs. This attack demoralized the strikers, and they began to flee. Strikers in Schuler's Hall fled the building, some jumping the three-story-high gap to neighboring buildings' roofs, while others dropped from a second-story balcony. The soldiers then stormed the Hall, arresting all those within without firing a shot. For his part in this action, which mainly consisted of yelling encouragement as he sat under an umbrella on the other side of the street, Colonel David Armstrong, Vice-President of the Police Board, was later appointed by the state legislature to the U.S. Senate.¹⁶⁷

Seventy-three men were arrested and placed in the basement of the Four Courts building.¹⁶⁸ Of the men arrested: 46 were German; 14 native-born American; 5 Irish; 3 English; 2 Polish; one Frenchman; a Cuban; and one unknown. By occupation: 41 were unskilled workers; 25 skilled workers; and 7 with some or no occupation.¹⁶⁹ The arrested men are probably a fair representation of the make up of the strikers in St. Louis. The vast majority were immigrant wage-laborers. None of the Executive Committee members were arrested at Schuler's Hall; however, several reporters were for being where they had

“no business” being.¹⁷⁰ Two members of the Committee, Albert Currlin and William Fischer, later that day tried to speak to Overstolz at the Four Courts Building “in plain German” to “amicably settle the existing trouble between labor and capitol.”¹⁷¹ Currlin and Fischer were quickly arrested.¹⁷² Allen and Lofgreen were soon arrested as well.

The next day, July 28, Federal troops poured into East St. Louis, dispersing the strikers around the Relay Depot. When the strikers tried to enforce the blockade the next day, they were arrested. The last incident of the strike occurred July 29, when Federal troops aided a U.S. Marshal in arresting a number of strikers trying to maintain the blockade.¹⁷³ That action ended the strike in St. Louis about one week after it began.

Members of the Executive Committee arrested at the end of the strike were brought to trial in mid-August. They were charged with “forcibly compelling peaceful laboring men to quit their employment.”¹⁷⁴ Bail had been set at \$3,000, only Currlin and John E. Cope were able to pay the exorbitant price. The prosecuting attorney was forced to enter *nolle prosequi* in all cases, because they did not have enough witnesses to proceed to trial. The defendants were freed, but there was still the possibility of future prosecution. In October of that year, a grand jury was reluctantly unable to act due to the constitutionality of the law being used to prosecute the former members of the Executive Committee.¹⁷⁵

Conclusion

After having started with bang, the Great Strike in St. Louis ended with a whimper. The loose control of the Executive Committee fell apart at the sight of armed government forces. This was the case all over the country, as government forces, including federal troops, intervened on behalf of the railroads to stop the strikes. According to Samuel Gompers, the 19th century labor leader, the Great Strike was “a declaration of protest in the name of American manhood against conditions that nullified

the rights of American citizens.”¹⁷⁶ J.P. McDonnell, editor of the *Labor Standard* during the Great Strike, said, “[The Great Strike] spread because the workingmen of Pittsburgh felt the same oppression that was felt by the workmen of West Virginia and so with the workmen of Chicago and St. Louis.”¹⁷⁷ The suppression of the Executive Committee in St. Louis roughly coincides with the end of major activity during the Great Strike nationally. Repercussions occurred sporadically for the next month, but the fever pitch of labor activity that marked the Great Strike from July 16 through the end of the month was effectively over. The events in St. Louis firmly showed that the state and national governments were behind the interests of the capitalists.¹⁷⁸ However, the St. Louis Commune, as it was called by local newspapers, under the guidance of the Executive Committee, was the most successful at conducting a peaceful general strike. From July 25 through July 27, the Committee held virtual control over the city and placed some sixty-odd factories, mills, shops, and foundries out of work for those days. The workers who participated in the general strike were from an extremely diverse background: 35 percent were American; 29 percent were German; 18 percent Irish; 12 percent English or Welsh; and 12 percent of the strikers were African-American.¹⁷⁹

Initially, African-American workers were welcomed into the strike, but racists in the Workingmen’s Party, Albert Currilin among them, vigorously began to, in Currilin’s own words, “dissuade any white men from going with the niggers.”¹⁸⁰ The increased presence of African-Americans at Workingmen’s Party sponsored meetings during the strike is a possible reason that the Executive Committee banned the meetings. As Philip S. Foner said, “One sure way of keeping Blacks out of mass meetings, and to keep white workers from joining the Black workers, was not to hold any mass meetings as all!”¹⁸¹ In an interview with the *St. Louis Times* on August 4, 1877, Currilin attacked the presence of African Americans, who, he claimed, forced themselves into the crowds of strikers uninvited and forgot their “place.” Currilin also feared that the presence of African Americans would be perceived by whites in St. Louis as an attempt to challenge white

With the end of the mass meetings at Lucas Market, communication between the Workingmen's Party controlled Executive Committee and the rank-and-file strikers was effectively severed. Without any leadership the workers were stymied and rendered ineffective, as seen with the large, confused crowd outside Schuler's Hall on Friday, July 27. Currlin, in his interview with the *St. Louis Times*, defended the decision to end mass meetings by declaring that the Executive Committee had feared the "mob" would turn towards violence.¹⁸³ Henry Allen, the only other Executive Committee member to make any statement, was interviewed by the *Missouri Republican* on Sunday, July 29. He blamed unknown "outsiders" as trying to "led on to acts of violence."¹⁸⁴ The Executive Committee had refused and tried to maintain an air of legality: "Why, there never was a time when a single policeman might not have sent away the Executive Committee," Allen said.

Both Allen and Currlin's interviews express their distinction from the "mob" that was advocating ~~from~~ violence. By distancing themselves from the "mob," they were, in fact, distancing their connection with the working-class, who, they must have forgotten, made up the crowds that had gathered at Committee meetings and gone on strike. The influence of Lassalleian ideas is the reason for this attitude. No action by the Executive Committee was aimed at improving the conditions of St. Louis workers. Rather than taking their unprecedented level of power and try^{ing} to improve the rights of trade unions, the Workingmen's Party dominated Committee tried, in their "Proclamation" and elsewhere, to turn the fervor for the strike into a political base to advance the Party agenda. Their disregard of a more Marxist trade unionism policy in favor of Lassalleian political advancement is a failure of the Workingmen's Party to advance the rights of the workingman.

The *Labor Standard* called the Great Strike the "Second American Revolution."¹⁸⁵ However, the results were not as dramatic as that implies. Workers

returned to work without any wage increases or further recognition for trade unions.

Many capitalists celebrated the suppression of the Great Strike as “the end of labor unionism.”¹⁸⁶ The success of the Great Strike was not material, it was that the potential power of the working-class became recognized. Across the country, workingmen had risen against the unfair practices of capital collectively. Radical movements were forced to go underground to wait for the “Revolution.”¹⁸⁷ Labor unions, eventually, began to grow. The Knights of Labor eventually reached 729,677 members in 1886.¹⁸⁸ In that same year, there were 1,411 strikes nationally.¹⁸⁹ Workers, though, were not the only ones to learn a lesson from the Great Strike. The following year, 1878, National Guard Armories were built throughout the country in order to combat any future upheavals.¹⁹⁰ Labor agitation would only mount as the Gilded Age progressed. Haymarket in 1886, where a bomb was exploded, and the Pullman Strike of 1892 are only some of the most violent episodes in an era that was marked by labor violence.

The St. Louis “Commune” never reached the scale of its Parisian counterpart. Mishandling by the Executive Committee ensured that the fierce power the strike initially had was dissipated. The real losers of the Great Strike, however, were not the railroads that lost several days business, but the workers. Through their failed strikes and “revolutions,” if St. Louis could be called such, strikers achieved little. Their quick suppression by Federal authorities on July 27 at Schuler’s Hall, in St. Louis, illustrated the lack of real support in class conscious activity by the working-class. It also shows to what lengths federal officials would go to support capital when it was threatened. Throughout the nation, Federal troops and local militias were used to combat the strikers. Allan Pinkerton, whose detective agency played a role in the strikebreaking and in general anti-labor activity in the Gilded Age, described the threat of government action against the strikes: “The rioters felt it. It went right home to them. They *knew* there was to be no higggle-haggle or trifling.”¹⁹¹ Pinkerton wrote of the Great Strike: “Hundreds have been punished. Hundreds more will be punished.”¹⁹²

- ¹ Cited in David O.Stowell, *Streets, Railroads, and the Great Strike of 1877* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 2.
- ² Philip S. Foner, *The Great Labor Uprising of 1877* (New York: Monad Press, 1977),157.
- ³ *Ibid.*, 187.
- ⁴ J.A. Dacus, *Annals of the Great Strikes in the United States* (New York: Arno Press & the New York Times, 1969), vi.
- ⁵ This claim is entirely mine, but based on the fact that he is often cited in every other source when the Great Strike in St. Louis is addressed.
- ⁶ David T. Burbank, *Reign of Rabble: The St. Louis General Strike of 1877* (New York: A.M. Kelley, 1966),207-8.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 1-3.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, 2-3.
- ⁹ Audrey Louise Olson, "St. Louis Germans, 1850-1820: The Nature of and Immigrant Community and Its Relation to the Assimilation Process" (Ph.D. diss., University of Kansas, 1970), 39 & William E. Parrish, *A History of Missouri: Volume III, 1860 to 1875* (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1973),224.
- ¹⁰ Parrish, 224. Shortly after the Great Strike, Adolphus Busch would come to St. Louis and marry Lilly Anheuser, whose father owned the Anheuser brewery. By 1901, Anheuser-Busch would be the largest seller of beer in the United States.
- ¹¹ Olson, 39-40.
- ¹² Parrish, 224.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 223.
- ¹⁴ Paul C. Nagel, *Missouri* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1973),168.
- ¹⁵ Parrish, 202.
- ¹⁶ All population data from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places*, 1998, <www.census.gov/population/documentation/twps0027/> (26 May 2004) & *St. Louis Census Demographics 1772-2000*, <www.usgennet.org/usa/mo/county/stlouis/census.htm>, (26 May 2004).
- ¹⁷ Nagel, 167.
- ¹⁸ U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places & St. Louis Census Demographics 1772-2000*
- ¹⁹ Olson, 297.
- ²⁰ John B. Jentz, "Artisan Culture and the Organization of Chicago's German Workers in the Gilded Age, 1860 to 1890," in *German Worker's Culture In the United States 1850 to 1920*, ed. Hartmut Keil (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988), 75.
- ²¹ Nagel, 201-2.
- ²² Burbank, 183 & Jentz, 75.
- ²³ Foner, 1877, 161.
- ²⁴ Parrish, 145-6 & *St. Louis Census Demographics 1772-2000*.
- ²⁵ Bruce Laurie, *Artisans Into Workers: Labor in Nineteenth-Century America* (Urbana & Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 195.
- ²⁶ Nagel, 93.
- ²⁷ Laurie, 195.
- ²⁸ Eric Arnesen, *Brotherhoods of Color: Black Railroad Workers and the Struggle for Equality* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001), 40.
- ²⁹ Norman Coombs, *The Black Experience in America* (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972), 92.
- ³⁰ Laurie 159.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² Louis Adamic, *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America* (New York: The Viking Press, 1934), 25.
- ³³ Robert Cruden, *The Negro in Reconstruction* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), 121.
- ³⁴ Nancy Cohen, *The Reconstruction of American Liberalism 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The

- University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 122.
- ³⁵ Adamic, 26 & Cohen, 123.
- ³⁶ Eric Arnesen, "American Workers and the Labor Movement in the Late Nineteenth Century," in *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America*, ed. Charles W. Calhoun (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1996), 42 & Cohen, 123.
- ³⁷ Cruden, 121 & Jeremy Brecher, *Strike!* (San Francisco: Straight Arrow Books, 1972), xiv.
- ³⁸ Burbank, 6.
- ³⁹ Gerald G. Eggert, *Railroad Labor Disputes: The Beginnings of Federal Strike Policy* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967), 24.
- ⁴⁰ Adamic, 26 & Eggert 24.
- ⁴¹ Burbank, 6.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³ Adamic, 26.
- ⁴⁴ Cruden, 122.
- ⁴⁵ Foner, 1877, 103.
- ⁴⁶ Philip S. Foner, *The Formation of the Workingmen's Party of the United States* (New York: American Institute for Marxist Studies, Inc., 1976), 1-3.
- ⁴⁷ Foner, *Formation of the WPUS*, 3.
- ⁴⁸ Laurie, 179.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁰ Philip S. Foner, *The Workingmen's Party of the United States: A History of the First Marxist Party in America* (Minneapolis: MEP Publications, 1984), 20.
- ⁵¹ Foner, *WPUS*, 20-1.
- ⁵² Foner, *Formation of the WPUS*, 3.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, 7.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁵ Constitution of the Workingmen's Party of the United States, art. 3, sec. 2a, as reproduced in Foner, *Formation of the WPUS*, 28. Reprints of the Workingmen's Party of the United States Constitution are available in both Foner, *Formation of the WPUS*, 26-35, and Foner, *WPUS*, 117-124.
- ⁵⁶ Constitution of the Workingmen's Party of the United States, "Ballot Box," as reproduced in Foner, *Formation of the WPUS*, 33-4.
- ⁵⁷ *New York Times*, August 11, 1876.
- ⁵⁸ Burbank, 19.
- ⁵⁹ Foner, *WPUS*, 86.
- ⁶⁰ David R. Roediger, "America's First General Strike: The St. Louis Commune of 1877," *Midwest Quarterly* 221, no. 2 (Winter 1980): 196-206.
- ⁶¹ Adamic, 28; Brecher, 1; Bruce, 56-7; Burbank 9.
- ⁶² Brecher, 1.
- ⁶³ Eggert, 25.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 26.
- ⁶⁶ Brecher, 7.
- ⁶⁷ Cited in Bruce, 104.
- ⁶⁸ Adamic 30.
- ⁶⁹ Brecher, 10.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.
- ⁷¹ Adamic, 32.
- ⁷² *Ibid.*
- ⁷³ Cited in Bruce, 147.
- ⁷⁴ Brecher, 13.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.
- ⁷⁶ Adamic, 30-1.
- ⁷⁷ *New York Times*, 25 July, 1877.
- ⁷⁸ Adamic, 33.

- ⁷⁹ Bruce, 238.
- ⁸⁰ Brecher, 17.
- ⁸¹ Adamic, 33-4.
- ⁸² *Ibid.*, 252.
- ⁸³ Stowell, 118.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁵ Burbank, 3.
- ⁸⁶ Parrish, 191-2.
- ⁸⁷ The claim of pauperism was made by the St. Louis Social Science Association, cited in Burbank, 5.
- ⁸⁸ Burbank, 5.
- ⁸⁹ Burbank, 15.
- ⁹⁰ Foner, *1877*, 159. However, Burbank, 15, states the meeting was held at night. This discrepancy is most likely, I believe, due to Foner's using the start of the meeting as the time and Burbank's using the end of it for the time.
- ⁹¹ Burbank, 16 & Dacus, 354.
- ⁹² Bruce, 255.
- ⁹³ Brecher, 17.
- ⁹⁴ Burbank, 16.
- ⁹⁵ Dacus, 354.
- ⁹⁶ Foner, *1877*, 160.
- ⁹⁷ Encyclopedia Britannica, *Commune of Paris*, 2004, <search.eb.com/eb/article?eu=59933> (26 May, 2004)
- ⁹⁸ Brecher, 17-18.
- ⁹⁹ Foner, *1877*, 163.
- ¹⁰⁰ Burbank, 16.
- ¹⁰¹ Foner, *1877*, 164.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 165.
- ¹⁰³ Burbank, 27 & Bruce, 257.
- ¹⁰⁴ Foner, *1877*, 164-5.
- ¹⁰⁵ Dacus, 356-8.
- ¹⁰⁶ Foner, *1877*, 166.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 168.
- ¹⁰⁸ *New York Times*, 25 July, 1877.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 24-28 July, 1877.
- ¹¹⁰ Brecher, 18.
- ¹¹¹ Cited in Burbank, 56
- ¹¹² Roediger, "Not only the Ruling Classes to Overcome, but also the So-called Mob," *Journal of Social History* (Winter 1985): 222.
- ¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 221-2, 229-30.
- ¹¹⁴ Burbank, 43.
- ¹¹⁵ *New York Times*, 25 July, 1877.
- ¹¹⁶ Dacus, 384-5.
- ¹¹⁷ Brecher, 19.
- ¹¹⁸ Foner, *WPUS*, 82.
- ¹¹⁹ *New York Times*, 26 July, 1877. This claim was later to be proven false. Burbank, 53, claims, also, that the strike leaders may have thought they could form the strikers into recognized militia squads and legally arm them with government guns.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 25 & 26 July, 1877.
- ¹²¹ A photo of the Executive Committee Proclamation of July 25, from the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, is reproduced opposite the title page of David T. Burbank's *Reign of Rabble*.
- ¹²² Charles W. Calhoun, "The Political Culture: Public Life and the Conduct of Politics," in *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America*, ed. Charles W. Calhoun (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1996), 191.
- ¹²³ Worth Robert Miller, "Farmers and Third-Party Politics," in *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of*

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 242-3.

¹²⁵ Robert C. McMath, Jr., *American Populism: A Social History, 1877-1898* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 53.

¹²⁶ Burbank, 55 & Foner, 1877, 173.

¹²⁷ *New York Times*, 26 July, 1877.

¹²⁸ Foner, *WPUS*, 82.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 83.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 177-8.

¹³² Dacus, 383.

¹³³ Bruce, 275.

¹³⁴ Burbank, 76.

¹³⁵ Cruden, 158.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 160.

¹³⁷ Coombs, 91.

¹³⁸ Foner, 1877, 178.

¹³⁹ Brecher, 20.

¹⁴⁰ *New York Times*, 26 July, 1877.

¹⁴¹ Foner, 1877, 178.

¹⁴² Dacus, 383.

¹⁴³ Burbank, 84.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 85.

¹⁴⁵ Foner, *WPUS*, 84.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁷ Foner, 1877, 179.

¹⁴⁸ Burbank, 111-2.

¹⁴⁹ Bruce, 275.

¹⁵⁰ Burbank, 112-5.

¹⁵¹ Foner, 1877, 181 & the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* as quoted in Foner, *WPUS*, 86.

¹⁵² Burbank, 173.

¹⁵³ Cited in Foner, 1877, 182.

¹⁵⁴ Foner, 1877, 183.

¹⁵⁵ The absence of any mention of race in the Party's Constitution is interesting to note especially in light that there is a section concerning women's rights. While unable to find any reason for this, there are two possibilities. First, race was not considered an issue. This would be more along the socialist roots of the Party and seems most likely from an ideological standpoint. The other possible reason is that race was left out of the Constitution for the very reason to exclude African Americans. This second option seems to be the one exercised by the St. Louis branch of the Party.

¹⁵⁶ Bruce, 281.

¹⁵⁷ Burbank, 118.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 117-8.

¹⁵⁹ Bruce, 275 & *New York Times*, 27 July, 1877. Bruce, 282, claims the merchants only raised \$18,000, but the claim of \$20,000 is used by Foner as well.

¹⁶⁰ Dacus, 386.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 387.

¹⁶³ *New York Times*, 27 July, 1877.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁵ Foner, 1877, 180.

¹⁶⁶ This quote is attributed to a Captain Fox in Foner, 1877 (p.186), but the same quote is attributed to Colonel Armstrong in Burbank (p.143).

¹⁶⁷ Burbank, 143.

- ¹⁶⁸ Foner, *1877*, 186.
¹⁶⁹ Roediger, "Not only the Ruling Classes to Overcome," 230-1.
¹⁷⁰ Foner, *1877*, 186.
¹⁷¹ Burbank, 145-6.
¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 146.
¹⁷³ Foner, *1877*, 187.
¹⁷⁴ Burbank, 180.
¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 181-7 & Foner, *1877*, 208-9.
¹⁷⁶ Samuel Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labor* (Ithaca, New York: ILR Press, 1984), 46-7.
¹⁷⁷ Cited in Bruce, 229.
¹⁷⁸ Brecher, 20.
¹⁷⁹ Stowell, 118.
¹⁸⁰ Foner, *1877*, 182.
¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 183.
¹⁸² Cited in Foner, *1877*, 208.
¹⁸³ *Ibid.*
¹⁸⁴ Cited in Burbank, 172.
¹⁸⁵ Foner, *1877*, 230.
¹⁸⁶ Adamic, 36.
¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.
¹⁸⁸ Brecher, 28.
¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*
¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 22.
¹⁹¹ Pinkerton, 407.
¹⁹² *Ibid.*, x.

Selected Bibliography

- Adamic, Louis. *Dynamite: The Story of Class Violence in America*. New York: The Viking Press, 1934.
- Arnesen, Eric. "American Workers and the Labor Movement in the Late Nineteenth Century." In *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America*, edited by Charles W. Calhoun. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1996, 39-61.
- . *Brotherhoods of Color: Black Railroad Workers and the Struggle for Equality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Brecher, Jeremy. *Strike!*. San Francisco: Straight Arrow Books, 1972.
- Bruce, Robert V. *1877: Year of Violence*. Indianapolis: The New Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1959.
- Burbank, David T. *Reign of Rabble: The St. Louis General Strike of 1877*. New York: A.M. Kelley, 1966.
- Calhoun, Charles W. "The Political Culture: Public Life and the Conduct of Politics." In *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America*, edited by Charles W. Calhoun. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1996, 185-213.
- Cohen, Nancy. *The Reconstruction of American Liberalism 1865-1914*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Coombs, Norman. *The Black Experience in America*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Cruden, Robert. *The Negro in Reconstruction*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Dacus, J.A. *Annals of the Great Strikes in the United States*. New York: Arno Press & the New York Times, 1969.
- Eggert, Gerald G. *Railroad Labor Disputes: The Beginnings of Federal Strike Policy*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967.
- Encyclopedia Britannica. *Commune of Paris*. 2004.
<search.eb.com/eb/article?eu=59933> (26 May, 2004).
- Foner, Philip S. *The Great Labor Uprising of 1877*. New York: Monad Press, 1977.

- . *The Formation of the Workingmen's Party of the United States*. New York: American Institute for Marxist Studies, Inc., 1976.
- . *The Workingmen's Party of the United States: A History of the First Marxist Party in America*. Minneapolis: MEP Publications, 1984.
- Gompers, Samuel. *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*. Ithaca, New York: ILR Press, 1984.
- Gutman, Herbert G. "Trouble on the Railroads in 1873-1874: Prelude to the 1877 Crisis?" *Labor History* 2:2 (Spring 1961), 215-235.
- Hillquit, Morris. *History of Socialism in the United States*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1910.
- Hunter, Robert. *Violence and the Labor Movement*. New York: Arno Press & the New York Times, 1969.
- Jentz, John B. "Artisan Culture and the Organization of Chicago's German Workers in the Gilded Age, 1860 to 1890." In *German Worker's Culture In the United States 1850 to 1920*, edited by Hartmut Keil. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988, 59-71.
- Laurie, Bruce. *Artisans Into Workers: Labor in Nineteenth-Century America*. Urbana & Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- McMath, Robert C., Jr. *American Populism: A Social History, 1877-1898*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.
- Miller, Worth Robert. "Farmers and Third-Party Politics." In *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America*, edited by Charles W. Calhoun. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1996, 235-260.
- Montgomery, David. *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans 1862-1872*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- Nagel, Paul C. *Missouri*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1973.
- New York Times*, 11 August 1876 & 25 July-28 July 1877.
- Olson, Audrey Louise. "St. Louis Germans, 1850-1820: The Nature of and Immigrant Community and Its Relation to the Assimilation Process." Ph.D. diss., University of Kansas, 1970.
- Orth, Samuel P. *The Armies of Labor: A Chronicle of the Organized Wage-Earners*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920.
-

Parrish, William E. *A History of Missouri: Volume III 1860 to 1875*. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1973.

Pinkerton, Allan. *Strikers, Communists, Tramps and Detectives*. New York: Arno Press, 1969. Reprint of the 1878 edition.

Roediger, David. R. "America's First General Strike: The St. Louis 'Commune' of 1877." *Midwest Quarterly*, Vol. 221, No. 2 (Winter 1980), 196-206.

---. "Not only the Ruling Classes to Overcome, but also the So-called Mob." *Journal of Social History* (Winter 1985): 213-319.

Stephens, Glenn. "Remodeling collective violence: James Tong's rational choice model and the Great Strike of 1877". *Political Research Quarterly* 48, Issue 2 (1995): p345.

Stowell, David O. *Streets, Railroads, and the Great Strike of 1877*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Way, Peter. "Labour's Love Lost: Observations on the Historiography of the Class and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of American Studies* 28 (1994): 1-22.