

# THE HARBINGER.

ORGANIZATION, EDUCATION, ELEVATION.

VOL. I.

RALEIGH, N. C., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1902.

No. 49

## STRIKE YOUR GAIT.

Some men have splendid fortune in the midst of all the strife  
Which we must needs engage in as we work our way through life.  
While some of us are plodding, others often pass us by  
And leave us toiling onward, while to meet success they fly.  
We marvel their good fortune and the race thus quickly run—  
The treasures they have gathered and the prizes they have won.  
And yet we often notice that the man who strikes his gait  
And holds it to the finish, always gets there soon or late.

Though some caprice of fortune yields great plenty to your friend,  
Give little thought to envy. Run the race unto the end.  
The race is not the running for what profit has the soul  
That starting with rare fleetness, fails at last to reach the goal?  
The laurel wreath is waiting for the man who nobly tries,  
Though he may finish second to the one who wins the prize.  
How often do we notice that the man who strikes his gait  
And holds it to the finish, always gets there soon or late.

Success will follow effort made by all along the way  
As surely as the shadows yield to lances of the day.  
Some may achieve it quickly through some happy circumstance,  
While others toil and struggle ere they note its smiling glance.  
For aye success is waiting with rewards that seemeth sweet  
For those who make haste slowly and for others who are fleet.  
And hence it is we notice that the man who strikes his gait  
And holds it to the finish, always gets there soon or late.

## WHY LABOR ORGANIZES.

JAMES LYNCH, OF BELLOWS FALLS, VT., IN THE AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST.

In accordance with the law of cause and effect, every effect must be the result of a cause, and as a logical sequence, the effect produced must be in direct proportion to the efficiency of the cause.

What, then, we might ask, is the cause, or rather series of causes, which has led to the wonderfully increased growth of organized labor in recent years? That this increase has been phenomenal, is a matter which admits of no doubt.

Chief among those causes, unquestionably, is the birth of new economic conditions, created by those combinations of capital known as trusts. They have, by increasing the cost of living and at the same time keeping wages stationary, if not reducing them, compelled the working man to seek protection in organization. They have awakened him from his pleasant slumbers of security, they have taught him that unity of effort is vitally essential to his well being, aye, that it is essential to his very existence as a free man.

With a zeal which might prove beneficial to humanity were it exerted in a better cause, trust advocates try to show the workingman what superlatively beautiful things they are, and how they are calculated to promote his interests.

They are wasting breath. A few visits to the butchers' or grocers' shops will do more to convince the workingman of the real meaning of the trusts to him, than all the graceful rhetoric or subtle logic their ablest expon-

ents can advance. The trusts' motto is economy in production, and even though it results in a diminution of prosperity for the workingman.

They are not very sensitive on that point; it seemingly is no concern of theirs. But let them ponder and weigh current events. Recent happenings in connection with the anthracite strike should have taught them a lesson it would be well for them not to forget—that, in the final test, the supreme power inheres not in the classes, but in the masses.

Is not there something as silly as it is impotent in the efforts which many employers of today make to disrupt labor organizations? They will not or cannot see that they are chiefly responsible for the formation of organized labor bodies, because they have brought about conditions which compel men to organize.

They cannot deny the fundamental right of labor to organize, yet on every possible occasion they seek to destroy labor unions. They would render inoperative the law of cause and effect. Let them pause.

If labor organizations are not entirely suited to certain employers' taste, let the employers remove the cause that lead to organization.

With a solicitude which would be commendable were it altogether above suspicion, some employers will plead for the inalienable right of a man to work wherever he likes at his own price, and when it suits their purpose, will not hesitate to deprive men of that same right, by the establishment of a black-list or the issuance of an injunction.

Trade unionist do not deny that a man has an inherent right to work where he will and at what price he will, but they have very grave doubts as to whether a man, perfectly willing to participate in all the advantages accruing to workingmen as the result of organization, is, at the same time, morally justified in staying outside the organization which secured better wages and conditions.

Some people would seem to have a very vague idea of what organized labor is today striving for, or what it has done to improve the conditions of the workingman.

The goal toward which organized labor is to-day fighting its way is, as Samuel Gompers has so ably expressed it—

to obtain for the workingman the greatest amount of prosperity that would be consistent with the industrial and commercial prosperity of the country.

Is not this a cause as indisputably just as it is worthy of the best energies of mankind to attain.

As to what organized labor has accomplished, it is safe to say, that it has done more to ameliorate the condition of the workers than all other causes combined. It has secured for them the repeal of laws, the injustice of which was only equalled by their

absurdity; it has consistently fought against industrial slavery and has to a large extent succeeded in eradicating the sweatshops which are a blot on our present civilization.

"Knowledge is power." The workingman of today is a radically different individual from the workingman of fifty or even twenty years ago. The word of Burns

If I were made to be a slave and serve my fellow-kind  
Why was an independent wish'er planted in my mind?

are constantly recurring to him. He feels that it is not good to be a slave. He feels that in the struggle for independence in modern industrial life, keenness of intellect is far more valuable than strength of muscle, and accordingly he seeks to educate himself.

History teaches him that labor organizations in one form or another have been in existence for over five hundred years, and he need not be possessed of any unusual perceptive powers to enable him to realize that no institution ever fashioned by human hands could exist for such a length of time were it not of some real practical value to the members of which it was composed.

Experience teaches him that if he is desirous of any substantial improvement in his condition, he will invariably have to seek it from some source other than the mere good will of his employer.

Common sense teaches him that the more harmonious the relations between employer and employe, the pleasanter and more profitable it will be for both, hence he is not over-anxious to be involved in a strike unless it be a necessity.

He is becoming better educated, and in that fact lies his hopes for the future. Organized labor is teaching him unselfishness, that unselfishness which is at the root of all that is noblest in human nature. It is teaching men that the day has gone by when women should be actuated solely by selfish aims, and that the day has arrived when they should be willing to stand shoulder to shoulder and fight for each other's rights.

## CURE FOR HYDROPHOBIA.

The Leipsic German Journal publishes the following antidote for the bite of a mad dog, which it says was an exclusive secret with a Saxon forester, but who, growing old, was unwilling to let it die with him, and, therefore, procured its publication. He is said to have used it for fifteen years, and rescued many human beings and cattle from the fearful death of hydrophobia. The antidote: Take immediately tepid water; wash the wound clean therewith, and then dry it; then pour upon the wound a few drops of hydrochloric acid, because mineral acids destroy the poison of the saliva, by which means the latter is neutralized.

Ten per cent. of English trade union shipbuilders are out of work.

## GOVERNMENT COAL MINES.

A. S. LEITCH, IN THE AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST.

For sake of argument, let us admit government coal mines as an important question. The suggestion has many friends, some few of them honest, the larger number simply that unthinking multitude caught by pleasant phrases and pseudo radicalism. Government ownership of coal mines would mean, in its full significance, *government ownership of coal miners*

The post office department is often quoted as an object lesson, and post office employes have their own grievances. They are yet looking for some loop-hole to squeeze through a remedy without facing a charge of high treason. Should a carrier go on strike and picket his route to persuade others from taking his place, you can see the carrier's finish, not in five months, but in about five minutes, and he will be fortunate in escaping five years in the pen."

Those who point with pride to government conduct of the postal business, should also recall the Idaho bull-penn horrors, showing how the government can run a mine. Had the same power controlled the anthracite district of Pennsylvania during the past year, there would have been no strike, no miners' unions, and no necessity for a wearisome arbitration; but there would have been the most despotic slavery of human beings and a wonderful strutting of poppycock officialdom in gold lace and red pinfeathers.

It is very easy for government ownership advocates to say that miners shall be paid good wages for eight hours' work and the coal be sold at cost. The argument is catchy, but fallacious. What is "good wages?" Questioned on this subject, [a laborer answered that he thought "\$2.50 a day was good enough for any man." A professional gentleman states that he "can not see how any self-respecting American citizen can live well, raise a family, and maintain an easy mind, on less than \$5,000 a year." Here is a wide difference. Certainly the miners should receive the best wages, if we consider the danger and labor attending his occupation; yet the major portion of the fruits of his toil go to "sweaters," who pilfer the difference between the cost of mining the coal and the price of the coal mined, and to those smug New England Puritans who "own" the coal lands and draw dividends stained with the blood of human beings who have died in the black pits, and frightened with the curses of children whose shrunken bodies and warped minds represent the rights of invested capital. And the remedy for all this shall be a change to official chattel slavery.

Anent this, a wealthy New York philanthropist and reformer says:

I worked one day of my life in a mine, and it was enough. I have always thought those men should be paid twice as much as those who work above ground in God's sunlight, and I for one am willing to have the price of coal doubled if I can only be sure the increase goes into their pockets.

Very kind of him! But there are thousands who will not, and thousands who can not, pay double price. And it is a passing strange fact that these worthy gentlemen who are so willing to dole out charity to the miner are his most bitter opponents in matters of common justice.

They pity the poor miner, but the weight of their benevolent influence is always cast in the balance with the vampire brood of middlemen and sweaters who fatten their vile carcasses off the sweat of the mine workers' faces.

In this question there is one fact so simple that all intelligent men concede its truth—that *the coal lands belong to the whole people.*

The coal is the property of all the people. The only issue is: How shall it be mined and distributed to the best advantage? Advocates of the present system contend that competition, and supply and demand, regulate everything properly, and are the best means of distributing the products to the people, who now pay only cost price—that is, cost of labor, carriage, intelligent supervision, and a fair return for capital invested. This may be true, under certain conditions. It is a noticeable fact that some people can see more colors in a rainbow than others.

The present system of running the mines, it must be admitted, is neither to the benefit of the public nor to that of the coal miner. To an impartial observer it would seem that these two are the parties directly interested in the matter.

It is doubtful if the government could run the mines any better for the people, and certainly it would run them much worse for the miner. For the legal fiction that a coterie of officials at Washington are "the people" is the basis upon which our government-ownership friends argue. It is a beautiful dream, like the fairy tales of our youthful days, with about as much substance as the froth on last summer's beer.

But all the talk of government ownership and operation, why not try the experiment of letting the miners run their own business without intermeddling of tinkers, tailors, and official sa-traps? The coal lands belong to the people. For the public good they can be taken, leased to the miners' union under certain restrictions, so that the interest of the people shall be safeguarded. This would answer the purpose much better than government ownership, which would be but changing one evil for a worse. Give the miners good wages—for they themselves would be the interpreters of that term—and supply a public necessity at cost of production and carriage, with the assurance that

the "profits" go into the pockets of the men who earn them.

It is not necessary here to go into a lengthy statement historical, legal, or "detail" phase. The miners, through the government, can easily pay fair valuation to present "owners"—minus the watered stock—and take measures to control the carriage, and establishment of depots in principal cities. This is merely a suggestion without frills.

Meanwhile, I notice that those who favor bureaucratic schemes are eager to exempt their own particular line from bayonet rule, which leads one to believe that they advocate Government ownership and operation, like boils, "as a good thing on someone else."

## SHORTER HOURS.

At New York, "Shorter hours" and the "restriction of output" were the subjects before Tuesday's session of the National Civic Federation. Grover Cleveland, Abraham S. Hewitt, President Eliot, Rev. W. S. Rainsford and John B. McDonald were among the well known present in addition to those who had attended Monday's meeting. Mr. Cleveland was on hand early in the morning and there was applause for him. At the afternoon session he came in without any demonstration on the part of the audience. The ex-President left the room with Oscar Strauss, vice president of the federation, before the close of the session. He made no address.

Professor John R. Commons spoke of the union at the morning session as an effort to interfere at one or more points with the liberty of the employer in conducting his business. What was needed was mutual understanding and mutual concessions between employer and employe.

Professor George Gunton of this city said that the laborer was more needed as a citizen and a consumer than he was as a producer. The professor asked why men who organized a \$1,500,000,000 corporation could not organize, say, the iron industry, so as to have the hours of labor in that industry reduced by fifteen minutes a day every six months until an eight-hour basis was reached. That, he said, would be good economics.

Lewis Nixon said that his sympathy with the working man in the matter of shorter hours has cost him from \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year for the last several years, but he considered the money well expended.

Labor papers do more organizing than any paid organizer. They educate the whole people in the principles involved, confining them to no particular class or kind, placing all upon one broad plain of equality.

## EARNED IT, IN CHICAGO.

"How did he ever get the title of 'Hon.?'  
"He declined a nomination for alderman once."—Chicago Tribune.