

THE HARBINGER.

ORGANIZATION, EDUCATION, ELEVATION.

Vol. II.

Raleigh, North Carolina, November 7, 1903.

No. 44

CARVING THE TURK.

The man behind the carving knife
Is coming to the fore;
He's sharpening the trusty blade
Oft used in days of yore.
And when it gets the razor edge
Required to do the work,
He'll proudly wave it in the air
And shout "Bring on the turk!"

When from the oven comes the bird,
So nicely stuffed and browned,
He like a hero true will pose
And proudly look around.
Upon each face about the board
He'll see a wistful smirk,
And then with an important air
He'll start to carve the turk.

But though the carving knife is
Keen,
It often disappoints,
For there is trouble right away
In getting at the joints.
The carver makes a savage jab,
Then gives the fork a perk,
And on some fair one's lap descends
A section of that turk.

With nervous hands he starts again,
And slashes left and right
Until the fowl that looked so nice
Is in an awful plight.
And his chagrin is more intense
At seeing smiles that lurk
On faces of the waiting ones
Who watched him hack the turk.

It takes so long to pass around
The turkey he has carved
That when he comes to serve him-
self
He's feeling almost starved.
And then he registers a vow
That he will play the shirk
Hereafter and will surely make
Another carve the turk.
—Pittsburg Chronicle Telegraph.

TO STOP CHILD SLAVERY.

Children of tender years, victims of the "sweatshop" evil and subjected to so-called "slavery" in Chicago's manufacturing establishments, have found new friends in the Chicago Teachers' Club. At the meeting held September 25, the club voted to co-operate with the State factory inspectors in an effort to wipe out the "child slavery evil." Intense interest was manifested in the work by the teachers and the vote to undertake the work of rescuing the children was unanimous.

No line of action was arranged, but the teachers will always be in readiness to answer the call of the State factory inspectors.

The determination of the teachers to enter the child labor field followed an address made by Edgar T. Davis, chief of the factory inspectors. It was the first meeting of the season and the Teachers' Club had invited Mr. Davis to inform them of the work being done by his department. Although somewhat brief, the address proved of interest to the teachers and was followed by a general discussion.

From data collected during Mr. Davis' trip to Chicago sweatshops the following table has been prepared showing as accurately as possible the condition of affairs:

Number of children employed in Chicago under fourteen years of age, 2,500; number of children employed in Chicago between fourteen and sixteen, 15,000; number of children employed in Chicago through fraudulent certificates and thus violating the law, 3,000; number of children employed in shops, working under unsanitary conditions, 2,000.

This table of statistics, declares Inspector Davis, is as nearly accurate as possible, and, if anything, underestimates the number of little ones employed in the city's sweatshops.

MAKING WAR ON ORGANIZED LABOR.

To Organized Labor, Greeting:

The Merchant Tailors' Association of the United States, backed up the Manufacturers' Association, are making war upon the organized journeymen tailors of the country, in the hope of crushing out unionism, and forcing the most miserable conditions as to wages, under the pretext of ranking workmen, and without regard to the check which organization interposes against avarice and injustice. In making the fight to refuse to furnish "back-shops" (shops in which the men can work), they thereby admit their purpose to return to the old system of tenement house home work. The following facts and appeal are earnestly commended to the serious, favorable and sympathetic action of all members of organized labor. Read carefully to your organization.

On the last days of June of the present year the merchant tailors of Kansas City, Mo., submitted to the journeymen tailors in their employ the following communication:

"Believing it to be our mutual interest, the undersigned merchant tailors have resolved that in the future we will treat with our men as individuals only, and employ same as long as they meet our requirements. It is not our motive to reduce wages; on the contrary, we will pay more for the highest class of workmanship, thereby making it an incentive to excel; we decline to pay as much for poor work as the first-class men are justly entitled to. We also reserve the right to judge the class to which it belongs, and place the journeymen in their respective grades. WE DECLINE TO FURNISH BACK SHOPS, as past experience has proven them to be a detriment to the craft instead of a help. We will not put any restrictions on our men as to helpers, as we deem it very essential to the trade that we have apprentices."

(Signatures.)

About the same time an exactly similar communication was submitted to the members of the Tailors' Union in Binghamton, N. Y. Since that time the merchant tailors of Cleveland, Denver, Chicago, Parkersburg, W. Va., Stockton, Cal., and other cities have taken exactly the same position as that set forth in the Kansas City letter, refusing to treat with committees of the tailors' unions, or to have any dealing with them as an organized body. While not saying so in words, yet in act declaring that the tailors' unions must disband.

The journeymen tailors were among the earliest pioneers of organized labor on this continent. Before the year 1800 they had some unions, and in the earlier years, running from 1800 to 1825, they formed probably more local unions on this continent than any other craft, and all through trade union history and development in this country the tailors have carried their share of the burdens and performed their part of the pioneer work of the trade union movement. In every effort that has been made to consolidate the trade union movement into a federation the tailors have taken part, and an active one. They have been affiliated with the present American Federation of Labor since its foundation. They have never asked assistance of a financial character from the other trade unions of the country in all their history, but the Merchant Tailors' Protective Association,

backed up by the Manufacturers' Association, of which body Mr. D. M. Parry is the spokesman and president, has declared that the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America must and shall be destroyed, and their actions in the cities cited above show that they intend to destroy the Tailors' International Union, if that is possible. Their members have been sued in the courts for damages, and their property attached; injunctions have been served upon them, and arrests of pickets have been made by the score. The expenses of the organization are, therefore, enormous, and they need the help of organized labor to meet them. If organized labor will respond in somewhat the same degree of liberality to assist the tailors in their struggle that they did to assist the anthracite miners in theirs, the attempt to destroy their organization will not be successful.

For several years the journeymen tailors have been struggling to do away with home and tenement house work. In this crusade they have met with a very great degree of success. Now comes the Merchant Tailors' Protective Association, backed up by the followers of Mr. Parry, and declares that the tailors must give up working in the shops furnished by the employers, as is done in all other trades, and carry their work home to their kitchens to make it. If the struggles of any organization are entitled to the sympathy and support of organized labor, surely this struggle of the tailors for maintenance of their organization and for the abolition of the home and tenement house work is exceedingly so.

In an interview published in one of the daily papers the representatives of the Employing Tailors stated that they could draw on the defense fund of the Manufacturers' Association, which was said to amount to a million and a half dollars, in order to successfully carry on their contest with the journeymen tailors. We feel assured that the organized workers in the United States and Canada will respond with sufficient liberality to make it impossible, even though the fanatics who are trying to destroy the Tailors' Union expend a million and a half, or even more.

We submit this appeal to our fellow-workers of this country, feeling assured that it is of such a character and that it will so strongly appeal to all members of trade unions that not a single union will fail to respond as liberally as possible.

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor is deeply concerned that the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America shall be successful in its effort to maintain its members in the great contest in which they have been engaged for several months, and in which they can and will be victorious, if sympathetically, liberally and promptly the unions, local, central, national and international come to their financial assistance.

Fraternally yours,

SAM. GOMPERS, Pres.
JAS. DUNCAN, 1st Vice Pres.
JOHN MITCHELL, 2d V. P.
JAS. O'CONNELL, 3d V. P.
MAX MORRIS, 4th V. C.
THOS. I. KIDD, 5th V. P.
D. A. HAYES, 6th V. C.
JOHN B. LENNON, Treas.

FRANK MORRISON, Sec'y.

Ex. Com. of American Federation of Labor.

NOTE.—Please send all contributions to John B. Lennon, General Secretary, Bloomington, Illinois, who will receipt therefor.

THE OPEN SHOP—BRAZEN HYPOCRISY!

BY SAMUEL GOMPERS.

Is it stupid'ity or hypocrisy? We are inclined to think that all this "crusade" by the Parry-led manufacturers and their mouth-pieces of the press in favor of the "open shop," or the refusal to recognize or deal with unions as business bodies having labor and services to sell, is the product of conscious hypocrisy, but it is not impossible that some of those who have joined it are really stupid enough not to see the absurdity, the self-stultification, the brazen dishonesty of this proposition.

The public has read the address recently issued by the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, and knows our position on the open shop question. It also knows something of the attempt of plutocracy to misrepresent President Roosevelt's attitude toward unionism. This order in the Miller case, which had no application to any service or establishment other than governmental, was tortured into something like a general principal or rule of action for all employers. This miserable attempt has failed, and even capitalistic papers have been compelled to point out to their readers that under no circumstances can the order or its influence be construed to apply to private business.

We do not propose to discuss here the merits of the Miller case. But the manner in which that case has been used, exploited and abused by enemies of organized labor must go far to convince even the skeptical that the "open shop" cry is hypocritical. Nevertheless, for the enlightenment of honest ignorance that may be deceived by this capitalistic trick, we will subject the open shop proposition to serious examination.

The open shop is represented as the embodiment of a great principle—the principle of equal rights and equal opportunity. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bible, are quoted in support of the open shop. Organized labor is denounced in the bitterest terms for daring to demand so unpatriotic, un-American and immoral a thing.

But the open shop proposition implies that organized labor must give up, not a special privilege improperly held, but the common and fundamental right to refuse to work with non-union men. Why should labor give up this legal and moral right? The right is of the same class and importance as the right to quit work. It is fundamental. To give it up would be to restore slavery, and to make slaves of the most skilled and competent of American workmen.

And why should not the union man work with and beside the non-union man? That, frankly, is none of the employer's business. Labor is under no obligation to justify its likes and dislikes to him. We were constantly told that supply and demand regulated the employment of labor, and that the market was free and should remain so. This being the case (we grant it for argument's sake), the workman may say to the employer that he will not work for him, except on certain terms, which terms may include an agreement on the em-

ployer's part to engage no men obnoxious to them.

These propositions cannot be denied. No one has been hardy enough to contend that union men may be compelled to work with non-union men, or that the former may, by law or judicial process, be prohibited from striking against the employment of the latter. In view of these facts, what life or meaning is there left in the "open shop" proposition?

Now, let us consider this proposition from the employer's point of view—and not necessarily the reasonable and fair employer. Take our violent and harmless friend Parry and his admiring disciples. This band of capitalistic agitators believes that labor unions are criminal conspiracies, "organized mobs." They discriminate (or would discriminate, if they had the courage and industrial power) against all union men. Suppose they should declare that on no account will they give employment to a man known to be identified with any union. We should instantly recognize their right to adopt this policy to threaten us with, to go over the country urging other employers to do likewise. We have no thought of claiming any privilege for labor which we deny to capital—plutocratic editors please note, digest, copy and remember.

But what would those patriotic and "American" defenders of the open shop say to Parry? "If the union shop is immoral or against the general interest, the non-union shop is equally so." Therefore, Parry would have to divide his work fairly between unionists and non-unionists. This right to favor his "scab" friends would be gone.

A remarkable conclusion, we think. Does any advocate of the open shop accept it, and would he apply it to Parry and all other employers angry and hostile toward unionism? Certainly not! The unionist may not demand the union closed shop, but the employer may insist upon the non-union closed shop. This is the position of our enemies. Can we credit them with honesty, with ignorance? We conclude that the agitation is hypocritical on the part of the majority of the employers and editors who are carrying it on.

As was pointed out in the open letter issued by the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, we do not deny the right of the non-union man to work where, when and for whomsoever he pleases. We simply insist upon the same right of all union men to refuse to associate with them in factory or in the club, and we insist upon our right to tell employers that they must have either union shops or non-union shops. They will not bully us into working under objectionable conditions by affecting to believe in any straw and impossible "principle." If they want our labor, they must make it pleasant for us to work for them.

In short, the whole question is really one of economic strength. Where unionism is weak, the open shop, or even the non-union shop, will prevail.

Where organized labor is strong enough to obtain just and decent treatment, and where it is able to supply the normal demand for the best labor, the employers will unionize their shops with good grace and drop the open shop humbug.

The rabid employers are teaching the still unorganized workmen the importance of unity, harmony and effective co-operation.—American Federationist.

REFUSE TO ARBITRATE.

[Special Correspondence.]

LOS ANGELES, Cal., Oct. 31.

Recently the Butcher Workmen's Union adopted a nine-hour workday and asked the Council of Labor for an endorsement. The Council withheld its endorsement until the butchers would agree to arbitrate in case of a refusal. To this the butchers agreed. When the managers of the packinghouses were waited upon, they not only declined to arbitrate, but refused to meet their employees upon any proposition. As a result a strike followed, and every member of the union came out and are still out. As usual the Los Angeles Times is daily resorting to abuse and misrepresentation, with the hope of prejudicing the public against the union. The Times has whipped the proprietors of small meat markets into acting as strike-breakers, and many of them worked all day Sunday at the slaughter-houses. There is a probability of a general strike in Los Angeles and a widespread industrial disturbance.

Union men and women everywhere can help their fellow-unionists in Southern California by rapping the infamous Times at every opportunity.

Let every reader of THE HARBINGER write one letter to each of the following advertisers in the Times:

Carrara Paint, 811 Carrara Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.
"Santal Middy"—E. Faugera, 26 North William street, New York, N. Y.
Royal Baking Powder Co., 100 William St., New York, N. Y.
Philo-Hay Specialties Co., New York, N. Y.
"Castoria"—The Centaur Co., 77 Murray street, New York, N. Y.
Chemical Co., Boston, Mass.
"Postum"—Postum Cereal Company, Battle Creek, Mich.
Lydia E. Pinkham Medicine Co., Lynn, Mass.
Scott's Emulsion—Scott & Brown, 409 Pearl street, New York, N. Y.
Ghirardelli's Ground Chocolate—D. Ghirardelli, San Francisco, Cal.
Tell these advertisers that organized labor does not look with favor upon any person or firm that is aiding labor's meanest enemy, the Los Angeles Times.

AN EDITOR'S PREDICAMENT.

An editor near Custer, Indian Territory, got a cattle show and concert mixed in making up, and now he has to keep dark. This is the way he did it: "The concert given by Robinson's most beautiful young ladies was highly appreciated. They sang in their charming manner, winning the plaudits of the entire audience, who pronounced them the finest herd of short horns in the country. A few are of rich brown color, but the majority are spotted brown and white."

Thirty-five clerks in the Louisville and Nashville railroad freight offices were told to get their salaries and leave the company's employ because they had joined the local union of the Railroad Clerks' Association. The men refused to take their money, but left the offices.

At the present rate the immigration record for the current fiscal year will exceed 1,000,000.