



B-4-U-R TOO LATE

We hear, now and then, that this or that union sends all its scabs to a hospital and that this "attention" is made possible by funds in the hands of officials and, it is argued that for this reason it is policy to hold no accounting of the moneys so expended in humanitarianism.

In the I. W. W. every cent is accounted for. But then, the I. W. W. isn't accused of humanitarianism. As much as the I. W. W. would like to put a blanket over the boss and send him to a sanatorium, it has never been accused of anything except a little disestablishmentarianism, or something like that. (I disrecall the author of that word, but I think it was the great British humorist, Gladstone).

Personally I don't think it a duty, nor is it advisable to care for scabs in this manner. It shows a weakness, a certain mushiness of an organization.

Like violence, it shows the weakness of an organization.

By the way, we have been accused of violence, by interested parties. The masters' press confides to its maudlin readers that the I. W. W. is violent as Hell; revolutionary and radical as the shades of night; that it believes in the destruction of property (just as if wage slavery was property). Nothing to it.

Hardly would we toil to produce to destroy to reproduce. 'Tis not work we want. (We have plenty of that). It's the full value of our work we are after. Truly the destruction of property creates work, but not wealth, and truly the employing class owns all property, but nevertheless, the destruction of property can only aggravate the slavery of those not a military organization.

Hardly would the I. W. W. labor all these years to get the parasites interested in work just to destroy his products. Think of it—the products that the lily-fingered parasite produced in the sweat of his brow—think of it! What sense is there?

No, the I. W. W. doesn't believe in destroying any property except wage slavery. Of that we have our "belly full."

Still and all, the masters consider us very dangerous citizens. There is always the danger that we will put them to work. (This would indicate the master is not fond of work), which is all true.

Hence he is trying to disrupt the I. W. W., with laws he is sponsoring; theories he is promulgating (with hired brains); and by trying to jail our active members. But he is predestined to fail.

In an organization where the officials have the say-so it would succeed; the officials could be "canned," if necessary, and the union would collapse; but in the I. W. W. the membership run the organization, hence there is no way the master can effectively cause a disturbance. Thus it is, I am not able to believe that our fellow workers were arrested so as to give the masters a chance to control our organization, like so many others that are controlled. In fact, I see no control except the rank and file control, not "supposedly to be," but real!

At this time the I. W. W. is organizing all labor into one big union, something needed very bad, although it is not a new idea. We are having good success in bettering the conditions of labor all over the country and this is so because we are filling a long felt want—doing all the heavy kicking.

In conclusion:

One of the main reasons why all labor should belong to a one big union is to do away with "all doubt" as to the "rightfulness" of their demands.

As it is now, when a body of men strike, the question arises, "Are the men entitled to a raise?"

If they all belong to one union the question would never arise. The capitalist flunkys would say: "Those are labor's demands," take them or leave them. Indeed the One Big Union of all labor would clarify the atmosphere considerably—considerably.

How about a lift, stranger—to run this organization.—(T-Bone Slim).