



Laws For Bankers

Paternalism is beginning to raise its ugly head in the beautiful and grand agricultural states.—Another case of beauty and the beast. But maybe we ain't well founded on this *yar* paternalism so we may as well discourse "on a concrete example" in our usual concrete way. First:

When a *farming-state* passes a law that protects a *banker*, that is real fatherly—paternalism—harmless, innocuous, innocent paternalism. When an agricultural state passes a law to protect a banker to the detriment of the farmers, that paternalism isn't so damned innocuous or innocent or fatherly—the usual joke about the boarders, milkmen and ice men, though it may apply here, will not be given "shape" by our pure minded scribe.

When a farming state passes a law that protects a banker to the detriment of labor, that paternalism is vicious virulent and violent.—But it is paternalism. It is class legislation of the most damnable sort—where one class (the farmers) make laws to protect another class, not themselves.

It is a situation where the farmer cuts his own and labors throat in order that bankers may swallow the better.

Such laws are in existence in several agricultural states. Mortgages take precedence over labor. Labor, the men who actually produce the wealth cannot collect a cent of wages until first the mortgage holder has been squared. Labor, that transforms weeds, thistles, etc., into wealth, must wait until the banker has first taken his mite—that mite, sometimes, includes everything the "hoosier" and his "help" have been able to gather together—labor is supposed to wait until capital has first been appeased.

Recently in Minnesota a court decision to the effect that landlord claims have precedence over the bankers, (widely published) conveys to an average person the idea that justice reigns—and it does—as between these two operators, landlords and bankers. The landlord, not farmers, are protected. Minnesota "is agriculture."

In Dawson, Minn., the home of More Ted, Less Taxes Christianson, Jolly soul, candidate for governor, a Norwegian farmer tells me he is a "renter" and according to Minnesota law I cannot collect a cent from him for my labor—a thoroly honest man, but kind of "tight." "Well," says I, "in that case may be it is better for me to collect my wages every night—if I'm not protected by law." If I'm an outlaw?—According to his sayso "more Ted" is one of

the fathers of this and other laws, and says he'll not vote for him—I told him to vote for the grey mare that I'm driving.

In North Dakota too, this paternalism is very thoughtful of the interests of the bankers and landlords—to the extent that a condition arises wherein it threatens the very existence of our A. W. I. U. No. 110 as a powerful organization. (And it is for that reason I hasten to expose it, in a concrete way). At any time the bankers can clamp down on John Farmer and prevent him paying the hard earned wages of our fellow workers, and since none but fellow workers do this work in this state, it would be made to appear that membership in our organization is an expensive experiment and despite all and abundant evidence to the contrary. Hence, the urgent call for this article. We are organized.

Concrete No. 2. An employer of labor, in case of an employee (a good one) is garnished for his wages, can protect said employee by paying him his wages every hour or every day. Employees of labor have this right and they can if they will protect the men that actually produce or put the finishing touches to materials that transform them into wealth.—the thing "these" all fight for. How much more "homely justice" resides in this simple act of an individual employer!

A state passes a law to protect the bankers, inconsiderate of the welfare of farmers (voters) and labor. Labor, the great majority, is to take what is left! We shall see about that.

RIGHT NOW.

If we are to be not protected by law we will discover protection elsewhere. (Let the me'ow cats note I'm belling for protection). But, I am unalterably opposed to collecting my wages every hour, so's to be protected. I simply won't have it. It's an insult to our employers, the farmers. Of course, as an organized body, we could collect our wages every half hour, if we want to. But, if we do, it will be because I have been out voted. I'm not in favor of it. I'm not in favor of absolute protection (a condition where the days pay is laid in our hand before we start working). Only lawyers work that way. But I am in favor of certain modified protection (conforming with modern needs). I believe we can trust the farmer for a whole days pay, and considering the holt the bankers have on the farmer, our faith in him shines forth like a streak of lightning in a coal mine.

Banks we do not trust!

This agitation for hourly pay day should cease. It will only cause a mixture of disorder. Let's be reasonable. Let's work days and protect ourselves evenings, when the farmer isn't busy.

Meet you in—in where shall we meet? You'll have a stake. Mebbe I will too. If I haven't, I'll have an alibi—about first mortgages.

Sherman said that "War is Hell," and so it is. We are at war too, only it is a war of an entirely different nature; a war for the betterment of the working class—the class that produces everything for the lily-

fingered plutocrat to squander on wine, women and song.

Will you never wake up? Will you never come to realize the situation that is before us today, and that has been in the past? The men in San Quentin are there for trying to make life more pleasant for you and the children after you. They are still there, and through their unflinching strength will stay until they are unconditionally released. If you are not in the fight, what is the matter with you? Oh, you don't believe in the I. W. W.; and then: you are not so sure that you believe in craft unionism either? Of course you don't; and no one will if he has horse sense. They have been kidding you for years. Do you know that the people have about got an ear full of that kind of doctrine?

Remember this: "Nothing will kill an unsound doctrine so quickly as to air it."

Craft unionism is like the man that built the house on the sand, and that house fell when the storm came. Industrial unionism is like the house built upon a rock. The winds came and the storms beat upon that house and it fell not. Why? It was founded like industrial unionism on a rock.

Give a dog a bad name and every one will take a kick at him, Abe Lincoln said, "There are two sides to an argument, and the man that don't look at both sides is dishonest." Let's look at the dog's side.

No, we are not burning haystacks and dynamiting bridges; the only dynamite that we use is mental dynamite. Get hold of some literature. Read, then if you have the courage of your convictions, hunt up a delegate.

Look in the I. W. W. song book, page 8, second verse, by Joe Hill. Then dare to say that you do not believe in industrial unionism, and you are not only lying, but unfair to yourself and the little children starving today the world over. I have seen them in some of the big city slums digging in garbage cans for subsistence for their little bodies. Get wise, fellow workingmen and women, get wise.—(By Peak Halyard).