



No More Caves

"HIRAM RAPS COURT RULING ON BOB'S ELECTORS PETITION."

Too much even for Hiram Johnson:

Hiram draws himself up to his full immaculate, republican height and denounces the decision of the California Supreme Court which barred the La Follette-Wheeler ticket of electors from the November ballot:

"The decision, in my opinion, is unjustified by the law, contrary to public policy and of most harmful consequences. It is decisions such as this that undermine public confidence in the courts," he unburdens his soul according to press reports. Hiram no doubt means well, but when he says "It is decisions such as this that undermine public confidence in courts," he intimates that public confidence is not already caving in as a result of former decisions such as this; that it is further possible to carry on mining operations under public confidence; that it still is safe to remove pillars and timbering that hold the swaying canopy of assurance in the "drifts" of Public Confidence.

Allow me to tell you, Hiram, that public confidence in California courts has been severely shaken—and assaulted—by decisions; not such as this—but by decisions so raw that I blush for shame; prisoners that are supposed to stand overcome with the enormity of their punishment for the crime of being class conscious Industrial Workers, turn their back and blush in pity and shame.

Your courts, Hiram, have railroaded members of the I. W. W. into prison under the criminal syndicalism law—regardless of the fact that there is no criminal syndicalism law in the United States of America and none in California—now or ever.

Furthermore: The criminal syndicalism law is vague and indefinite, therefore, unconstitutional and should be so declared by our courts—that's what they're paid for—to know the law.

Never in any of your courts has it been proven that Industrial Unionism is criminal syndicalism; that members of the I. W. W. are criminal syndicalists, yet members have been sent to prison under that "law." Your courts have decided that

proof of criminal syndicalism is not necessary. You need no proofs? Your courts need no evidence to form opinions? What kind of courts have you, Hiram? Rather all seeing, all knowing, ain't they? Tell me, Hiram, aren't they getting to be quite a joke? Quite a joke?

Your state arrests witnesses on the stand and puts them in the "can" for criminal syndicalism when they testify clearly that they are Industrial Unionists.

Your state hires sex-perverts to swear away the lives of decent citizens, in your courts—after which, you, Hiram, have the colossal assurance to come out in a public report and intimate that "such decisions" as the LaFollette-Wheeler electors will find a "public confidence" that may become "undermined."

I am surprised.

Allow me to assure you, Hiram, the public has become hardened. Such decisions as the barring of the LaFollette-Wheeler electors ticket from the ballot will not raise a ripple in the "sump" of public confidence.

'Tain't going to cave no more.

* * *

Whenever there is any good in the capitalist system our writers are liberal enough to note it, and our papers broad enough to print it. Thus it was with keen pleasure I read in the Sol. an official document praising the wonderful gift of brains of our exploiters. And, although I'm inclined to doubt the authenticity of the brains, I am not in the least skeptical about the good will that engendered that burst of confidence. Although I firmly believe that the said brains of our exploiters are somewhat problematical to be yet unearthed—I do not think the writer intended his remarks to be final on that score—so I must beg to take exceptions to such promiscuous broadcasting of unearnt praise. The writer is too chivalrous—a fault.

Always have I been of the opinion that capitalists purchased all their brains—and please note that my opinion must pass under the guns of the editor—I can not say, print this; print that; I say, "there she is, look 'er over"—Of course, the editor will stand for a certain wildness on my part, but if I start pitching so badly that the catcher can't reach them the editor will warm up another writer. With an official document it is different; if it isn't over the plate, the umpire is blind—that's all there's to it. . . as I was saying, the capitalists do not use their own. Yet we are given to understand that they select the best brains to run our industries; that they do not hire brains for trial; that they do not experiment with various brains until one hired brain, smarter if not better than the rest, is able to persuade "him," a semi-idiot, that: "I'm your man." Brains

come in a package, in an enclosed wrapper and there is no way of determining the quality until after trial, and, I do insist, it requires no extraordinary powers to determine from a free demonstration the quality of such brains. Further, the best brains are not conducting the industry of the people. It is the submissive brains that conduct industry today! We are told to ape the system in the selection of our officials—that's how I take it.

Isn't that carrying the art of politeness too far? Are we to ape the very thing that has been apeing us since 1905. If we do, we'll go back to 1905. How about it?

Admittedly the capitalist system is bad, indeed that people strain every nerve to "get out of it"—some jump in the lake, some hang themselves and some, like the members of the working class, organize a one big union for self-protection. Is it then proper for officials undergoing trial to ask us Industrial Workers of the World to model our organization after the trailing system? Shall we model our activities after the manner of those Business Buccaneers that stole our thunder and are drifting bewildered in the "mazes" of an imitation one big union? For, I take the position, they do not know the next move. They are waiting for a cue. I take the position that if every agitator "shut-up" for five years, the capitalists would "cut" their own throat thinking they were carving a turkey. Brains? Uh! They are doing business on our brains, and we have nothing to copy from them. If we have nothing better to ape than capitalist procedure, we may as well let the Y. M. C. A. emancipate the slaves. That's that.

P. S. "SUBORDINATE"

An Industrial Union is not a subordinate part of the I. W. W., it is merely a part of the I. W. W. The I. W. W. is composed of Industrial Unions. No superiority enters into the question. Being composed of Industrial Unions, it can not be superior to itself; neither can it be divided into subordinate parts. It is a whole, a union—(that's it)—you would not say (would you?) that, the four quarters of an apple are subordinate part of an apple? Of course not. You wouldn't say the I, the Hon. T-Bone Slim, am a "subordinate" part of the I. W. W., would you?—Of course not!

You wouldn't say that I'm the Major part of the I. W. W.—surely you wouldn't. Of course not! You wouldn't start hacking up the I. W. W. into parts inferior, indifferent, superior, subordinate, supreme, minus, plus, major—or fruit?

You'd leave it whole—wouldn't you?

BOYCOTT CALIFORNIA PRODUCTS!