



## SOULS AND LIFE

This theory, of course, is not popular, for obvious and many reasons—and may not be true—but its unpopularity should not mitigate against it, in view of the deplorable conditions fostered under various theories born of egotism, etc. Its unpopularity can be understood the better when it is remembered that to accept this view is to repudiate existing customs, to illustrate:

The "soul" of a parasite is necessarily in a very damaged state, in bad condition; and, assuming that he departs life by accident rather than by request, (which fates forbid) his "soul," such as it is, mixed with "life" and contaminates the whole; even as a drop of vinegar in a quart of milk. On the other hand a good man dies—his "soul" returning to the "whole" puts new life and vigor into a very delapidated society. Hence it can be seen this theory would amount to the overthrowing of existing customs. A murderer caught red handed would not be executed—37 doctors would "hover" about him to see to it that he would not die—the shape of his "soul" is in—every effort would be made to prevent his rotten "life" ruining the whole works.

Now here's where the unpopularity of this theory comes in: Man is conceited and thinks he is good. Now, under this theory, whenever society discovers that his "social soul" is getting threadbare and frayed around the edges it would have only one way of improving its "soul-politic," that is: They would have to step out and borrow the "life" of a great man—bag a saint.

Gosh!—so you see, it's taboo. Better all suffer than sacrifice one for the whole? Hm! If this theory was law preachers would step out on the front porch of the parsonage and cuss the "Living Jesus" out of their neighbors, in a most profane manner; there would be no good men—or, they would hide the fact instead of parading in front of every body. Sacrificing "one for all" is the "thought," then, that fathered

the light-fiction about Christ being a saviour. Imagine a glass of muddy water as soul, can you clarify it by tossing in a chunk of mud, a bourgeois soul, every now and then? Suppose you try pouring in a little crystal clear spring water, the "soul" of a saint or—and watch this—a glass of muddy water clarifies itself if left undisturbed. Save a soul, hm, that a way.

Space demands concrete examples o' soul—Sorry!

Ex. No. 1. A boiler down in the basement generates steam; steam passes through pipes to radiators in 20 rooms—each radiator has a soul (steam) but not an individual soul—each radiator responds to life; to steam, in that case.

Ex. No. 2. A string of oil-derricks come to life as a result of one cause, directly an engine—POWER (soul) being transmitted by "lead cable"—No "pump" in that case, has individual soul (private power) yet each pump "performs" somewhat after a manner of man all puffed with the importance of his isolated (?) soul, personal. . . There's no such thing—the dirty towel still looks good.

A revolution given me I do not want, for it again can be taken away.

The "individual-soul-theory" was such a revolution in thought, probably the first one—and bases on a "suspicion," if honest; and ego, if indifferent—no proofs ever being introduced.

It was given, not taken; it was "drilled," not "embraced"—nothing there to embrace. A bunch of separate souls! A cluster of "lives!" Assorted powers!—

Expect me to believe that?

Shall I speculate as to the weight of speckled, brindle or striped "souls?"—a galaxy of high-grade "lives"—of myriad "peps," jerking the human machine this and that way . . . No!

The dirty towel still holds good. Life is one, and "soul" with it. All people partake of the "power," soul of life. All move because of it and would not move without it. All are nursing at the common teat, not alternately but at one and the same somewhat lengthened moment, not a bunch of suckers—but a one big union; a unit—nothing grows by divisions—They are One, grammar notwithstanding. How can people say one big union is impracticable when it is . . .

The I. W. W. is not a theory. It is something you can tie to—I speak for it—but not in this article. This article is mostly "conjectures" intended for "convention periods"—plausible enough and all that. . . I hope my next article will not be about Soviet-China of Imperial Wash-

ington—I prefer to stay at HOME and deal with Wage-Slavery and Wageless-Slavery; 9x14 racks and other power extracting devices. . .

Or back to paragrapes.