



The Heart of the Thing

The boycott on the movies is beginning to bear fruit and the boycott on fruit is giving the growers the "movies," the "wil-lies," or something. Press reports Mabel "in-con-solably" drunk. Edna, ditto.

The legitiate — Burlesque is commencing to "root" for the Films—That's how serious it is—Better watch your step burlesque, or you may have to take on dishwashing for the relief of your Near Yeast.—The I. W. W. doesn't know what fooling means. When they pull off their famous plaster, the hair comes off with it. Watch your step, legitimate; don't tantalize a bulldog.

A tempo

Sometimes I wonder do we, the Industrial Workers, need so many laws for our—for our guidance? Ye know we are supposed to be over 21 years of age and very intelligent. In fact, we have been selected by capitalism for the part we play because of our ability to think. Laws we need, of course, but do we need so many of them, and such old ones?

I am led to make these remarks because some of the membership is beginning to chafe under the operation of a preponderance of law (our laws, of course).

Evidently some of our laws, rules, regulations and resolutions conflict, one with the other, for only recently a ballot appeared with only eight candidates for the General Executive Board upon it—the law calls for 21 and that proof of qualification be established prior to acceptance of candidacy of nominee.

Now the question rises, was there another law that had disqualified all and sundry members of the I. W. W. and left only eight fortunate candidates for said office to be disqualified later by their dearth of numbers? Laws!

It would seem that we must learn to make officials of our members in the shapes we find them in and not in the shape some advanced legislator desires.

After all, it is our organization, no better, no worse and our membership shall be the body that its official life shall be selected from, law or no law—I happen to know there are more than eight I. W. W. in the United States.

If a law disqualifies members by the "wholesale," disqualify the law.

Why am I so severe with law?

Ah, its a long story; too long to be recited here, in one-issue of this paper, and there is no need to recite it because I have already established the point that the membership is intelligent. We will merely content ourselves by saying that we have laws dating back to the regime of George Hardy, which no longer fit the changed conditions of today. We have laws made afterwards, during war's hysteria, and they are still on the books. We have piled law on top of law until finally one of them smothered: I refer to the one that calls for 21 names on a ballot—only eight showed up.

Our laws have transformed branches of the I. W. W. into branches of the G. O. C. (to be polite) insofar as a branch cannot do anything that requires funds—it must first get permission from the secretary of the industrial union. This law pre-supposes branch members are ignorant until they prove themselves intelligent by consulting with their officials.

This law looks innocent, but it has stolen the apples of branch activity.

I will not use up space longer, will not even sum up, I will merely ask you to overhaul all laws made in the past four years. There you will find the source of all present contentions. Why let the so-called advance thinkers delude themselves any longer? Break the news of their shallowness gently to them.

Tell them you have merely viewed their maneuvers with amused tolerance. Stay by your card.

What is the matter with the I. W. W.?

Nothing. Not a thing. All these things referred to have had their time and place and have served us as shock absorbers in time of need, but that time is past.

Credit is hard to bestow because the sincerity of arguments advanced in favor of these laws lead us to suspect the fathers were quite unconscious of the timely service they were rendering the I. W. W.

They have saved it.

Now let us get down to business, make instructive constrictive laws that fit, that work in harmony with the needs of our times. Many old laws are good. They should be spared—and will be spared when we recall that we had an organization worthy of the master's ire before emergency laws came with their relief—for a temporary need.

No. Don't go back. Go ahead.

I'm arguing that: Let us cease living in past hysterical—emergency times.

We have moved!

Who will second it?