



H'OPTI- MISM

Some people have an idea that will-power is an institution that stays and doesn't change; that it is a part of a man same as his leg or watch; that once you have it, you always have it, and so on

That is an—an erotic idea—shall I say it?

. . . .

Will-power comes and goes—at will.

There—I've admitted the existence of it!

Now, let us locate it:

To start in let us move from the position that there is no such thing as will-power. I believe that is the correct position.

To generate will-power, then, we must move — act — perform some sign — else, we must differentiate between the will-to-do and the will-to-not-do. For instance, to abstain from drinking red pop we must first quit red pop before our will-power puts itself in evidence. That's the will-not-to-do and consists not of will-power but actions taken.

The will-to-do, on the other hand, as in stealing a horse, for instance, the act itself covers the transaction and will-power operates only afterwards, if at all. . . .

We find will-power is not a fundamental phenomena any more than a corn on one's foot.

The "corn" wasn't there first but developed as the result of friction (action), so with will-power; what is it but a mental callous resulting from the action taken, or the processes of recording the action taken?

Will-power gives you no super-power to accomplish things. Will-power does not antedate the act, or fact. Your reason tells you what to do; your organs, (with or without will-power) are capable of doing, and do perform, the dictates of reason most satisfactorily. Will-power follows, after a prolonged exercise in action, even so as bodily strength follows the judicious exercising of muscles. Will-power does not precede the act—it follows one or several acts, and is not a necessary part of any accomplishment.

A poetic term:

Wait for will-power to act and you will wait "for a heluva long time."

Will-power's side kick is "tomorrow."

. . . .

What we need is not better delegates—but more of them.

The outlook in the woods is decidedly optimistic, though disorganized. On the other hand an atmosphere of optimism prevails among the lumber operators. Edward Hines, multimillionarie lumberman says the demand for lumber is great. That would seem to indicate that Charley Strange will be able to "keep up" his dues in the lumbermen's association without much trouble. In fact, it is thought, none of them will suffer actual want the coming summer.

Elsewhere, too, the reports are encouraging. Henry Ford, John Rockefeller, Morgan and so on, are all prosperous and will not "hafto" work for board and clothes—in order to live. They're pretty stakey.

In every sense of the word the Wrepublican era of prosperity has arrived until the slaves organize as a class . . . after that a far more widespread era of prosperity will blanket the whole people; mobbe reach to as far as where we are—shivering on the edges.

If at any time things begin to snarl, the matter can be taken over by the membership and adjusted according to the only known rule that can or will adjust anything—the majority rule.

Meetings, conferences, conventions and more meetings, conferences, and conventions meet, confer and convene; until the snarl subsides.

. . . .

(A tip to toppers: Organize your drinking; form a "tipplers trust"—the "times" demand organized procedure. Organize your every move).

Pool your labor power with the I. W. W.!

. . . .

The Stock and Dairy Farmer takes a fling at the Twentieth Amendment (child-labor) with a most heart-rendering "no" . . . and adds:

"Taking a different slant a farm woman with a family of her own" (get that family? of her own?) "says": "Some men of vision" (get that—"men") "believe this amendment to be another weapon secretly forged for the destruction of our Constitutional form of government; for if this becomes unduly oppressive our people will revolt and destroy it as others have done. The chaos and misery following the overthrow of organized government in Russia should be a horrible example to all men and women of red-radical leanings"—Stock and Dairy Farmer, February, 1925.

This woman with a family of her own quotes what "Some men of vision" believe. (Was there any pink snakes in the vision?) It will be remembered Russia had a constitutional government under Nicholas, known as "Darkest Russia." If that is the kind this woman pines for, I believe she can be accommodated. Her tale about "chaos and misery" is based upon the belief of "some men"—and not upon knowledge.

The editor of that paper has insulted us.