Evidence

and

Cross-Examination

of

J. T. (RED) DORAN

in the case of the

U. S. A.

vs.

Wm. D. Haywood

et al.

PRICE 15 CENTS

394

PREAMBLE

OF THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of the working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system.

We find that the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade unions unable to cope with the ever growing power of the employing class. The trade unions foster a state of affairs which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping to defeat one another in wage wars. Moreover, the trade unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers.

These conditions can be changed and the interest of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all.

Instead of the conservative motto, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work," we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, "Abolition of the wage system."

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for the everyday struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.

Evidence

and

Cross-Examination

of

J. T. (RED) DORAN

in the case of the

U. S. A.

vs.

Wm. D. Haywood

et al.

PRICE 15 CENTS

June 28, 1918
10 o'clock A.M.

JOHN T. DORAN,

one of the defendants, called as a witness in his own behalf, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY
Mr. Christensen:

Q. What is your name?
A. John T. Doran.
Q. Where were you born, Mr. Doran?
A. New York City.
Q. Speak a little louder, will you?
A. New York City.
Q. New York City; how old are you?
A. Thirty-eight.
Q. Thirty-eight. You are a member of the Industrial Workers of the World?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long did you remain in New York City after birth?
A. All through my childhood and young manhood, young boyhood.
Q. Received your education there?
A. New York City.
Q. How old were you when you went to work?
A. Why, I went to work on my own initiative at the age of about 16.
Q. When did you first affiliate with any labor organization?
A. I was about 17, a little older, a few months older, perhaps.
Q. What organization did you affiiliate with?
A. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of the A. F. of L.
Q. How long did you continue to be a member of that organization?

A. Why, I was in good standing, I believe, when I was arrested on this charge.

Q. You have been a member of that organization for about nineteen years?

A. All of that.

Q. When did you come into the Industrial Workers of the World?

A. As soon as I discovered they were in existence, about a year after they were formed; 1906, or, perhaps, the early part of 1907. I joined a Propaganda League.

Q. What was the reason for your going into the Industrial Workers of the World at that time?

A. Well, I had been around the country a good deal at my trade, and I found that conditions on the jobs were so poor that something was necessary, and I found that the organization with which I was affiliated did not properly protect me, was unable to protect me, and for that reason, after becoming acquainted with the philosophy of the Industrial Workers, I accepted it as a practical program and became a member.

Q. Now, during your membership, have you spoken for the organization?

A. For the last seven years I have been especially active for the organization, that is, speaking for them.

Q. Did you speak for them during the summer of 1917?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Up to the summer of 1917 you were a paid lecturer or simply volunteered your services?

A. Up to the fall of 1916 I received practically nothing from the organization. I do not suppose I received in the form of compensation, up till 1916, in October, $25, though I always put in considerable more money than that. I was active all the time.

Q. And you contributed to the organization?

A. I used to work every day and go out on the soap box at night, if the weather permitted; and if I worked steady and got in a full week's pay, my wife

and I agreed that we could afford to pay one day's wages to further the move, and that was the policy we followed up to the fall of 1916.

Q. Now,where were you in the summer of—you worked at your trade all the time, did you?

A. Yes, I worked at my trade. Sometimes I had to work at anything I could find; the stool pigeons used to keep me on the jump at times.

Q. Well, you mean that you had to seek different positions right along because of your activity in your organization?

A. Activity in the A. F. of L. organization and activity in this organization caused me to constantly be discriminated against, and it was one continuous round of box cars and knocking about in order to keep myself and my family.

Q. You are a married man?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been married, Mr. Doran?

A. Thirteen years, I believe, this year.

Q. You were married since you became a member of this organization?

A. No, thirteen years I have been married.

Q. Where were you married?

A. I was married in New York City, in St. Jerome's Roman Catholic Church, by Rev. Father Meckla.

Q. Now, were you in Index last summer?

A. I was.

Q. Were you working there?

A. I worked in the blacksmith shop of the Index & Galena Lumber Company, last summer.

Q. When did you quit work?

A. When the strike came on, which was, as near as I can recollect, about of 17th or 19th of July; I am not quite sure of the date.

Q. Did you go out and speak for the organization there?

A. When we went on strike the boys elected me as one of the strike committee in Index, and the day following that, or perhaps the second day following the walk-out and my election as one of the local strike committee, and at the request of the Everett bunch, I went to Everett, then to Seattle, and made two or three trips back to Index in the course of the next ten days or so; then went on about the country speaking.

Q. You mean by "about the country" in the northwest, in the region——

A. The lumber struck district.

Q. I see. And you delivered speeches, then; about how many speeches did you deliver?

A. I haven't any idea as to the number; they used to keep me busy, sometimes two meetings a day, sometimes three, and growled that I did not make four.

Q. Well, did you make the camps?

A. I made the communities in which the companies centered their business activities, and consequently centered the activities of the workers. I did not go very often right into the bunk houses in some of these camps.

Q. Now, did you observe conditions in your travel about the northwest in the lumber camps?

A. I certainly did.

Q. Now, prior to July, 1917, when the strike was called, had you gotten around that territory also?

A. Yes, sir; been over the same district practically before there was any strike, in the fall of 1916 and the early part of 1917.

Q. Now, how many camps would you say you made during this period, immediately prior to the strike, during 1916 and the fall of 1917?

A. Well, I made practically——

MR. NEBEKER. Just a minute; what do you mean, 1916 and the fall of 1917?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: The spring of 1917, pardon me.

A. I made practically all the larger camp communities; for instance, I made Monroe, I made Aberdeen, Hoaquiam, Tacoma, Seattle, Everett, and all those places.

Q. Describe the conditions that you found prevailing, typical of those camps you found.

MR. NEBEKER: I object as a conclusion. Let him state what his observations were and what he saw, but not give his conclusions as to whether they were typical.

A. Well, I found that camps, as a general thing, whether they were strictly lumber camps or construction camps, were pretty much the same sort of unsanitary, abominable places in which the men were forced to live. Many times there was not any hay, much less mattresses; usually a soap box affair that a man, if he had blankets, could throw them in there and sleep; and if he had no blankets he could do the best thing he could. The grub usually was not—well, it was mighty poor, to say the least. Of course, conditions varied in different places. As the men had some semblance of an organization, some semblance of economic power, they forced, or conditions were better than where they had not any organization and had not any organized economic power; but, on the whole, sanitary conditions were poor, little or no provision was made for bathing, and dirty, filthy animal life was in abundance. Animal life you had to pack with you if you visited one of these camps; you took some of it away with you usually in spite of everything you could do. That, as a general condition, is what my experience has been, not only in lumber camps, but in all those camps.

Q. How long did the men work?

A. Some of them could stand it for months; sometimes it was so rotten they could only stay a short time; they were short stake men.

Q. What was the period workday, how many hours?

A. Ten or twelve; understand, they would say ten hours, lots of places, ten hours a day; that meant ten hours on the job. The job might me a mile or a mile and a half away, over a trail very often, and the actual time put in, from bunkhouse in the morning to the time you returned to the bunkhouse, was very much more like twelve.

Q. Now, when you went, after the strike was called, to make your talk, what subject did you talk on?

A. Well, I used what I am pleased to call a subject, a chart, and I delivered what I call a chart talk, using crude illustrations—a blackboard and a piece of chalk. I have been using that for about four years—about four years. I found that the average slave, with little or no imagination—

MR. NEBEKER: This is not responsive. I object. Just wait until he gets to making his chalk talk.

MR. CHRISTENSON: What was the subject—industrial conditions?

A. Yes, sir; I adopted a title, after I had heard it given by some one else, Professor McMann of the University of Washington State.

MR. NEBEKER: This is objected to as heresay.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, what title did you give it?

A. "Exposition of Political Economy."

Q. Now, your talk there, did you make any study of industrial conditions and economics and statistics as a basis for the talks that you made?

A. Absolutely; my own experiences as a worker, and everything I could find that I considered authentic and reliable, such as Industrial Relations Report, or Government documents. Any time I said anything, I tried to be as nearly correct in my statements as it was possible for me to be, and I relied upon reports and literature that I considered authoritative.

Q. The talk that you gave, was that substantially the same at the various places where you—

A. Always the same; that is, I did not recite it poll parrot fashion, but the substance did not vary.

Q. Now, were you ever requested by any local to make a tour of the country and deliver this talk?

A. Several times, the organization, that is, local organizations, have requested that I be routed throughout the United States. With the exception of one time in Seattle, last year, in the month of April, I never considered it because of the fact that I could not live on what the organization was able to pay and keep my family, so I never undertook it, excepting in last April, 1917, when Local 382 voted for me to go on the road with the chart; at that time I agreed to go; then the strike came on and the plans were not carried out.

Q. Well, what salary did you draw when you went on the road and made these talks?

A. I got $18 and paid my own expenses, and borrowed enough to live on from my friends, usually.

Q. Now, Mr. Doran, tell us, in substance, the talk you made in traveling around the country. This is the talk you made during the summer of 1917, subsequent to the strike.

A. Yes; I always used notes, that is, notes in this way, I would take in order to carry out a continuity of thought, to remind myself as I would go on; I always used notes. Is it permissible to use them here?

Q. Well, if it covers the things that you talked about.

A. Absolutely the same as I used every meeting. "Now, Fellow Workers, you have heard a good deal about the I. W. W.."; this is as I gave it; that is, the idea.

Q. Exactly.

A. You have heard a great deal about the I. W. W. and you know what people say about us. You know that the newspapers generally credit us with being a lot of murderers, a lot of irresponsible dynamiters, and so forth.

I am an I. W. W. I am an I. W. W. for a reason, just the same as hundreds of thousands of other

working men have become I. W. W.s, and it is because of the fact that your position and mine, as workers, our interests are in common; it is because of the fact that I am interested in having you understand really what the I. W. W. is that I want to talk to working men for workingmen.

Now, then, I come out here tonight to talk to you on industrial unionism, as one worker to another, not intending to give you a whole hatful or headful of economic language, but to talk to you as I talk to you on the job, to talk to you as I talk to you in the jungles, and on the box car, to talk to you and reason to you just as we reason in these contemptible hunkhouses or wherever we may be.

Now, then, the I. W. W. does not ask you, as workingmen, to do a single solitary thing that you do not already do. We do not involve in our propaganda any new morals, if it is a question of morality with you. We ask you to do in the interest of humanity, in the interest of yourself and your wife and your babies, just what you now do in the interest of these excess profits of the Masters, and it is because that is true and because you have already justified the moral of things that the I. W. W. advovate, that I am going to draw pictures for you. I am going to prove to you that you do believe the stuff. I am going to prove to you that you do practice these things, but that you do it; you do it for your own misery on the one hand, and the excess luxury of the Masters on the other.

Now, then, in order to make clear to you the situation I briefly want to outline this: We are living under a system that we call "capitalism" and you and I know what it means to you and me; you and I know what it means to millions of our kind; you and I know what this poverty and suffering and degradation and crime mean because we see it; we experience it; we feel it. That is the product of capitalism; all that you see about you—your penitentiaries, your poor houses, your pestilence, everything—is the product of capitalism.

This is a matter of fact; it is axiomatic, if you will. Things, as they are, represent the amount of intelligence exercised by the masses in their own behalf. When you know what you go through and what I go through, I think it fair to say that we have not exercised a whole lot of intelligence, at least those of you who have remained outside the I. W. W. I am doing the best I can. I am an I. W. W.

Now, then, we I. W. W.s suggest something. We suggest doing away with capitalism. Why? Because we find it objectionable. We suggest tearing it down, but we are not destructionists. We propose to tear it down, but we propose to put something in its place, and what is that thing we propose to put up in its place? Socialism.

Now, what is Socialism? People tell you that Socialism is all sorts of things, or, rather, that it embraces all sorts of things, free love, for instance. Now, it does not anything of the kind. Socialism is a system just as capitalism is a system. Capitalism, on the one hand, permits persons or groups of persons, to own privately the things that are necessary and socially operated; through that private ownership the destinies and the control of the masses are maintained.

Socialism says: Socialism as a system—we propose to own socially the things that are socially necessary, such as the machines of production and distribution, and the earth—it is ours by right. Everything that is worth while, Fellow Workers, belongs to your kind and my kind.

They talk to you about knowledge. What is knowledge? Knowledge is the sum of our human experiences down the ages, and who has had any experiences that are worth while? Only we who work; only they, who in the past, have worked.

Listen. This is something that you might just as well get into your head now as forty years from now. You have got to understand it some time.

I want to give you the law of economic determination:

Man thinks in terms peculiar to the manner and condition under which he makes his living.

Given groups, thinking in like terms, create their own environment. Now, crudely, that means what I will illustrate for you this way: Men thinking in terms peculiar to the manner and conditions under which they make their living. Take a group of miners, what are the terms in which they figure things about them? In the terms of the mine and the mine experiences. They think in terms of the conditions under which they make a living, terms peculiar to the conditions under which he makes his living.

Take a bunch of sea-faring men, what terms do they think in?

Take a bunch of lawyers, what kind of terms do they think in? In terms peculiar to the sophistry of law.

Take any other calling; take any other group of men; each thinks in terms peculiar to the manner and conditions under which he makes his living.

Now, then, we, as workers, on the one hand, think in the terms of workers.

I think that you recognize the reason or, if not yet, you will in a few minutes, I hope. Socialism is a system under which we hope to own and operate socially the things that are socially necessary. Now, that is the end. We have got to get that end. How?

There are two methods suggested: One, the method of the political socialist, which I, as a workman, as an I. W. W., reject, for the good and sufficient reason to me that it is chimerical, it is impractical, it won't work.

On the other hand, there is a method known as Industrial Unionism, which I, as a workingman, have accepted. Now, I propose to explain to you the system that I have accepted. But, here, realize this: This is all preparatory to going into these ex-

planations. Recognize this: We live socially; we operate socially. We are absolutely dependent upon each other. As a matter of fact, you stand clothed —in what? Did you make your coat? No. Will you make the bread that you will eat or the food that you will consume? Do you make the bed in which you lie? No. Yet you need these things. Now, you are organized by your own deeds, and the things that you need are social products—commodities as produced; for instance, we will raise all of the coal in Pennsylvania, perhaps, and all of the wheat in North Dakota; but miners, with only coal, and farmers with only wheat, would be in a pretty fix, wouldn't they? There must be some methods, some arrangements by which exchanges can be made. Without wasting too much time, I want to say briefly that the institution through which exchanges are made are known to you as "business."

Now, I am going to take a business and build it up here for you, and then pull it all apart and show you where you fit, see? That is my purpose, to build up a business, to show what it amounts to, and where you get off at under the present program.

Listen. I emphasize this business stuff particularly because we have all had ambitions. I know when I left school—and I am just as human as some of you, even though I do not look it—I recognize that when I left school my ambition and my hope and my desire was to go into business. Well, I learned to manipulate tools and when I got a job, why, then I got a few sacks of tools together and I went into business. We all hope to do that, because business, we have been taught to believe, seeking economic security, represented security.

Now, it does not under the present program and there is a reason for it. Do not misunderstand me in this thing. I, as an I. W. W., attribute this to what? That is, I attribute our position to what? To the machinations of a few individuals? No. We are the victims of a system. I will show you that

as we go on; I will show you the relation of yourself and your boss.

Now, let us go into their business because we all hoped at some time or other to have a business. Down on the bottom of the mass, this line represents you, your kind and my kind. Now, when I say your kind and my kind, just realize that you do not have to, necessarily, have to have a shirt of this kind; you do not necessarily have to be an electrical worker or a logger.

When I speak of your kind and my kind, I speak of our class, the workers. Our class is made up of what? Bookkeepers, stenographers, clerks, janitors, printers, and so on down the line.; all sorts of workers.

Now, this great mass of men and women on the bottom here, represented by this line, their activities in any business are governed by another element and that element is known as the straw-boss element, and then, supervising the activities of the straw-boss element, we have another element, and that is known as the foreman element; supervising the activities of the foreman is the general foreman, the superintendent, the manager, the general manager, and the economic waste, the profitholders, the bondholders, the people who do not do anything.

In this business, for the time being, I want to assume the position of economic waste; in other words, I want to be the boss; I want to be the guy that clips the coupons, that gets it all out of your hide, and I want to show you how he operates.

Supposing, now, that I am hiring as boss, this group, this ordinary rank and file element. There are two things that determine what I will pay; what are those two things? One is an army of unemployed, and the other is, roughly, the value of a commodity. I determine, or, rather, those who come to me seeking a job, competing against one another, they determine what the value shall be; but there is one thing principally that determines what I shall

pay this lower group. There is a big bunch of men looking for work. The standard rate of wages in the community is $2; that is, an accepted thing, for purposes of illustration. We will say that this lower group is hired at $2 a day. First of all, the unemployed determine the job conditions of this bunch. I have often heard men in the craft unoin say—good, honest, sincere fellows, just as good, square union men as ever lived, but who did not have an understanding of their position and their own interests—I have heard them say, "We have got job control; she is good and clean." There is no such thing in the face of an army of unemployed.

The unemployed tend to determine job conditions for this bunch first, and this lowest paid worker determines, or tends to determine the compensation of all these workers.

You understand here now, that I have included, too, this general manager as a worker. Do you get that? Some of you fellows figured he was just a brainstorm running loose, did not amount to anything. He is not. He is necessary. He represents the executive ability necessary to the handling and conducting of this business. I include in this thing every man, woman and kid that does anything useful in nature. I do not, of course, consider an accumulation of profits as useful, at least not to me and my kind.

Now, then, this lowest paid worker determines the compensation of the others. I have gathered a group of men, women and children to make up this lower mass. Now, I want some straw bosses. What do I want straw bosses for? Why, I want straw bosses to take care that these people get lots of profits for me, and how am I going to get straw bosses? Well, the first thing I will do will be to offer a bribe. I will offer 50 cents additional to the straw boss. I will give him four bits more a day, $2.50, and you all want to be straw bosses. Why? Do you like the name? Do you like the term? No.

What you do like, Fellows, is this: The additional four bits, because that means many more socks, so many more pork chops, and a greater chance for your kids to live, a better opportunity for you to get by, and that is the reason you want to be straw boss, because of the material interest in this thing.

Now, then, how do I go about picking out this straw boss group? That is something you want to find out. Now, suppose that this meeting tonight is divided off into three sections, and this first five sections here represent fifty men, ten in each section, represent the fifty employes here. I want to pick a straw boss out of each one of those five sections. How do I go about it? Well, they know how they can get a pull with the boss, don't they? Of course they do. Please me. How will you please me? By sleeping on the job? How will you please me? By taking good care that there is no accident occurring to your fellow workers? Nix. I am not interested in that. How, then, will you please me? By setting me a rapid pace, by tattling, telling tales, being mean, small and contemptible with those you work with. The man that is most successful as a speed merchant, as a tattler, as a stool pigeon, altogether as a contemptible worker, is the man that can best represent my interests. So it is he who gets the job of straw boss, usually—not always.

Now, then, from the straw boss group I pick a foreman, gauging the value of the foreman the same way. The value of the foreman to me is determined by his ability to make profits for me. If human conditions, human considerations interfere with my profits, then he is absolutely to disregard them. If you do not believe it, try being a straw boss or a foreman and see how quickly you will get canned if you take into consideration the welfare of your fellow workers in contrast to the welfare of the boss' dollars.

Now, then, having chosen straw bosses that way, I pick a foreman in the same way, and I bribe him. I give him another four bits, and I have a $3 foreman.

A JUROR: Mr. Doran, will you stand over there?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: You are standing between the drawing and the jury.

THE WITNESS: Can you see now?

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE WITNESS: I have bribed the foreman and I am paying now $3 a day. If I have a $3 foreman, I have got what? A$4 general foreman, a $5 superintendent, a $6 general superintendent, an $8 manager, and a $10 general manager. Why? Do you suppose for a minute that I am going to pay $5 for a foreman to herd a lot of men at $2 a day? It isn't necessary. The compensation of this supervising the activities of others is determined by the compensation of the group immediately beneath, or the group to be supervised. Now, then, the lowest paid worker; the compensation of the lowest paid worker tends to determine the compensation of all workers; and the gauge of value of each of these men occupying and holding their respective positions—this is an important thing, fellows — get this clear — the gauge of value by which these men hold their position is the ability to make profits. Now, then, we I. W. W.s suggest something different. We suggest a new program. We say, "What will you do for yourself?" "Organize." "Organize which, organize who?" "Organize all the workers." But, you cannot go to this scissor bill straw boss that is pounding his fellow workers on the tail and talk organization to him. Why? It is very true his economic interests are identical with the economic interests of this rank and file bunch. It is very true that the foreman's interest—in fact, all of these useful workers have interests in common, but you cannot tell this bunch here that their interests are the same as the bunch on the bottom. You cannot make them see it. Why? Because they are chuck full of that bourgeoisie or boss morality which says that the master and slave have interests in common. Therefore, we organize who? We organize this bunch. (Indi-

cating.) We just go around and make you guys come in while the water is fine. Put your name down on a card. Everything is lovely. You sign up. We get enough of you organized, and then what do we do? Well, the first thing we do we boost the wages and we make this job $3, rank and file. The ordinary workers are getting $3 compensation now. I want to make this point clear, and I will cover it a little later on, but I want to emphasize for you now that money increase or the wage increase is not the important issue with you. The basic issue with you is destruction of competition; the doing away with your competitors; doing away with the army of the unemployed, and we will go into that as we go along, but I want to emphasize it here. As a result of organization we increased this pay of the rank and file to $3 a day. If I get $3 a day, what kind of a straw boss have I got? Why, I boost him to $4. If I get a $4 straw boss I have got a $5 foreman, a $6 general foreman and an $8 superintendent and a $10 general superintendent and a $15 manager. Isn't that so? Of course it is so. You have seen it operate. Now then, here! We have organized these workers. We have got them all to stick together to boost job conditions. Their activities tend to boost what? They tend to boost everything here and nothing there. (Indicating.) Now, they will tell you—I want to put something down here for a note—they will tell you that the masters and slaves have interests in common. They told me that and they will tell it to you. "A fair day's work for a fair day's pay." I used to swallow that stuff right along, and I remember one experience, years ago, where on a gang where we were doing some work, a little local, a little gang difference arose as to which was the better man, and one great big burly brute, he was the better man all right enough but we didn't think so, or some of us were foolish enough to believe that we could stay with him and we were battening arms in the city of Pittsburgh; it was in the summer; it was hotter than—well, the climate they tell you

about in the Bible. Well, we went on battening on arms that day, with this fellow in the lead. We had been in the habit of making 20 or 25 or perhaps 30 under favorable conditions. That man put on 68 arms that day. Most of us tagged him a close second or third. We had been doing a fair day's work when we were doing twenty. After that, 68 arms was a fair day's work and the pay did not go up a bit. They told us that the master and slave have interests in common. Now, then, let me show you about the compensation of all this crowd. (Indicating.) Suppose that this business is doing $100,000 worth of business a year, $100,000 of business in excess of all overhead expense in excess to funds for depreciation of machinery, insurance and so forth and so on. There is $100,000 clear out of this business. Now, then, let us suppose that on the $2 basis of compensation for the lowest paid worker that the labor time for one year—the labor time of all the workers from the general manager to the mucker—the labor time for one year represents $50,000. Now, then, if the labor item for one year's wages of all these people represents $50,000, and you are doing $100,000 of business in excess of all other charges, the difference between the two sums is $50,000. For whom? Why that is for this guy up here. (Indicating.) That is for the boss. That is for me.

Now, then, suppose that, as we have shown here, we organize a little. We get this bunch organized and increase the wages for the lowest paid worker. We are still doing $100,000 worth of business in excess of all charges and all overhead expenses. Now, then, the labor item on this new basis has jumped to what? It has jumped to $75,000 a year. And $75,000 a year from $100,000 leaves what, $25,000? A $75,000 labor item here and $25,000 gravy for the boss. Suppose we don't organize now. Suppose that we refuse to organize, you have what they call a panic. Suppose there is a vast army of unemployed and you fellows have not sense enough to protect your own interests through organization. Workers

in competition one with the other. Workers in competition one with the other will tend to drive down this pay. You know as well as I do when you have hunted a job. Suppose you have seen an advertisement in a paper: "Wanted—Five men to clean boilers." You go out there and there are only three men there. You can come pretty close to getting what you want. You go down there, five men, to clean boilers, and you see five hundred looking for the job. You know that you don't get anything like enough to buy doughnuts. You know it and I know it.

Now, then, in competition one with the other this is driven down to a dollar a day. If we have a dollad a day gang we have a dollar and a half straw boss, a two dollar foreman, a three dollar general foreman, and so on up. Now, we are doing $100,000 worth of business a year, $100,000 worth of business and no organization. The slaves in competition with the others have beaten the rate of wages down to one dollar on this basis the labor item for one year amounts to what? Twenty-five thousand dollars. Twenty-five thousand dollars from one hundred thousand dollars leaves what? Seventy-five thousand dollars. For whom? For this guy up here. (Indicating.) Don't you see just exactly, as your wages go up here, his profits go down there? (Indicating). Just exactly as your wages go down here, so do his profits go up there. (Indicating.)

Then they have got the nerve to tell me—I am one of those working stiffs—and they have got the nerve to tell me that the master and slave have intrests in common.

And, speaking about this, as I have often had the boss tell me, speaking of this fair day's wage for a fair day's work, I believe in being absolutely honest. I try to, anyway, as honest as a man can be under the dishonest system that we have, and I say, "A fair day's work for a fair day's pay." All right. I have got a mighty bum job and mighty bum pay. To be absolutely honest with myself, I have got to

give exactly the kind of work I am paid for. If I can't be square with myself, how in the name of common sense can I be square with my neighbor? A man does not understand honesty here who does not understand it over there. (Indicating.) When I have a bum day's pay I give a bum day's work in order to be honest—to show physically—if I am on the job where the pay conditions are bad and the general living condition bad, I have not sufficient physical energy to deliver anything else but the value of what he gives me.

Now, then, suppose that we have organized this. You will still say, "In this business we need a foreman. We need straw bosses, and we need the men to handle the executive work, the supervisors and so forth." What are you and the I. W. W. going to do? Tear this thing apart and leave it there? Nix; nothing like that. We cannot at this time organize those men, because they are the products of that capitalistic idea, and think that they have to do anything and everything in the interests of this crowd. (Indicating.) Psychologically, they are enemies of ours. Economically, their interests and ours are identical. Now, we cannot do anything with them but, when we have organized this bunch on the bottom (indicating), what do we do? We have got to have straw bosses. Well, where will we get them? We will pick them out of our gang just as the boss now picks them, but we will pick them in a different way. We will pick the most efficient man in the crowd to be straw boss, and we will pick what we consider to be the best representative brain in the crowd. And what will the gauge of value be? Ability to make job conditions easy and simple. The man that we choose as straw boss out of our gang will be a man who, actuated by human impulses, will be able to carry on efficiently the production that is necessary to do the work that is necessary, but also to do it with the least possible expenditure of human energy and the least possible work to the human units involved. Now, then, we choose the straw boss

that way and we pick the foreman by the same moral. We choose the general foreman by the same gauge. We choose our sales manager and our genral manager and all the rest of them because of their absolute ability to deliver the goods, because of their ability to see things that are necessary.

Listen! See how these two morals work? The present moral, the capitalist's moral, production for profit? It counts the human element nothing. What does it mean? Brother against brother. Sister against sister, father against father. Don't you believe it? Let me show you. Suppose that you are my boy and you are working for me in a gang, and I am your straw boss, foreman or superintendent. Now, then, if you are my boy it is a cinch, at least we will suppose that I am the ordinary father and you the ordinary son—it is safe to say that my interests will center themselves in you and your welfare. I will give you the squarest deal possible on that job. But, say, if you don't cut the buck, if you don't do the work, how can I hold my job as foreman or straw boss? If I allow you to shirk, can I hold my job? No, sir. Why? The relationship is there. You are my boy, and I should give you a fair deal. I am anxious to give you a fair deal, but I cannot do it. I cannot do it because this influence that stands up above will sever me from my job if I try it.

Now, listen, fellows. No relationship, morality, nationality, religion, lodge, church nor anything else plays any part in this thing. Suppose that I am your boss and I belong to one lodge here. You are a slave down here and belong to the same lodge. You go to the same church or live in the same general section of the earth. Does that make any difference in our realtionship? Not a particle. I may fill you full of bunk and tell you what a fine fellow you are for the job, and shake hands with you and ask you when you are going to lodge and when you are going to church, and all this, that and the other thing, but when the paymaster comes around I haven't got anything to say about the pay envelope. It is just

the same as all the rest of them. Now, then, as fellow lodge members or church members or members of any other sectional creed, listen: As my province as boss goes up, yours as slave, goes down. Therefore, nothing enters into this thing except the question of your class organization. I will prove that now as we go on. But the moral of this capitalistic program, the gauge of value is the ability to make profits, and that makes what? Here are human beings, good fellows, friends of mine. Personally, I have a number of friends who occupy positions of this kind; just as good men as I ever saw. I know general managers and superintendents that I would be glad, as men—as men, independent of my class status; glad to know them, glad to converse with them, glad to exchange ideas with them, all around good fellows, in my estimation. Yet, when I work for them, they certainly have to pound me where I live; they certainly have to take advantage of me. Now, then, the first gauge here, their value is determined by their ability to disregard comfort and security here (indicating.) This bunch is chosen because of their ability to disregard the comfort of the others, and so on clear to the top (indicating.) And at the top you have what? You have the general superintendent, the general manager, the men who, at one time, may have been the actual bench worker, giving orders to shoot you down or to club you in a strike. That is the product of that moral.

Now, we I. W. W.s in choosing our straw bosses, our foreman and general foreman and so on clear to the top, gauging their value by the ability to make job conditions easy and simple, that results in what? This fellow is chosen because he makes the ordinary bunch comfortable. This bunch is the high expression of that self-same humanitarianism. This is the high expression here and there. (Indicating.) And, at the top, you have the most efficient men for making living conditions worth while. And, when you get down to it, what is your problem here? You face a problem from the day you come into the

world until the day you go out of it, and it is always the same. It never changes. Your problem is to live, and live as easily and comfortably and as securely as possible. You face that problem. Now, then, this whole discussion is a discussion having to do with that problem. The high brow talks of economics. The average ordinary working stiff scares to death. Economics! You and I, who have given some attention to the subject, perhaps we understand it; but in your language, the language of the job—what is economics? What does it mean? What does it amount to? Economics is simply the science of living. So, fellows, we have got to be mighty scientific to get by now-a-days, don't you think so? That is all there is to this high brow stuff. They confuse you with the words that you do not understand. They confuse you with a lot of fancy language and other things. For instance, there is one thing that they tell you, and they have told me this for several years. I believe it was in 1915 that a government agent reported that there were ten million people suffering from pellagra in this country. Now, what is pellagra? A boil on the neck, or something of that sort? The ordinary worker does not know. Pellagra is slow starvation. Ten millions of people suffering from slow starvation in this country, and, say, that is not the tragedy of the thing at all, though bad enough. The newspapers that commented on that situation in the self-same issue had articles written by eminent professors, telling your kind and my kind that we eat too much! Pellagra is and it was slow starvation; yet they have the colossal nerve to tell us that we eat too much. The pity of it is that most of you fellows believe it. I have seen fellows who were very plainly suffering from mal-nutrition, or every evidence that they had not proper foods, say, "Well, I think I do eat too much. I am going to Fletcherize. I am only going to take one doughnut in the morning instead of six, or three or four." That is the tragedy of the thing, that you believe this stuff. Now, here, that brings

up the question which is of vital importance. I am a worker. You trust me with your life. You will go on a job with me and permit me to make an electrical connection with you on a line that means instant death. You do not question me. You will trust your life with other workers. You do it every minute of the day. Every day that you live and work. You don't question us that way. I don't question you and you don't question me, but just as soon as I, working stiff, get up here and talk to you in the language of the working stiff, you want to know what he is getting out of this, what he is getting out of that. Who put him up to this sort of stuff. I don't believe it, anyway. I saw Professor so-and-so's article and it says different. Who is the professor? The fellow that you trust with your life? No. He is one of the guys that fills your kids with a lot of false ideas, and then your kids go out and sustain the system that he defends. That is one of the tragedies of the thing.

Oh, here is a very important point, a mighty important point. It should be gotten over right now. I am the boss. They talk to me about law. They talk to me about order. They talk to me about decency. If you can conceive of a program with a greater ideal, with a finer program than the I. W. W., I want to know it and I want to know it quick. I want to join it, join in the move, join in the furthering of the scheme. But the I. W. W. represents to me today the finest expression of all there is good, possibly conceivable in the human breast. The I. W. W. represents ease and comfort for children and women. The idea of girls today, but into motherhood tomorrow. What were they brought here for? Why did they come into the world? To propagate their kind. Anaemic, drawn, over-worked, and under paid, denied the most sacred calling of the family, the privilege of propagating their kind. Then they have nerve enough, they have nerve enough to question us! We want children. We want homes. We want babies, not the kind of babies

that they want us to have—starved, miserable, scrawny little creatures. We want full grown, healthy, developd children, and we will have them. And we I. W. W.s will bring them here, because we will change the system that makes degradation and poverty possible. Now, they talk to me of the law involved in a thing of that kind. Listen. I am your boss. I am the man that pays you, and I am paying you $2 a day. I am paying you $2 a day. I make law for you. I say to you, "Here, you can have a wife. You can have babies, and, if you have them, you can feed them and you can take them to a picture show; you can give them clothes, you can give them the things that they need, but you can only give them $2 worth. See? I determine for you. I am your absolute master. I make the law of life for you; $2 worth is all that you can have. I am your boss. Now, why am I your boss? I am your boss because you and your kind are silly enough to believe that I should have the right to privately own these things that are socially necessary and socially operated. And, unless you believe in that right, as long as you will concede to me the privilege of economic superiority, then, that long you will be slaves. I will make every law for you, and I circumscribe every act. I tell you even when to eat and whether you can be buried in a potter's field or not. If I have only paid you $2 a day, then they will bury you in a potter's field. If I paid you $6 probably you could pay for a $20 plot. Everything is in my hands and the law of life for you is made by me. You fellows have got to make your own laws. You have got to get down and attend to business and get down soon. Where is this law of life, for you, made? It is made on the job. Practically at the point of production. Why has the boss exercised direct action? I force you to obey my will. How? When I want to cut your wages from $2 a day to $1 do I ask the bunch of mush-faced politicians to do it for me? Do I go to the Senate or Council Chamber to do it? No. I walk in on the

job and I say to you: "Listen, I have been paying $2 a day for ten hours. From now on it is $1 a day." You will say, "I don't like it." "All right, if you don't, move. We will get somebody else that will." Your life is made for you right there by him. Now is when you organize, when you get down to cases, when you organize, the only thing you have is your economic power when on the job. What do you do? You make your law. You raise your wages. Does the politician help you? Is he necessary? We have nothing to do with him. Tend to your own affairs. You have in your hands the power that he has in reference to the world. You are the only people in the world that are worth while. So, as far as your law is concerned—well, you have to make it. You have got to make it. In making that kind of a law, what kind of a law is that you make by boosting your wages? A law that is a benefit to mankind. Let us understand one another right here. What do we mean by law? Law is the uniformity of things, a rule established by authority. That is what law is. Of course, a lawyer and others will try to scare you with a lot of Latin phrases about law, but that is really all it is. It is simply a rule of action established by authority, uniformity of things.

Listen. There is a rule of law in your church which says the pew rent is four bits a month. Well, you go to church. You pay, you obey the law, and your pay four bits a month. There is a law in the union that says the dues are four bits a month. It is a rule of action, uniformity of things. You obey the law, you pay your dues. There is a rule of society that says, "Thou shalt not kill." You are not going around killing anybody. You obey the law. So on all through life. Law is simply a rule of action, and the rule of action that we propose to establish—the uniformity of things—is the uniformity that knows no poverty and knows no misery.

Now, this kind of institution in the last few years has established itself into a different sort of thing.

This is ordinary business. Now, as a rule of the introduction of modern machinery and efficient systems, as the result of competition among business men, as the result of a desire for markets, certain changes have taken place. Those changes no man can stop them. They are peculiar to the advancement made by the mechanic. As a result of the modern machinery and efficient system, these changes have taken place and we can now deal with a modern institution called "Industrialized Business." I will show you what has happened in the last fifty years or so, and, incidentally, show you why it is harder for you to make a living, and, incidantally, prove that portion of our preamble, which says: "The centering of the management of industries into fewer hands make trade unions unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the master class." And if we had a bunch of business men here tonight it would give these little business men an understanding of why they and their little businesses are hitting the grade so heavy. It would make them understand the utter futility and utter hopelessness of bucking a program of this kind.

Now, for the purposes of illustration, let us deal with the article called steel. Now, in the production of steel we have, what? Well, we have a number of operations absolutely necessary. For instance, we have chemical laboratories necessary in order to determine as to wheteher the raw materials are of the proper kind and so forth. We have the chemical laboratory. We have the machine shop. We have foundry plants. We have transportation or teaming or anything, anything to transport the material necessary. We have power plants. We have the carpenter shop. Now, we have a number of other departments, perhaps. A number of other operations are incidental to the production of steel. But, at one time or another, in the manufacture of steel, they used to use these businesses as separate institutions and determine what was necessary and what was not. This machine shop was a separate

institution. This was also separate (indicating). But some genius, about forty years ago, came along, and he says, "This laboratory, machine shop, foundry, transportation power and everything, carpenter shop, and so on, are all necessary and incidental to the manufacture and production of that article known as steel. Therefore we want markets. Competition is too keen. The thing for us to do is what? Be efficient. Consolidate these interests that are directly necessary in the production of steel, allied one with the other, by the nature of their own activities." And a group of men got together and they said, "Here, we will take this laboratory, machine shop, foundry and so on, and we will whip them all together into one industrial business. And when we have those businesses organized under one head, the first thing we will do will be to eliminate a lot of economic waste." Economic waste of what kind? Well, for instance, in the handling of the ordinary business, as I have just shown you, there is an army of all kinds of employes, janitors, clerks, bookkeepers, stenographers, mechanics, laboratory, and so forth and so on, teamsters and so on. In the handling of the ordinary machine business, there is pretty much the same sort of affairs, the same sort in every one of these individual businesses. When they group all this business under one head, then what do they do? They find that there are a number of workers in this business duplicating the activities of the workers in that business (indicating). And that, and that, and that, and so on; in the total there are a great army of workers which duplicate the activities of the other. That, my friend, is economic waste, and, therefore, that economic waste, if we are to be efficient, must be eliminated. So these men got together and they eliminated the economic waste. They put the office in the center. Then they do what? They have the janitor force, the whole operating and supervising force directly under one head; and, above everything else, they have the close co-operation between these several units,

each necessary to the production of steel. The consequence was that they produced steel at a price that permitted them to control the market. That was what they were after. Now, then, there are two other elements to be considered. One is the small business, and the other is the worker, your kind and my kind; see how it affected him and see where we got off under this program. Incidentally, let us take a look at the little business man and see where he got off under this program. Incidentally, let us take doesn't know what is the matter with him. This combination produces steel and at a price that permits them to control the market. Now, they tell you that competition is the life of trade! In a social system, when the very nature of your system, the very nature of the instrument through which you produce the things that you must have in order to live—is highly co-operative. As man has developed the modern machine, as the need for hand labor has gone out, as the labor instrument has been centered in the fellow on the machine, so has he need for the control of that instrument centered into the hands of fewer and fewer. Co-operation! That is well and good. Fine. The only thing. But they teach you and me that competition is proper. They will co-operate as far as possible, but they will teach you to fly at my throat, or I to fly at yours. Look! What is your standing in society? What is mine? I go to the same cheap restaurant; I live in the same poor, miserable district that you do; I live and associate with you entirely. Then, why in the name of common sense, should I fight you? Why should I compete with you? Only because you and I have become familiar with our own interests and our own affairs. Well, they recognized this, and what took place? Here is a little business operating as a laboratory. Here is another little business operating as a separate unit, a machine shop, a foundry, a carpenter shop, and so on. The business that the combination of these individual units would produce would be what? The article would be steel, would

it not? Of course. That is what they are producing. Now, then, this group—this business—has a number of workers and all their activities are reproduced here, and here (indicating), and the overhead expenses are great. These individual units operate separately in the general production of steel and, naturally, the cost is high. This small business man then loses his market. When they lose their markets they throw out their employes, and the kick that they registered was what? They kicked against this (indicating) industrialized institution that the business men of this country for years have erroneously called trusts. That is not a trust. That is simply industrialized business. This small business man has kicked against this industrialized unit. Why? On the basis that it is not efficient? On the basis that it is not of extreme value to society? No. Their basis for their kick was personal, material welfare. These small business men, when you say, "Here, you are selling steel: the product of your individual firms. Here, your price is so and so." And you say, "I wouldn't pay that price; I can buy directly from this industrialized institution for 40 per cent. less." "Yes," you say, "yes, unfortunately that is so; I regret to admit that it is so, but then I cannot sell at that price." And they do not question the right of this institution. They do not question its efficiency or its value, but they question why it should be permitted to exist, because their individual economic interests are menaced. Now let me show you that the ordinary workers are in the same relative position. Take the laboratory worker. We have a form of organization here known as craft unions, of which I am and have been a member for a good many years. In the craft unions the laboratroy workers would be organized as laboratory workers, the chemists as chemists, clerks as clerks, stenographers as stenographers, machinists under the head of machinists, foundry men under the head of foundry operators, carpenters under the head of carpenters, and so forth and so on according to their craft identity, their

craft occupation. Now, let us understand one another right here. What do we mean by craft men? What is a craftsman? What do you mean by the use of the word? A craftsman is one who, because of his ability to manipulate his hand tools, tools of a given kind, is conceded to be an expert in that particular occupation, and he is, therefore, called a craftsman. As a carpenter theoretically operates and manipulates his hand tools in the work of wood, so he is conceded a craftsman. But craftsmanship is something different from what the laborer possesses. What is it? It is skill. Now, then, remember that. Craftsmanship is called skill. Skill becomes private property. It is not the possession of all workers. A craftsman is in possession of a certain kind of property—a thing called skill—and he bargains for and sells, collectively, what? His labor power? Yes, but he does not figure that. He bargains for and sells collectively his skill. Carpenters make a place for carpenters. The carpenters' union permits only carpenters to join that union, and so on. Now, here, craftsmanship has ceased to be. The carpenter trade has ceased to be, in the fact of what? Modern machinery. Efficient system. If I were hiring a man today, you might come to me and tell me that you were a first class carpenter, you could take a trunk of a tree and fashion it into anything—tables, newel posts, stairs, cabinets—anything that I wanted, and I would say to him, "I would not hire you, though you may be the best craftsman in the United States," and the reason why I would not hire him is this: I can go to the mill where a boy stands over an intricate machine and that machine turns out more newel posts and banisters in ten hours than you could turn out in ten years. Modern machinery has done away with the craftsman.

Take the printer. I have knocked all over this country with printers. Printers are supposed because of their occupation—or were some years ago—were supposed to be pretty much of a migratory class. They used to drift around from place to

place. Although there is ten times as much printing done as there used to be, yet the number of persons engaged in the printing trade is less relatively and proportionately than it was twenty years ago. The old-time printer used to walk into an office and would take his stick and set up a whole lot of type. Some worked on headings; some on something else, but it was a hand operation. A printing plant was run by practical craftsmen—printers—men who knew the printing trade. Now you walk into a printing plant today and what do you see? Why, a young woman sits there at a linotype. She sets up more type in eight hours than eight printers would set by hand in eight hours. . Where are the seven other printers or eight printers?

They go on a flock of box cars somewhere out into the desert and look to make the way stations so they can make some little town gossip sheets. You walk into an office and ther is a young woman sitting; years ago they used to train men to do clerical work. We had a bunch of men especially trained as accountants. We had men especially trained as bookkeepers. We had men especially trained for other of these operations. Today, what do you find? You walk into an office and there is a young woman sitting at a typewriter. It has a special carriage on it. She pounds out the entries on these loose leaf ledger pages and when it is done she puts it into the book. The bookkeeping is all done; the accounting is all done. She draws $8, $10 or $12 a week and the $150 expert is looking for a job scabbing on shovel stiffs somewhere. Generally speaking, the girl is manipulating the work that was formerly handled and performed by these thousands and thousands of workers. For fear that the girl might make a mistake, they have even got the foolproof apparatus to check up her brain. She sits there when she is counting the numbers. She does not take time to count them even. She sits there and knocks at a Burroughs adding machine and

jerks out a sheet from underneath. No mistake possible. Can't make a mistake.

THE COURT: Ten minutes recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken).

THE COURT: Proceed.

THE WITNESS: Craftsmen have organized on the basis of their craft interests; that is, the carpenters have organized as carpenters, the bricklayers as bricklayers, and so forth and so on; the laboratory workers have organized there, and the machine shop workers there, and the foundry workers there (indicating), and each organization represents what? Each organization represents a little unit in itself. Only machinists are members of the machinists' union, and only members of the carpenters' trade are members of the carpenters' union. Though in the production of steel it requires the services of great numbers of machinists and great numbers of foundry workers, great numbers of transport workers, power plant operators, carpenters and so forth. They each organized as little units, and each little unit is an autonomous body, privileged to do just as it likes in regard to the rest of the organization. The consequence is this: The machinists have trouble in the steel plant and the machinists vote to strike. The carpenters haven't got any trouble and, though they are in the same plant, they stay on the job. Now, then, when you organize, the fact is that there is an army of unemployed always ready to take the place of the employed workers, and scabs are recruited from the army of the unemployed or from some source. The machinists go on strike, the machine shop in the steel plant is filled up with scab machinists and union transport workers, power plant operators, carpenters, and so forth, all remain on the job. Now, no one questions the value, no one questions the efficiency of this industrialized method of doing business. The ordinary labor official knows that the industrial system of production is higher. He does not question that,

although the bricklayers' union in 1913, I believe, voted from its own meagre treasury, five hundred thousand dollars. Think of it, what an enormous sum! Five hundred thousand dollars! That money was raised by subscription and assessment, and the purpose of it was to buy a brick yard in Texas. The union bricklayers wanted to have a union brick yard. They bought a union brick yard. They hoped to have a union brick yard laid out by union bricklayers. They failed to realize that scab transport workers, and, perhaps, scab laborers, and perhaps scab miners had a part in the production of the things that made the brick and permitted the use of the brick. However, this is the point: The bricklayers did that for this reason: They had been a tight little craft union for a great many years in building buildings, viaducts and aqueduct systems and things of that kind and it had been the policy to use bricklayers. Now, then, with the introduction of modern machinery came what? Came the loss of the bricklayers' skill. When modern machinery came in, with it came the concrete mixer, and with it came the system of building reinforced concrete structures, and with that the introduction of the most efficient method going and the loss of work that was formerly done by the bricklayer. The bricklayer proposed to stand in the way of modern ingenuity. He proposed to stand in the way of modern efficiency and development in order to maintain his craft or skill property privilege. He failed to realize that the big, raw-boned unskilled laborer with a steel wheelbarrow in his hand today is in possession of that which has replaced the skill of the bricklayer. He fills it with concrete, fills it with cement, sand and broken stone and so forth, and dumps it into a steel cylinder. The steel cylinder is whirled rapidly and concrete is made. The concret is dumped out and pourd into crude wooden forms. They are building a bridge or an abuttment somewhere. The mixture is allowed to remain a matter of a week or so,

and then, after a week, they knock off these crude forms, and there stands, as a monument of the skill of the unskilled, the one in possession of the modern machine, the thing that has done away with the need for the bricklayer's skill. They bought a brick yard and hoped to beat the system that way, just as the farmer hopes to beat the system. I have got something for you on the farmer that I want to get into you. I propose to get it tonight for this reason, that they have a broad difference of opinion between the working man and the farmers—the working man in any industry. And just as the farmer hopes to beat the system, so did the bricklayer hope to beat the system. Instead of organizing on class lines and organizing into one class union all of the workers that are necessary to the production of things that eliminated the needs, the bricklayer proposed to do this purchasing.

We I. W. W.s say: "Listen; what is the good of buying railroads? We don't want to buy railroads. We don't want to buy brick yards nor the mills nor the factories. We don't have to indulge in a co-operative plan or a co-operative program. This is what we mean to do: Organize the slaves in the brick yards and then we own the brick yard; organize the slaves on the railroads and then we own the railroads; organize the slaves everywhere and all these things are ours. But to buy them and attempt to compete with the capitalistic masses is nonsense. We are not there. We cannot cut the buck. These men organized this way, though they recognize the fact that they operate in an industrial unit, and they are powerless to protect themselves. Now, the men who are at the head of these labor unions, who are they? The machinist union with a bunch of machinist officials. These men are supposed to have studied economics; at least they are supposed to have studied the things that are of interest to working men. The foundry men's union has foundry officials; the carpenters' union has carpenter officials.

Now, one of two things is true; either the officials of the carpenter's union or the machinists' union or any other, in fact, of the individual crafts union is an up-to-date workman and can intelligently represent the workers of his organization, or else he is not. If he is strictly up to date, if he knows what he is paid to know, then he knows that this industrial system of production is the proper and necessary operative system. If he does not know that, he is in business as a labor faker—one of two things. Either he knows that this is absolutely the condition, or else, if he does not know it, he hasn't brains enough to represent men in the situation that absolutely calls for the knowledge of the true state of affairs. Now, these labor skates do know that the industrial system of production is the system under which we operate; they know that as well as I or any I. W. W. knows it. But they have, like the small businessman, material interest. They have a little interest of their own that prevents them from telling the rank and file followers the truth. Here! The machinist officials know that this is so. Then, you, as a working man, say to me, "Why don't they tell it? Why don't they do as they are paid to do?" They don't dare to for the same reason that these people grumble about it. As long as there are separate unions, there are separate pie cards. As soon as all of these unions are whipped into one industrial union, as soon as this becomes one industrial union, then, that instant, you do what the bosses did when they organized this institution. You eliminate economic waste. You have one set of union officials where you now have a set of officials here and here and here and here (indicating). Each group is afraid to say anything about the truth, for the reason that each group expects to get the can if it becomes one union. Do you see? They have their own jobs and they realize that if they tell the truth, they lose their jobs. Therefore, they say nothing about it, in face of the fact that is demonstrated on

every hand. Now, we I. W. W.s understand something. We understand that every man, woman and kid incidental to the operation of that unit is necessary to the union to defend his or her interest in that unit. We I. W. W.s say that every man, woman and kid that is on the job is there because he is necessary. The boss is not a philanthropist. He tells you so, but he is not, actually. And they are all necessary to their union. They are necessary to the one business union, to produce. They are necessary to one union of workers to defend, and this, in the language of the I. W. W., is the bosses' branch industrial union. This is, in the language of the I. W. W. what the I. W. W. workers' union will be. And, by the way, that reminds me of a thing that I should emphasize here. The I. W. W. What do you mean by the I. W. W.? "I won't work." "I want whiskey." You have heard them say that. The I. W. W.s—every man in this industrial system of production, every man, woman and child that operates today, though they may disdain to connect themselves with the organization that I belong to, though they may entertain the desire to discredit it, the fact remains that all of you fellows that work for a living and all of you wage workers—are I. W. W.s right now! I will prove it to you.

The system of production is what? The system of production is the industrial system. You, if you are wage workers here, you are industrial wage workers, and the system and its ramifications are as wide as this world. Therefore, you are industrial wage workers of the world. I. W. W. A whole lot of you have not sense enough yet to carry a card in the union. Eventually you will have to. There are no two ways about it. You have got to come in. Either that or drown. It is the only way out.

Now, then, the labor skates do not tell—understand, I don't say this in bitterness; I do not say this account my holding any personal prejudice or any animosity against the men of the A. F. of L.; I

carry an A. F. of L. card; I have worked all day on my job and have gone out to my union meeting at night to try to put over this educational propaganda. I realize that there are many, yes, vast hordes of working men just as honest, just as sincere and just as purposeful, perhaps, as I am. Their ideas, their purposes, their sincerity and their honesty do not take the same form as mine does. They do not understand the thing, perhaps, as I understand it. But I cannot question the man that strikes with me. The man that will walk off his job; the man that will go on strike to improve his baby's condition. The man that will take a flock of box cars and suffer the hardships of a trip across the desert or the mountains. The man that will suffer the abuses of police force, militia and other subverted forms of authority. Not a bit. He has struck with me a good many times. The thing that I question, the thing that I can't understand, is his intelligence. That is all. I question his intelligence. I don't blame, although there are many mercenary labor skates, as we call them; I don't blame them near as much as I blame you and as I blame myself. I pay the bill. Your condition is what you make it. You make your condition. If you think in terms of your own interest; if you think in terms of class interest, then you will enjoy it. As long as you think in terms of prejudice and bias and brutality and so forth, things incidental to this system, then you must suffer. But you say that the labor skate did this, that or the other thing; well, while he is not a paragon of virtue; while he is productive of many wrongs, while some of them right now in this lumber strike are functioning as industrial police, the fact remains that we are all workers and do not, at any time, permit the boss to inject venom between you, the industrial unionist, you and the A. F. of L. rank and file members.

Now, then, here! These men who are the heads of these unions, many of them are sincere. Many more of them are insincere. They have one func-

tion. The only function that the craft union official can fulfil today intelligently and consistently is what? He gets paid as long as he is an official. Where does his money come from? The machinists' union furnishes the machinist officials with a pie-card. The carpenters' union furnishes the money for the carpenters' union officials. As long as there is a carpenters' union there will be finances. As long as there is a machinist union there will be machinist finances; and because their jobs are and because they are dependent upon these individual groups, therefore, these labor skates see to perpetuating themselves, and they operate as industrial police.

One of the things that was brought forcibly to my mind in connection with my own trade was this: I am an electrical worker. My card is paid up. I come into towns where they are supposed to have job control. As a matter of fact, we have never had it for years, but they are supposed to have job control. I come into town and I have a paid up card in my pocket. I am of a good many years' standing and there is nothing against me. Nobody charges me with theft, murder or anything like that. I come into a town and I go to the union headquarters. "Anything doing?" The business agent looks me over, and he says: "What is your name?" "Red" Doran." "Um-hum; I don't know whether there is anything doing or not. You can go out and rustle." So, I show him my card and I go out and rustle. I find a job, somebody that is willing to hire me. I am told to come back tomorrow. "Have you seen the business agent?" "Yes." "Well, go and get a card from the business agent so it is all right to go to work. Everything is fine and dandy, and you can go to work tomorrow morning." Then I go back to the business agent and I say, "Well, I have found a job." "Where?" Then I say, "Judge Thompson's job." "Oh, is that so. I didn't know they were using any men over there." I say, "Is that so. He

told me to come down and get an O. K. from you and I could go to work tomorrow." He says, "Now, listen, Red, you know the by-laws. We have got a lot of idle men here in town. You can't go to work as long as we have any local idle members." I can't go to work because I am "Red" Doran, the agitator.

Willie Smith comes into town. He has a card. Willie goes down and sees the business agent. The business agent lets him go and rustle for a job. He gets it. The company hires him. He comes back to the agent, the business agent, for a card to go to work. The business agent knows that Willie Smith never opened his mouth in his life; that he never growled at anything the boss said; he never asked for what was coming to him, but will stand for anything. Can he go to work? You bet your life. The businss agent wants Willie and all of his relatives on the job because, as long as Willie is on the job Willie will pay dues, and as long as there are dues coming in the pie cards will be paid for the officials.

The officials' function—the only function that they have under the crafts form of organization—is that of industrial police.

Now, then, I want to talk to you—so much for the steel. I want to call your attention to something that the masters recognize and that the workers have not come, many of them, to recognize, and that is this: A commodity is not a finished product until it is actually in the hands of the consumer. From the time that the raw material comes from the ground—the natural resources—until it is actually in the hands of the consumer, the article is in the course of production. Now, people still question that. The masters understand it and, actuated by the same desire that they were actuated in here (indicating), efficiency, elimination of waste, some of the big steel mill proprietors devised a combination of businesses; that combination, my friends, is the modern trust.

Now, I will explain that to you to show you the position in connection with the trust, where you get off at and what it means to you and what it amounts to for you and for your boss. I have shown you the single business that has gone to the industrialized business—the steel mill. All right; now, in the production of steel as a commodity, what have we got to consider? We have got to consider raw matrials. Where do the raw materials come from? Why, they come from the mines. All right. Now, then, Mr. Gary and his associates or some of the steel officials decided that, as long as they had to pay the prices to other capitalists who owned the mines, they were indulging in economic waste. They were not keeping for themselves all the profits that there were in the business. Therefore, they decided to take over the mines and they hooked up the mine with the mill. Now, they had the materials from the ground to the mill. But after they had connected themselves up that way they found there was another thing they had to consider. What was that? Transportation. They found that the raw materials had to come from the mines, through the medium of the transportation department, to the steel mill. Now, everything looked as though it were fine and dandy. They took it out of the ground. They transported it to the mill, and there, at the mill, they manufactured the raw materials into the finished article, steel. But it was not finished, because it was still in the steel mill, so they had to organize a distributing agency. That distributing agency was what? The big subsidized construction companies, the big subsidized shipyards, the big subsidized industrial plants of one description or another that could use the output of the steel mills. Now, then, they had, in this question, the raw material and everything from the mine, through the transportation industry into the mill where it was fashioned and eventually distributed to the consumer. All right; so much for the combination as

affected by the industrialized business kings of the country. They had trustified all industrialized business here. What about the workers? Do you remember? If you don't, I do. Do you remember the steel strike in Pennsylvania; do you remember how Mr. Gary decided that no two bosses could exist in the same establishment? On the same job, at the same time? No two absolute bosses? Mr. Gary recognized the fact that if he was going to run that business he had to run it; if he was not going to run it, then the unions should run it; but as long as there was any question as to who was doing the running, either one or the other was to get out of it had to be settled. So, Mr. Gary, having studied your weaknesses as you have not studied his, Mr. Gary decided upon what? The elimination of the craft union man. How could Mr. Garry decide upon the elimination of the vast army of working men? This is the way he did it. I will assume the position of the craft union man in a steel mill. I am a rougher or a roller. My job is to take a steel neck and pass it through the roll, where it is crushed and rolled into the proper shape or form. I am a roller. I am a rougher, as the case may be. I receive a pretty good salary. I get $7 a day, perhaps $6 a day. I am a rougher. I poke it through the rolls. Jim, here, is my helper. Jim is my side kick. He is an unskilled laborer. I am organized on the basis of my skill as a rougher or roller. Jim, he does not belong to my organization. Why? Well, you see, I am superior to him. Jim is just an ordinary common working stiff; but I am a roller. Jim, though, when I have no tobacco, I will borrow his. When he has no lunch, he will borrow part of mine. When Jim's wife has a baby, my wife goes over to help and to administer to her wants. When Jim's kid gets the measles, so do mine; we all live in the same neighborhood; we all suffer the same. We go to the cheap play houses; we go to the cheap theaters and we visit together, and we live togther. We

work together; we die together. But organize? Organize? Where do you get that stuff? "I am a rougher; he is just a working stiff. Organize in my union? Nothing doing." Such was the situation in the steel mill, and Mr. Gary, through the activity of his stool pigeons, determined upon the destruction of labor unions, and Mr. Gary decided to foment trouble. A strike was agitated. I and my kind, secure in my knowing, or the knowledge that I had of my own superiority, went out on strike. We were not going to stand for this. We decided as roughers and rollers to strike and walk out of the plant. When we were going out of the plant, why, Jim was going, too. The man at the door says, "Where are you going?" "Why," he says, "I am going out on strike." "You are going out on strike? What for? You have got nothing to strike for." "Well, I am going out with 'Red.' Do you think I am going to scab on him?" I get magnanimous, and I say, "You are not scabbing, Jim. You are not a rougher or roller. Stay here. Fine and dandy. It is all right." And I tell him to stay. Jim still doesn't want to stay; he wants to stick with me. He works with me and he wants to go with me. But Jim has all this time harbored secret ambitions. Jim has always hoped some day to be a rougher or a roller. Why? Because Jim draws $3 a day, and I draw $6. Jim sees, as the only thing out, the road to economic security—the job of roller or rougher. So the boss' agent at the door, the superintendent, says: "Listen, Jim, you are foolish to go out. 'Red' don't want you to go. Another thing, you are not organized; 'Red' is organized as a rougher, and when his union officials deal with this company they will deal on the basis of the roughers' interests. They won't deal on the basis of you common laborers. You will not be considered in the thing. The thing for you to do is to stay on the job. Listen, Jim, you always did want to be a roller, didn't you? Sure you did. You wanted to learn to handle the machine and you

wanted to develop and have knowledge of the game." Jim says, "Certainly I did." "Stay with me, now. You stay on the job. You are getting $3. Of course, you're not as good, you realize, as 'Red', but I will pay you $4 for a start, and just as soon as you make good you will get the other $2.' Jim thinks, on the one hand, what? No interest with me. I have disdained to have anything to do with him. And, on the other hand, what? Gratification of his ambitions; $4 a day now, and $6 in the future. Here is a raft of kids on the one hand, and they haven't got what they want and Jim's ambition on the other is to give it to them; $6 a day and he can give it to them. Jim listens. Jim is human just the same as any other human being. Jim listens and Jim stays. I walk off the job, I and the rest of my kind. I go over to our union hall and for the first time in a long time I have a holiday. We knock around and we have picnics and one thing and another for a little while, and then suddenly become conscious of the fact that the mill has not shut down at all, and we are out of it. We have left it and still it runs. Then we think. What happened? Jim is on the job. The mill is still running and it keeps on running, and we decide to send a committee over to see Mr. Gary. Our committee walk in to Mr. Gary. "We have come to see you in connection with the strike." "With what?" "In connection with the strike.' ' "What strike? What are you talking about?" "Why, the roughers' strike." "Roughers' strike? Why, is there a roughers' strike? I didn't know there was any strike on. Of course, we understood that some of our employes just voluntarily walked off the job, but I didn't know anything about a strike. I have got no time to deal with committees. Come on, gentlemen, move out." The committee comes back over to the union and, of course, the stool pigeons are busy. Discontent is rife. Funds are getting low and I and my kind are punished, and we think that something is

wrong somewhere. Panic-stricken in a few weeks or a few months, depending on our resources and our personal greed, why, we consider declaring the strike off and, finally, we do declare the strike off. Then back to look for a job. The strike is off, and I walk into the mill. "Good morning, any chance to get a job, working?" "Why, no, nothing doing here." "Well, the strike is off now, I just thought I would come back." "No, sorry; nothing doing." Meantime, you know, we have got kind of hungry. I have taken up a few notches in this thing. Another week goes by and I have taken up another notch. I go around again. "Mister, I would like to go to work. The strike is off. I haven't any work." "Don't be bothering me." The third week I go back again. "Now, I have got to get work." "I am very sorry; I have not any time to bother with you."

The fourth week, "Mister, please, I have got to have work. I have got my wife and family. I am on the hummer and I have got to go to work. You know I am a good roller and you know that I am a good rougher and I must have a job. You know I am perfectly competent." So the superintendent figures a while, and he says: "Listen, 'Red', I don't know; I might put you back to work. Of course, I hope that you have learned your lesson. You see you would not pay any attention to what we told you. I am your boss and interested in you and yet, in spite of the fact that you have always found me perfectly honest and fair with you, you let these blamed labor agitators twist and tie you around their fingers and cause a lot of disturbance here in this mill. Now, you have lost out. Now, you are down and out. Now, your family is suffering and perhaps you have learned your lesson. On the strength that you have, and because I sympathize with your babies, I am going to let you come back to work, 'Red.'" Tickled to death. Beat it down into the rolling room and just about the time I am ready

to start, he says: "By the way, I forgot something. Listen. When you left here you were drawing $6 a day. Now, you realize the company does not need you. We do not have to take you. It is simply that we are looking out for your welfare and the welfare of your babies. We dont want to see any unnecessary suffering; but, since you have been gone Jim has been doing the work and I have been paying him $4 a day. Now, of course, if you want to go back to work—it is a matter of indifference to us—but if you want to go back to work, why, of course, we cannot consider for a moment giving you any more than we have given Jim. The scale is $4 a day now; otherwise it wouldn't be fair to Jim." Well, I have to eat; $4 a day is all I can get; I usually get $6; well, I will take it on. Jim looks at me, and he says, "Here, I thought you was a rougher." "I am. I was a rougher until you scabbed on me." "Yes, you were a rougher, but you were getting $6 a day, and I am getting $4 now, and you come in and scab on me." They get Jim, a laborer, and "Red," a rougher, at logger heads, fighting with each other. The situation is ideal for the promotion of Mr. Gary's business, but mighty hard and the pressure is pretty heavy on the stomachs of Jim's children. That is what occurred in the steel mills, briefly. I don't want to give it all to you. I could take you through every bit of it. I have experienced it all.

They tell you, and, perhaps, some of you have commented on it: " 'Red' is bitter at this system." No, I am not bitter at this system, particularly. I am too goodnatured to be bitter. That is a cinch; but I have every reason to be bitter. If you had seen—if you had seen, as I have seen, some of the petty small tricks that are pulled, and all of the human suffering that I have seen in an attempt to make a living for myself and my kind, then you, too, perhaps, would feel as I feel. Though, above it all, the bitterness that I hold is an intelligent bitterness, if any. I do not wish at this time, and never have,

and that is one of the reasons why I joined the I. W. W. I never have wished for a violent outburst against people who are not solely responsible for my condition. I am a product of the system. My purpose is to change that system, but I do not propose to change it through agencies that are valueless. For that reason, I adopted the I. W. W. principles. The I. W. W. recognizes this, if it recognizes anything: That emotionalism is the controlling factor in men; that intelligence is the guiding factor. If I live in a community where violence is indulged in I have my life to defend. Where violence plays a permanent part, I am not safe. Therefore, I do not believe in indulging in violence.

If there is any bitterness attributed to the I. W. W. organization it is an intelligent resentment of conditions as they are.

Now, Mr. Gary, having disrupted the organization of the workers in the mills, found himself face to face with what? The same sort of an affair in the mines. There are two organizations in the mines, the Western Federation of Miners who were mining the ores, and the Metal Mine Workers; and there was the coal miners union. Now, the condition in the Western Federation of Miners was what? They had an aggressive organization, and it had to be broken up. Through the agency of stool pigeons, spies and local situations, the union was made impracticable. The same thing of the coal miners. Here is the situation which exists in connection with the miners' activities. The miners are organized on what is known as the district form of organization. They are all organizd in the Miners' Union. All of them organized in the Miners' Union, but they are organized in district form. Districts are declared with regard to the handling of their district business. The consequence was this: That the district in the northern part of one state would be on strike while the district in the southern part of the state, as in the case of Colorado, both mines

united and controlled by the same interests, remained at work, producing the necessary materials, while these men in the northern district were out on strike; these poor tools showing you how good the working man is at the bottom. These lower fellows tried to meet the needs of their striking brothers in the north by turning their own meagre pocketbooks to send supplies and foodstuffs to the strikers and their families.

And these poor fellows, showing how good the workingman is at bottom, tried to meet the needs of their striking brothers in the north, by draining their own meagre pocketbooks to send supplies and foodstuffs to the strikers and their families; but when this bunch was properly beaten, because of this division in their organization, then this bunch would go out on strike, and that bunch would produce all, and the consequence was that the miners' organization has disintegrated, falling of its own weight.

Now, then, the same thing held true in regard to the transport workers. Here is your Lake Carriers organization out here on the lake front—I dont say that part here—I always refer to the Lake Carriers' Association, because it is a part of the steel mill program; but I am in Chicago now—the Lake Carriers' Association out here on the lake front, carrying the steel from the mines to the mills.

How are the operators on those boats organized? They were organized as pilots, longshoremen, cooks, waiters, seamen and so on, like Heinz' pickles, 57 different varieties of unions, all operating on the one job. The strike was first provoked among the cooks and waiters, the marine cooks and waiters. This is what happened. The cooks and waiters went out on strike; scabs and Chinamen were recruited from Duluth, Detroit and other lake ports. The scab would go in the fo'castle, prepare his stuff for the union crew made up of the captain, mates and the seamen; a sailor would come in the fo'castle and

look the cook over and say, "Go on, old scab, don't come near me," but he would beat it right over to the table and eat the stuff that the cook cooked, and they would choo-choo and go to sea.

Then it wasnt very long until the cooks' union became a matter of a joke. Then the longshoremen scabbed as they did in the last strike down in San Pedro in 1916; some of you fellows remember; you were in it; and in 1916 the sailors scabbed on the longshoremen this way, and they did it on the lakes, too; there were members at San Pedro, members of both unions, men who were carrying longshoreman cards and also carrying a card of membership in the Seamen's Union. They went out on strike as longshoremen and then they went up to the Sailors' Union hall, laid down their card, paid their dues, and got a permit to go to work as sailors, handling the cargo on the boats that they refused to handle as longshoremen. And that isn't all of it, fellows. Listen. You saw this and I saw it. That isn't all of it. This is what happened, too. These self-same scabs, these self-same union seamen, scabbing on themselves as longshoremen, donated out of their seamen's wages, one day a wek to help the strike of the longshoremen. Now, what do you know about that? That is an absolute fact, and that same thing took place here on the lakes. They had union longshoremen scabbing on the sailors. The union captain would look over a scabby sailor and say, "Where did you ship before, somewhere on the canal?" Listen; he abused the non-union crew, but he still gave them orders, and when the sailors became non-union, then the mates were forced out and he got a scabby mate, and he worked under a union captain, and bye the bye, the whole thing went to smash, as it must properly go to smash.

The engineman on board, the union engineer, makes me sore because, as you know, I have been an enginer for many years—had to; the union engineer makes me sore. When they force his fireman

out on him, a scab would come in and the engineer would sit in the engine room and look back in the fire room and say, "Come on scab, hurry that coal; don't you know how to make a fire? Who told you you knew how to fire?" The fireman, doing the best he could, keeping steam up as best he could, and the union engineer criticising him will have his license in that engine room, and open up his trottle and take the boat out to Duluth or Buffalo or some other port, open up the throttle and take her out, under his privilege as an engineer licensed by the government, licensed to break the fireman's strike.

The firemen all got licenses as soon as the engineers went out, and then the engineers were on the hummer. The firemen opened the throttle, and so was broken the craft unions on the lake.

Now, then, this is not an industrialized business now; this is the trust in formation. The steel trust now had what? They had the mines under control because they had manipulated the conditions of the workers' union there. They had this under control because they had manipulated the situation there. There is another point you want to remember in connection with that: Do you remember how they injected these, oh, "welfare" programs? They won't pay you the wages, and they tell you how they are going to take care of your wife and babies; and they will open up club rooms, and their scabby headquarters; you remember that sort of thing; well, that is what they did to compensate for the workers' organization. They now had all three here, and it was effective opposition.

There was one other thing now that met their advancement and that was what? That was the men employed in the distributing agency. Who are they? They were the building trades workers. They were the men organized in the building trades departments of the American Federation of Labor, principal of which was the structural iron workers. The structural iron workers were a good, staunch,

earnest bunch of working men, who took their lives in their hands every hour and minute of the day; they work swinging way out fifteen or twenty floors above a street on a narrow line. A man thinks in terms peculiar to the manner and conditions under which he makes his living, and these men took a chance with their lives every day, every hour; everybody knew what a dangerous occupation a structural iron workers' trade was, and when they were forced on strike, psychologically reflecting their activities on the job, they took chances, too. Unfortunately, foolishly, they indulged in violence that had to destroy their union, but the violence that the structural iron workers indulged in at no time or never was a counterpart for the murderous schemes and plans of the paid agents of the masters, who sought to provoke and discredit, provoke the ironworkers and discredit their activities. One thing, never let these moralists talk murders with you; they murder your kind and my mind in industry, two million a year, and then, as in the case of the structural ironworkers in the Los Angeles Times explosion, and I, as an I. W. W., do not justify that, and we as I. W. W.s do not believe in that program; no I. W. W. does; yet, the simple truth of the matter is that the crime of the misguided McNamara boys at no time weighed with the crime of the Erectors' Association, or any of the rest of these combinations of good and righteous business men.

Now, then, the structural ironworkers' organization went on strike. The steel frame was raised by scab structural ironworkers and the good union cementworkers came along and put around these steel columns concrete; and good union painters would come along and would paint over the concrete, and a good union carpenter would come along and put in the surbases, or the marble workers, covering up and hiding the scab-built structure—all done by union labor; and when the ironworkers, in retaliation, indulged in violence there, their organization went to smash.

Now, listen, twenty-one men were blown to kingdom come or somewhere else in the Times explosion. The McNamara boys went to the penitentiary. The structural ironworkers' union has not amounted to much since, although, as men, the structural ironworkers were the men who took more chances in one minute, one hour in their lives, all in the interest of humanity, than all the Garys ever did in the interest of humanity.

Now, then, this is the situation. They had the striking department open; the steel trust now dominates the whole situation. They have it from the ground through its various stages of development, and through the distributing department to the actual users. That is a condition of industrialized businesses. That is the modern trust.

Now, then, there is another agent enters into this. They don't only use steel in the United States; they don't only use steel in Mexico; they use steel all over the world, and these steel companies have been developed all over the world. There was one thing more remaining for modern capitalism to do, and that was to develop its international aspect. That was the thing that proved conclusively that your capitalist's program cannot possibly be a national program; that your capitalist program and they who make up these combinations cannot be nationalists in any sense of the word; they must be international because of their international interests. These various national combinations organized themselves under the one head; the modern business element became your modern international capitalisms.

Now, briefly, my friends, this is the ground work; this is the thing that you and I see. This is the program that has been developed about us. This is the industrialism of business and the trustifying of industry that has taken place as the result of the introduction of the modern machine. This has all been done in the interests of profit. We I. W. W.s

ask you to do exactly—what? Nothing different. We do not ask you to organize differently from the way you are organized now. All we say to you, in your single industrial communities, is to organize into an industrial union. Your interdependent industrial unions organize into one big union—one big union of the working class, the I. W. W., the purpose of which is the abolition of poverty, the abolition of poverty through the abolition of the cause of poverty; not that you do not go to church or comb your hair in the middle; the cause of poverty is not because you drink five glasses of German disturbance each day. The cause of your poverty is profits, profits—the incentive of this private system of ownership.

Say, why don't they try to own the air? They cannot cut her. They need it; they cannot cut her. Why don't they own privately the sand of the beach? No. They want to own privately only those things that are socially necessary and through that ownership they are able to exploit you, because of your needs.

I talked this in Seattle one night, when I first came up here, and a young woman (I knew something about her, knew something about her circumstances), and she said to me: " 'Red,' this stuff is good; it is first rate," and she said, "I don't know but what I agree to a very great extent with you I. W. W.s, but this thing I do not agree upon; I do not agree with your concept of private property. You fellows do not believe in private property, you I. W. W.s, and I believe in private property."

I thought to drive home a lesson; I thought to make her think, so I said to her, "Listen, I am going to show you that we I. W. W.s are the only ones that do consistently believe in private property, and you, you who accept the bourgeois morality, you do not believe in it at all. You do not believe in private property at all." I knew something of this girl's circumstances; I knew she worked in a store, and I

knew something of the compensation paid store workers, so I said to her, "Now, listen, you say you believe in private property. You have on now a dress; that belongs to another man. That dress isn't yours. You don't want to own privately your own dress. That dress is the property of one of these excitement plan houses, fifty cents down and fifty cents every time they catch you. You don't believe in private property when you go to eat. Where do you go to? You go to another man's restaurant. You eat on another man's plate; you use another man's stool, and when you go to sleep, where do you sleep? In another man's bed. You pay $3.50 for a room for the privilege of crawling into another man's home, and you believe in private property. No, you don't, not for a minute. I believe in private property. I want my own home. I want all the things that are necessary to my personal, physical comfort. I want all the things that are private in character, to be owned by me privately, for my exclusive use, but I want you to own privately all the things you want to, your own clothes and all the rest of it. Your capitalists' moral, your bourgeois idea, precludes any idea of that. There is no hope. We want to own socially only the things that are socially necessary, and privately the things that are privately necessary."

Now, then, having laid the groundwork for this, having started you as I have along the line of reasoning consistent with the program and the philosophy that I represent, I am going to bring you down to the ground where you live, in this strike—right where you live. We have got a strike on. I was working in the shop, just as you were working in the shop. You know what you went through in camp; you know what the conditions were in the mill; you know about it just as I know it. Now I am going to show you what this strike amounts to; I am going to explain to you several things that have not been explained before; I am going to explain to

you the utter futility, the utter hopelessness of the program as suggested by Mr. J. G. Brown; I am going to show you that this scheme of his is not a practical thing, and, above everything else, I am going to emphasize to you—for you, rather— the need of industrial solidarity, not only as I tell you of it, but as you actually see it used, and as organized against you by the organized capital that is involved on the other side of the strike.

Now, we will take up, in starting to do this, I will take up three lumber companies for the purpose of illustration. I will use three; I might use thirty; I might use as many as there are companies, but three will carry out the idea and, in illustrating here, I will show you that you are up against a pretty stiff industrial combination, and that your craft union organization cannot possibly—now I propose to prove that to you—cannot possibly protect you, either during this strike or any other of like nature. I am going to grant you something in connection with this; I am going to grant you something that has never happened; I am going to grant you a condition existing, a perfection of organization, a craft organization that has never existed; I am going to concede a solidarity of workers that has never existed in the craft unions and I am going to prove to you that you are beaten. You are beaten without a show in the world.

Now, let us take three of these big combinations. They may be lumber woods shipping concerns; they may be mining outfits; they may be anything; the illustration applies with equal force to any and all lines of industrial activity; but, in this particular case, I am talking and using the lumber outfit for the purposes of illustration.

Now, let us take three big lumber companies; let us take the Weyerhauser outfit, the Jones outfit and the Thompson outfit. All three of these outfits are operated by their respective owners. The Weyerhouser outfit operates the Weyerhouser business and

all questions that are peculiar to the Weyerhouser business are settled by the Weyerhouser Company. Every question that has to do with the individual concern of that Weyerhouser outfit is settled by the officials of the Weyerhouser business. The same way with the Jones outfit. Every question that has to do with the Jones business, every question that is of vital importance to that company is settled by the officials of that company, and the same way with the Thompson outfit.

Now, then, questions that are of vital importance to all of these outfits, these lumber companies operating in the lumber industry, where are they settled? When Weyerhouser faces a question that is beyond him, if Jones or Thompson face questions that are beyond them, and their officials, how do they settle differences and questions? They settle their differences through the industrial union of the lumber barons, and that industrial union of barons is known under the head of the Lumbermen's Association. Weyerhouser belongs to that; Jones belongs to it, and so does Thompson, and so do all the other lumber outfits belong to the Industrial Union of the lumber barons.

Now, then, any question that is industrial in nature, any question that is of vital importance to that industry is settled through the medium of that industrial union, all of these outfits having representation.

I want to show you now what takes place, assuming that these plants are organized solidly in the A. F. of L., I am going to grant you that this Weyerhouser outfit is organized solidly; every man, woman and kid on this job is organized in the A. F. of L. It is organized, of course, in accordance with their craft union idea; the engineers in the engineers' union; the bookkeepers in th bookkeepers' union, and so on, but they are all organized solidly and they all decide to strike. These other two are all organized solidly, but these men and women on this job decide to strike, and they walk out. When this plant goes

on strike, what happens? This is the first thing that happens. Weyerhouser's representative on this job comes over to the industrial union masters and he says, "Look here, Jones, look here, Thompson, my men and women have gone out on strike; they have tied up my business; they have got me shut down tight. Every one of them has walked out. Now, listen Jones, listen Thompson," this is what Weyerhouser says; he says, "Listen Jones, listen Thompson; my people have gone on strike, and not because you love me, not because you belong to the same lodge, not because you live in the same neighborhood and go to the same church, you must take care of my business for the reason that our interests are identical as owners and operators of these lumber companies.

"You must take care of me, not because of a moral obligation, but because of a class interest; you handle my orders, you handle my business during this strike, or else I will grant the demands of those workers, and if I grant the demands of those workers on my job, then instantly the workers on your job will force you to grant similar increases."

Therefore, Jones and Thompson decide to protect—what? To protect their mutual class interest through the agency of this industrial union, and Jones and Thompson, though they may be competitors for the local market, though they may be in competition seemingly, one against the other, for local markets, yet these two will take care of Weyerhouser's orders and Weyerhouser's business until the workers are beaten, or until strike breakers and scabs can be secured. Now, what happens? That is, what takes place on the business side of the institution? What takes place among the workers?

This bunch of workers come down and see Jones' workers. They are all organized; they come over and see Thompson's workers. They say, "Look here, fellows, we are out on strike; we have got them all tied down tight" and Jones' men and Thompson's

men say, "That's the dope; that's the system; stay with it, stay with it; we will appropriate $100 a day or $10,000 from our treasury; stay with it and beat that outfit into submission."

Some of the Weyerhouser outfit who happen to have I. W. W. tendencies will say: "While we are out on strike, are you going to give your moral and financial support? Listen, Jones and Thompson are supplying the market of Weyerhouser. I tell you what you fellows do; you fellows come out on strike with us; let's put them all on the bum; recognize the principle that 'an injury to one is an injury to all.'" These A. F. of L. men say, "No, those I. W. W.s, those Anarchists, those irresponsibles are trying to put things on the bum, trying to mix things all up. We are working for Jones; Jones is a good boss; we are working for Thompson; Thompson is a good boss. We have an agreement with each of these outfits and we recognize the validity of these agreements. We are men of purpose, integrity, and we are going to stay by our agreement," and they do. They go on producing lumber until this farce is split, or these men and women driven back on the job—scabbed to death. This becomes an open shop. After this becomes an open shop, now what takes place?

Now, then, this one over here will go out on a strike, and this open shop and this union shop, through the agency of the Lumbermen's Association, will take care of Thompson's business while he beats his slaves into submission, and that becomes an open shop, and then there are two open shops existing; these two open shops will take care of this business, and how long will it be before the third shop becomes an open shop? This is the way that they destroy the effectiveness of craft organization. That is the way that they make it inoperative in the interest of the workers, beating them, one organization against the other. Now, the I. W. W. does what? The I. W. W. organizes just as the masters do. The I. W. W. says, "Here, this is Weyerhouser's job."

"All right. Every man, woman and kid on the Weyerhouser job organizes into a union of that particular job, and all of the questions concerning that particular job are settled by the workers on that particular job. All the workers on this job are organized into one union and all of the questions peculiar to that particular job are settled by the men on that job, and the same way here (indicating). But questions of vital importance to this whole industry, where are they settled? They are settled in the Union Hall, in the I. W. W., the Workers' Union; just as the Lumbermen's Association is an industrial union of the masters, so is this an industrial union of the slaves.

Now, then, we have got it under I. W. W. control, and let us see how it works. This is the way it works here, fellows. You know we have got them on the run now. We will keep them on the run. This is the way it works:

The Weyerhouser bunch go out on strike; conditions on that particular job are bad and the men and women go out on strike or are forced out, or, for any other reason, leave. As soon as they leave, what happens? Weyerhouser, of course, rushes over here to the Lumbermen's Association, and he says, "Jones, Thompson, take care of my business, not because you love me, but because we belong to the same class. Look out for me. If you don't, I will have to grant what they want; and if I do, why, you will have to come in on the same thing." And while Weyerhouser's agent is doing that, what took place in the Workers' Union?

A bunch of these slaves out of this job came down into the Industrial Union of Workers, and they say, "Look here, you fellows on the Jones job; look here, you fellows on the Thompson job, we are on strike at Weyerhouser's; we have tied her up; we have tied her up because of abominable conditions; we want to increase the pay, decrease the hours or we want more money; whatever it may be, we have

tied that job up. Now, listen, you fellows on this job, and you fellows on this job: Not because you love us, not because we go to the same church, not because your skin is of the same texture, or color, but because you are of the same class, you fellows stick with us or, by Jingoes, we will lose and anything we lose on this job you will lose on those jobs"—clearly a question of class interest. So these workers, being intelligent in their own affairs, decide to go on strike with Weyerhouser's slaves, and what happens? Jones' slaves come up to him and say, "Look here, Jones, we are all going out on strike," and Thompson's slaves say the same thing. They say, "What is the matter? Any trouble in this mill?" Jones said, "No trouble on this job is there?" "No." "I am a good boss," Jones says. You are a good boss; no trouble on this job; everything fine and dandy on this job, but there is trouble over here on the Weyerhouser's job." Jones and Thompson say, "What have I got to do with the Weyerhouser job; I don't know anything about it." "You belong to the same class and as long as Weyerhouser's slaves are having trouble on the Weyerhouser job, so would you have trouble on the Jones and Thompson job."

Immediately Jones and Thompson get busy. They say, "Look here, Weyerhouser, what is the trouble? Our men are going out on strike. Our men have tied up our plant; everything is at a standstill. You are having trouble with your slaves. We cannot afford that. You have either got to settle with your slaves or we will be forced to take over your markets and drive you out of business. We have got to grant these demands and we have no voice in the matter until you settle this trouble satisfactorily with your slaves first."

Now, then, what is the situation? Under the A. F. of L. form of organization, we had one bunch of workers out on strike; we had two groups of organized workers backing up three industrial groups

—three groups of industrialized masters beating one group of workers into submission. That is your A. F. of L. plan—class unions backing up good bosses, beating these slaves into submission.

Under your I. W. W. plan, what have you got? You have three united groups of workers forcing two groups of parasites—well, to knock hell out of the other one. That is the way the thing stands. We pit these interests, not against ourselves and against our time, but against themselves, in the way that they have successfully, up till now, pitted us one against the other.

Now, then, there are several questions involved in this strike here, of vital importance and, seemingly, logical: The strike, as you know, is the strike for the eight-hour day; it is a strike for better conditions on the whole. That was a camp that was 100 per cent. organized. I was in a camp that was entirely Wobbly-ized. The boss said there, "I will grant you the eight-hour day; I will grant you anything." I said, "Now, your attitude will pay in the long run, but your attitude at this time in no wise affects the eight-hour situation. You are a member of the Lumbermen's Association, and you are willing to grant the eight-hour day. You are willing to concede all of the things we ask. But you, as an individual member of the association, are, on account of your class interest, a menace to us who work for you. We got along with you well here, it is true, but we cannot accept the eight-hour day from you while the eight-hour day rembains an open question elsewhere, and the reason we cannot accept that is the same reason that your Lumbermen's Association, according to your own statement, has threatened to throw you out of its organization if you grant our demands. You tell me that your Lumbermen's Association refuses to permit you to remain in membership if you break any of its rules, and one of its rules is in this case that you do not grant the demands of the strikers; but you are willing

to scab on your own association, grant these demands and you wonder why we are not willing to take them up and show you our position in the matter clearly. The Lumbermen's Association is organized industrially; it embraces this whole country and all kinds o foutfits belong to it. Now, here, we will say, are the Everett mills; here are the Index mills; here are the Seattle mills, and the Ballard mills, and the Hoquian mills and so on, innumerably. They have several hundred, I suppose a thousand mills; I don't know what the membership is, and I don't care. But, here is each one of these units, each one of these plants, all of these plants have memberships, in what? They have memberships in the Lumbermen's Association. Now then, the Lumbermen's Association, their purpose is what? Why? to gather together, to promote their mutual interests. What are their mutual interests? Mostly prices. What kind of prices? High prices for disposal, and low prices when they buy. Their business is to regulate and control the sale of their commodity, and regulate and control all of the things that affect that commodity. Now then, among other things, the question of the strike has arisen, and it has been—it is of long standing; several months before this strike came on, there were all kinds of talks, in the camp, of strike, and of the possibility of strike, and whether the workers thought they would be able to succeed, to successfully improve their condition. The lumbermen recognized this thing. They knew it was talked about. They have their stool pigeons everywhere and they decided in their own association, under the leadership, so I am told, of Mr. Grammar, the Secretary of the outfit, they decided they would appropriate five hundred thousand dollars for advertising, for publicity, for general campaigning, and you know that they are now spending a whole lot of it, and that appropriation was to fight the eight-hour day. They recognized that if they could get—that is, to fight off the eight-hour day as a whole, as an

industrial idea. They decided that they would fight, and they deciided that, if the mill owners in Everett could talk the slaves into taking the eight-hour day there, and they would refuse to grant it at Index, and maintain the ten, and they would get it, say in Seattle, they **would** refuse to grant it at Ballard or Bellingham and refuse to grant it in Hoquiam, then, they would have three—a couple or three or twenty, as the case may be, of these small units, or large units, as the case might be, governed by local color and condition; they would have these several units operating on eight-hour basis. Of course they would have them producing. What? They would have them producing lumber to supply the demands of all, or as nearly supplying the demands of all as their production would permit, spread out over them all. That would have meant what? That would have meant inevitably in time that these mills, these towns, that struck out for the 8-hour day, the slaves would have been starved into submission, they would have gone back on the ten-hour basis. When they went back on the ten-hour basis, what would take place in the eight-hour mills? Then the Lumbermen's Association would, through the individual membership and the individual owners of these mills, notify their slaves there that they could not continue to operate on the eight-hour day because they were in competition with the ten-hour people, and, if the slaves would not stand for ten hours in those mills, all right, they would fire them anyhow, and these mills would supply the demands until the ten-hour scab crew could be organzied.

Now, then, the price of lumber is determined the same way. They fix their prices; they regulate what they will sell for, and the conditions of sale. We, I. W. W.'s, when they offer us the eight-hour day, knowing this to be so, being in touch with our communities just the same as the Lumbermen's Association, having exactly the same ideas in mind that the industrial kings have, we say, "No, no eight-hour

day anywhere unless it is an eight-hour day everywhere; an injury to one is an injury to all," just the same as the lumber baron says, when the demands for lumber came on, when the lumber barons got together in their Lumbermen's Association, and you have seen it, they have jumped the price of lumber that used to be ten, twelve, fifteen dollars a thousand, they have jumped it to a hundred and five dollars, and in some instances higher.

They regulate the price and they are respectable, decent, law-abiding citizens for doing it, but you and I, we workers, when we get together and we regulate the price of our commodity, well, they tell you that we are a bunch of long-haired, wild-eyed, free-lovers, and irresponsibles of every description. We I. W. W.'s know what we are doing. The thing that we are doing today, the thing that we are doing now is winning the lumber strike. We have beaten down to their knees the lumber barons, a group who, up till this time, have done—what did they do here the other day? They defied the President of the United States in his request for an eight-hour day. They defied the governor of this state; they have defied every agency, but their own little interests here, and we, we wild-eyed irresponsible I. W. W.'s, have beaten them into submission. We have got them on their knees. Stick with it, and we will take them all the way down the line. These camps will be fit to live in; we'll have baths in them; we'll have good grub; if we don't have good grub, and baths, then they don't run the lumber camps, because we are going to settle it.

Now, this is a test of strength between two great big powerful institutions.. Here is the Lumbermen's Industrial Union on the one hand, a big powerful institution because of its protection of organization. Here is a powerful institution on the other hand, powerful because of the protection of its organization. Which of these two will win in this struggle? Between these two classes the struggle must go on until the workers of the world take over the indus-

tries and operate them in the interest of society, and so on. This is the struggle of these two; which will win? We cannot lose, and this is the reason we cannot lose: We are the workers. We produce the things that keep society alive. Our organization is necessary to society. These people cannot win if we continue to exercise solidarity, because they are unnecessary to society, and society, in its needs, will force the issue. The government will take hold of this thing; the government or society, actuated by the social demand, will take hold of this thing. We cannot lose. These people must lose, but the solution of it all lies with you. If you continue to exercise industrial solidarity, well and good. The other, if you don't win. When they win it is starvation and misery for you. When you win, your kids are fed and clothed, and if you stay winning long enough, if you continue exercising industrial solidarity, there is nothing in this wide world to stop you putting this outfit into overalls and watching them work.

Now, then, in the several sections involved in the strike, we are face to face with a situation that is of vital importance. We have a number of small farmers, commonly referred to as stump ranchers. Now, these men have come into possession of a mortgage to a small patch of ground, from which the larger trees have been removed, and nothing remains but stumps and wreckage. These men are attempting to pay for their so-called homes. These plots of ground have been purchased from the lumber associations, usually on the long time basis of so much down and so much every time you get anything. Now, there are a lot of you fellows here that are strikers of the stump ranch variety. The only element that we find scabbing on us of any importance at this time is the stump ranch farmer. I was down to Port Angeles a short time ago, and at Port Angeles when I came into town, it is a community made up largely of little ranchers, ranchers, farmers, stump ranchers, and so on, I was that horrible Red Doran, that I. W. W.; they were absolutely convinced that I was going

to steal all of the stumps out of their ranch. I was going to sell their wives, and eat their kids, and there was nothing to it. They knew it.

Now, I went in there, and a good many of these men were scabbing on us, and I said, "Look here, Fellows, this is a square deal. You are out on a stump ranch trying to make a living and you cannot make her go. I am in a blacksmith shop trying to make a living and I cannot make it go. Now, it is a dead moral cinch that we both work, ain't it? 'Yes.' All right, I'll tell you what to do, you give me an opportunity to explain the I. W. W.'s position to you and I am willing for you to continue to scab if I don't prove to you that the longer you stay on a stump ranch the less chance you ever have of owning a stump ranch. If I don't prove to you that a good-sized farm with a big plot of ground operating as most of them are operating, with mighty few exceptions, the longer a farmer works on a farm, the harder he works on the farm, the less chance he has to meet his mortgage. If I don't prove that to you guys, go on back and scab, and I won't say anything about it." So, recognizing that that was my only chance, and, appealing to them on that ground, I suceeded in getting a sufficient number of them to agree to listen to me, and I pulled my farmer talk, my stump ranch talk, and the mill that had been operating the next day—

THE COURT: Suspend until two o'clock.

(Whereupon a recess was taken until two o'clock of the same day, Friday, June 28, 1918.)

Friday, June 28, 1918;
2:00 o'clock P. M.

Court met pursuant to recess.

(Roll call of defendants; all present.)

THE COURT: Proceed.

THE WITNESS: Now, then, Fellows: In connection with your stump ranch proposition; in order that the thing may not be misunderstood, I will go briefly and quickly to the base of the matter. Now, we know from sources that at least I am willing to

consider authoritative—the Industrial Relations Report, a United States report—that the farms of this country, most of them are operated, or a great percentage of them are operated by tenant farmers. That brings into this basic question the question of economic determination. As I remarked here before, a man thinks in terms peculiar to the manner and conditions under which he makes his living. Given groups think in like terms according to their environment. Take a young lad born in the country. A young man or woman born in an agricultural district; what represents to them economic security? Naturally—the rural district, agricultural district—their whole environment forces them to think in terms of chickens, cows and land. Land, as the necessary thing to give them economic security. A young boy of the city thinks in terms of tools, mechanical industries. Business that uses tools peculiar to the mechanical activities of the industrial center. The farmer boy thinks in terms of agriculture. He thinks in terms of land and in things that are peculiar to land; chickens, cows and so on. A young fellow born and raised in the country, naturally coming up into boyhood and into young manhood, seeking to marry, he wants first to get some land. Why does he want land? He wants land because once in possession of that land, he supplies the labor power necessary to produce for him the things necessary for him to have in order to live; economic security. Now, as a result of the graft and theft and conditions existing with regard to the land of this country, all of the valuable land or a great portion of it is in the hands of some landlords; absentee landlords to a great extent. As a matter of fact, hundreds of thousands of acres—and, in one case, millions of acres, are held by members of nobility abroad, while the farmer boy raised here has not enough land to work on. The timber fields, and railroad grants, all that kind—all of the valuable land is in the possession of the landlords, and the young boy of an agricultural community finds himself face to face with this prop-

osition: Either he must take up some land, own it and control it, through the licensee of a local bank; he must take up that land locally on a share basis, or else he must take up the government proposition. The United States government bets any of its citizens 160 acres against their time that they cannot make a living. Some of them go out and try it. Usually you will find that the 160 acres that is open to the settler is so located that it is impossible to get by on. Our country here, this western country, you are acquainted with it, you know that nine-tenths of the men that ramble around this country have at one time or another been homesteaders, or potential homesteaders. They have tried to make good on the government bet. There the land stands straight up on edge, and you try to farm both sides of it, working eight hours in the forenoon in the shade and eight hours in the afternoon on the other side of it in the shade; or else the land consists of desert. It is 16 miles to the north to water, 16 miles to the east, south and west, and usually miles straight down. You could take ten buck Indians and a barrel of lime juice and you couldn't raise umbrellas on it. Now, that is the sort of a proposition, if you wish to take up a farm that you are forced to face, except that you hire out usually on the share basis; hire out this land in the control of the banks. An agriculturist thinks in terms of agriculture. You cannot blame him for wanting some land, so he undertakes to get some land. This is the situation. Now, the land is represented by the bank. Let this represent the bank (showing). Let this represent the farm land (showing). These are three desirable plots of farm land. This farm land may be owned by anybody. It doesn't make any difference. Usually its control is in the hands of a bank. A young boy wanting to establish a home for himself, goes to the bank, and he says, "Here, I want to take up this land on a share basis." There is usually competition for the privilege of operating desirable land. So there are five of these young men want this land. There are three desirable plots,

and it is in control of the banker. The first fellow, a great big, powerful boy, comes to the banker and asks permission—the local bankers know something of the local situation. They know something of the color; something of the life of the applicants. This great big lad, anxious and willing, has the reputation of being a first-class worker. He is a first-class worker, and he asks for this contract. The banker agrees to let him have this land on the basis of 50 per cent of his product. 50 per cent belongs to the bank and 50 per cent belongs to him. All right. The next applicant, just as anxious to have a home and just as desirable to establish himself and live as a good citizen, is not physically the equal of this first boy. He is a little inferior physically, though temperamentally and intellectually he is perhaps his equal. Well, he wants a piece of land. There are these four applicants, and this one is the next successful tenant. The banker engages, of course, on the basis of fifty-fifty. He picks out the farm boy who, in the banker's estimate, is best able to make good on the soil. So the second boy, who is not the physical equal of the first, gets this piece of land. Out of the remaining three, the next most likely candidate gets this piece of land on a fifty-fifty basis. That leaves a standing army of unemployed; two. Two of these farm boys, each actuated by the same desire, each seeking a chance to live, and they want land. Now, that is the element with which these are kept in line or check. This is an illustration of the general situation, you understand.

Now, we say they all start off the first year. The big powerful animal here, who has every advantage, he produces at the end of the year, that is, he has produced $60 an acre. (Showing.) This one has produced $70 an acre. His product is worth $70 an acre. All right. This lad at the end of the year has produced $50 an acre. (Showing.) Now, then, at $70 an acre, on a fifty-fifty basis, $35 goes to the bank and $35 remains in the possession of this fellow. On a $60 basis, $30 goes to the bank and $30

remains in his possession. On the basis of $50 an acre, $25 goes to the bank and $25 to the farmer. Now, then, originally the first year, before this work was undertaken, there was a value placed upon that land by the banker. What is the value of that land? If the land has not been operated, the banker does not know what the value of the land is. He will hazard a guess, basing his conclusion upon the value of adjoining property. Now, if he says this land is worth $300 an acre, or $500 an acre, or any other number of dollars an acre, consistent of the price of land in the immediate neighborhood, each of these young men start out with the intention of securing ultimately that farm for themselves. They say $300 an acre. All right. Fifty-fifty basis, one-half of it is mine, and one half of it belongs to the bank, but I will not have to work very long before I will have enough to buy this land. Away back here, underlying all of their activities, is this idea, that some day this land is going to be mine, that is the thing that they think of.

At the end of the first year this fellow has produced $35 for the bank. All right. $35 on the basis of 5 per cent interest, calculates on the—$35 is 5 per cent, then the principal is $700. $35 at 5 per cent is interest on $700. $30 at 5 per cent, fifty-fifty with the bank is what? It is interest on $600. $25 at 5 per cent, that is what? Interest on $500. What is the value of that land? The value of that land to the banker is respectively $700, $600 and $500. Although he may have estimated it originally at $300. But the banker figures value of land, not by what it will produce in social necessary wants or needs, but by what it will produce in interest. And at the end of the first year—at the end of the first year's contract, the bank finds itself face to face with this situation: Here are three pieces of land, all of them equally fertile; all of them equally desirable, yet the three different men have produced, their activities have resulted in different valuations respectively seven, six and five hundred. So, when these young

farm boys come to the second year to get the privilege of farming this land again as tenant farmers, what do they run into? Of couse, the big strong husky boy, he looks for a renewal of his contract, and the banker says: "Of course, Jim, you are fine. You did nobly. You did well. Certainly, I will renew your contract for you. I will renew the contract. You have got me $35 an acre last year," and the banker signs up with him.

But when the second man comes along the banker is not so anxious. He says, "Now, look here. I know you and I know your family and I knew your father. I know you are a good fellow. I know you are intelligent and there is nothing wrong with you. I am anxious to renew the contract with you. I am willing that you have the privilege of this land again, but actually I am losing money on you. I am losing money. You know, of course, that friendship is one thing and dollars another. You cannot expect me—you are too good a business man as a farmer to expect me to lose money on you. If you can do as well as the other man has done, why, of course, I am glad to sign up with you. I am losing money on you for this reason, that there is Jim over here with this acreage, he has produced $35. That land is worth $700. Now, if Jim's land is worth $700, so is all the rest of this land, and you have only produced $30. That is productive on a $600 basis. That means that I am losing $100 valuation if I allow you to have this. However, I will tell you, because of your family, I think I see a way out. You spend a little money for some modern machinery; put a little machine equipment on this farm and bring it up to its proper development. Bring it up to its proper prospective capacity and everything will be fine and dandy." So, of course, the second man promises.

The third fellow comes along, and oh, he is out of luck entirely, he has only produced $50. That $50 means a loss of $20 more to the bank. The bank has not any intention, of course, of throwing him off of there, but the banker pretends he is; pretends

that he has every intention of denying him an opportunity to operate the land. So, playing him against these unemployed two he has—the two that I have used for illustration, he bickers and dickers with him, and finally he secures the promise of this man to put in modern machinery and give a mortgage to assume some burden and to take some additional debt. To whom? Why, to the banker, and the banker pretending to be very magnanimous, pretending to be very kindly and good and considerate; agrees to lend him enough money at 8 per cent or some other per cent, to buy machinery to boost the banker's business $20 more. Everything is fine and dandy. They start off the second year. Everything is lovely. Now, then, they go to work. At the end of the second year, what has occurred? Jim has no modern machinery. He has been saving a nest egg, hoping to buy the ranch some day. This second man has gone to the expense of some machinery. This third man has gone to considerable more expense, and each are indebted to the bank for the machinery that they have purchased; but with the aid of this machinery in these two instances, and without the aid of machinery in that, all three of the farms now produce what? $70 an acre. All right. $70 an acre. Fifty-fifty basis, $35 for the bank and $35 for the farmer. That means at 5 per cent that all of this land is worth $700 an acre. Everything is lovely. They sign up at the beginning of the third year, but before they sign up, the banker now is disgruntled with the big strong, husky, cautious fellow. "Jim," he says, "look here, you have done just as well as the rest of them, I will grant you that, but you have not any initiative. You are never going to be a success in life. Here you are out here by hand, deliberately killing yourself doing things that could be just as readily done with some modern equipment. Now, then, I am sure that you could do better with that land. You see that these two men down here, each using a little machinery, have made their land productive to the extent of $10 to $20 an acre more than it had been the pre-

ceding year. Now, then, you have not done a bit better this year than you did last year. If you would put in the machinery, you would not only save yourself a lot of hard work, but you would also improve your chances by improving the productivity of the soil." So, at the beginning of the third year, Jim starts out equipped with some machinery and also equipped with a mortgage to the bank. Now, then at the end of the third year, what occurs? Jim, with his extra physical capacity, Jim with his brute strength plus machinery, produces what? $90 an acre. $90 an acre and these two are only $70 over here. (Showing.) Something pretty wrong somewhere. $90 an acre on a fifty-fifty basis, what is that? $45 to the banker and $45 to the farmer. All right. $45 at 5 per cent is what? It is interest on $900. Interest on $900. Now, then, when Jim comes over and says, "Oh, I am doing pretty well. I made $90 an acre this year, $45 of which is mine. I will soon be in a position to buy this land. Mr. Banker, you value this land at $700. Pretty soon I will be able to buy it. Everything is lovely." The banker says, "Oh, listen, Jim, you are not abreast of the times at all. Don't you know that they are digging some new canals in China? Don't you know that in Panama they have a new plague, and for that reason land values have gone up? Land values have gone out of sight. Now, right here in our immediate neighborhood, to prove to you that land values have gone up because they are building canals in China, or the chickens have got the pip somewhere, because of these unusual things, land that was formerly $700 an acre is $900 an acre." These other two boys face the same situation. They hope to buy the land at $700 an acre. Jim makes a $900 proposition. By the time they stock up with more machinery and some more mortgages to make what is a $900 an acre proposition, Jim has gone to a hundred, and when Jim's has gone to a hundred, land is worth a thousand dollars an acre, and as long as Jim works as hard as Jim works and as hard as his neighbor works, the

longer they stay with it, and the less chance they ever have to own one of them.

I was talking to a man in Yakima the other night. He was a long-whiskered gentleman of about sixty or seventy. He had been to my meeting the previous evening, and I was passing down the street and he grabbed hold of me, and he says, "Say, wait a minute. I want to talk to you." I stopped and listened to him. He says, "Look here, I have been a farmer all my life. I thought I owned a farm for the last thirty years. Last night I found out that all I owned was a mortgage; all I could ever hope to own was a mortgage, and the thing that makes me sore—the thing that makes me wild altogether, is that it took you damned I. W. W.'s to show it to me." Now, that is the situation with the average farmer—that the average farmer faces. He thinks in terms of agriculture naturally. He goes out and finds the land taken up, all of it that is desireable; all of it that is worth while. The bank holds him and grinds him through mortgages of one kind or another—of course, these fellows have their limit of endurance. How often will you find a man on the front end of a street car—a good practical farmer, an agriculturist who should by every reason be still in the country operating on a farm; what do you find him doing? Find him down there trying to make a longshoreman out of himself; trying to run a street car; taken away from the environment that he knows. Why? Because after putting in the best years of his life here and bucking a game of this kind that cannot be beat, it is worse than gambling in a gambler's house and gambling with the gambler at that. You cannot beat it. You can't beat these people here that way. There is no chance in the world to beat them when you play with their cards. You play their game. So, in desperation, perhaps with a raft of kids, he goes to the city expecting to make good in the industrial centers where millions of industrial slaves cannot make good. The industrial slaves of the city go out to the country and try to

make good on a farm, where the practical farmer cannot make good.

Now, that is the type of man usually that the stump rancher is. He takes on a peice of work from the company. The company gives him ten acres, we will say, on the basis $20 an acre, or $50 an acre or some other number of dollars an acre. He takes up this land and this is what it looks like. (Indicating.) Here is his patch of soil. (Indicating.) This is what it looks like. (Showing.) These are the stumps. (Showing.) He takes this thing up on the basis of $20 an acre. The company allows him to pay $20 down, and then they employ him at $3 a day and they will take so much out of his monthly wage and give him an opportunity—yes, to raise a family. Be fine and dandy. Ten acres. Well, he starts in. The instant that he puts the first few dollars into this thing, that instant he becomes the abject slave of that lumber company. That instant he becomes absolutely in their power to do with as they like. Why, he gets a few hundred dollars—understand that the man is actuated by his own motives. He is pushed by his own desires. He seeks a home. He gets hold of a few dollars and he buys him some lumber; perhaps he stays up a little later than his neighbors at night and doesn't buy it, but gets it. He gets a little lumber together here and he starts him a shack. Now, he has got a wife usually. Most stump ranchers have—oh, yes, they are strong on that family stuff. No race suicide among stump ranchers. He has generally got a family, a wife and six children. He gets a little shack together out here, and he goes on and plods and economizes and gathers together enough money to buy him a cow and twenty or thirty chickens, and perhaps a sow. Now, he has got a pig, a cow and some chickens, and he has got a stump ranch. Of course, his neighbor is another stump rancher in about the same sort of a fix. For the first six months or a year this fellow that is working in the mill all day or in the woods all day, when he comes home at night he will hook

himself up to his neighbor's plow, and they will plow a little around between the stumps. The next night the neighbor will do it, and they are both scabbing on a horse. They have there—this thing is unequipped generally. You will usually find that the fresh water is over on this corner; away over here. (Showing.) So the stump rancher puts his wife to work scabbing on an engine, piping water from there to here. (Showing.) His wife, she wants to help. She is anxious to do everything she can. A good woman and he is a good man; just as good a citizen as it is possible to get, or find anywhere, and they are both seeking to do something for their little brood. They are willing to put up with any hardship, and she generally runs barefooted, around here; you could never buy her shoes to fit her after she has been on a stump ranch any length of time. Snow shoes would be about the proper thing. She puts up with all sorts of hardships and endures all sorts of things; self-denial is the thing that counts. Well, they have got a cow. He knocks out these stumps as circumstances permit. In time, of course, he gets rid of much of it, but in the meantime what is the situation with regard to his job in the mill. He is an abject slave. The more he puts on this bit of land, the greater number of instalments that he pays on that land, the more the company has him in their power.

They cut his wages at option. They do anything they like with him by option. He does not dare quit, because of this nest egg. This is his stake. He is always fired with the ambition and always looking ahead to the day when he will be clear and he will enjoy economic security. His children are just like any other children. They would like milk; they would like eggs. They would like fresh pork. This does not hold good with only children of the stump rancher. This holds good with the children and wives and families of all ranchers. It does hold good with all tenant farmers as a rule.

Now these children would be benefitted by fresh milk; they would enjoy fresh milk and cream, but do these farmers' children have fresh milk? No. Not for a minute. The fresh milk is taken—the cream is separated and is sent to town. There remains the skimmed milk. Does the farmer's child drink skimmed milk? Not on your life. No, sir. That skimmed milk goes to the pigs because you can't peddle the kids, do you see?

Then, too, there are eggs and chickens. The farmers' children would like to eat eggs and they would enjoy chickens. Do they do it? No, sir, not on your life. The chickens are taken to town and sold, and so are the eggs; the pigs are sold, and Mr. Stump Rancher has in return for his commodity, what? He has money. In the meantime, his children have been puny. He finds himself now in the possession of money. What is he going to do with his money? Well, he has got it. He is in town, and before he comes back out on the ranch he stops in the drug store and he spends a portion of that money to buy patent medicines, and I guess he gets some Omega Oil along with other things, and when he gets back out to the ranch he takes each youngster in turn and rubs a little Omega Oil on the outside of the stomach to cure the ills that come from not putting good grub on the inside of the stomach. That is the situation with the average tenant farmer. He is seeking to beat the system by starving himself to death. Now then, suppose—all things come to an end. Suppose that in time he does succeed in removing most of these stumps. Suppose we will say, for the purpose of illustration, he has removed them all. Of course, there is a long, wearisome trouble siege. Both for him and his family. He has to put the youngsters to work. Usually they are denied babyhood. Ususally they are denied childhood. Always they are denied a proper schooling, particularly in the lumber district, or in districts owned and controlled by the lumber barons of the type that I know and that you know about. You know that your

youngsters do not get any kind of a chance. The same holds good everywhere.

Suppose now that he has got this thing plowed up. He has scabbed on the horse and he has used a shovel and he has done every conceivable thing in order to be successful. He has got a few furrows of stuff here now. He has got some spuds or some wheat or something or other of that description, and he sees ahead of himself, what? A chance to clear up on his little patch of stumps. He has got a chance now to pay for the doctor's bills that his wife has incurred through having ruined her health. He has got a chance to do any one of a number of things he thinks. He has raised spuds and the crop is good. All right. He turns his crop out. He figures on the basis of his debts. He figures on the basis of his own needs, on the basis of the time put in here to plow and otherwise make the soil productive, and he figures that he has got to sell the spuds at 90 cents a bushel in order to make good. It doesn't make any difference whether it is spuds or cucumbers or carrots, or whatever it is. This is just an illustration. He figures that in order to pay him—in order to meet his obligations that he has incurred incidental to the production of this stuff, he has to get 90 cents a bushel for his spuds, and he starts out with the intention of getting it. This is what he comes in contact with. He finds out when he gets to the market, spuds are selling at what? 85 cents; or 70 cents, or 60 cents, or some other number of cents; less than he must have in order to get by on. Now there is a reason for it. What is that reason? Briefly this is it:

Here is a big ten thousand acre farm, a hundred thousand acre farm, or a farm such as I have seen in portions of the United States, extending for miles. You know—You know the story that runs through this country, that of the Miller and Lux concern, who in 1850 are supposed to have taken advantage of the land law and driven a hayrack with a rowboat on top of it from one end of this country to the other,

and had taken up as tide lands, land that extended from the Canadian border to the Mexican line. You know of the story that runs of the Miller & Lux ranch, how Miller and Lux can go into the United States at the Canadian line on their own private property and leave the United States at the Mexican border and never have stepped off their own property. I have seen ranches of that kind. You have seen ranches of that kind. You have seen ranches, hundreds and thousands of acres, many of those large ranches are operating, producing what? Wheat; spuds and other things necessary to man's privilege to live. How are they operated? They are operated efficiently. They are operated with the aid of modern machinery. They have consolidated things. They have operated—the changes in farming have been just the same as changes of mechanical industry. They have been controlled by the introduction of modern machinery. This fellow here with his ten thousand acre farm he has got steam tractors. He has got gasoline engines. He has got aqueduct systems. He has got light and heating and he has got electricity. He has got anything and everything that makes a big farm modern. My friends, the big, modern farm is just as modern as any modern machine shop. Every detail is thought out. Now, then, the small rancher makes up his account and sees where these people who do not have to consider the matter of hours, this poor little fellow—some of you fellows have taken in the harvest, haven't you? Well, you know how the average farmer works in the harvest. He puts in an eight hour shift in the morning and an eight hour shift in the evening, and then does the chores in the evening; when he ain't doing anything he stands at the bank, and then, of course, when he has nothing else to do, he goes to bed; a matter of twenty hours, of twenty-two hours, in fact in some of the harvesting country a man does not need any bed or any blanket. All he needs is a lantern just so he can keep on moving. You have been there and you know that it is hard work. You

know what hard work these men put in. However, that fellow is a farmer and he is the same kind of a fellow that you are. You know that he is entiled, just as much as you are, to the full product of his toil. All right. This man puts in many hours with his own process of production. This man with the modern machine is in competition with him. They work nights. They have electric lights and they start these machines off and they cut twenty-four or any other number of furrows at one time, where he drags along little by little. The consequence is that when having figured the cost of production of spuds on this ranch they find that ten cents will cover the thing. Now, ten cents is the cost of production on this ranch and 90 cents cost of production on this ranch, both of these men must sell in the same markets. It is a cinch they cannot go less than the cost of production, and it is a cinch that these people are not going to charge any less than they have to. So there is only one way out of this, and that is, this product of this large acreage, produced with the aid of modern machinery and efficiency, is sold at 85 cents a bushel in competition with the small farmer over here attempting to compete by hand. The consequence is what? The consequence is what you see on every hand. The consequence is what the inevitable consequence is. Do you see? The centralizing of control in all industries is in fewer and fewer hands, my friends—I was born and raised in this country and so were my people before me. They told me—as a child, they told me that we did not believe in kings, that we didn't believe in crowned heads and rulers; that we and all of our forefathers had once ridded ourselves of the parasitic bunch that were a detriment to us; we citizens of this country—we would enjoy freedom and security. Now, listen: Let me show you something—something in connection with your freedom and security. I have got your Industrial Relations Report and I want to back up my statement. I want you to know that I did not take this stuff—dig this stuff up out of my own head.

I want to call your attention to something that you should know in the light of the fact of what they tell you. They tell you that we did away with kings. The kings of this country are more powerful than any other kind of kings that ever lived. Those are the kings that own the interests of the people. When men or a group of men own the things that you must have in order to live, then they own you. This is what we face today. Here in this country—on page 9 of this abridged report of the United States Industrial Relataions Commission we find this—we find that six financial groups control 28 per cent of the total number of wage earners engaged in the industries covered by the report of our investigations. The Morgan, First National Bank group alone controls corporations employing 785,499 wage earners. Think of it. Think of it. When a man owns the things you must have in order to live, he owns you. Of course he does.

Now here is one financial institution that owns roughly three-quarters of a million—the destinies of three-quarters of a million of wage earners, and the six of these financial groups employ 2,651,684 wage earners; two and three-quarters million in round figures; two and three-quarters millions of men absolutely dominated and controlled by industrial kings; a control that is just as autocratic a control, that is just as arbitrary a control, that has no more consideration of you and your interests than any feudal control that ever existed in the past. Now that is what we face here, you and I and all other wage workers; farmers, slaves in the mechanical industries, and any other useful citizens of not only this nation but the nations of the world are face to face with this industrial program. The cure-all, as we see it, is what? The cure-all is to take them ourselves. Why shouldn't we take? We use these tools. We do the work. They are only useful to us. All of society must have the product of the earth and the tools of production and distribution, and therefore we say we should use them and we should operate them. We must own them. The matter is up to you.

Stop and think. Stop and think. Think of the master's right to drive you. Resent that. Rather demand —yes, first—hold the concept—concept is necessary first. Hold the concept of your own freedom, and then you will conceive freedom for all. But your own freedom can never come as long as you remain economically inferior. The economically superior class of this country—that is the class that own and control the things that are socially necessary, can do as they blessed well please, as long as they remain superior; as long as you are inferior, part of the subject class, you will obey the will. That is all.

Now here is another thing. I am a married man. I haven't any babies now. I have a wife that is a cripple. Most of you fellows have met her. This is the thing that affects me. I think it affects any man that stops to think. It is purely natural for a man to marry; for a man to want to marry; for a man to want to have babies. These mush-fakirs, in the face of the industrial system such as exists, have nerve enough to tell you and to tell me that our women—our daughters, our mothers, our sisters, our family relatives of one kind or another—something is wrong with them. They are not what they should be. I have heard these apologists for this system say—"Oh, excuse the red light district; excuse the poverty and prostitution. Excuse it on the basis of the lack of moral fibre." Moral fibre lacking in our women! Our girls. You may not have a sister, maybe, that has been forced to endure some of these things, but some of your kind have sisters that have felt it. Some of my kind have felt it. 64.4 per cent of the women in industry earn less than $6 per week. Get it? Let it go deep. Realize it in its full significance, $6 a week. Here is a woman, actuated by instinct first, and then by every spirit of morality, every spirit that has to do with decency—here is a woman who gives in exchange for her life the things that she must have, all that she has at her command; her labor power. In return for that labor power she gets what? She gets $6 a week, eh? Then when she goes out and

peddles her soul, as she must—you would do the same if you were a woman—she goes out and peddles her soul. The terrible part of the thing is that your kind will sit and listen to a lot of apologists, contemptible respectables, hurl it into your teeth that your women are no good, when they pay $6 a week. That is what we face. That is what I, as an I. W. W., object to, and that is what I, as an I. W. W. will continue to agitate to do away with all the time. I cannot conceive of being square with myself and be conscious of the existence of these things and not fight against them. I am a slave. Yes, I am a slave, but you bet your life I am not a submissive slave. I am a slave that is battling every inch of the way. I justify my battle on the ground of humanity's cause, and that is the battle that the whole organization fights.

Now, then, you fellows, you know what you are up against. Here is another point that I want to make clear for you. This idea of pitting one against the other; a first class man, second class man, third class man and fourth class man. You have had your bosses tell you that story so much that you believe it. You have had your bosses tell you that stuff so often that you take pride in out-doing one another. What is the good of it? The only thing that you get out of it is misery. The only thing your kind gets out of it is misery. Now, I am going to show you here what the second, third and fourth class man program means for you. Incidentally you can use your own judgment as to what it means for the class that drives you on; the class that gives monkey dinners while your kids and mine go hungry. The class that revels in the things that ours die for the want of. The class that wastes more stuff than would keep thousands of our kind going, and the class that is utterly worthless, while we—we people who keep this whole game turning over, well, we know what it is. It is a flock of box cars, and it is misery. It is everything that is damnable, in my estimation, and you know it.

Now let me show it to you. Your first, second and third and fourth class man stuff gives you an opportunity to think what it means to you. Give your first, second, third and fourth class farmers an opportunity to think what it means for them.

Here is a first-class man—and he is a first-class man. What is he? What does he amount to? A first class man. A first class man is an unusual individual. Just as I showed you that the farmer boy —just as you find on your own jobs, the man who, because of some physical superiority, a man who, because of some mental superiority, he excels those around him. He is a first-class man. What does he draw a day as a first-class man? He draws $4 a day. A first class man. A second class man, what is he? He is the man next to the first class; next in physical superiority; next in the ability to do much work, and he draws $3.50 a day. The third class man, less able to do or conform to the speed and productivity of the first class man, he draws $3 a day. Now here is the fourth class man, the mediocre, the ordinary individual; just the common herd. He is a fourth class man and he draws $2.50 a day. We I. W. W.'s understand it, if we understand anything. All men are not equal; not physically or mentally, but all men have absolutely an equal right to live; absolutely an equal right to live, though they may not be physically or mentally the equivalent of each other. Now then, the first class man is the man who excels all others; he is conceded first class because of that fact. The second class man is the one who does not quite reach the first class man; marked by his ability. The third class the same, and the fourth class the same. Now all four of these men are workers. All four of them get a living. The second class man cannot ever be a first class man because he lacks the quality; the quality that would permit him to be first class. The great majority of third class cannot ever be first class; cannot ever excel—many of them cannot ever be second class. The mediocre—the ordinary individual who has to make a living, he cannot, or many

of them cannot ever be anything other than what he is.

Now the first class man's compensation is fixed—it is fixed by what? Fixed, as I showed you in the illustration of the business, by his needs. The value of the commodity is determined by what it costs to reproduce that commodity. Did you ever look at it this way, fellows? The boss always gives you just enough—just enough so that you can eat enough and sleep enough to come back out on the job tomorrow and work enough, to earn enough, to sleep enough, to eat enough and come back out on the job the next day, and so on. That is what he does. He permits you to have what is necessary to reproduce yourself—your labor power. And these lowest paid workers determine the compensation of all, but the maximum for this man (indicating), is set by those beneath him. Any time that he backs all his superiority, his first class standing, and makes excessive demands, then the combination of second and third class men or fourth and second class men will keep him within reasonable limits, and the consequence is that all four are like dogs chasing their tails. They never get anywhere.

The fourth class man goes home at night and he says to his wife, on pay-day, he says, "Yes, Mamie, I know she is rough. I don't understand it. It is fierce. We can't get shoes for the kids to-night. We can't pay the insurance this week. You will have to stick up the landlord and see if you can't make him wait until next payday. Perhaps the butcher and the grocer will wait also." It is one continual round of suffering for the fourth class man. The third class man comes home with his $3 a day and he is face to face with the same problem. His wife talks in terms of clothes for the children and talks in terms of bills long overdue, and he says, "Oh, it's a fright. I don't see what we are going to do, but then just stop and think, I will admit we are in a pretty bad shape, I know we are. I know we are. But just think how much better off we are than Jim down here; he is

only getting $2.50 a day." Why, of course he never stops to look at the parasite that is enjoying everything. He gauges his own standing and his own social importance by the misery of the bunch that is beneath him. Then the next bunch, in the same way, turn and estimate their economic security, not by what the parasite enjoys, but by the suffering and degradation of the fellow that is under him. So on, clear to the top. Now, I said we recognize the fact that all men are not equal. This fellow can not do that work. Another can do these two. But this is something that can be done and this is something that will rebound to the benefit, not only to the individual family, but to the community and to the nation and to the whole social order. These men here can come down to the spirit of the fourth class man. These men can come down to the spirit of the fourth class man, then they are all first class men. You will see here. The institution is destroyed. Why compel a man of exceptional ability to conform to the conditions established by the weaker? What does this man gain for himself as a first class man, standing alone, more than he would gain with all the rest of them first class? What does he gain? Ease. Not the excessive speed. He enjoys superiority that nature has endowed him with. He does not have to work so hard, but he gauges his activity by the speed of the slower man, and he is not forced to see and to know of the suffering of his kind. Aside from that, they are all in the same position then, and they can all get all they have the intelligence to demand, and take it by the exerise of industrial solidarity.

We know that men are not equal, but we also know that men have an equal right to live. This program of ours—this I. W. W. program is operative just as much in the mechanical industries as it is in the agricultural industry, and it is in the agricultural industry operative in exactly the same way that it is operative in the mechanical industry. This I. W. W. program—the whole world stands to gain. Even the

useless parasites will be benefitted by being made to go to work. What chance do they stand now, or you stand now? Your boy starts out at 13 or 14 or 15 to go to work. You don't ask him what he is going to be when he grows up. The boy of the parasite family, what do they do with him? Well, they make lawyers and doctors and professional men of one kind or another out of the boy, without consulting his capacity usually. Without consulting the boy or endeavoring to find out what his special aptitude is. They make a professional man out of him. The consequence is that we have spoiled some of the finest shovel stiffs that ever walked by making lawyers out of them. We have spoiled some of the finest lawyers that ever happened by making shovel stiffs out of of them. It is a topsy-turvy system. Everything is upside down. Our program contains—it contains the ground work, the basis from which the new society can and will be built. Tonight, it is your privilege to join. It is your privilege to take out a card. It is your privilege to unite with me and with every other man and woman wage worker of this whole universe. They talk to you in terms of work. That reminds me of the colored girl. This thing is a bad thing to have on your mind all the time. Work, work, work, every place you look, work. For you, but for you only.

Now the difference between work and the other is this: The office in which a given activity is in charge—take, for instance, the young girl down in the department store somewhere. She is selling bonnets. She is racing up and down behind the counter and she walks twenty miles a day. She is selling bonnets in a department store. She goes home at night and she is so blessed tired she can't turn over. She just comes in and hits the hay. Zowie, she is dead until the next morning. She is all in, down and out; worked to death. Take that same girl, she walks twenty miles a day peddling bonnets behind a counter. Take that same girl and hand her twenty

dollars, and say, "Mamie, go down town and buy yourself a bonet." Why, she will go down town and walk forty miles buying a bonnet and come home at night and she is the happiest youngster you ever laid eyes on. Tired? No, never heard of being tired. She was working on one job, the same sort of physical activity, and on the other she was buying a bonnet as a matter of pleasure. Take a bunch of fishermen. They fish all week and they row a boat and pull hard and come in every night dog tired and sore and cross at everybody, including themselves. The Fourth of July comes along and they take the same boat that they used all season through and they dump a half a barrel of German disturbance into it and a couple of hams and some rye bread, and they go out and pull five times as far, and for all the rest of the year they talk about what a glorious time they had on the Fourth. A letter carrier, when he knocks along his work, 29 miles a day delivering letters, takes a trip up into the mountains for exercise; the difference between work and pleasure. We I. W. W.'s see the possibility of making pleasure out of all of these things. You are organized by your needs; just the same as the five men in a boat. This will illustrate the point and it will show you too. We talk in terms of rest, and so forth and so on. The five men in the boat. The boat is ship-wrecked—the vessel is ship-wrecked and the five men are in a lifeboat. One of them is a navigator. The other four, one is a Chinaman, the other an Irishman, the other a Scandinavian and the other an Englishman. Now that is a combination that ought to fight ordinarily. Usually they can manage to tangle things up in pretty good order, but they are all ship-wrecked and in this one boat, and one of them is a navigator. Upon whom does it fall to navigate that boat to shore? Why, the man who is qualified to do it. The other four, they sit there at their oars and when they pull, everybody pulls in harmony. The Chink might call the Irishman names, and the Irishman might call the

Scandinavian something that he should not call him, but, as a matter of fact, they all pull absolutely in harmony. Why? Because they have got needs. They desire to get to shore. They are governed by their needs. They are organized by their needs. If you can see this thing you can see the scheme of the I. W. W. The program is briefly as I have outlined it. I cannot give you any more tonight, because there are lots of other nights. This thing is as big as the human family and experience itself, but she will work, and this is the way. This is the medium through which we can. We will build a new society, a society that knows no master, a society that knows no slave; a society where little children, hungry, shall not exist.

Now then, usually we have questions and literature for sale, and collections and things of that kind, but coming back to the present, I think we can dispense with that part of it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q. Mr. Doran, did you go to Butte last summer?

A. Yes. sir, I went to Butte last summer.

Q. About what time?

A. As near as I remember, the 12th or 13th of July.

Q. What did you go there for?

A. I went there to pull this chart stuff, talk to those slaves and make them familiar with industrial unionism and what we stood for.

Q. Well, did you deliver that talk in Butte?

A. I did not. I was run out.

Q. Well, what did you run out for?

A. Well, just on general principles, I guess they didn't want me to deliver that talk.

Q. What were the circumstances surrounding your leaving Butte?

A. Well, I got in in the morning, in the city of Butte, and went to a hotel, good hotel, and hired a room, and went up to bed—looked around town first

and then went up to the Electrical Workers Hall to see how things stood up there, and went from there over to the meeting held by the miners; anybody and everybody was privileged to talk at this meeting, and the question came up concerning the brutality experienced at that time by men who were on strike, so I asked the privilege of the floor from the chairman and I got up and stated that the only way to curb the activities of these people who were practicing the brutalities spoken of, reported by these men, was to give unlimited publicity to the attitude of the miners, and the justification for their strike. As a consequence of the talk—I talked perhaps ten minutes, perhaps not ten minutes, as a consequence of the talk, the men asked me if I was a member of any union involved. I said I was a member of the electrical workers' union. I had been up and shown a paid up card to the representative of the Electrical Worker's Union in Butte. They asked me to transfer to the Miners' Union, and I did it. They put me on the publicity committee, in order to telegraph to the president, to state the facts concerning the Butte situation, and to help in the general publicity scheme that my talk had suggested.

The meeting was over about six o'clock—5:30. I started down the street and as soon as I did I discovered I was tabbed and I know gunmen pretty well by general appearance, particularly during a strike; almost anybody can tell them by their appearance, and the characters that were following me, I considered gunmen. They followed me down to the hotel, five or six of them, and I hung around the hotel for a while and a rig drove up, a closed automobile; nothing was said to me, however, at the time, but I kept my back to the wall, kept away from allowing any—they seemed to want to kind of get around me; they didn't offer any violence or anything—seemed to kind of want to get around me. I kept my back to the wall, managed to be on the inside of the sidewalk all the time; so that got tire-

some after a while, and I went into the hotel and I sat down there to write a letter and while engaged in writing the letter I noticed some of them go to a desk a few feet from where I was, and I saw a man that I thought was proprietor of the hotel; I am not sure that he was the proprietor, but I saw him deliberately draw a diagram showing the location of my room. My room was located on the first floor—on the second floor, rather, and on that second floor the window of that room opened out on a thing like would be above this court room here, a roof of a foyer, and the opening from many other rooms—the windows from many other rooms led out onto this roof and there was no lock on the window; I saw this man deliberately draw a diagram of the location of my room. I did not say anything. So I started out of the hotel, and one of the apparent leaders of this group of anywhere—they would vary, sometimes four or five, sometimes be as many as a dozen, he walked over towards me at the desk. I edged around pretty near the desk in the Finland Hotel, and he looked on the register first, and he came over to me and he says, "What is your name," and I says, "Who wants to know?" "Well," he said, "I want to know." I said, "Well, have you any reason for wanting to know?" "I got all the reason that is necessary," so I said to him, "Are you a police officer?" "None of your business who I am."

I turned to the clerk and said, "Do you know anything about this guy here?" "Oh," he mumbled something. I said, "Do you permit this sort of thing in your hotel?" "Oh, permit anything they want." "Well," I says, "Is this fellow a police officer?" "Well, none of your business." So then he said—then they flocked around me—well, I couldn't lick a half dozen of them, that is a cinch, so I said, "My name is J. T. Doran, why?" "Well," he said, "I just wanted to know, and I want you to know you have got to get out of this town and get out quick." "Well," I said, "why must I leave?" "Never mind,

none of your questions; there is nothing to it, you just get out of town."

"Well," I said, "I am not going to get out of town." He said, "You will either go out of town or we will take you out of town feet first."

So we went to bed that night; they didn't offer any more suggestions of that kind, but the whole thing, the atmosphere and everything else did not leave me any doubt at to what their intentions were, particularly as I knew something of the type of men, and I went up and slept in another fellow's room that night. I had been instructed—these fellows told me to get out of town or they would pack me out feet first, so I discussed the thing with the friend and one or two of the men in Butte, miners that I knew, and they suggested, knowing the Butte situation, knowing the Butte atmosphere, they said that the very best thing I could do was to comply with the orders. I told this man first that I was a free born American citizen, that I was well within my rights in coming into a city and putting up at a good hotel, offering no disorderly conduct or anything else, as an excuse to order me out, and that I had a perfect right as a union man and as a citizen to be at an open meeting of the miners. It hadn't any weight with them; he just simply ordered me out under threat, and I went.

Q. You left town? Now you say that was a miners' meeting that you attended in the afternoon?

A. Absolutely, an open meeting of miners.

Q. Have you your card with you?

A. What? My electrical workers?

Q. Yes.

A. I have got the one I transferred into the Miners' Union with me. You see I have been in jail about ten months, and I am way in arrears now, but I have got the card that Shannon transferred.

Q. All right, I will get it.

A. I haven't it, either; I have left it over there.

Q. While you were in Butte, by the way, was that subsequent—bring it in the morning.

A. I will bring it in the morning.

Q. Was that subsequent to the Speculator fire?

A. I think it was the second day after the fire, immediately after the fire, because they had not yet got the bodies all out.

Q. Where was this miners' meeting that you attended?

A. In Finlanders' Hall.

Q. Did you observe the condition in Butte resulting from that fire with regard to the carrying of the men out of the mine that had been killed?

A. I did not actually see the bodies; I did not make any attempt to see them. I saw the hysterical women and the bawling kids around there and I did not want to see—the description of the bodies was enough; I did not want to see that, but the hysterical women and the kids that were crying on the street and the general—the whole sad circumstance was so much in evidence that I did not want any more of it than I could possibly help.

Q. Did you go to Aberdeen for the purpose of delivering this chart talk at any time last summer?

A. Yes, many times I went into Aberdeen, and I delivered talks at both Aberdeen and Hoquiam; one talk in Hoquiam, an especially large meeting for that particular place, I held at the—I think they call it the Finnish Workmen's Hall.

Q. Were you threatened there?

A. Well, I had been threatened before I got to town, while I was in Aberdeen. Aberdeen is about four miles from Hoquiam, and while I was in Aberdeen I was told that if I made any attempt to talk in Hoquiam that night—I had talked there several times, and used the chart, that is portions of the chart, fitting the local situation, and giving local

color, but always with the chart, so I was told that if I attempted to talk at Hoquiam that night they were going to hang me. This was early in the day.

Q. What did you do?

A. I went up to the—I have forgotten the name of the building there—it is the biggest office building in Aberdeen, where the county attorney has his office, and the county attorney was out, was out of town sick, and his law partner was acting as county attorney. I asked him, "Are you an authority here in the business of your law partner?" He said, "Yes." "Well," I said, "I came up here to tell you that at Hoquiam I am going to hold a meeting tonight and I have been informed that if I attempt to hold that meeting I am going to be hung. Now you are the county official here and I just thought I would come up and let you know about it because, of course, I haven't any desire to be hung, and on the other hand, we have no violence whatever in this strike, and we do not want any provoked now, and everything has been orderly as far as we are concerned, and if this is an attempt, as rumor gives it to me, to start disorder and perhaps indulge in murder, why, I figure that you should know it and you should put in operation such legal machinery as would prevent it," so he laid back in his chair for a minute and he looks at me, and he said, "Now, listen here, Red, I know all of that, I have heard all that, but," he said, "I am not interested in it."

I said, "Do you mean to tell me as the county official where there is a rumor of a possible riot and rumor of a possible murder, that you are not interested?" "Well," he says, and he hemmed and hawed a little bit, and I said, "Murder is never justified." "You are a public official; this program is up to you." "Now," I said, "I am going to talk in Hoquiam; if

you want to, if you are desirous of preventing any disturbance there, it absolutely remains in your hands. If you are not desirous of preventing any disturbance, I am going to talk in Hoquiam, and you understand that these people, knowing me as they do, any violence that is offered to me will be probably —they are human—will probably make them mighty sore, and rather than, to keep the orderly, quiet condition that you have known during this strike, you will tend to provoke disorder, and other things not good for any community."

"Well," he said—we talked for a few minutes, and thinking it over, it seemed to be after he got over—found I took a stand on it, he was not at all unreasonable; we went into the question of class interests, and he said, "yes," he said, "I know"—

MR. NEBEKER: Just a moment; it strikes me this is hearsay and immaterial and irrelevant.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, do you know J. G. Brown?

A. Yes.

Q. How long have you known him?

A. I have known him ever since I last came to Seattle, or rather, since I first came to Seattle the last time, the fall of 1916 or early part of 1917.

Q. That is the man you referred to in your chart talk?

A. Yes, he was president of the Shingle Weavers' Union.

Q. Of the Shingle Weavers' Union?

A. Yes, that is the shingle weavers—there is a combination, too, of timber workers, but he is the head of the Shingle Weavers.

Q. Subsequently they were known as the International Timber Workers' Union?

A. Yes, but they have been split and out so

many ways, I don't understand just what it is; the shingle weavers have one union, of which Brown is international president, and the timber workers is an adjunct of that, and just what the close, intimate relationship is, I do not know.

Q.—Now, was there a strike of that union last summer in the northwest?

A.—Oh, yes, there was a big shingle weavers' strike.

Q.—Who controlled the mill organization?

A.—The A. F. of L., Brown's union.

Q.—Do you know when they went on strike?

A.—About the same time we went on strike. If I remember correctly, a day or two before or some little time before.

Q.—Do you remember when theirs was called?

A.—I don't remember the date, but it was about the same time, and if anything a little bit before ours.

Q.—I refer now, not to the time the men went out, but the time the strike was called?

A.—Oh, yes, there had been a call the same time; let's see, I think it was in June that they were called out, in the district of Aberdeen, and whether that applied generally or not, I don't know.

Q.—Do you know what the relations were between this organization, the mill workers that were out on strike, and the Industrial Workers of the World?

A.—Why, the most cordial, the most cordial everywhere; in fact—

MR. NEBEKER: This is objected to as immaterial and irrelevant.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A.—Practically every place that I went to talk, my audiences were made up, particularly in the mill town, were made up of a large percentage of J. C. Brown's men, and they were on strike with us.

MR. CHISTENSEN: Q.—Did you speak before any of their locals?

A.—Why, the timberworkers' organization has

no halls of its own that I know of anywhere. They have small little places where they meet, but the timber workers' organization always came to halls other other than I. W. W. halls, where I was to talk, and usually, as I say, had the major portion of their membership present. Their halls, if they possessed one, would not have housed a meeting anyhow; that is, none that I know of.

Q.—Now the time you were in Butte, Mr. Doran, and you attended this miners' meeting that was held at Finlander Hall.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was there any I. W. W. organization in Butte at that time?

A.—Not that I could find.

Q.—Who occupied Finlander Hall?

A.—Well, the miners were using it. I understood that the Finnish Board of Finnish Workmen or a Finnish Society of some kind or other owned it, but the striking miners were using it; at least they used it the only day that I was there;; that was distinctly a miners' meeting.

THE COURT: Ten minutes recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

MR. CHRISTENSSEN: Q.—Mr. Doran, when you left Butte, where did you go?

A.—I went right straight back to Seattle.

Q.—When was it you left Butte?

A.—I left Butte, I got in on either the 12th or the 13th of July and I left on the following day.

Q.—Is that July or June?

A.—July.

Q.—That you left Butte?

A.—June; I said July; it was June.

Q.—Now, you were at Index when the strike was called?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know how the timber workers' strike was called?

A.—Why, it had been called by a referendum;

they decided in the various communities, they had voted on it.

Q.—A referendum of the members?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Did I ask you this morning, what the issues in that strike were?

A.—I don't think you did.

Q.—What were the issues?

A.—Eight-hour day; no reduction of pay; sanitary camp conditions.

Q.—Did you attend the meeting of Number 500 of the Industrial Workers of the World at Index on June 17th?

A.—Not June 17th.

Q.—Or July 17th?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And July 19th?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—I hand you this document and ask you to state what it is?

A.—The minutes of the meeting at Index.

Q.—Of Lumber Workers' Number 500 of the Industrial Workers of the World?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who was the secretary there?

A.—Well, there was no permanent secretary; secretaries were elected at each meeting; a little lad named Shaparo was the stationary delegate.

Q.—Was Tucker—

A.—Tucker was the recording secretary at several meetings, and then there were other fellows; DeWolfe and Henning, oh, several of them,. I don't remember all of them.

Q.—Members of the organization?

A.—All members of the organization.

Q.—Were these the minutes that were kept by these men?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have looked at them?

A.—Yes, sir.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I offer this in evidence, your Honor.

MR. NEBEKER: How do you know that they are the minutes, Mr. Doran?

A.—Well, I was at the meetings and Tucker and I shacked together, and Tucker wrote that first part of the mass there; Tucker and I were shacking together at the time, in fact, until I left Index, Tucker and I had a shack between us.

Q.—What do you mean by a shack between you? A place where you stopped?

A.—Yes. A shack is one of those two by four places that the lumber company rented out.

Q.—And that men like yourself occupied?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now were these minutes written up in that shack?

A.—The minutes were taken at the meeting and I don't know whether Tucker transcribed them in the shack always or whether he did not, but whenever—Tucker used to do most of that work. Tucker would have everything pertaining to the meeting at the shack, for the reason that soldiers had been brought in there and we hadn't any place to keep the stuff.

Q.—Mr. Doran, can't you be satisfied with answering the question?

A.—Why, yes, I am trying to give you the circumstances.

Q.—What I want to know is, were the minutes written up in the shack or the place where the meeting was held?

A.—They were originally written up in the meeting; that is, all minutes were taken there; whether that particular mass was written there, I am not certain of.

Q.—You do not pretent to have seen those minutes written?

A.—I saw minutes written at that meeting, those meetings that I was at; whether that is the absolute

piece of paper or not I cannot swear to that; I saw minutes taken. I made motion—I cannot swear of course that that is absolutely the same piece of paper.

MR. VANDERVEER: Q.—Did you hear the minutes read?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—At the following meeting, and approved?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Could you by examining these determine whether or not they were the minutes of the meeting?

A.—I could. There is a number of motions that I made myself, and I could remember my own motions.

Q.—Well, there is the July 17th—

A.—Well, I made—

MR. NEBEKER: Just a moment, Mr. Doran. Without looking at the minutes do you recall any of the motions you made?

A.—Yes, sir, I can recall very nearly all of them I made at that meeting. I made one motion—

Q.—I am not asking you for them. I suppose they are in the minutes, are they?

A.—I just started to look.

Q.—I was just making inquiry to see whether you thought you cold remember them independently?

A.—I can remember them absolutely because I had a purpose in making them at the time.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—Now the meeting you attended—have you looked at that yet?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Those are the minutes?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Of the local, those meetings held at Index?

A.—Yes.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I offer them in evidence, your Honor.

MR. NEBEKER: What is the purpose of your offer?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, to show the things

the organization did in connection with the strike, detailed strike activity.

MR. NEBEKER: Is there any part of these minutes that bear upon that subject?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yes.

MR. NEBEKER: If so, I wish you would point out what it is.

MR. VANDERVEER: They are all marked in green.

(Minutes referred to were received in evidence and marked Defendants' Exhibit 57.)

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Now Mr. Doran, the first meeting you attended after the declaration of the strike, did you make any motions at that meeting?

A.—I did, I made several motions.

Q.—What did you do there, what motions did you make?

A.—Well, I made a motion—I made a motion to the effect that—

MR. NEBEKER: Let's get the date of these meetings definitely, and when the motions were made.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: July 17th.

MR. NEBEKER: Let the witness answer.

MR. CHRIISTENSEN: All right; tell us the dates of the meetings.

A.—The 17th of July was the first meeting.

Q.—All right, tell us.

A.—As soon as we held the meeting I emphasized the need for safeguarding ourselves against stool pigeons and stuff of that kind, and made a motion to the effect that all violence was to absolutely be taboo, and that everyone in that meeting constitute themselves a committee of one to take mighty good care that there was no violence indulged in by any outsiders. That was to forestall something that afterwards developed anyway, three of four days later.

MR. NEBEKER: Well, that is not responsive, let us get along here.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: What else did you do at that meeting?

A.—Well, the company used—you see the company had to have water in its boilers, otherwise the boilers would be useless. We pulleed out everybody. It was a one hundred per cent camp, so we agreed to allow them to have their firemen still remain on the job so that their boilers would not be ruined, and the town without water, and there was a water system to be developed, so we permitted men to go to work to construct the water system and we allowed the company to furnish the electric light, men to operate the electric light plant that the town might have electric lights. The company refused to use those men and the town went without light, but they kept the other men, and then I made a motion that we supply men to the Forest Reserve representative who was there, to fight fire. The fire was raging somewhere back in the hills beyond our camp, and I made a motion that our strikers go out and fight the fire, and the company agreed to allow the—

Q.—Well, what else did you do at the meeting? I will inquire as to that further?

A.—Then we voted to allow the cook and the flunkey to feed the men in the company's cook house, and we agreed to allow the engineer and fireman to operate the engine, and haul the men back and forth from the fire to the camp.

Q.—How far away was this fire from Index?

A.—It was somewhere beyond the camp, I didn't see the actual fire; my job was down below.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I will read from the minutes of—the minute book of Index Branch of Lumber Workers' Industrial Union Number 500 of the I. W. W. Reading from July 17, 1917, Index, Washington.

M. & S. that the regular order of business be suspended so that the Branch will have plenty of time to consider the eight hour strike call from District Headquarters. Motion carried.

M. & S. that the secretary read the report of the

Convention pertaining to the eight hour strike. Carried.

M. & S. that a publicity committee of three be elected. Motion carried.

A. R. .Tucker, J. T. Doran and E. J. Shaparo were nominated.

M. & S. that nominations be closed and the above three be elected by acclamation. Motion carried.

M. & S. that we go on record against violence of any kind in connection with this strike. Carried.

M. & S. that each member constitute a committee of one to watch and see that no violent depredation be committeed by any one. Motion carried.

M. & S. that we allow the city or Co. to employ men to lay water main connecting city water system with mill water system for fire protection during the strike. Carried.

M. & S. that we allow as many men as are needed to be used for fighting fire in the woods. Carried.

M. & S. that the cook house in the woods be kept open to feed the men who are fighting fire so long as they are needed. Carried.

M. & S. that the cook house refuse to feed any one not being used in fighting fire. Carried.

M. & S. that the logging engine and other necessary equipment for carrying the men and supplies to the woods for fighting fire be allowed to be used. Carried."

Then on July 18th, "Motion was made and seconed that all men connected with strike lumber workers be admitted to meetings whether they have taken out cards yet or not. Motion carried."

MR. VANDERVEER: Did you get the back of the page preceding that? Just turn right over, the whole bunch.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Meeting July 24, 1917.

"That all watchmen and firemen be allowed to go back to work as prisoners were released. Carried."

July 24th continued:

"Fellow-Worker Doran explained how labor

fakir, J. G. Brown, tries to sell the working class in conjunction with the bosses, also other very important and interesting features in behalf of the organization."

Meeting July 25, 1917:

Motion was made that we pay the lady who allowed the use of car $3 and the price of gas. Amendment to motion that we pay $5 and price of gas. Amendment carried.

M. & S. that the strike committee send a man to Everett to consult sheriff, regarding the selling of whiskey in Index. Motion carried.

M. & S. that Frank Williams be sent to Everett to consult sheriff as to ways and means of preventing the sale of liquor in Index. Motion carried."

That is the meeting of August 14, 1917.

MR. NEBEKER: Was Mr. Doran at these meetings?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I don't know whether he was or not.

MR. NEBEKER: Well, the admissibility of your documents depends entirely on his testimony; that is why I inquire.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: He has identified the record, the minutes. He has identified this as the minutes of Local No. 500 at Index, the branch at Index.

MR. NEBEKER: Well, my point is—

THE COURT: He identified them because he was there.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, were you at these other meetings when the things I have read about—

A.—Some of the things you have read I was there. Others of them I don't know as I recollect. I would have to re-read it. I was not paying much attention—for instance, that question of the gasoline and the woman's automobile, I was there.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—Well, now, do you know the date, Mr. Doran, that is the quickest way to get at it; when did you leave?

A.—Well, I left Everett—I left—

Q.—Index?

A.—Index, I think it was the meeting of the 19th, I think was on Thursday; I think I left on Friday morning in an automobile, made a meeting in Everett Saturday afternoon or Saturday evening, I am not sure.

Q.—That would be about the 25th or 26th you left, July 25th or 26th?

A.—No, it was the following day from the 19th, I think.

Q.—The 20th?

A.—About the 20th. I think Sunday I held a big meeting, five thousand people in Seattle on Sunday, and that as near as I recollect without resorting to a calendar—I haven't seen a calendar—was about the 21st or 22nd, and I got word they were going to arrest me.

MR. NEBEKER: Well, that is an excursion—now did you not attend any meetings in Index after the 21st?

A.—Oh, yes, I did.

Q.—July 21st?

A.—Yes, I came back at irregular intervals.

MR. NEBEKER: Well, the point is, I object to it now, that it is not affirmatively shown to have been a meeting which the witness attended.

THE COURT: Of course this depends on this witnesse's identification of this record when he was there.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Well, as to the meetings of July 17th and 19th—

A.—Well, there is no question about that, I was there.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That has been identified. As to the other matters, I will let the witness look at them and see if he attended the other meetings, and offer them later.

Q.—Now, Mr. Doran, how was the strike conducted there at Index, tell us what you did?

A.—You mean with regard to managing our affairs?

Q.—Yes.

A.—Well, immediately the strike was called, we organized a strike committee and we also organized a relief committee to furnish the families or others with such food and necessities as might be needed, and the strike committee to transact any and all business of a strike nature with headquarters and with local companies, should anything arise. There was nothing very much to do. It was apparantly—at that time most cordial relationship existing between the company's officials and we, of the strike committee; it was a little bit of a camp, you know—town; we were in to Fatty Voss' place—he is the treasurer of the company, we were in his place drinking ice cream soda and he was joshing us as to when we were going back, and all that sort of thing.

MR. NEBEKER: Can't we cut this out and save time?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Was there any violence there?

A.—Now, let's see, the 19th—I think it was the night of the 19th somebody visited the mill and some belting in the mill was cut, ruining it, and the same evening one of the gunmen from Everett had arrived. We heard of it—the strike committee heard of it the following morning and immediately they went to Fatty Voss and said—I said to him, "Listen, you dont for a minute imagine that that sort of thing has been done by any of our men?" He said, "That is all right, Red, I am not asking any questions and I know everthing is all right. I know none of you fellows had anything to do with that." I said, "If there is any danger of a repetition, we are not only willing but anxious to throw a guard around your plant to keep anything of that kind from happening again. It was not necessary, however; everything went along peaceably.

Q.—You have in your speech made some com-

ment about a talk with Voss at Index; did you have a talk with him about the strike issues?

A.—Why, yes, I talked to him and explained to him—

Q.—When was this?

A.—When the strike was called, of course as soon as it was called, he felt kind of provoked about it, but then when I explained to him why it was necessary for us to call it—

Q.—Tell us about it.

A.—(Continuing)—for all of us to stay out, even though he was willing to grant the concessions, he apparantly had not any further feeling in the matter, excepting he inquired how soon it would be over, and I told him as soon as he could get his Association to agree to us going back on the eight hour basis.

Q.—Did you have any talk with him as to whether or not—do you know whether he was a member of the Lumbermen's Association?

A.—He told me himself that the concern was, and he mentioned the fact that he was represented or was present at the Lumbermen's meeting, so I assume from that that he was a personal member or representative.

Q.—Did he say whether or not he, as an individual, could grant the eight hour day without violating the Lumbermen's Association decision in the matter?

A.—No, he said he could not, but that they had talked the matter over and were willing to.

Q.—Do you know Dr. Carleton Parker?

A.—Very well.

Q.—How long have you known him?

A.—Since 1913 or 1914.

Q.—Before I touch on that, were you in other places and talked with any of the mill owners or lumber company owners?

A.—Well, not that I would know them personally; I would hold a meeting, for instance—this occurred in Aberdeen.

Q.—What I mean is this, did you have any similar

talk with any one like you had with the official at Index, personally?

A.—Not to be conscious of who I was talking to.

Q.—Now you observed the men in these camps and various towns you went to, where they were on strike, did you, as to their conduct?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You were there during the day—

A.—Yes.

Q.—In picket camps?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How many of these camps would you say that you made in the northwest?

A.—Oh, I made, I didn't go to every little picket camp, because the picket camps were scattered, a few men here and a few there, but I went to such localities as tended to centralize all of the picket camps, for instance, at Elmer or Raymond or that other little town down below there.

MR. VANDERVEER: South Bend?

A.—South Bend; a lot of these little jerk-water towns where they centered their activities.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—Well, did you observe their conduct as to whether it was orderly or not?

A.—Well, the chief of police in Aberdeen told me—

MR. NEBEKER: Well, this is not responsive.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Just a moment. First tell us as to whether you observed their conduct, as to whether or not it was orderly?

A.—I never saw anything out of the way. I saw everything just as well conducted as it was possible for anybody to conduct themselves. The men were sober.

Q.—You had a talk with the chief of police at Aberdeen?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Regarding what subject?

A.—Well, I spoke more on the strike, that is, on the conditions during the strike, and this was in

September. He said, "Well, we have got to hand it to you guys, they sure had a clean town and no bootleggers while you fellows were maintaining our picket lines."

Q.—Do you know what the activity of the branches of the I. W. W. in the northwest was, with reference to the liquor question?

A.—Absolutely taboo.

Q.—During the strike?

A.—Absolutely taboo, and there were notices in many of the halls posted to that effect. If a man appeared under the influence of liquor, of course like anything else there was an occasional derelict, but if a man appeared under the influence of liquor, he was immediately decidedly unpopular; they were taken off to recover or else chased out of the immediate vicinity.

Q.—Why?

A.—Why? Why, you cannot win a strike and fight booze at the same time.

Q.—That was the uniform policy of the organization?

A.—Absolutely.

Q.—Now did you speak at Port Angeles?

A.—Yes, sir, many times. I say many times, perhaps a dozen.

Q.—Well, shortly after the strike commenced?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you speak there in September?

A.—Immediately preceding my arrest, yes, I did.

Q.—Did you speak there on the 7th or 17th of September?

A.—As to the exact date I cannot remember. I could if I had—my account ought to be in these files, my railroad account.

Q.—Well, the talk you delivered there, was that a chart talk similar to the one you have delivered here?

A.—Yes, sir; yes, sir.

Q.—Did you ever discuss the question of sabotage at any of your meetings?

A.—Why, I have explained what sabotage was, yes, sir.

Q.—Well, tell us briefly what you have said on that subject.

A.—Well, I explained that sabotage did not mean destruction of property. Sabotage meant the withdrawal of efficiency, industrial efficiency, and told the workers that they practiced sabotage in the interest of their bosses, and illustrate the thing this way:

I said, for instance, down here in California, there is a little colony, what they call Little Landers Colony. It was located at the base of a hill, and at the top of this hill there was an extensive water supply, but in order to conserve that water it was necessary to build a dam. Now the privilege of building the dam was under the competitive system and the dam was known as the Ottay dam. Men went down on that job and it was a slave job right. They kept them on the jump all the time. Naturally, under the competition condition, contractors have to cheat on materials. They have to get the contracts, they have got to live, they cheat on materials, they squeeze and pinch here and there as the circumstances permit, so no one questions the fact but what a concrete dam could be built so solidly that nothing could take it out. I illustrate, by the Chinese wall as it stands today. We could duplicate that; we have the materials, but it is not done, and the reason it is not done is because of this competitive program, and the conditions under which it is operated, but it is the slaves themselves who actually practive the sabotage. Here is a fellow wheeling cement. At the instruction of his foreman he cheats a little on the cement; his gravel is not clean cut and clear. The sand is of a poor or inferior grade and the concrete, when it is poured in there is not what it should be. The consequence is that after a time, as in the case of this Ottay dam, the dam bursts—a storm came

along, an unusual storm, that is granted—a storm came along and it burst this dam and the water flowed down off this mountain and drowned out all of these little settlers in the low land at the base of the hill, their little one acre farms were ruined; their stock was gone; their homes scattered to the desert in every direction.

Now I explained that the workers had practiced sabotage in the interest of the bosses' profits, but that the I. W. W. said "Go on that job and put so much cement in there, put so much clean stone in there, put so much stuff in there that they can have all the storms that it is possible to brew in southern California and that dam will still stand and there will be no loss of life or property.

On the other hand, I spoke of an incident that occurred in Jersey; I was doing some electrical work in a building one day, one of these little bungalows out in the suburbs, and a fellow was spending some time on the door sill, a carpenter, and he was making a pretty close fit of things, as is necessary if you want protection against the weather in that country, and the boss came along, the real estate man came along and he said, "Holy smoke, man, you are putting in an awful lot of time on that doorsill; you have got to get a wiggle on." This carpenter turned to him, and he said, "Why, man alive, I am only trying to make a good job out of this thing; I am putting in a door sill here as it should be put in; I want to make a house fit lo live in." The real estate man said, "Fit to live in! What are you talking about, I am not building this house to live in, I am building it to sell."

And so the same way with my work as an electrical worker. I get a job in competition with other workers, and speed, efficiency,—speed-efficiency, profit-efficiency was the gauge.

I went in to do my work. I had to eat; I had to shoot her in just as I was told to shoot her in. Of course, there were rules and regulations supposedly

governing the installation, but nevertheless, I had to pinch and squeeze everywhere, and the consequence was, as a result of speed work and conditions, I had to do the best I could to get done. The idea was to get done. Electrical fires are reported all over the United States; millions of dollars worth of property destroyed because some man has practiced sabotage in the interest of the masters. We I. W. W.'s say, we electrical workers can do a good job; you muckers can do a good job. Do it. Practice sabotage in the interest of the safety and security of society. It was along those lines that I spoke of sabotage.

I spoke too of the bosses' sabotage, or, rather the commission merchants' sabotage. I told of an instance down here in Ohio, we were building a line across the country one time, and I was boarding with a farmer who put a lot of us up, we were building the line through there and he boarded us, took us as boarders temporarily, and he had a lot of sheep-nose apples, and I noticed—of course, I don't know much about those kind of things,—I noticed he had them covered over with screening, chicken screening, and I asked what that was for, and he said that was to keep the hogs from killing themselves, and the cattle from killing themselves with these fine apples. I said, "Why, goodness, man, these kind of apples, they are fine; why don't you ship them into town, it is not very far into Cleveland, why don't you ship them into town?" "Why," he said, "ship them into town, I couldn't get the price of the barrels for the apples."

I continue then, and explain that I was in New York shortly afterwards and saw children on the street passing these fruit stands wishing and desiring apples apparently from their attitude, and here was an abundance of apples going to waste, because the farmer, after having done all of the hard work necessary to raising them, could not get over the sabotage practiced by the middleman and those who operate this produce game, could not get over that.

Impeding production in the interest of profits, simply meant a dead loss to him. I have seen the same thing in California,—fruits of all kinds going to waste; I have seen field after field of spuds, where farmers would not even take the trouble of taking them up. One case down here in Castorville, sitting at the depot one day, and across from the track was a fine patch of spuds, I did not know who this fellow was alongside of me. I said, "That is a fine looking patch of spuds." He said, "It is a fine patch of spuds, and the spuds are fine too. They are these Salina potatoes, the kind of potatoes that have made the S. P. famous, according to their advertising," but he says "they will never be picked, they will never be gathered." I said, "They won't, what are you talking about?" "Well," he said, "They won't." I didn't believe him. I questioned him a little further, and found that he owned the potatoes. I said, "Do you mean to tell me, man, that fine field of spuds is not to be gathered"? He said, "That is exactly what I mean." He said, "If I gather those spuds and pay 7 cents," I think he said, "for a sack, and put them on the car, they offer me 56 or 58 cents for them." He says, "I cannot pick them for that and I cannot sack them for that; they are going to waste." I was waiting for a train. I got into Oakland. The thing kind of shocked me and I said to my wife when I got home, I said, "Have you bought any spuds lately?" She said, "Yes;" I said, "Where did you get them?" She said, "I got them down to the market." I said, "In what quantity?" She said, "I got a sack." "What did they cost?" "$2.25." Oakland was 80 miles on a railroad away from this town; that is also on his railroad. I explain along those lines that sabotage was practiced by the workers in the interest of the masters, and sabotage did not mean violence, did not mean destruction of property; that it was silly to talk of destruction of property when we had to recreate it, if it was a social requisite, and so on.

Q.—Did you ever advocate driving spikes into logs?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Cutting logs short?

A.—No, sir, although—

Q.—Is that sabotage?

A.—That mere fact of cutting a log short would not be destruction of property. Cutting the log short now, that is an idea that prevails, yet it is not true—

MR. NEBEKER: This is not responsive, if the Court please. The witness should not be permitted to make an argument on every question asked. I object to it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—Why isn't cutting logs short, sabotage?

A.—Because the only thing they succeed in doing by cutting logs short is in disorganizing the orders that the companies have. They do not waste any material which is just like the hog. All of the log is used. It is simply, if they have orders for certain sized material, it may tend to disorganize their order system; that is all, but there is no loss, no unusual loss attendant.

Q.—Did you ever say anything on the subject of fouling a gear or a line?

A.—No. You mean—well, I heard this witness here say something about fouling a line.

Q.—Well, did you ever—

A.—Say anything like that?

Q.—Make any comment about a line?

A.—Absolutely nothing of that kind.

Q.—Is that sabotage?

A.—Certainly not.

Q.—What is it?

A.—That is murder.

Q.—Now, you have had experience in the woods?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Mr. Doran, you know what a block is and how it operates?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And is it possible to foul a line?

A.—Why it is possible, yes; but it is not very probable unless you go and get a wagon tongue or something else, and a whole lot of help and pull slack in it and otherwise. It makes it practically impossible. Of course, nothing is really impossible, but you would never get a logger to indulge in it.

Q.—When a line fouls and breaks, Mr. Doran, what happens?

A.—All the loggers in the immediate vicinity are attempting to get over into the next county, because when a steel line parts, particularly with any strain in it, or even a hemp line, for that matter, when a line parts, she is just like a whip, you know, and saw —saw a man in two, saw their legs off, kill them; there is nothing to that. That is one of the things that a man is specially anxious to avoid.

Q.—Do you think that would be a good form of sabotage for working men?

A.—I never did advocate murder.

Q.—Have you heard others talk on sabotage, Mr. Doran?

A.—Why, yes.

Q.—Did you ever hear any I. W. W. advocate driving nails in logs or cutting them short or destruction and violence?

A.—No. Of course, I have heard men talk about —gossip that appears in a paper, but I never heard an I. W. W. advocate driving—no loggers advocate driving spikes or steel into logs, that have to be cut by themselves or other fellow workers.

Q.—Did you ever make any talk in which you referred to the war, after the declaration of war?

A.—Why, after I got back from Butte, I did not mention war at any time excepting in this sense, of course, I mentioned the class war, the war of the classes or something of that kind, but I think that the only comment I made on war was in connection with this, the Butte strike, the copper miners strike. The copper miners,—this appeared in the paper, the cop-

per miners had offered to have the mine turned over to the government, and this was their suggestion; they said that they would pay $8 a day to every man, woman and kid connected with the mine, that they would work 6 hours a day, that they would make the mine absolutely safe, and that they would guarantee to give the government all of the copper that the government wanted at a price not to exceed 2½ cents less than the government was then paying the copper company for it.

When this declaration came out, a statement appeared in the Anaconda Miner, I think, and Mr. Clark—some mention of the thing was made to Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark had berated the miners as unpatriotic citizens and emphasized the fact that the country was at war and that copper was a requisite, and any interference with the production of that requisite was unpatriotic, so when this suggestion was made to them, that the government come in and that these men would not go back to work, unless they got what they were striking for, he is supposed to have said ,or was quoted as having said, and I quoted him the same way, "To Hell with them; sooner than grant the demands of this bunch of maniacs and Anarchists here, I will flood the damn mines first."

Now, my only statement in connection with war had to do with that little incident, and I went on to enlarge, of course, upon the thing, stating that in the mind of a Mr. Clark, it was unpatriotic for workers to strike for living conditions in a mine, and for safety appliances, but that it was absolutely patriotic for him to threaten to cut off the government from all source of supply from that particular copper district by flooding the mines, and incidentally I understood that to flood the mines once meant the loss of considerable property, property that never could be used again, because to once flood them, they never could be emptied. Comments of that kind was the only comments I made on the war, and on the President's proclamation or Secretary Baker's eight-hour

day, I said we were perfectly willing to produce lumber, anxious to produce lumber; production of lumber was the thing we live by; we would produce lumber on the 8 hour basis, and that we wanted the government to exercise its influence to either have the lumber barons grant our demands or else to take over the proposition and we would run them on pretty much the same basis as the miners had guaranteed or offered. That is my only mention of war.

Q.—Well, after war became a fact, Mr. Doran, what was your attitude towards it?

A.—Well, like any other inevitable thing, I hadn't anything to say about it. We had it, and we were face to face with it, and that is all there was to it, although I said nothing either before the war or after the war.

Q.—Which cause did you favor, Mr. Doran?

A.—Now, you mean?

Q.—Yes.

A.—Well, I have a brother in France and another one about to go, both as officers, and I would naturally—blood is thicker than water; if there was not any other reason.

Q.—What is your attitude towards the Russian situation?

A.—Well, I feel that Russia has received—the Russians as a whole, as a people have received a tremendous abuse of confidence by their supposed Socialist friends in Germany, the Socialist comrades that deliberately went in and shot them down and so on. I am, of course, favorable to the Russian program.

Q.—Do you know Dr. Parker? I think you said you did.

A.—Yes, I know him well.

Q.—How long have you known him?

A.—Since 1913 or '14.

Q.—Now, you saw him last summer, Mr. Doran?

A.—Why, I saw him many times during the

spring. I say many times—as often as circumstances would permit, yes.

Q.—Now, in what capacity was Mr. Parker up in the Northwest, if you know?

A.—His own private position?

Q.—Now, did you confer with Dr. Parker about the strike?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How did you come to confer with him about it?

A.—Well, when Dr. Parker struck town, according to his statement he said—

MR. NEBEKER: Well, now, I object; this is hearsay.

MR. VANDERVEER: Your Honor, conversations are necessarily hearsay, but conversations—

THE COURT: Just a moment,

(Short interruption.)

MR. VANDERVEER: The witness is asked about a conversation with Dr. Parker. Counsel objected that it is hearsay. It is exactly on a par with the conversation that he sought to show as to the defendant Parenti, a similar matter and similar purpose, similar connection in every respect,

THE COURT: You want to get in statements by Parker?

MR. VANDERVEER: By both—the conversations.

THE COURT: On what theory is the Parker conversation admissible?

MR. VANDERVEER: To show what requests, if any were made by Parker and what reply was made, in the sense that the whole of any conversation is necessary to explain the parts of it—upon precisely the same theory which counsel asked a representative of the California Fruit Growers', or Packers' Association here if he attended a certain meeting, and if there was a representative of the government there and if he heard the representative of the government make a certain request and then if he heard

what Mr. Parenti replied to it, percisely the same situation for precisely the same purpose, only we put the other English on it.

MR. NEBEKER: Well, the question is an entirely different one, of course. In the one case it is proving the admission of a defendant, a party to the suit, which is always admissible, what was said to him and his answer or his silence in the presence of a statement made to him, is often admissible if he is a party to the suit. But Dr. Parker is not a party to this suit, and anything he said is not binding upon either party to this suit. Now, at most, this witness would only be able to testify, or his defendant would only be able to testify to the fact that he had had some conversation with Parker, and then if his statement is admissible under the rule your Honor has already made, that anything he has said during the period of the indictment is admissible in evidence, anything he said as an I. W. W., then he could tell us what he said, but that would not open up at all the door for his making statements that this, that and the other man said so and so to him.

THE COURT: Does this conversation relate to a conversation between this witness and Parker in some official capacity?

MR. VANDERVEER: Respecting what?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: The lumber situation.

MR. VANDERVEER: The lumber situation, the logging strike.

THE COURT: What was Parker's position?

A.—Parker told me he represented the president —Dr. Parker.

MR. NEBEKER: I move to strike out that statement as hearsay, as not competent evidence that Parker is or occupied any position, any official position in connection with the government.

MR. VANDERVEER: Why, if the Court please, their own witnesses have said who Parker is. I do not know why they stand here and question it.

MR. PORTER: We do question who he is.

THE COURT: Answer the question.

A.—What was the question. What was that last question you asked me?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—You say you had some conversations or conference with Dr. Carleton Parker?

MR. NEBEKER: Where is Parker now by the way?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: How did you come to have these conversations with him, these conferences?

A.—Well, when Parker first came to town he hunted me up; I was already in Seattle; he hunted me up; he missed me the first time he came to the hall,—several times he came to the hall. Finally he left word for me and as soon as I heard he was in town I went to see him. I did not know what his capacity was. As soon as I saw him and learned that his business was government business in connection with investigation of the lumber situation or aeroplane work, and for cantonment work, then, of course I was particularly anxious to see him, so he said to me—

Q.—About what date was this?

A.—Now, let me see. I was so blamed busy there, to call for exact dates is pretty hard. I think it is a matter of record in those minute books.

THE COURT: Was it during a time when the industry was suspended?

A.—Yes, sir; yes, sir.

THE COURT: About how long after?

A.—The early part of the strike.

MR. VANDERVEER: Q.—After you came back from Butte?

A.—Yes; because I had occasion to remark that I missed him by being in Butte. He said to me flatly, "Red"—he and I were old acquaintances, he said flatly, "Red, I am up here to find out something, I am not hiding anything from you; I am connected with the United States Government; I am not hiding anything from you, and knowing you personally I

feel I can get an honest statement of facts from you; therefore, I want to ask you some questions in connection with the situation here." So I said to him, "Yes, I have absolute confidence in you; I know that you cannot be bought and I will answer you any questions that you ask me, consistent with my position as only a member, but anything that calls for anything involving organization matters must be taken up with the organization. He understood that so he did not go into that.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—Were you reporting to the organization and receiving instructions?

A.—What is that?

Q.—Were you reporting to the organization and receiving instructions after this talk?

A.—As soon as I saw him I went to the committee or members of the committee at the headquarters and I told them who he was, and I told them of my personal confidence in him. Of course, you understand that during a strike everybody is looked upon with suspicion, particularly a government man; so. I said to them, "I know this man and personally there is not anything that I would not trust him with, and if you will take my personal endorsement for that much, I would like you fellows to consider him—at least consider the proposition of talking to him and keeping in touch with him." So, Martin and Whitehead and several of the others there, three or four of them knowing something of Parker's previous history and on this endorsement said, "Yes, that anything they could tell Parker and be of assistance to him they would gladly do it, knowing who he was and knowing that there was not any danger of the thing being misrepresented," so from then on I used to, as I would meet Parker, Parker used to tell me his impression of the investigation he had made, what he had found, ask me what I thought of the strike, and how it was going, and I might say that he said that it was generally recognized the justice of our claim was generally recognized and that the gover-

nor had told him that our claims were everything they should be and it was undoubted it would be granted and so forth. And he told me several times that from time to time he expected the Lumbermen's Association to grant the demands; that there was a big move on in the inside, but the opposition under a man named Grammar, who was secretary, as I understood it, prevented the thing going over. However, he said, there is no question of the ultimate winning of the strike.

Q.—Who is Mr. Grammar?

A.—As I understand it, Mr. Grammar is secretary of the Lumbermen's Association, the West Coast Lumbermen's Association; it may be he does not occupy that particular position. However, he was a power in the Lumbermen's Association move there in the North West.

Q.—Before when you mentioned the name Martin did you mean the defendant here in this case?

A.—John Martin, who was secretary of Seattle district 500; he is right there (Indicating defendant.)

Q.—Did you ever talk with Mr. Parker regarding the willingness of the men to go back to work?

A.—Yes, yes, in fact I asked him what he thought of the possibilities of the government taking hold of things. He said "these boys would go back?" I said, "Instantly; all they want is the 8 hour day; all they want is these sanitary camp conditions, and if the thing is granted, they will go back. "Well," he said, "the government needs the work, and the government will undoubtedly recognize the justice of the thing, and force or use their influence, so far as possible to force the concessions.

Q.—Did you discuss the question of the efficiency of the work when the men went back, if their demands were granted?

A.—Yes. He said that the lumber men recognized that it was absolutely hopeless to try and cut logs with a lot of ordinary strike breakers, because logs is something you cannot do unless you know the

game. You cannot go down to your slums and pick up loggers; you can get gun men, but not loggers.

Q.—You spoke in your speech about profiteering; what was the basis of your reference to profiteering that you made in your lecture?

A.—Well, of course I used that illustration—

Q.—What was the foundation?

A.—Well, the foundation was as broad as the reports of Industry; since 1914 the returns in the various corporations had been so enormous, such an enormous increase in profits; the steel trust, copper trust, why, in the first four months of 1917, while it had gained two hundred fifty million dollars, a quarter of a billion dollars in the speculation of wheat that was to go to Europe. Those were reports that came out of their own papers, and I spoke of that sort of stuff, and the increased price of lumber and everything as I found it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Take the witness.

CROSS EXAMINATION

By Mr. Nebeker.

Q.—Carleton Parker is dead, isn't he?

A.—I was informed that he died suddenly of pneumonia contracted—

Q.—Well, he is dead, is he?

A.—Yes.

Q.—All right.

A.—Last winter.

Q.—Have you got a trade?

A.—A trade? I have got an electrical workers card—not much of a trade left to it.

Q.—Are you a soap boxer as known to I. W. Ws'?

A.—Well, I am pretty well known, yes.

Q.—I say are you a soap boxer as known to them?

A.—Yes.

MR. VANDERVEER: A little louder, Mr. Doran, you are still talking to the same people over here.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—How long have you followed that occupation?

A.—How long have I followed what?

Q.—That occupation?

A.—Soap boxer?

Q.—Yes.

A.—All my soap boxing up to the fall of 1916 was purely a matter of personal—

Q.—Oh, but can't you answer my question. How long have you followed it?

A.—I have been giving this chart stuff about three and a half or four years.

Q.—Well, what other kind of stuff did you give before that?

A.—Along the same lines, without the aid of the chart.

Q.—For how long?

A.—For the I. W. W's, soap boxer?

Q.—Yes.

A.—Oh, about seven years, I guess, all told.

Q.—Altogether, beginning about 1913, 1912?

A.—1912, somewhere along in there.

MR. VANDERVEER: Seven years would be 1911.

MR. NEBEKER: 1911, about 1911, is when you commenced?

A.—1911, or '12, somewhere in there, yes.

Q.—Had you been any kind of an orator before —prior to that time?

A.—I never considered myself an orator at any time.

Q.—Well, I use that name,—had you been a speaker prior to that time?

A.—Not that I knew of. I used to get up in the local union meetings and talk; generally if I thought a thing I generally could say what I thought.

Q.—And could you also say things you didn't think?

A.—I am not in the habit of doing that; I kid myself if I do.

Q.—Did you ever sell patent medicine?

A.—No, sir; you bet your life I didn't.

Q.—You think you could, don't you?

A.—I haven't any idea.

Q.—Well, have you had any other vocation for the last seven years outside of speaking as a soap box orator for the I. W. W.?

A.—Well, now, what do you mean by vocation? I never got anything out of it.

Q.—Any kind of work?

A.—Why, I have worked on the job all of that time.

Q.—All of the time?

A.—All of the time, yes.

Q.—When was the last job you had, where you worked?

A.—The last job I had was when the strike came on.

Q.—That was about what, July 17th?

A.—July 17th.

Q.—What job did you have at that time?

A.—I worked in the blacksmith shop.

Q.—In what way?

A.—Well, it is a combination blacksmith shop, I do blacksmithing—

Q.—Can't you tell us without too much variation?

A.—I don't want you to misunderstand me. I want you to tell me just—I want to tell you just what the thing was.

MR. VANDERVEER: May it please the court, counsel's sole purpose in cross-examination seems to haggle and quibble rather than to get information. Now, I submit the witness has just as many rights as counsel has. The asking of a question gives the witness the right to answer, so long as he does directly in his own way.

THE COURT: The question is, what you did in the blacksmith shop.

A.—Well, I did everything. I worked around the machine bench, I worked at the forge, everything

that turned up in the machine shop, and blacksmith shop.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—That was a shop run by the Index Lumber Company?

A.—Yes, sir; right in the plant; that is, in their grounds.

Q.—At what place?

A.—At Index.

Q.—How long did you hold that job?

A.—I had only gone there,—I have forgotten, a couple of weeks or so before the strike came on.

THE COURT: We will suspend here until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon an adjournment was taken until the following day, Saturday, June 29, 1918, at 9:00 o'clock A. M.)

June 29, 1918, 9 o'clock A. M.

Court meet pursuant to adjournment.

(Roll call of defendants: All answered "Present.")

J. T. DORAN,

one of the defendants, resumed the stand as a witness in his own behalf, and testified as follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued)

By Mr. Nebeker:

Q.—You told us yesterday, Mr. Doran, about working for the Index Lumber Company for about two weeks in June of 1917.

THE COURT: Just a moment, Mr. Nebeker. I do wish you all would try to get here on time.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: One man's tardiness holds up everybody. Don't figure on getting the last car that will get you down to this court room a minute before court convenes. That is not fair to the rest of us. Go ahead.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—(Continuing.) In addition to the job you had at the Index Lumber Company place for about two weeks in 1917, how many other places did you work in that year?

A.—In 1917, that was in July, not June.

Q.—Well, June or July?

A.—During that year, from the fall of 1916 I worked for the organization entirely.

Q.—That is the only job you did at manual labor in 1917?

A.—The fall of 1916 and '17 up to the time I was arrested—

Q.—Well, now, how many jobs of manual labor of any kind did you perform in 1916?

A.—In 1916 I was working for the S. P. railroad and I had worked for the Edison Company, and due to the blackball, after working a number of months, I was let out on the S. P.

Q.—Oh, don't now, answer my questions, so we can go on. How many different places did you work in 1916?

A.—I worked on the S. P. rairoad and I sold automobile accessories during the summer and in the fall I came to Seattle.

Q.—How long at a time did you work for any one employer in 1916?

A.—1916, just long enough to stay ahead of a blacklist.

Q.—Well, how long would that be?

THE COURT: Mr. Witness, will you answer the question, what was the longest time?

A.—Several months, about three, I think.

THE COURT: Now look towards that last man, the man in the second row.

A.—I think the S. P. job lasted about three months.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—What were you doing for the S. P.?

A.—I was doing line work, electrical construction work, repair work.

Q.—In what department?

A.—Maintenance department.

Q.—Where?

A.—The city of Oakland. Now wait a minute,

that was in—I said 1916; that was the early part of 1916 and the latter part of 1915—the early part of 1916, I don't remember whether it was then I got out—no, I got out of there in December, 1915; 1916 I was not on the S. P. It was the fall of 1915 I was on the S. P., and then went south on the A. W. O. I was mixed up a little bit on that.

Q.—All right. What was the longest time you worked for one employer in 1916?

A.—In 1916 I did not work—I worked for the organization as an employee for a matter of about seven months.

Q.—Did you do any manual labor for the organization?

A.—Yes, I consider it manual labor, going about from place to place; I didn't do any work with tools.

Q.—Well, now, in 1915 you worked three months for the S. P., did you?

A.—For the S. P., yes.

Q.—What other employers did you work for in 1915?

A.—I worked on the Tri-City Labor Review, a labor paper of the city of Oakland; I worked out at Berkeley for the Acetelyne—I think it is the Commercial Acetelyne Gas Company, who installed a branch at Berkeley.

Q.—How long did you work for that company?

A.—Until the job was through; I wired it and worked on the plant itself, a matter of six or seven weeks I guess. Then I built a house for a friend; that took about two months.

Q.—Where was that built?

A.—That was built at Berkeley, or outside of Berkeley in the hills.

Q.—What is your friend's name?

A.—Miss Pollack.

Q.—What?

A.—Miss Pollack; she and her mother.

Q.—What other employment did you have at manual labor in 1915?

A.—I wheeled scrap iron and did common labor work, odd jobs as I could get them, and aside from that I worked on the San Francisco Railroads for an inventor, who was installing a safety device, street signals.

Q.—What was the longest period of time that you worked for any one employer in 1915, and who was he and where was he?

A.—Well, the employment on the paper was intermittent; it is not steady, although I was engaged for quite a period of time, day after day, one day after another, the nature of the work on the S. P. permitted me to get in more time, one day succeeding the other than any other job I had, but that was due to the nature of the work.

Q.—You have already spoken of that, as covering about three months?

A.—As near as I recall it it was about ten or twelve weeks, I think, yes, I think that is what it was.

Q.—Now, what was the next longest job you had in 1915?

A.—Previous to 1915—well, let's see, I came and I worked—I had many little jobs, two days here and a day there, just odd jobs as I could find them.

Q.—Yes. Well, now, in a general way was your employment during 1914 about the same?

A.—My employment during 1914—I worked for the Edison Electric Company.

Q.—For how long?

A.—Until the job was through.

Q.—Where?

A.—Out building a line, a line outside of Perdue, that is the Southern Sierra, not the Edison.

Q.—Over what period of time did your employment continue?

A.—Well, the nature of the work—

Q.—Oh, answer the question, over what period of time did it extend?

A.—Well, it ran sometimes for a week, sometimes

two weeks, sometimes a month, sometimes a couple of months; it depends on the nature of the job; they were construction jobs.

Q.—Now did you during any of those years have any position of superintendent with any employers? Were you a straw boss at any time?

A.—Yes, I was a sort of boss for this fellow building the San Francisco railways; that is, this electric system or signaling system, I kind of supervised the thing.

Q.—Who was that?

A.—He was a doctor, he is an inventor, a doctor, it is Italian, Giribelli from Oakland, a doctor from Oakland, Dr. Garibelli I think is the name; he invented this apparatus for safety device on street cars and I got the job of installing it.

Q.—He was just experimenting with it, was he?

A JURROR: A little louder, please.

A.—This doctor was an inventor of an apparatus for regulating traffic at street corners and he employed me to supervise the installation as an experiment on the San Francisco Street railways.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—You were not working for the railway company at the time?

A.—No, I was working for the doctor.

Q.—Well, outside of that were you ever straw boss anywhere of foreman or superintendent?

A.—Oh, I think not—no, I don't know that I was. I have been in semi-official authority—something I tried to avoid if possible.

Q.—You do try to avoid it?

A.—Deliberately try to avoid it?

Q.—Now you have told us why you left Butte, will you tell us why you went there?

A.—Yes, I went there to explain the position of the I. W. W.

Q.—Did you go on your own initiative or under instructions from somebody else?

A.—Why, I was asked to go and I went.

Q.—Who asked you to go?

A.—Dick Brazier, a member, a defendant here, asked me if I would go; he had a telegram and asked me if I would go, and I said yes.

Q.—He had a telegram from whom?

A.—I don't know who it was from. I suppose that it was from William D. Haywood; I don't know that; I think so.

Q.—You and Brazier were in Seattle at the time, were you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And when do you say you landed in Butte?

A.—I think I left Seattle on the 12th, arrived in Butte on the 13th and left on the 14th. I may be off a day, one day or the other.

Q.—Did you state in your direct testimony that you were in Butte on the 9th?

A.—I did not.

Q.—Did you see the telegram from Haywood to Brazier?

A.—I don't recall whether I did or not.

Q.—Brazier went with you to Butte, didn't he?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you remember whether that was a telegram saying that Kirkenen wanted an Irish speaker to go to Butte?

A.—I don't remember anything like that. I don't really believe I saw the telegram.

Q.—I see. Do you know Kirkenen?

A.—I never met the man in my life until I met him in Butte.

Q.—You did meet him in Butte then, did you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Did you know he was an I. W. W. secretary there at the time?

Q.—Well, was he?

A.—I did not.

Q.—You don't know whether he was or not?

A.—I don't know.

A.—No, sir, I simply met Kirkenen the same as I would meet any other reliable man in a district.

Q.—Well, don't you know that Kirkenen had headquarters there and was secretary at that time?

A.—I certainly do not know anything about that.

Q.—Well, do you say he did not have headquarters and was not secretary at that time?

A.—Well, there was no local there that I knew of, positively not.

Q.—Do you know Shannon?

A.—Yes, I am not well acquainted—

Q.—Didn't see him there?

A.—I met him there at this meeting—did not meet him; I was simply in the crowd with him and highballed him.

Q.—Do you know Peter Potagi?

A.—I met him there for the first time.

Q.—Did you know he was an I. W. W. leader?

A.—I never saw or heard of the man in my life until I met him there.

Q.—Did you meet him there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know Korpi?

A.—No, sir, I don't know him.

A.—I don't know the man; I don't recognize the name.

Q.—Nobody told you about him carrying a red flag in a parade a few days previous?

A.—Nobody had time to tell me anything.

Q.—Do you mean they did not or you did not?

A.—I mean those gunmen around there did not give them an opportunity.

Q.—Now did you learn Peter Kirkenen on the 6th of June, the next day after registration, wired to Haywood and asked him to send an Irish speaker to Butte as soon as possible?

A.—No, sir, I had no conference with anybody there. I was not permitted to get in touch, by circumstances, was not permitted.

Q.—If that was done, you never heard of it, is that so?

A.—I don't know anything about it.

Q.—Now, Mr. Doran, you visited a good many

of the lumber camps and the lumber mills in the northwest in 1917, did you, between April and October?

A.—Yes. That is west of the Hump, west of the Cascades.

Q.—I wish you would tell us just as briefly as you can each and every mill and each and every logging camp that you visited.

A.—You mean to go through the mill, to have gone through it?

Q.—No, just visit, went to them.

A.—Well, now—

Q.—Whether you went through them or not?

A.—That will require at least this explanation: Take a town like Arlington, for instance, it is just a streak in the road. Now there is no mill really right in Arlington, but right around Arlington there are woods and mills and things of that description.

Q.—Well, I will ask you to include in that any towns or villages or camps you visited that are near the various mills.

A.—Well, let us start from there then.

Q.—Yes.

A.—Arlington. Now there is a school house—

Q.—Now I would like you at the same time, if you will, to give us—this was a sort of trip you made over the country there, was it?

A.—I was on the trip continuously, you see.

Q.—I want to get the dates, the first date and the last date, as near as you can. I don't ask you for each one.

A.—I don't know as I can do that. You have got these lists, you can check them up.

Q.—Can't you tell when you first started out making the camps?

A.—I started out making camps immediately after the strike was called, I went out on the road.

Q.—When was that?

A.—The strike was called, I was in Index, the 20th, I think, or the 21st, it was when I left there.

Q.—Now, is that the first date when you started making these camps, visiting them?

A.—No, that is the time I came to Everett, then to Seattle.

Q.—Well, wait a minute. You know what I am trying to get at.

A.—I know, but I don't want you—

Q.—I want to know when you started out rounding up these lumber camps and mills.

A.—That is just exactly what I am trying to tell you.

Q.—When did you start, what date?

A.—I don't know; I can organize it for you this way—

Q.—Was it in June or July?

A.—It was in July.

Q.—All right. Now go ahead and tell us the various ones you visited.

A.—Well, I visited Arlington and a school house that is nine miles from Arlington, which is the center of population. I talked at this school house, the center of population for the Danaher camps, and I think there is Riggles, or Ruggles camp, I have forgotten the name of them; there are several camps in there; they are mostly stump ranches in that neighborhood, at the country school house—

Q.—Go ahead, let's hasten over this.

A.—Arlington and this school house; Bellingham, Monroe, Index, There is another little place there—well, I cannot recall that; Everett, Monroe, Seattle, Tacoma, Aberdeen, Elmer, Hoquiam, Raymond, South Bend, Port Angeles, Centralia, some kind of a picnic grounds outside of—right in the woods, outside of Port Angeles; Ballard; I think that is all I can recall now.

Q.—Now, there were strikes on at all of those places?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you were making speeches for the I. W. W. at all of those places?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You spoke about you experience in the lumber camps and the logging camps and the character of the food and working conditions. When did you ever work in a logging camp?

A.—I worked in that logging camp directly for the logging company.

Q.—When?

A.—I just explained to you, in July.

Q.—Of what year?

A.—The Index Lumber Company, in nineteen—

Q.—You mean during those two weeks?

A.—During those two weeks; a man can get awfully sick of that grub in two weeks.

Q.—I thought you were working in a blacksmith shop.

A.—Yes, but the nature of the work would take me out; I went and set a boiler out in the camp right smack up against the bunk house.

Q.—Did you sleep in the bunk house?

A.—No, I did not; I came back to town.

Q.—You would not sleep in one of those bunk houses?

A.—Well, I have often slept on the floor, the ground, rather than sleep in the bunk house—not necessarily a lumber bunk house, but almost any construction camp bunk house—often hit the ground.

Q.—Well, construction camp bunk house, what do you mean by that?

A.—Well, you see these construction camps, take all construction camps, it may be any kind of general work, pile work or line work or road construction or grading camps, things of that kind, camps that a man in that country, the situation is a little different from what it is here, east; camp conditions are generally about the same.

Q.—You are rambling now; just a moment. Do you mean to say that what you have said about the bunk houses of logging camps is based upon your experience in bunk houses in construction camps?

A.—On the whole what I have seen of bunk houses in the logging district, yes.

Q.—Now, I want you to give the name of some company, some logging or lumber company in the northwest, where you observed any of the conditions that you have mentioned, that is to say, where the bunks were constructed as you stated they were, were, and where they were vermin infested as you stated they were.

A.—Well, I didn't get any of the vermin at Index; the bunch kicked about it.

Q.—Just answer the question so we can proceed.

A.—Index is one place; going about from camp to camp, or from town location to town location.

Q.—Now you have named one.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Name another.

A.—I cannot tell you the name of this lumber company, but it is on the road between Elmer and Hoquiam, and I think it was one of the camps of one of these men that was on here, the Brothers camp there—you had one of these fellows as a witness.

Q.—Yes.

A.—The camp is located right alongside the road.

Q.—You mean Schaefer Brothers?

A.—Schaefer Brothers; I noticed that in passing through there.

Q.—What was the condition of that camp?

A.—Well, just the same as anything else.

Q.—Well what was it, what was the condition?

A.—Well, ordinary plain board buildings.

Q.—What kind of bunks did they have?

A.—I don't know; I wasn't inside of the bunks, in the Schaefer camp.

Q.—Well, now I am asking you to name some place where the bunks were of the character you have said they were.

A.—Well, I cannot be—I do not want to be certain about that particular design of bunk in places that I have visited, because I have only given super-

ficial consideration to them; that is where I was not personally interested; I was interested in Index.

Q.—Did you give as superficial consideration to it when you talked to these ignorant working men out in the field as you did on the ground?

A.—No, I know if I do not tell the truth to working men about their own conditions, they know I lie, and when I lie I hurt myself.

Q.—Yes; that is, if you lie and get caught at it, you mean. Is that the idea?

A.—When I talk of the conditions, if they do not experience what I talk about, they do not believe what I do say, so I am careful.

Q.—You never did work in a logging camp in your life, outside of the blacksmith shop in Index?

A.—Actually employed for a loging company, no.

Q.—Or at logging or lumber camps?

MR. VANDERVEER: I am going to bring officials here who inspected these camps for the State of Washington.

MR. NEBEKER: Counsel is testifying here.

THE COURT: This is perfectly proper cross examination, is it not?

MR. VANDERVEER: He has professed great anxiety to hurry and I said—

THE COURT: Is this proper cross examination?

MR. VANDERVEER: Why in the main it is, yes. I have not objected.

THE COURT: Well, the present question, is that?

MR. VANDERVEER: I did not make an objection, your Honor. I merely made a suggestion to counsel.

THE COURT: All right, go ahead.

MR. VANDERVEER: He is so anxious to hurry.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—Now, Mr. Doran, during the time that you were traveling around, you know the lumber camps, that is among the men that had been working or were working at the lumber camps in the northwest in 1917. Did you keep in touch

with the literature and newspapers of the organization?

A.—Not nearly as much as I should, no.

Q.—Well, did you get the Industrial Worker all the time while you were up through there?

A.—No, I tried to and could not.

Q.—Didn't you distribute numbers of the Industrial Worker around among these men during that time?

A.—No, sir, I don't believe I ever distributed a paper of any kind. I was not fortunate enough to have them. I might have had from time to time a single copy of my own that I would give to some man, but otherwise I could not catch up with the literature; I was moving too fast.

Q.—You did not see the Industrial Worker, I assume, from time to time during this period?

A.—Oh, of course I did as often as I could.

Q.—And whenever you got one of the Industrial Worker you read it through, didn't you?

A.—Sometimes; I always—

Q.—You noticed the headlines about the strike and what the purpose of the strike was, did you?

A.—As a general thing I would read it if I got a copy of it.

Q.—And did you also receive Solidarity during that period of time?

A.—I don't think that at any time I received a copy of Solidarity. Solidarity is an eastern organ, and I did not get hold of it very often.

Q.—So you think during all that time you never saw a single issue of Solidarity?

A.—Well, unless I saw it in the window—not to read it; I don't think so.

Q.—Did you see any of the bulletins that were issued from time to time by 500, and by 400, and from Headquarters here with respect to the purposes of the strike?

A.—I tried to catch every 500 bulletin that came

out. Very often I didn't get them. I tried to get them.

Q.—So that in that way do you say that you did keep pretty well informed as to the general policies of the I. W. W. in conducting that strike?

A.—Yes, I was in direct touch with the man—

Q.—Well, but I am asking you now as to the policies, as directed by the officials of the organization?

A.—I was in direct contact with John Martin, secretary, all the time, and he gave me such information—

Q.—He was secretary of what, at that time?

A.—500, at Seattle, that is the district.

Q.—Did you have a strike committee acting in connection with John Martin there?

A.—There was a strike committee, I don't know—

Q.—Who were the men?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—Was Hunsburger one of them?

A.—I don't know whether he was or not.

Q.—Do you know Hunsburger?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—He was an I. W . W., wasn't he?

A.—I believe he was, yes.

Q.—Wasn't he right there acting with Martin, in the same office, all of this time?

A.—I don't know anything about it; I was on the road; I know Hunsburger was around town.

Q.—Do you know Baker?

A.—Which Baker?

Q.—Well, Frank Baker?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Wasn't he a member of that strike committee, together with Hunsburger?

A.—I don't believe so. He belonged to another union.

Q.—Do you know O'Brien?

A.—Yes, I know O'Brien.

Q.—James O'Brien?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was he a member of that committee?

A.—Yes, O'Brien was a member of some committee there, I presume, the strike committee.

Q.—Well, now, you mean to say that while you were out there going around, you knew these men but you did not know who constituted the strike committee under which you were acting?

A.—I did not know the full committee, no; I was directly in touch with Martin, to get instructions from Martin that the strike committee had given him, as secretary.

Q.—How many times did you visit Seattle during this period?

A.—Well, I don't know; I started out to follow my whole course—

Q.—Well now, that is not answering the question, Doran, and you know it.

A.—I know, but I don't want to make any misstatements.

Q.—All right. So you don't know then how many times you visited Seattle?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—About how many times?

A.—I don't know, six or eight or ten, something of that kind.

Q.—Once a month?

A.—Yes, more often than that, perhaps.

Q.—Twice a month?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Three times, or four?

A.—I should say in the course of the whole ten or twelve weeks perhaps ten or twelve trips in—back to town, from some outlaying district.

Q.—At least once a week you visited Seattle?

A.—Not always; I presume so, about once a week.

Q.—Did you always go to headquarters?

A.—I always saw Martin.

Q.—Did you always go to headquarters where he was?

A.—I always went to headquarters where he was?

Q.—You never learned that Hunsburger was chairman of the strike committee?

A.—You must understand that there are a number of committees there. Hunsburger was in the office; I don't know what his official business was.

Q.—You did not know that O'Brien was a member of the strike committee?

A.—I knew O'Brien was a member of the strike committee.

Q.—The very strike committee under which you were acting?

A.—Yes. I knew that O'Brien was but I did not know about Hunsburger. Do not misunderstand. There are several committees all working actively around there at the same time, some local and some district; it is easy to confuse them.

Q.—I am speaking of the strike committee that had general jurisdiction under Martin over the entire lumber strike.

A.—Well, O'Brien—

Q.—Wasn't there such a committee?

A.—Yes, and O'Brien was on it. I would not say so much for Hunsburger because I don't know.

Q.—Do you know anybody else on that committee?

A.—Yes, there was a big, tall narrow fellow from Centralia, I don't know what his name was; I knew the man but I don't know his name.

MR. VANDERVEER: You are confusing the strike committee and organization committee.

A.—He was on it.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—Your work was marked out for you by Martin and this strike committee, was it?

A.—To this extent, that they would tell me "The bunch wants you at so and so," and I would go.

Q.—And you never communicated at all with the strike committee?

A.—Except for date purposes or maybe a meeting would be changed somewhere.

Q.—In such a case with whom did you communicate?

A.—John Martin.

Q.—John Martin was not on the strike committee, was he?

A.—John Martin was the secretary of the district, and he was the man I did business with.

Q.—Answer the question. Was he on the strike committee?

A.—I don't know.

Q.—I believ you stated that you had no difficulty in picking out gunmen, did you?

A.—I said that, yes.

Q.—That was from their appearance, they looked like gunmen?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That is, men who carry guns, is that what you mean?

A.—No, I meant that contemptible type that usually flock around to administer law and order.

Q.—It is not every man that carries a pistol in his pocket that you refer to then?

A.—Why certainly not.

Q.—You have carried a gun yourself, haven't you?

A.—Not as a usual thing, no.

Q.—Well, you have done so, haven't you?

A.—Why, some times.

Q.—Did you ever shoot anybody?

A.—No, I never shot anybody.

Q.—Didn't you shoot a man in the leg one time?

A.—I did not.

Q.—And weren't you charged with having done so?

A.—I was charged and held I believe fifty-seven days and never tried; they turned me out.

Q.—As a matter of fact, didn't you shoot the man in the leg?

A.—I certainly did not shoot him. Why didn't they try me, if they thought so?

Q.—Well, the prosecuting witness himself failed to appear, didn't he?

A.—The prosecuting witness said that I was not the man.

Q.—How many times have you been arrested, Doran?

MR. VANDERVEER: Wait a minute, now. Now this incident is over, your Honor, I move to strike it out and I ask your Honor to caution counsel that that is not proper cross examination. The commission of crime is not a subject of examination. It is only the conviction of crime.

THE COURT: In view of the witness' testimony about gunmen, it is proper cross axamination, to ask him if he did not carry a gun or shoot somebody or was accused of it.

MR. VANDERVEER: I would like an exception.

THE COURT: Proceed.

MR. NEBEKER: Q.—How many times have you been arrested?

A.—I have been persecuted and arrested a number of times, never tried.

Q.—Answer my question; how many times have you been arrested?

A.—In Los Angeles they arrested me four or five times a week for months, and never let me see a judge.

Q.—How many times have you been arrested?

A.—I don't know, hundreds of times on that kind of charge; I was never convicted of a felony in my life.

Q.—Have you been arrested a dozen times?

A.—Yes, several dozen times.

Q.—In every case you were in the right and they were in the wrong, I suppose?

A.—They never tried me.

Q.—Answer my question.

A.—I don't know. They never took it to a show down; I presume I was right.

MR. NEBEKER: That is all.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Christensen:

Q.—When you went out to those camps to talk, did you go out under the direction of the committee or invitation of the branches?

A.—Why, they would send to Martin, telling him to have me go, and Martin would tell me who wanted me, and I would go; the bunch on the job did that; they arranged the meetings themselves, as I understand it.

Q.—And up to 1916 you had done no work for the organization?

A.—Not under pay.

MR. NEBEKER: I object to that.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—I mean under pay.

A.—Yes, two weeks in Phoenix once, that is all.

Q.—And that is all?

A.—And then this, I want to say, because I had forgotten the incident before, where I worked for the A. W. O. I worked seven months under salary of $10 a week, which I never collected. I collected, I think, $90 or $92 for seven months work at $10 a week. The rest of it—profit and loss.

Q.—And you made your own living at your trade and such jobs as you could get?

A.—On the odd jobs, anything I could make a living at, any kind of work I could get; my trade, if I could get a job at it, because it paid me more money; if I could not, I took anything.

Q.—You say you are blacklisted as an electrical worker also, prior to that time, 1916?

A.—Well, yes.

Q.—And since?

A.—I have got to use an assumed name to get a job. They can me every place I go; not that I am not a mechanic. I have got a book here, should be, in

the Public Library, proving I am a mechanic, a text book.

Q.—You are the author of a book?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the title of the book?

A.—I wrote the book entitled: "Explanation of Switch and Signal Circuits," the only, I believe up to date the only mechanic's handbook that has been used in connection with the electrical system of signaling.

I am a mechanic, nobody questions that, and yet they can me as soon as they find out who I am; that is black list.

Q.—That book is used by whom, Mr. Doran?

A.—Why—

MR. NEBEKER: This is a conclusion. I object to it as immaterial and irrelevant and not redirect.

THE COURT: What is it? I cannot hear what you gentlemen say down here.

MR. NEBEKER: Well, I beg your Honor's pardon. I thought you were close enough. I object to that as immaterial and irrelevant and calling for a conclusion of the witness and not redirect.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Answer the question.

A.—Well, I don't know who is using them outside of mechanics engaged in that line of business. They bought a number of them at the time, but I quit publishing them. I found I was making pretty efficient slaves and I quit publishing them.

Q.—How long ago is it, Mr. Doran, since Sammy Gompers has done any manual labor?

A.—Oh, God, I don't know.

MR. NEBEKER: What is that?

A.—I said I don't know.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: These two pamphlets I show you here, state whether or not you are the author of those two pamphlets?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do these two pamphlets cover part of the

lecture that you delivered here, which was your usual lecture?

A.—Why yes, except that they were organized for reading purposes rather than illustrative purposes; in substance the same thing appears throughout my talk, the substance of it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I offer these in evidence.

(Exhibits marked Defendants' Exhibits 58 and 59.)

MR. CHRISTENSEN: You say that you were working for the Tri-City paper?

A.—Yes, I worked for the labor outfit there, the A. F. of L., the official organ of the Central Labor Council. I worked on the advertising end and then used to write a number of articles for the paper, local stuff.

Q.—Was that the official organ of—

A.—The Central Labor Council of Alameda, the Tri-City Labor Review represents the Tri groups there, Alameda, Berkeley and Oakland, you see. It is the official organ of the Central Labor Council, American Federation of Labor.

Q.—Did you bring your card with you this morning?

A.—I did.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mark that.

(Card referred to was marked Defendants' Exhibit 60 for identification.)

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I show you Defendants' Exhibit for identification, number 60. State what that is?

A.—It is a receipt from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers signed by Billy Delaney of Local Union 77, I. B. W., City of Seattle, Washington.

Q.—I see that this receipt bears the name of "J. D. Thompson" or Thomas.

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Is that the receipt that you received in payment of dues, in that way?

A.—That is my receipt, yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell us why the receipt was made to J. D. Thomas?

A.—My name is John Thomas Doran, and because Doran, plus the red head, is pretty easy to keep track of, and not willing to use an alias unnecessarily, I used the name J. D. Thomas, just turned the last initial into the middle initial and used my middle name, and the Executive Board of Local Union 77 in the city of Seattle, did that for me, in order to help me get a job and make a living, it was so hard to make it without it.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I offer that in evidence.

MR. NEBEKER: No objection.

(Document marked Defendants' Exhibit 60 received in evidence.)

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Doran, one or two questions I forgot to ask you yesterday. Did you ever conspire with any one to interfere with enlistments?

A.—No, sir, absolutely not.

Q.—Did you ever conspire with any one to interfere with the operation of the selective service draft act?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you ever in your talks make any mention of that?

A.—No, sir. I paid no attention to that at all.

Q.—Did you ever conspire with any one to cause disloyalty and insubordination in the service?

A.—Absolutely not.

Q.—Did you ever do anything to do that?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you conspire with any one to curtail the supplies for the government?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Or to keep the government from getting necessary supplies?

A.—No, sir, I struck for living conditions but I did not conspire to curtail any government products

or anything of the kind—had not that in mind; I was striking for living conditions.

Q.—Did you ever enter into any conspiracy at all with any I. W. W.'ites?

A.—No.

Q.—Did your activities in 1917 in any respect differ from your activities prior to 1917?

MR. NEBEKER: This is objected to as asking for a conclusion of the witness.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—Well, the things you did in 1917 in making your talks and so on, and your activities, were they the same as your activities prior to the declaration of war, in 1917?

A.—Yes, of course.

Q.—Was your motive the same after the declaration of war in connection with your activities, as they were prior?

A.—Absolutely.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: That is all.

RE CROSS EXAMINATION BY
Mr. Nebeker:

Q.—The declaration of war by the United States against the Imperial German Government did not change your attitude on the general subject at all, is that the idea?

A.—I had not discussed the war before nor after.

Q.—Just answer that, if you please.

A.—What do you mean by that?

Q.—Did it change your attitude or your motives in any way?

A.—Well no, because I had not had anything in confliction witn it.

Q.—I am not asking you the cause. Did it?

A.—It was the same all the time.

Q.—Absolutely. You say you did not conspire with anyb dy. You did act harmoniously with these other defendants, didn't you?

A.—To get eight hours and more pork chops, yes.

Q.—Answer the question.

A.—Yes.

Q.—You acted harmoniously with an understanding with these other defendants?

A.—On a strike, yes.

Q.—And in general as to the policies of the I. W. W.?

A.—Any official such as—

Q.—You can answer that.

A.—Now wait a minute. Any official such as Martin, I worked in harmony with.

Q.—Well, were you at loggerheads with any of the other officials?

A.—I did not have anything to do with other officials.

Q.—Well, was there any dispute between you, for example, and Haywood, as to any matter of policy affecting the organization?

A.—I had no connection with Haywood, no correspondence, nothing to do with him.

Q.—Well, you did not answer the question, Red.

A.—Well, then I cannot say that there was not a confliction and I cannot leave the impression that there was not a confliction, because I had nothing to do with him.

Q.—I am going to ask you the same question about others. Did you have any dispute with Forrest Edwards?

A.—No, sir, I never saw the man before.

Q.—Or with Rowan?

A.—I did not see Rowan.

Q.—So far as you know, your purpose was to act in harmony with all these officers of the organization as far as you knew what their policies were?

A.—Anything strictly organization matters—

Q.—You never called upon any of these officials of the organization to adopt a different policy from what you knew they were following, did you?

A.—Well—

Q.—That can be answered yes or no.

A.—Well, I have suggested things, yes.

Q.—Have you ever done it in writing?
A.—No.
MR. NEBEKER: That is all.
A.—I have suggested things.
MR. NEBEKER: That is all.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: That is all. Exhibits 58 and 59—
MR. NEBEKER: Oh, just a moment here. Have you offered those in evidence?
MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yes.
MR. NEBEKER: I wanted to inquire about them before Doran leaves the stand. Just a word:
Q.—Are these exhibits 58 and 59, when were they printed?
A.—I don't know when they were printed; they were printed as near as I believe, as near as I remember, in November or December.
Q.—Of last year. Well, were they written in December of last year?
A.—I am pretty certain that they were written in November.
MR. NEBEKER: Well, they are objected to as immaterial and irrelevant.
MR. CHRIISTENSEN: I think he testified that the substance covered his lectures.
THE COURT: He says they were written after the indictment. Sustained.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: Q.—Were they written while you were in jail?
A.—Yes.
MR. CHRISTENSEN: I see. I will pass this exhibit to tne jury. (Handing to the jury Defendants' Exhibit number 60.)
(Witness excused.)

NEW PUBLICATIONS

The following is a list of new books published by the General Defense Committee

The Everett Massacre

By WALKER C. SMITH **Price Postpaid $1.00**

A clear, concise statement of Everett's Bloody Sunday and its aftermath. Cloth bound.

Opening Statement of Geo. F. Vanderveer

The opening argument of Attorney Vanderveer in the Chicago cases. **Price 10 cents**

Testimony of Wm. D. Haywood before the Industrial Relations Commission

A remarkable word picture of the I. W. W. **Price 15 cents**

Evidence and Cross Examination of Wm. D. Haywood

An interesting chapter in the I. W. W. cases. **Price 25 cents**

Evidence and Cross Examination of J. T. (Red) Doran

Red Doran's famous lecture, delivered in the Courtroom. **Price 15 cents**

Order from the

General Defense Committee

1001 W. Madison St. Chicago, Illinois

Funds Are Still Needed

These men, some of whom have been in jail for more than a year, appeal to your sense of justice and fair play to insure them a fair and impartial trial.

■ ■ ■

The great trial in Chicago, which resulted in the conviction of 101, has drained the resources of the Organization to such an extent that we must again appeal to you if we are to provide any kind of a defense for these men whose ONLY CRIME has been LOYALTY to the WORKING CLASS.

■ ■ ■

SEND ALL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE

GENERAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE

1001 West Madison Street **Chicago, Illinois**