

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION
INDUSTRIAL WORKERS
OF THE WORLD
HELD AT CHICAGO, ILL., 1907

Stenographically Reported by
W.S. McDERMUTT

OFFICIAL REPORT

Published by Authority of the Convention.

Transcribed from the original newspapers and edited by
ROBERT BILLS
For the official website of the
Socialist Labor Party of America

Uploaded August 2011

FIRST DAY—MONDAY, SEPT. 16, 1907.
MORNING SESSION.

The Third Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World was called to order at 10 o'clock A.M., by Wm. E. Trautmann, General Secretary-Treasurer, who thereupon read the official call, under which the convention met.

Following the reading of the call, the Secretary-Treasurer addressed the delegates as follows:

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The constitution providing that the Secretary shall call the convention to order, I hereby declare the convention open for the transaction of business. The first business before the convention will be the election of a temporary chairman to act until the convention is legally organized by the accredited delegates. Nominations are now in order.

Fellow Worker Katz of Paterson, N.J., was nominated. No further nominations being made, on motion the nominations were closed and Fellow Worker Katz was unanimously elected temporary chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATZ: Fellow workers: According to the constitution, Article 3, Section 2, the General Executive Board shall draw up a list of delegates against whom no contest has been filed at the general office, to go to the convention; the secretary shall read the aforesaid list and the delegates on the said list shall proceed to form a temporary organization by electing a temporary chairman, etc. Now, the first order of business will be for the General Executive Board or the General Secretary to read the list of uncontested delegates. The Secretary has the floor.

The Secretary read the following list of delegates, locals represented, and number of votes for each delegate:

Local Unions—	Votes.
E. Aiazzone, 510, 120, 67	3
C.H. Axelson, 64, 356	2
F.H. Alexander, 86	1
P. Bohm, 538	4
N.R. Benson, 116, 258	5
August Boesche, 17	1
G.M. Conover, 6	1
Paterson Delegation, Katz, Caminita, Trainer, 152	28
D. De Leon, 161, 58, 192	3
J. Desmond, 215	1
T.W. Delaney, 43	1

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

F.E. Dressler, 83	1
A. Finnigan, 150	1
E.J. Foote, 205, 224, 8	3
J.L. Frank, 215	1
W. Glover, 33	1
L. Ginther, 327	1
H. Hagenson, 84	1
F.D. Henion, 14	1
Wm. Herrman, 270, 239	2
H.J. Huber, 174, 503	3
J. Issach, 221	1
J.A. Jones, 529	1
A.J. Kraft, 262	2
F.G. Kremer, 123	1
Arthur Keep, 257	1
F. Liesner, 72, 251	2
J. Levoy, 1	1
M. Lindner, 52	1
A. Ohman, 125	1
W.J. Pinkerton, 17	1
P. Quinlan, 29	2
H. Reigate, 554, 238, 190, 53	4
S. Rotkowitz, 89	1
Wm. Rice, 500	1
George Speed, 92, 276	12
J.H. Schwend, 105	1
G.F. Spettel, 307	1
W.H. Thomas, 302, 555	2
W.A. Walters, 130, 179, 91	3
B.H. Williams, 233, 98, 236, 330, 283, 363, 263	11
C.L. Webert, (New Bedford, Mass.)	3
G.N. Young, 159	1
Wm. Yates	3
Vincent St. John	1
A. Mischele	1
T.J. Cole	1
F.W. Heslewood	1
Eugene Fischer	1
W.E. Trautmann	1
M.P. Haggerty	1

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The General Executive Board, upon investigation, desires to contest the credentials of fellow worker Sam French, because he is not a member of Local Union No. 266, of Bridgeport, Conn., which local elected him as delegate to this convention. (Article 3, Sec. 11.)

Also the credentials of C.G. Covert, elected by Local Union 196, Youngstown, Ohio. There is no constitutional provision to cover the protest, but as said local paid only \$5.25 from October, 1906, to August 12, 1907, and then paid on that date the amount of \$15 for tax, it is apparent that this was done so that the local would be entitled to representation at this convention. This contest is made for the purpose of enforcing a ruling of the convention on such doubtful cases.

We have also received the credentials of a representative from Local Union 1475 of the United Mine Workers of America, at Panama, Ill. That delegate is here with instructions and requests from the organization, and it is recommended, that the convention consider the seating of the delegate at an opportune time.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the reading of the names of delegates whose seats have not been contested, and also the three others. According to Article 3 of the Constitution, the proper action to be taken now will be that those delegates against whom there is no protest elect a committee on credentials; that the delegates against whom there is no protest constitute the convention, and that we proceed with the roll call to see who is present and who is not present, and as the names of the delegates are read the delegates will step forward and receive their badges.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing before the house but acting on the protests now.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

DEL. FOOTE: The point of order is this: Before the badges are given out should not the convention be in the hands of a credentials committee to be appointed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that your point of order?

DEL. FOOTE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hold the point of order not well taken. The constitution is plain upon that. It says that the delegates against whom there is no protest shall constitute the convention. Now, there are only two against whom there is a protest, and I don't see why we could not go ahead.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

The delegates present then stepped forward in response to the calling of their names and received their badges.

DEL. JONES: A point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment. I will request the delegates not to speak until they obtain the floor. There is nothing before the house now until the Secretary concludes his report, and then we will proceed. The Secretary wishes to read a letter from some delegate who is not present, and then we will proceed with the regular order of business.

COMMUNICATIONS.

The Secretary read the following two communications:

Goldfield, Nev., Sept. 11, 1907.

W.E. Trautmann,
Chicago, Ill.

Fellow Worker:—

I have been putting off writing in hopes of being able to start for Chicago any day, but am not able to start up to date and do not expect to be able to leave here any time in the next thirty days. Our trials have not been set and we cannot get any inkling from the prosecution when we will be called. Court is in session, and while it is improbable that we will be called on to appear any way soon, nevertheless it is in their power to call on us at any time to appear. I will have a report in for the convention in a day or so covering my work as Executive Board member for the past year. Remember me to all the delegates. With best wishes, I remain,

Yours for Industrial Unionism,

VINCENT ST. JOHN.

New York, Sept. 13, 1907.

Dear Comrade Trautmann.

I have just been to the office of the Hamburg-American line to find out when the steamer *Hamburg*, the ship on which Bohn and Heslewood are to arrive, and was informed that she will not be in the dock at Hoboken, N.J., until Thursday, Sept. 19. I am dropping this line to you so that you may act accordingly.

Yours most fraternally,

PAUL AUGUSTINE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow workers, you have now received your badges. I presume it is plain to those who are not delegates, that is, who have not a badge, that they will be seated in the rear part of the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

hall, and that around the tables only delegates whose credentials have been read will be seated. The first order of business now will be the election of a committee on credentials, a committee of five, I presume. How many shall the committee on credentials consist of? A motion will be in order.

Delegate Glover moved that a committee of five be elected. Motion seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominations are now in order.

The following nominations were made:

By Alexson: Foote.

By Levoy: Trainer.

By Foote: Pinkerton.

By Bohm: De Leon.

By Liesner: Glover.

By Hagenson: Axelson.

By Levoy: Spettel.

On motion of Delegate Bohm the nominations were closed.

Delegates De Leon and Spettel declined, and on motion the remaining five nominees were by acclamation elected as the committee on credentials.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Fellow worker Chairman, it would be advisable and it would expedite matters if a committee on rules and order of business should be elected by this convention right now, so that we can immediately proceed after this credential committee reports, with the report of the other committee; and it would be also advisable, if it meets with the approval of the convention, that we have a committee of three elected that would act in the revision of the stenographic report. You all have seen the announcement in the *Industrial Union Bulletin* that the stenographic report is going to be sent every day to the subscribers, and every delegate will get the full minutes right here the afternoon after the day of the convention, so that in order to have the minutes correct a committee of three should be elected to revise the proof every day and send it to the printers, so that we get it dispatched as soon as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the suggestion of the general secretary. What is your pleasure?

DEL. LIESNER: I move that a committee of three be appointed or elected to carry out the suggestions and also to act as a committee on revision of the stenographic report.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot do that. You have to take these things one at a time and elect the committees separately.

DEL. LIESNER: Then I will change my motion to elect the committee on rules.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the motion seconded?

DEL. DE LEON: What is it?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we proceed to elect a committee on rules and regulations.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominations for the committee on rules and regulations are now in order.

The following nominations for the committee on rules and regulations were made:

By Levoy: Thomas.

By Liesner: Haggerty.

By Foote: Herrmann.

By Axelson: Henion.

By Pinkerton: Spettel.

On motion of Del. Bohm the nominations were closed and the delegates as mentioned elected as a committee on rules and regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, about the other proposition, to elect a committee of three to revise the daily stenographic report.

On motion of Del. De Leon, the editor of the *Industrial Bulletin* was made a member of that committee and the Chairman thereof.

Secretary Trautmann suggested, in view of the advisability of having an experienced printer to act with the committee on revision, that Organizer Walsh, a printer, be made a member of the committee.

On motion of Del. Hagenon Organizer Walsh was elected a member of the committee.

Del. Levoy nominated Fellow Worker Caminita as a member of the committee.

On motion the nominations were then closed and the three nominees, Edwards, Caminita and Walsh, were elected as the committee on revision of the stenographic report.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: With the permission of the Chairman, I wish to make an announcement. I have given strict orders to the assistants in the office that no one, no matter who he be, be permitted to go over

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the files or documents of the organization without I be present and give permission. It happened two weeks ago that one of our organizers went through the drawers and the desk and everything in a search for documents, when I was absent looking for money. That thing should not be repeated. This morning it again happened that the files were gone through and even letters from the files were dropped on the floor. Now, such things cannot be tolerated in any office.

THE CHAIRMAN: It goes without saying that no one has a right to look over any documents unless the elected secretary is present and gives permission to do so.

Now, is there anything further before this convention at this time?

DEL. GLOVER: I wish to state that there ought to be something done in regard to when the convention shall convene again, that we should set the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly, that should be done now. Make a motion to that effect.

DEL. GLOVER: I would move that the convention adjourn to reconvene in the afternoon at 2 o'clock.

Motion seconded, and the convention thereupon at 10:55 adjourned until 2 o'clock P.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 16, 1907. AFTERNOON SESSION.

At two o'clock the Chairman made the following announcement:

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to announce that due to the fact that the Committee on Credentials is not yet ready to report, they have requested me to notify those who are here that they cannot be here until three o'clock, so that the session will be opened at three o'clock instead of two as was announced. Of course, most of the delegates were aware of this, so they did not come here. The Committee is still in session at the Bush Temple and the convention will be opened at three o'clock.

The hour of three o'clock having arrived the Chairman called the convention to order and the regular order of business was proceeded with as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: The convention will please be in order. Is the Committee on Credentials ready to report? Del. Foote, as the

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Chairman of that committee, I will ask you if the committee is ready to report?

DEL. FOOTE: The committee is ready to report. Secretary Pinkerton has the report ready.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary of the committee will now make his report.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS.

Del. Pinkerton submitted the report of the Committee on Credentials, which made few changes in the list appearing above.

During the reading of the report, Del. Pinkerton explained more at length certain action taken by the committee, as follows:

DEL. PINKERTON: In the case of L. Caminita, the votes are to be divided between the delegates from Paterson, N.J., and there is one of those vote that will have to be settled by those delegates themselves. The best conclusion the committee could arrive at was to give each one of the delegates nine votes, and the odd vote they will have to settle between themselves, so that would entitle Del Caminita to nine votes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think they would be satisfied with nine votes each.

DEL. PINKERTON: We would have given them nine and a third votes each, but there seemed to be an understanding between the delegates that they would settle it themselves.

DEL. TRAUTMANN: Allow the other two delegates nine votes each, and give Del. Katz, ten votes.

DEL. PINKERTON: All right.

In the case of Del. Reigate, one vote has been taken away from him. It will be explained in the minutes of the committee.

There was a contention in regard to the seating of the delegate from Local 196. It was the sense of the committee that the delegate from Local 196 be seated, and that Secretary Trautmann be called upon for further information in regard to this contention. In connection with this contention as to the delegate from 196, we recommend that action be taken by the convention covering such cases.

Del Pinkerton then read the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Credentials, as follows:

“Moved by Trainor, seconded by Axelson, that the credentials be turned over to the secretary to be acted upon one at a time. Carried.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

“F.H. Alexander, delegate of Local Union 86 of Omaha, Neb., is entitled to one vote upon representation of his credentials to the credential committee. Moved by Alexson, seconded by Trainor, that the 28 votes of Paterson, N.J., be divided equally between the delegates representing the district. John Desmond, Local Union 215 of Pittsburg, Pa., is entitled to a seat, but declines to accept on account of instructions from the local not being in accord with his opinions.

“We find that Local 192 is in good standing; that while the report shows only a per capita tax for \$3.50, that the local had stamps in advance for money forwarded when the organization was in need of funds. Moved by Trainor, seconded by Axelson, that the delegate from Local 190 be seated. Carried. In connection with the position assumed by Local 190 we recommend that action be taken by the convention covering such cases, the seat being contested under Section 11 of the constitution.

“Duplicate of credentials from Local 8 missing. Moved by Axelson, seconded by Trainor, that the case of Local Union No. 33 be submitted to the convention by Delegate Foote. Carried.

“Delegate Ludwig Gunther, of Local Union 237, is entitled to a seat on presentation of credentials. Moved by Axelson, seconded by Trainor, that French be seated, and that his case be presented to the convention, his case being contested because of his not being a member of the local sending him as delegate, which is in violation of Section 11 of the constitution. Recommendation from committee that a precedent be established for future guidance. Albert J. Kraft, Local Union 252, will be seated upon presentation of credentials.

“F.J. Kremer is entitled to a seat on presentation of credentials from Local 123.

“Arthur Keep, of Local Union 257, is entitled to a seat on presentation of credentials.

“Local Union 260 of Plainfield, N.J., requests that Rudolph Katz represent them if Patrick Quinlan cannot be present.

“Local Union 198 of Toronto, Canada, cannot be represented, owing to the fact that only \$3.80 per capita has been paid in the past six months.

“San Francisco Local No. 363 denied of vote on account of no payment of per capita in the last six months.

“Weber and Yates, from Local 157 of New Bedford, are entitled to 7 votes, making $3\frac{1}{2}$ each.

“Schwend, of Local 105 of Anaconda, Mont., is entitled to 2 votes, the per capita tax being paid from September 1.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

“Moved by Trainor and seconded by Axelson that Local 53 of New York be given representation and vote credited to Daniel De Leon. Moved by Trainor and seconded by Axelson that Anthony J. Francis be seated and given 4 votes. Speed’s claim for 12 votes cannot be allowed; 10 votes is all that can be permitted to one delegate, according to Section 14 of constitution.

“It is the sense of the committee that the Executive Board be seated and given one vote each.

“Moved by Glover, seconded by Trainor that the communication from the Unity Club requesting that Comrade Elizabeth Gurley Flynn be given a seat, same to be referred to the convention for action.

“We recommend that Comrade Flynn be seated and given a voice.

“We recommend that M.W. Fennell be given a seat with voice at the convention as representative from the coal miners in Panama, Ill. {”}

At the conclusion of the reading of the report and minutes of the Committee on Credentials, Del Pinkerton continued as follows:

DEL. PINKERTON: In our haste to get to the convention we neglected to elaborate this report as much as we possibly could have done, if we had taken the time. We wanted to get the delegates to work, and so we made our report as hurriedly as we could, and I will say in this connection that a couple of hours or even a half a day is not time enough to go over the work that was submitted to us to do in a couple of hours.

In regard to the representation of Miss Elizabeth Flynn, and also the Coal miners, they not being a part of the I.W.W., we recommend that they be given a seat with voice or vote, leaving it to the convention to take action. I will read the communications in this connection which were submitted to the committee:

Del. Pinkerton read the following communications:

“United Mine Workers of America,
Local Union No. 1475.
Panama, Ill., Sept. 14, 1907.

“This certifies that M.W. Fennel was duly elected a delegate by Local Union No. 1475, U.M.W.A., located at Panama, Ill., to represent them at the regular annual convention of the I.W.W., which convenes at Chicago, September 16, 1907.

“Given under the hand and seal of the secretary, 14th day of September, 1907.

“O.B. GERLACH,

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

(Seal)

“Sec. L.U. 1475,
“U.M.W.A.”

“Unity Club,

“New York, Sept. 12, 1907.

“To the Third Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World:

“Fraternal Greeting:—

“This is to certify to you that Comrade Elizabeth Gurley Flynn has been elected to represent the Unity Club as a fraternal delegate to your convention. May this convention be another stride toward our goal the emancipation of the working class. Speed the day.

“Yours for the unity of the workers,

“THE UNITY CLUB,

“ERNEST KATZ, Sec’y.

“JOHN COOKE, Organizer.”

DEL. PINKERTON: That constitutes the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now do you want to add anything to that, Secretary Trautmann? You said you had some further report to make.

DEL. TRAUTMANN: I understand from the committee that the matter you refer to will be taken up at the proper time. Of course, it is only proper for the convention to act now on the report submitted as a whole, and then we can take it up seriatim.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, fellow workers, you have heard the report of your committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. WALTERS: I move you that the report of the committee be received and take[n] up for action.

DEL. BOHM: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded that the report of the committee be taken up for action seriatim. Are you ready for the question?

The question was called for, and being put, unanimously prevailed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first part of the report will be the seating of the delegates where there is not question raised, and granting them the number of votes allotted by the report of the credentials committee.

DEL. WALTERS: Mr. Chairman, before voting upon that I would like to ask for some information from the chair or the committee. I see that they have credited me with four votes. I represent five unions, and

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

should have, I think, seven votes; at least I should have six.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you give the delegate any information on that Del. Trautmann?

DEL. TRAUTMANN: On the books he is only credited with four locals.

DEL. WALTERS: I brought the credentials with me and submitted them to the committee this morning, from Local 95 of the Building Trades of New York, and also from Local Industrial Union No. 15 of the Machinists and Metal Workers of New York. I handed those credentials to the Committee on Credentials this morning before they convened.

DEL. PINKERTON: We had those two credentials, but we could not find any record of the two locals.

DEL. WALTERS: I guess you can get the records from the General Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hope that no delegate will rise and speak until the Chairman gives him the floor.

DEL. GLOVER: I just wanted to say as one of that committee that I distinctly remember the credentials of Local 15, and that vote was given to Daniel De Leon, as a communication was received asking that that vote be turned over to him. That is why he gets four votes instead of three.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Committee I would suggest that the order which followed in the book in making our report, be followed; that is to say, that the roll-call be taken from that, and then the members who have points to bring up, do so when their name is called, and in that way we can get at it in a consecutive manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there is a motion now before the house to seat all these delegates and give them their votes as allotted to them in the report of the Credentials Committee. I think it would be best to take that action, with the exception of those who may raise some objection and who may later on go themselves to the committee again. That would be the proper thing to do. Now there is Fellow Worker Walters, who claims that he is entitled to seven votes and he is credited with only four. He may go back to the committee and they may look that up and it would not waste the time of this convention. If there is not objection I will put the question to a vote and then we can take these things up as we go along. Is there any objection?

DEL. REIGATE: I rise to a point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of information.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. REIGATE: I would like to ask in regard to Del. Covert: As I understand it none but actual wage workers shall belong to the membership, and I raise the point that Bro. Covert is not an actual worker, and therefore not entitled to be a delegate to this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the delegate present? Will he arise?

DEL. COVERT: I am present, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you an actual wage worker?

DEL. COVERT: Yes, sir.

DEL. TRAUTMANN: I desire to call the Chair's attention to the fact that objections should be presented during the progress of the reading of the report seriatim.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair stands corrected. Now we will proceed with the vote.

DEL. PINKERTON: I would like to make a correction in the report of the committee as to the vote allotted Fellow Workers De Leon and Walters. He is making a mistake; he has No. 53 and No. 15 confused. It is the vote of 53 that is allotted to him.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will proceed to vote on the motion that any delegates against whom there is no protest as in this case of Fellow Worker Walters, should be seated with the vote allotted to them by the Committee on Credentials. Are you ready for the question?

The question was called for and the motion prevailed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will take up the other cases as they come. Which is the next case that is not settled?

DEL. PINKERTON: There has been an error made in connection with Local 95 and Local 15, the papers having been mislaid. That is, the credentials are here, but information as to their standing we have not got.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have the printed list.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We have looked it up and Local 95 is entitled to three votes and No. 15 is entitled to one vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: That makes the four votes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Four votes more.

DEL. WALTERS: That makes me seven votes. I carry credentials from five unions; in one I am entitled to three votes and in the others I am entitled to one vote each; that makes my seven votes.

SEC. TRAUTMAN: What is the total number?

DEL. WALTERS: I haven't got that with me. I couldn't tell you what Local 15 has.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I can not find that out here.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. WALTERS: Yes, you can find it out there.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the numbers of the locals you represent.

DEL. WALTERS: I represent Local 91, I represent Local 179, I represent Local 15 Industrial Union, and No. 95 and No. 130.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the statement of Delegate Walters; what is your pleasure? Shall we refer it back to the Committee?

DEL. AIAZZONE: I move you that he be given the votes he is entitled to.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The general officers {office?} only received the credentials of three locals and the Credentials Committee received the balance. They were handed over directly to the Committee on Credentials.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we are clear upon it. Simply, the three credentials have not been acted upon that Fellow Worker Walters brought in today and handed directly to the committee. Now, a motion would be in order, then, when you state the motion, state how many votes he should get.

DEL. AIZONNE: Certainly, according to the standing there (indicating record).

DEL. PINKERTON: As secretary of the committee, I find out from Secretary Trautmann that Fellow Worker Walters is entitled to eight votes, instead of seven, and his credentials representing eight votes in our hands.

DEL. AIZONNE: Mr. Chairman, I move that he be given eight votes.

The motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the next case.

DEL. PINKERTON: There is no case to be acted on, unless somebody has objections.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is something to be left to the convention. Those we must decide. The Mine Workers' delegate?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No.

DEL. PINKERTON: Local 196. Now, Fellow Worker Trautmann is to give us an explanation in regard to this contest of 196. We have seated him, but there is some action that must be taken by this convention to establish precedents for the future.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: The reason why the credential was contested was not on any constitutional ground. The constitution does not cover that case. But we have seen, in the case of that organization, 196 of Youngstown, that the local had

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

only paid on the average of three and a half members for eleven months, and then a month prior to the convening of this convention they paid enough for one hundred members. That is, if they would have only paid once before dues to the organization they would not have been entitled to any delegation or representation at this convention; but, paying up at once for one hundred members, in a similar case—say, for instance, that they would have paid \$30, and would have paid it two months prior to the convention, they perhaps would have been entitled to two votes. Now, in case of such repetitions, or if the organization should grow, and no provisions should be made in that respect, then we may see the convention simply packed by delegates, no matter from what side they may come. Now, this organization and the convention should prevent the packing of any convention. If there is going to be an honest purpose that we are looking for, we should provide so that no stuffing and no fraud should be committed. I do not accuse the local of Youngstown, Ohio, of trying to defraud the organization, but it may be the case in future conventions, and in order to pass on a case and force a ruling of this convention and of this organization, it was necessary to take one case and protest it, so that a rule will be provided, and no such fraud in future be committed. I do not say that there is fraud in this case. That was the sole purpose of the testing of this credential by this contest. There are about two hundred locals, and if they had sent similar credentials their cases would have been protested by the General Executive Board. Now, the seating of this delegate does not do away with the failure to provide in the constitution for such cases; and we want, through this committee and this convention, to have the Constitution Committee instructed that a strict rule must be provided, so that such cases should never come before any future convention.

DEL. TRAINOR: Mr. Chairman: In regard to that, the committee has sent a recommendation to the convention that such things should be stated more explicitly in the constitution, to prevent occurrences of this kind in the hereafter. I believe Del. Pinkerton has that recommendation there.

DEL. PINKERTON: That was read.

DEL. LEVOY: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I would like to know if the Secretary sent credentials to that local?

SEC TRAUTMANN: When the credentials were sent out they were sent to all those that we had on the roll, on the directory, and that included this.

DEL. LEVOY: I would like to state that the local was not entitled to

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

credentials. The office did wrong in sending them credentials. If they were not in good standing, they were not entitled to credentials. On the other hand, I believe that the local in Youngstown, no matter what they say about it, carried on the fight for pretty nearly a year, and they were struggling along pretty well. And, if we are going to feel the pulse of this organization by the money we send in, I think we can stuff the convention just the same. We can get a lot of people in the locals, and elect delegates, as we had at the last convention, and we had a pretty hard fight to get them out of here. I believe, in the case of that local, if they were sent the credentials, the secretary's office did not look up the credentials—we ought to seat that delegate. They are spending their money and sending their delegate here to be represented.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the committee. What is your pleasure? We will have no more talk unless a motion is made.

DEL. HAGGERTY: I move you that this delegate from Youngstown be admitted to membership in this body. (Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That has already been done by the committee. That would mean to concur in the recommendation of the committee.

DEL. HAGGERTY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that would not do away with the future trouble.

DEL. HAGGERTY: It does not do away with any precautionary regulation that you may wish to inaugurate hereafter, not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded that this convention concurs in the report, or in seating the delegate from Youngstown. Does anyone desire the floor?

DEL. BOESCHE: I would like to have the delegate explain. I have seen communications, in Pittsburgh; the letterhead had "Covert Plumbing Establishment" of Youngstown, Ohio. Is he in business today, or has he been in business in the past?

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the fellow worker ready to explain that?

DEL. COVERT: Mr. Chairman, I have been in business, that is myself, but today I am out of business. They simply legislated me out. They couldn't get me out any other way, but they legislated me out, and I have no business.

Now, I would like to just explain about this condition, of how this per capita tax got mixed. We were very weak, but since we have been struggling and agitating the local has commenced to grow, and we have got money through that means, and sent it in to pay up our debt, and our local is growing; and for that reason we have the money, or

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

got the money, to pay up our tax and pay up to date. There was no intention on the part of us to run in delegates or anything of that kind. It was simply that we wanted to be square with the headquarters, and when we got the money we sent it in.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I would like to know if he is employed by anybody now or if he intends to set up something else.

THE CHAIRMAN: He just stated that he is a wage worker. Now, if you have any proof that he is not a wage worker, go before the Credential Committee again and bring it in writing. That is all we can do. You have heard the motion, that we concur in the report of the committee and seat the delegate from Youngstown. All in favor of this motion say aye, and all opposed no.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. Now, is there any action to be taken, so far as the recommendations of this committee are concerned, in making a provision in the constitution itself, or does that come up afterward? A motion ought to be made to that effect.

DEL. SCHWEND: Mr. Chairman, I move you that a committee of three be appointed by the chair to draft an amendment to the constitution to cover such cases as this we have just disposed of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, fellow workers, wouldn't it be better if you would make a motion that this be referred to the Committee on Constitution that is to be elected?

DEL. SCHWEND: That is all right, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Is that your motion?

DEL. SCHWEND: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been made. Is that motion seconded?

(The motion was duly seconded by several delegates.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded that this matter be referred to the Committee on Constitution, which is to be elected here this afternoon. Are you ready for the question?

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. What is the next case?

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading from report of the committee): "Moved by Axelson and seconded by Trainor that the case of Local Union No. 33 be submitted to the convention by its representative."

THE CHAIRMAN: The representative of Local 33.

DEL. GLOVER: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: It seems, according to the list that has been prepared by the general secretary, that we have paid no money to the general office during the last six

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

months. However, he brought out his ledger, and all that we could discover upon that ledger was that Local 33 had paid \$1.50. Now, stamps—

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In September.

DEL. GLOVER: What that \$1.50 is for I do not know, but I am quite sure it was not for stamps, and that at no time since Local 33 has been in existence has it ever bought less than \$5 worth of stamps, and I also know that there were stamps bought for Local 33 only a matter of three weeks ago, and I saw the stamps delivered into the hands of the financial secretary. Now, there must be some mistake somewhere. However, I cannot straighten out the matter at this time, but it is my intention to get in touch with the secretary as quick as possible and get him to look up the receipts from the general office and forward them to me, if possible, so that I can have them and present them to this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the secretary wish to speak on that?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I only have to state that up to this time there has been no error found, not a solitary one, about the payments, and the financial statements have been sent regularly the last three months to all local unions, their standing and what they have paid. Every local organization has been requested to report if they found any error. Now, if the secretary of Local 33 had found any error in the statement he would have so reported, undoubtedly. So it all depends on whether the secretary, if he was instructed to pay the money, has forwarded it to headquarters. I did not think about this case, otherwise I would have gone over the files. The organization ordered stamps in advance, and we advanced them all the time. There is not a solitary exception where we did not advance stamps, but the stamps are simply debited against the organization. I looked that up as soon as I came over.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any additional light to throw on this?

DEL. GLOVER: I do not care to take up the time, because I do not think it will help matters much, and I will let it rest as it is for the present.

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not require any action. We will take up the next case.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In the last convention, when you look up the stenographic report—or is it in the constitution? I have forgotten. It says that no local should be made to suffer in case of any fault of the secretary in not sending in regular per capita tax. That is either in the stenographic report or in the constitution.

A DELEGATE: Not in the constitution.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Not in the constitution? It is in the stenographic report then? I looked that up.

Del. Pinkerton then read further on the report of the committee as follows:

“Moved by Axelson, seconded by Trainor, that Fellow Worker French be seated, and that his case be presented to the convention, with recommendations that precedents be established for future guidance.”

DEL. BOHM: I move it be accepted.

DEL. PINKERTON: In the case of French, I believe that he is not a member of the local, but that they requested him to represent them here.

DEL. WALTERS: I move you that we receive this report, and concur in the recommendation of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, take similar action as we did take in the case of the delegate from Youngstown? Is that it?

DEL. WALTERS: No. I move that, in this matter, as I understand it, that this delegate is not representing his own union, but is representing another union, and the committee as I understand it reports favorably upon seating him, and I move that we concur in the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee also bring in a recommendation, just the same as in the Youngstown case. Now then, your motion is that Delegate French be seated?

DEL. WALTERS: Certainly. That we concur in the recommendation. And the recommendation goes further and states that there should be a precedent made, in order that this should not happen in the future. That means that we will turn this matter over to the Committee on Constitution after.

(Motion granted.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The Committee on Credentials has not explicitly stated the case. The constitution, as it stands today, is clear and explicit in the matter. It distinctly states that the delegate must be a member of his local union for at least six months. I was present when this case was argued, and this should have been brought out by the Committee on Credentials, that the reason why they seat this delegate, or recommend his seating, is because a precedent was established at the last convention in opposition to and in violation of the constitution.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

The constitution itself on this matter should not be changed, it is so distinct, and prevents any fraud, if there be any. But, because that precedent had been established, for that very reason the recommendation has been made that the delegate be seated. Now, in explaining to the Bridgeport people, it is not a question about French, or anybody else. I wrote distinctly that if French had been elected by his own local as delegate, perhaps no contest could have been lodged against his seating, even if he represented the Bridgeport local. But he had not been elected. Local number 113 of Bridgeport intended to send a delegate, or, at least, they inquired whether they could send one, and I understand that French was to have been sent as delegate, and for that very same reason, as I stated, having given the ruling on the constitution, they could not send him as a delegate, and they did not send any. Now then, comes the Italian local, 266, of Bridgeport, that sends him. The local is in good standing, and has a perfect right to be represented, but it cannot be represented, according to the clause in this constitution, by a proxy: It should be represented by its own delegate, and that is the reason why this contest has been made. If this convention upholds the recommendation of the Credentials Committee, then you simply overthrow the clause of that constitution. But, if you do it with the understanding that that clause should stand, and the precedent be abolished from now on, then well and good; or, you have to do away with the clause altogether. And that is the only reason why the delegate's credential has been contested. You should judge this matter from this viewpoint, in order to come to a conclusion.

DEL. FOOTE: The case of French was considered in the presence of French and in the presence of General Secretary Trautmann. I would like to have French here, to give his explanation of this. The constitutional clause there, as we know, is in itself ambiguous. It does not make a definite statement. It says that no member shall be elected from his local union unless he has been a member in good standing for at least six months, but it does not say, as I understand it, that he shall not be elected from another local. And the point is that French was not elected from his own local, but that another delegate is here representing his own local. He is elected from Bridgeport. French has an interesting explanation of this, and I would like to have him have the floor. The action of the Credential Committee it is possible that we could turn over. A precedent was established. The clause in the constitution is the same identically as the clause in the old constitution. The old constitution was taken up by this convention,

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

and this convention decided that this body itself was the constitution. We had that right when McMullen said that we had organized by that constitution, and not organized at all. I say that this convention has the power to act upon that. That clause in the constitution was not changed when it was brought from the old to the new. I would request that French be given the floor, for his explanation of this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make that as a motion?

DEL. FOOTE: Yes, sir, I would make that as a motion.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that French be given the floor. Any objections? If there is no objection we will give French the floor. Is he here?

DEL. FRENCH: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't make it too long.

DEL. FRENCH: No, I will make it short. Don't worry. I am not particularly anxious to make any scrap over this thing, but I would just like to see the principle of the matter threshed out, although I am not struck {stuck?} on becoming the scapegoat. Still, I want to explain, seeing that I cut out the explaining over at the Credential Committee: I want to explain how this came about, that I accepted that credential, and was willing to take a seat in this convention. There were certain developments, which it would take too long to explain here now, that have been taking place in Bridgeport, such as take place and will take place in every city, in every industrial center, that this movement will have a footing in. As soon as they get a footing, and we wake up not only the bosses' tools, the capitalists' henchmen, the police officers and newspapers and other things, we wake up in our own ranks all who have a yellow streak, and they will proceed to make as much mischief as possible.

Owing to that situation arising in Bridgeport Local 113, into which, by the way, the members of Local 266 had all transferred, because they were all English speaking and were all machinists and metal workers, and Local 266 continued a mixed local, through the Italian members that had come in, that were not metal and machinery workers, and who did not take part in this effort to disrupt, but rather did their best, and are doing their best to build up the organization in Bridgeport, but, of course, having to confine their efforts to their own race and their own language which they speak—in Local 113 a move was made, because they had plenty of money, to send, and they could have sent, two delegates. But these fellows who, trying to break up the movement, had to attack the fellow that was engineering all the fuss of

stirring up the town, and wanted to prevent any delegate from being sent, because they had no material themselves to send. And they voted not to send a delegate, and got the Hungarian branch to do likewise. They first were talking of sending a fellow worker in the English branch, and they nominated me and a Swedish fellow worker. And then the contention was raised there by the men who were engineering the disrupting game, this contention was raised. Now, the secretary of that branch did not write here. His name is Donderi. I do not think you have got any communication from him. The financial secretary is Henry Beaudreau. He sent that credential. The recording secretary's name is Dunderi.¹

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know him.

DEL. FRENCH: The secretary of Local 266 is Panarilla, whose name is signed on there. The secretary of Local 266 got no communication, and certainly had no communication with headquarters because—this present secretary of Local 266 has had no communication with headquarters, as I was trying to get their organization in shape, and their supplies I furnished them. Now, the situation becoming intensified, I finding myself in a muddle of crookedness and treachery, I made up my mind that I was going to come in here, if I had to beat a freight back home, and I told them that, and having to go to the Italian Local 266 last Tuesday night, when they met, talking with the men there about this situation, two or three men who talked English well, I told them I was coming in here. I said, "I will not only offset the work of those crooks, but I will go into Chicago and settle it up there." And then he said, "Are you going to get any credential for the convention?" I said, "I don't know; I understand that some of my friends in this town have written to Hartford and asked the Hartford fellows to give me a credential." And this fellow said, "Would you take a credential from us?" I said, "Sure; I will take any credential they give me, and take a chance on being seated; I would like to have a voice in the convention when I get there, but I am going there anyhow, whether I have a voice or not." He says, "You might as well have a credential from Local 266, but as we have no money we cannot pay any expenses towards it." I says, "You give me the credential. I will explain it." All right. He explained it to the Italians, who did not understand English, and the fellows were there and talked it over, and they had some general discussion, and made some motions for me to bring up certain things if I proceeded here, and they made out the credentials and

¹[Note the conflicting spellings of this name.—R.B.]

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

forwarded one here and gave me the other one. I told them there might be—

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker French, just a moment. There are some of your remarks that have no bearing upon the matter at all. I hope you will make it short. We have other business to transact.

DEL. FRENCH: All right. But I held the impression that this explanation was necessary to the getting of this credential.

Now this quibble—reference has been made to somebody writing on for information on that. In that English branch, where this point was raised, in the 113, no communication was read to that effect. The former secretary, and all the English-speaking members, withdrew, refused to take any part in this organization until the thing was straightened out. Well, now when this matter was brought up and discussed in both places, they asked me what I thought about this clause. I said, as far as that is concerned there may be a protest against this being seated, on this, because of this having been brought up in the other branch. I didn't think of that. I was aware of it. And I said, "Now, this thing has not been changed; it is just as it was last year, punctuation marks and all; and last year it was shown to be an India rubber section, and it was stretched. I myself last year represented—I had seven votes from Paterson, and I was a member of the same union of which I am a member now, and have been since the I.W.W. was formed, Local Number 73, but I happened to be over in Paterson, and was located there, and was seated here without any protest, and many others also.

Now, I held that that precedent having been established, and this thing not having been changed, that there was a fighting chance for me to be seated, if this organization—and possible the Hartford ones—desired to have me seated; and if it had not been, as I said before, for these fellows in 113 who were trying to put the movement on the bum in that city, they would have sent another delegate in here and taken a chance on getting him seated.

That was one contention. Then, as to the legality, I do not know as it is my place to argue on the effect of barring out a member who would come in in that way, because what those men wanted me to come here for, the men who wanted me to come here, was, that the locals in Connecticut are composed of men whose horizons are bounded by the one-horse towns they live in, and they figured that I having had considerable experience, and having been here before, and all that, they figured that it would be wise if they could get me here; and the fellows who opposed that contention made that plain, that you can

send any delegate at all. For instance, Local 266 could send one of its members, and there isn't a man in it—well, there is one, who can speak fluent English. The majority of them could not be understood at all. They would need an interpreter. But they couldn't send any one. They couldn't be represented here by one of their members, because he couldn't talk if he got here; he couldn't say anything without a translator. And they wanted certain things brought up here, and they asked me to try to get seated on their credentials. And my contention was that as long as the matter is brought up, and my contention is that this India rubber section having been shown to be India rubber last year, that precedent still holds, while I agree with the committee that something should be done to make the thing more definite and to avoid such complications in the future; yet I do not think it is worth while to make a scapegoat of Local 266, if you approve it now. But I am satisfied to accept the seat on that, if the convention is satisfied, and I am also satisfied to take part in straightening out that section, so that you will have no room for any further quibbles on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. DELANEY: I would like to speak on that motion. This section says that delegates to the convention from local unions must have been members in good standing in their local unions at least six months prior to the assembling of the convention, provided their local union has been organized that length of time.

That language may not be very explicit, but the meaning is certainly clear to me. The object, as it appears to me, is to keep any man from coming here as a representative of a local which does not know him, or which knows very little of him. I think that this convention is supposed to be composed of representatives of those locals,—not coming here to argue any particular case of their own, but coming here as representatives of those whom they carry credentials from. I think, from the statement of Fellow Worker French, that that is not the case with him.

I hope that motion will be voted down, and that we do not concur in the report. I do not think he is entitled to a seat.

DEL. FRANCIS: Section 14 of the Constitution says explicitly that if the locals cannot send by themselves, they should go in together and send a delegation, as in the case of Paterson, but it also says plainly that the delegation should be members of the unions. Now, in the French case, it simply amounts to this, that he has not a transfer, and I hope that when an industrial worker leaves a town, no matter under

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

what conditions, if he goes to work, he should get a transfer, and then, wherever he goes, if he gets a transfer, there would be no quibble about representation. French, as I understand, went to Bridgeport, but if he went with a transfer, then he could have been a member. But, as you are not a member there, according to the constitution, I do not see how the constitution can be stretched in your case and you be seated as a delegate. There is only one thing that can be done, and that is to leave out the precedent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? I want to say to the members that if they want the floor they should rise.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And give the names out loud.

THE CHAIRMAN: After they get the floor they can give their names, but when a man points his finger at me I don't know what he wants.

DEL. AXELSON: In regard to this case, and this recommendation by the Credentials Committee, I wish to say that I heard the discussion from both sides. We listened to the report, and to the remarks made by Trautmann, and to those of French. French's report, as he said to us, that last year they seated delegates in the same manner as they propose this delegate is to be seated now,—we listened to that report, and the trouble that has broken out in that locality, and we thought it would be a good thing to have a representative from that locality, and get that trouble threshed out. That is the reason we have recommended that this delegate be seated.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the report be concurred in, that is, that the delegate be seated, and the matter referred to the Constitution Committee.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, Mr. Chairman, they may talk about not going by a precedent, but at the last convention I can state three specific and distinct cases where delegates were seated in this body, and they are not cases where delegates were seated in this body from unions of which they were not members. I know that in New York, where I come from, this matter has been thoroughly discussed with the members, and the majority of the members maintain that if any delegate was sent to this convention, they would be seated, that this convention would not quibble on this clause of the constitution. Now, Kinneally came here last year. He was a member of 170—I mean, he was a member of 28, of the Transportation Department, and he was seated from local 179, as well. French at that time was a member of 179, and carried credentials from Paterson. Moskowitz of New York, he was a member of local number 358, and carried credentials from

other locals and not from his local. De Leon represented that local at this convention last year.

Now, this matter has been thoroughly discussed, as I said before, in New York, and the majority of the members in New York were convinced that this convention would seek delegates that were sent, with that clause in the constitution, that we would not quibble on such small matters.

Now, French has been up in this section of the country where this local which has sent him is located. He thoroughly understands the conditions there. He thoroughly understands all the fight that has taken place there in the last few months. He is the typical representative from that portion of the country.

Now, Trautmann tells us that he corresponds with the English speaking element of that local or one local, if I understand him correctly. I do not know whether he corresponds with this Italian local that sends French. If he has not, I am under the impression that that local sent him here with the same impression that the membership of New York have, and for this reason I hope that the delegates of this convention will take this matter under consideration and seat this delegate. Then we can recommend, or turn over to the constitution committee something that will eliminate this clause, and make it more specific.

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Workers: It seems clear to me that the delegate ought to be seated. To begin with, he has a due book which shows that he has been a member of the organization since it was founded. Consequently he is not a member who just simply jumped in in time to get hold of a credential, to defraud the organization. I do not see why he should not be seated, as well as I should be permitted to represent and organization who asked me to carry their credentials here and use their vote. It seems plain to me. I carried a card from the time I joined the organization. So does this delegate whose seat is contested, representing another local. Now, that is the difference? His card is clear. If he has been in good standing since the organization was founded he certainly has been in good standing six months prior to the granting of these credentials. It looks to me clear that he ought to be seated, and that it cannot conflict with the constitution, if that is the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us come to a vote upon this question.

DEL. THOMAS: I desire to say that it seems to me that this quibble that we are at regarding the seating of Comrade French, or Fellow Worker French, is inconsistent, even with the present report of your

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Credentials Committee. I am so situated that in the event you should decide that Fellow Worker French is not entitled to a seat in this convention, you will cut me down one vote, similar to my comrade or fellow worker here, for the reason that I represent two locals, and it would make it plain to me that those two locals cannot be satisfactorily represented at this convention, owing to the fact that they have not the fluent language that we English speaking have, with which to express themselves. Consequently they selected me, your humble servant, to represent them. That is, Blythedale local 302, and Duffy local 555. Now, if you decide in this convention to deprive French, whom you all know as a bona fide fellow worker, because he has his dues paid up, and he is in good standing, I am similarly so situated that if you decide against him, then I cannot vote consistently upon this question. And I for one desire that you will seat Fellow Worker French, and if not, then I will have to go back and report to Local 555 that though I was in good standing—I challenge the contradiction by the books—that they could not be allowed to be represented in this convention. You see, by that position that it is very inconsistent to make a scapegoat of one delegate and then, others similarly situated, in the same position, you will give a franchise in this convention, representing locals of which they are not members.

(Cries of “Question.”)

THE CHAIRMAN: Brother Trautmann has asked for the floor a number of times.

DEL. JONES: Section 11 says, “Delegates to the convention from local unions”—“from local unions.” It does not say their own local unions, but says they must have been members in good standing in their own local union six months previous to the convention. It says that they shall be delegates from local unions. They do not need to be in good standing in the local that they represent, but as long as they are in good standing in their own local unions, according to this section of the constitution.

DEL. HAGENSON: This case has not been brought out, in a way that it seems to be entirely understood by many. The main part of this case is not the precedent that was set a year ago, which left an opinion and weight of the membership of this organization throughout the country; and it is not very much the question of this particular delegate at this time. But it is the precedent, as it is left for the future. In my judgment it is very dangerous indeed to allow a man who is a total stranger to a membership which he is undertaking to represent to be elected a delegate to represent them. How can he possibly represent

them? He will only represent himself. He cannot represent that membership, because that membership does not know him, does not know what he expects to do, or what he is. And for that reason I believe there should be in the constitution of this organization some clause by which—

DEL. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. JONES: Will you interpret that Section 11? Does it say that the member shall be in good standing in his own local union? Is he entitled to represent any other local union, if he is in good standing in his own? Does the constitution say so, in that section?

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker Jones, you cannot expect the chairman to interpret the constitution if the Committee on Credentials was not clear. Now, this fellow worker is simply giving his version of it, as I understand it. Your point of order is not well taken.

DEL. HAGENSON: Now, I hope, if this constitution does allow a member to be seated who is not a member, who is not elected by his own local—which course may indicate that he was not in favor, that he was not thought trustworthy by the membership that knew him—if there is no provision in the constitution by which that man would be prevented from representing some other local, I hope that before this convention adjourns it will be made clear that that cannot be done. And while I would like to see this delegate seated, yet I believe it would be a bad precedent to establish.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Executive Board, represented by Fellow Worker Trautmann, will have the floor last. I guess that the other members have been heard enough.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I believe that the last speaker has covered the ground very well. There are only a few words to be said. It is not a question of seating or not seating Delegate French. It is a question whether the precedent established at the last convention should stand, for the guidance of coming conventions. The question is whether we should permit an ambiguous clause to stand, so that the door will be open in future to any man who may transfer his vote or who may try to get proxy credentials for any place or any part of the country, in order to be here at the convention. The case cited by a delegate, of Buena Vista, is not similar to the case of French. I myself, being asked by the local (Duffy) whether the one or the other local could be represented by one delegate, said yes, provided that delegate is a member of either one of the locals. That is the point. That man must be a member of one at least of the locals which he represents at this convention, and he can

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

only be a member of one local, according to the constitution.

The contest was made for that special purpose, realizing the danger in future conventions, realizing that if this matter is not brought before the convention and the doors closed against those who would seek admission under false pretenses, that perhaps in future conventions, when the I.W.W. will be strong, when it will start to do the real fighting against the capitalist classes, that the sane {same?} capitalist classes, though they may not try it this year, will try in future years to get their henchmen, their agents, their hirelings, into the conventions of the I.W.W. and try to destroy the work of years. That is the only reason why this contest has been submitted, with the recommendation that this clause be made more strict, and be enforced, and we are all satisfied. We have established this case, and we do not want to have it understood that this case of Guffey should lead the Constitution Committee to make another ambiguous clause. They are not similar, they are not identical, and they should not be so construed.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. FOOTE: The point of order is that, as I understand it, you gave Secretary-Treasurer Trautmann the last talk. I believe in the regular rules of order the Credentials Committee should have the last statement of this, inasmuch as they presented the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Brother Trainor and you are on the floor. Which of the credential committee should have the floor upon it? Go ahead. Construe it in that way. I simply wanted to cut the debate as short as possible.

DEL. FOOTE: I simply want to make a statement, to clear it up. The credentials committee is not defending that clause in the constitution. The credentials committee take this position,—that that clause in the constitution is ambiguous, and should be corrected by this convention. But the credentials committee want to give every man a fair shake. We do not want to bring this point against French, or any other delegate. We do not want to make one man or one local union a point of attack on this proposition, or a shut-out for them. On the other hand, we have had trouble in Bridgeport. French is thoroughly conversant with that trouble in Bridgeport. And I myself believe him when he said, knowing him as I do, that there is a yellow streak there, the same as there is a yellow streak every place; and we know that French has got no yellow streak in him.

I believe that the recommendation of the Credentials Committee

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

should be accepted. That French should be seated, and the recommendation that the convention, through its constitutional committee, should take up this clause and cover it for your future action. There is only one case, and that is of French, as I understand it.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Just one question I would like to ask of you. Does that mean to infer that the General Executive Board is interested in keeping French from the floor of this convention?

DEL. FOOTE: No, no.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: On account of anything of that kind going on in Bridgeport.

DEL. FOOTE: No. I beg your pardon. The only point was, the inference might be left that, the convention taking action of this kind, was taking an action against a local union or a delegate from a local union, or a representative. That is the point.

THE CHAIRMAN: We now come to a vote. The motion is, that the report of the committee be concurred in, that is, French seated, and the matter referred to the committee on constitution. All in favor of this motion will say aye; those opposed, no.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

DEL. FOOTE: A point of order. Is the credentials committee discharged?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, not yet. We are waiting for the further report.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The secretary of the committee is getting the copies ready.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary of the committee on credentials will proceed to the next point.

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading) "Local Union No. 260, of Plainfield, New Jersey, requests that Rudolph Katz, represent them, if Patrick Quinlan cannot be present.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Quinlan is not present, I believe, not here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that? The report is that there is a delegate elected, I believe, in a local near by the city where I live, and the delegate has not appeared yet. The union writes a letter, that in case he does not come I shall represent them. Is there any objection to that?

DEL. THOMAS: I move that the request be granted.

(The motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.)

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading) "Local union No. 198, of Toronto, Canada, cannot be seated, owing to the fact that only \$3.80 per capita has been paid in the last three months."

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In the Quinlan case I wish to just make the point, so that it goes on the record: Is it understood that, when Quinlan arrives, that that vote is going to be transferred to Quinlan again?

DEL. BOHM: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: If you do that, you allow every member to transfer his vote, and you establish another precedent, and you allow anybody to come in here and establish his vote, and transfer his vote, from one delegate to another.

DEL. FOOTE: I would like to ask the secretary if Fellow Worker Katz had not already ten votes, before this?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. FOOTE: The limit is ten votes. Then he cannot have another vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the limit?

DEL. FOOTE: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, but that is not the point. Shall that ruling stand, that a delegate can transfer his vote, in case Quinlan should appear? Perchance you only had nine votes, shall that ruling stand as a ruling of the convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: That will have to be brought up and handed to the constitution committee.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Supposing the constitution committee overlooks that matter?

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion could be made now, that the constitution committee should deliberate upon that point. I do not see how we could take any action now, though.

DEL. AXELSON: Chairman and Fellow Workers—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing before the house. This motion has been carried, and the fact is, I cannot represent the local, any way, so you may as well take up the next point.

DEL. AXELSON: The case is dropped?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. AXELSON: That is satisfactory.

DEL. WALTERS: As I understand, this vote was taken and that it gives you that vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. WALTERS: Why not?

THE CHAIRMAN: As I understand, a delegate can only have ten votes, and that is illegal.

DEL. WALTERS: Yes, that is right.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I am not quibbling on questions, but a quibble is necessary, to prevent the establishment of some precedent. The delegates from Paterson might agree that they transfer his vote from ten to nine, and he accept that vote of Quinlan, and when Quinlan arrives he should transfer it back to him. That is the only point.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next point. The committee reports on the delegate from Toronto, that he cannot be seated; is that so?

DEL. PINKERTON: That the delegate of 198 cannot be seated, owing to the fact that only \$3.80 per capita has been paid in the last three months.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. BOHM: I move that it be accepted.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You meant that we should concur in the report of the committee?

DEL. BOHM: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

DEL. AIAZONNE: I second the motion.

DEL. SPETTEL: I think that it is unjust to the delegates sitting in the rear of the hall here. There are one-third of them that didn't know what they were voting on here, what the fellow workers here in front were voting on.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean that they should speak louder?

DEL. SPETTEL: Speak louder, so that the delegates may hear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the delegates must speak louder. If you are preparing to make speeches for the I.W.W. it should be no trouble. You should practice here.

The motion has been made that we concur in the report of the committee relative to the seating of the delegate from Local 198 of Toronto. All in favor of this motion will say aye.

DEL. SPETTEL: These delegates back here do not know what the motion is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I have stated the motion loud enough. I will repeat the motion so that every one can hear it. The committee recommends that Local 198 of Toronto should not have its representative seated, because they have only paid \$3.80 per capita for the last six months. The motion has been made to concur in that report of the committee. All in favor of this committee will say aye.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion was carried.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. REIGATE: Do I understand that I have the three votes from the other locals which I represent, being a member of 198?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading) "San Francisco local number 363 denied a vote on account of no payment per capita in the last six months."

THE CHAIRMAN: The same case now, San Francisco Local 363.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Who represents it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Who has the credentials?

DEL. PINKERTON: I believe that is one of the six or seven locals represented by Speed—or, Williams.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is he present?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee who represents a number of locals in California, that his vote for one Local, 363, that he should not have a vote for that local, because they are not in good standing.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I have no recollection of having received credentials from 363. I believe that that is the Italian mixed local of San Francisco.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You are correct.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I have no credentials from that local.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They were sent to general headquarters and we had to pass on it.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes, but they were not sent to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: In that case there is nothing to pass on.

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading) "Weber and Yates, from Local 157, of New Bedford, are entitled to seven votes, making three and a half votes each," on account of some per capita tax, I believe, that has been received since.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They have received tax in September, on September 5th, so that it will increase the standard of the organization. They have been continually growing, and the account of per capita tax sent in increased the ratio of representation by the two delegates of that local, and it was so reported to the committee on credentials.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure?

DEL. FRANCIS: I move to concur.

(The motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.)

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading) "Schwend, of Local 105, of Anaconda, Montana, is entitled to two votes, the per capita tax being paid from September 1st," entitling him to same.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no action necessary, I believe.

DEL. BOHM: No. That is all right, I guess.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates are seated, if there is no objection.

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading) "Move by Trainor, and seconded by Axelson, that Local 53 of New York be given representation, and vote credited to Daniel De Leon." Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection to that? That is, the delegate will have that vote.

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading) "Moved by Trainor, and seconded by Axelson, that Anthony J. Francis be seated and given four votes."

That is where the correction was made to eight, was it not?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No. That was Walters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection to that, that Delegate Francis be seated, for four votes, according to the per capita, but not by the local he represents? If not, so state.

DEL. PINKERTON (reading): "Speed's claim to twelve votes cannot be allowed. Ten votes is all that can be permitted to one delegate, according to section 14 of constitution."

THE CHAIRMAN: No action necessary.

DEL. PINKERTON (reading): "Moved by Glover, seconded by Trainor, that the communication from the Unity Club, requesting that Comrade Elizabeth Gurley Flynn be given a seat, same to be referred to the convention for action. We recommend that Comrade Flynn be seated and given a voice."

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you all hear the report of the committee?

DEL. HAGGERTY: I move that the report of the committee be concurred in.

(The motion was seconded by Del. Bohm and others.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, that the representative of Unity Club, Miss Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, be given a seat, not a voice; is that it?

DEL. HAGGERTY: Seat and voice.

THE CHAIRMAN: Seat and voice in the convention. Are you ready for the question?

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

DEL. PINKERTON (continuing report): We recommend that M.W. Fennell be given a seat and voice in the convention as the representative from the Coal Miners' Union of Panama, Ill. Let me say just one word on that. We hurried up in connection with this work in order to get to the convention. We do not state, understand, but we assume that neither of these representatives are representing anything in connection with the Industrial Workers of the World. We just put in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the recommendation so that the convention can take action.

DEL. FRANCIS: A point of information. Is that the point that Delegate Levoy got the floor for before?

THE CHAIRMAN: That was it. The committee recommends that he be given a seat, but leaves it to the convention as to whether he shall have a voice or not. I do not see how he can have a vote.

DEL. LEVOY: As to those delegates, we do not know that under the constitution they can have a voice, but as far as they are concerned the way they are here they should be given a certain time to explain it. For instance, we will be deliberating—

THE CHAIRMAN: One moment, Brother Levoy. Before we can do something, somebody should make a motion.

DEL. LEVOY: All right; I make a motion that those two delegates shall be given a seat and a certain specified time to explain the matter as to what they are here for, and take it up in the convention. (Seconded.)

DEL. THOMAS: A question of information. I desire to ask if both delegates that are here representing the United Mine Workers are members of the Industrial Workers of the World. I know one is, and I believe he is entitled to a seat and voice in this convention, but as to allowing him the right to vote as a representative of the United Mine Workers, you cannot do that; the constitution debar him from that. But I would suggest and would recommend the adoption of a motion that we give those delegates a seat and a voice, but no vote. (Seconded.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In the case of the Unity Club of New York City, I should say that that is only extending a courtesy to the Unity Club. It has a certain aim in the general labor movement of this country. But in the case of the delegate from the United Mine Workers of Illinois it is quite different. He represents by a vote of the United Mine Workers an element that is today in rebellion against the United Mine Workers of America, that element being not only that one local which is in rebellion, but three or four or five, and very likely if the convention does its duty properly, will be followed by at least one-third of the locals in the state of Illinois. But before the convention seats that delegate from the United Mine Workers I think the membership at large of the Industrial Workers of the World should go on record as to why the delegate has been seated. He has been sent, as stated in explanation to the General Executive Board, for certain purposes. He brings instructions from the rank and file of the United Mine Workers to the delegates to this convention, and being seated at this convention

on the recommendation of the Credentials Committee, he should be seated with full information to the delegates and to those whom he represents as to why he has been seated. The case is a peculiar one. We have in the State of Illinois fourteen coal miners' organizations. We have organized them and they are all in open rebellion against the fakerism of the United Mine Workers of America. Here is a local, after agitation being carried on for the last two years, that is in rebellion for reasons that the delegate will explain, and we should know the reasons why he and the best locals of the United Mine Workers come to the Industrial Workers of the World with a message that we must act on if we are going to get the confidence of those coal miners of the State of Illinois, and I would entreat this convention, before seating the delegate, to have him given time to explain why he has come to this convention.

DEL. LEVOY: That was my motion. I moved that we should seat those delegates and give them a certain time to explain their mission. But I do not believe, since they are not sent here by an industrial workers' local, that they should have any voice in the deliberations of the convention. It is no more than proper, if we want to have any information from them. If the delegates want some information I believe they will give it to us, but they should have a certain time to explain their mission—why they are here.

DEL. AXELSON: I move, if it will be in order at this time, to give this Fellow Worker Fennell the privilege of the floor for a certain time mentioned. I believe he can state some facts concerning his presence here now. (Seconded.)

DEL. LEVOY: There is a motion before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will have to be made as an amendment. Do you want to make that as an amendment to the motion?

DEL. AXELSON: All right.

DEL. LEVOY: I will accept the amendment.

DEL. FOOTE: I wish to make a point on the amendment. I do not care myself to have this delegate confined to fifteen minutes on such a proposition as the United Mine Workers of Illinois or of America. I believe those men should be given time before this convention to fully explain their position relative to the rest of the coal miners throughout the country. Furthermore, I do not believe it is opportune at the present time to call upon this delegate to make his report. I believe it ought to be left until the convention is thoroughly organized, and then take the time for him to go ahead with his report and make it fully.

DEL. AXELSON: It is not my intention to limit the deliberation on

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

this question to fifteen minutes, but what we want now is to have him state his position right here with the rest, and afterwards he will have his say in the convention and we will give him all the time necessary.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move as a substitute that the delegates from the Mine Workers of Illinois be given the floor in this convention at the proper time.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is no substitute.

DEL. DELANEY: I do not see how we can possibly act on that recommendation. I think that he should be seated and the question of the vote left until later. I believe those delegates here representing industrial unions, even though they have not paid the per capita tax, ought to be seated and given their vote, but I think the instructions from the Industrial Union should be made first. I think that question should be left until we hear from them.

A DELEGATE: It is the proper time now.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be best if we would make that the first order of business tomorrow, and take this matter up tomorrow morning. The convention ought to be permanently organized before we adjourn, and we should elect some other committees so that they will have time to work tonight and report to us tomorrow morning, and then those delegates would be prepared to speak before they are seated.

DEL. HAGENSON: I would like to ask what the motion before the house is. Is it the substitute?

THE CHAIRMAN: The substitute has not been seconded. The motion before the house is that these delegates be given a seat and voice at the proper time before this convention, without a vote.

DEL. HAGENSON: That leaves it that they would not be given a vote now.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what it means. If you desire they can be given the floor now.

DEL. HAGENSON: I do not see why this delegate should not be allowed a voice in the convention since he is here, since he wants it, while the convention lasts. I do not believe we should debar him from a voice here at all, while we cannot well give him a vote, and for that reason I would like to see him seated with that understanding, and I believe the credentials that he has read are sufficient to show his mission.

(Question called for.)

DEL. AXELSON: I do not believe the Chairman stated the motion correctly. As I understand Delegate Levoy made a motion that we give

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

this delegate a specified time. I make an amendment to that motion that we give him fifteen minutes right now. (Seconded.)

DEL. LIESNER: I move to amend the amendment to make it as much time as they require to explain their case. I do not believe in limiting it to any time.

DEL. AXELSON: The reason why I mentioned fifteen minutes was because we would not delay any of the work that we are doing now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any one else who wishes to speak on this question?

DEL. HAGENSON: I would like to make a substitute. My substitute is this: That this delegate be given a seat and voice in this convention.

DEL. LIESNER: That was the original motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is practically the first original motion.

(Question called for, and previous question moved.)

DEL. SCHWEND: A point of order. My point of order is that we are not thoroughly organized as a convention and we cannot consistently take up the matter; that we must have rules, and we cannot properly bring this before the convention until we are thoroughly organized and ready to transact business.

DEL. KARN: The motion I understand is to concur in the report of the committee. A fellow worker just now got up and amended the amendment that the delegate have a voice and vote. Now that is concurring in the report of the committee, is it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is not. The committee did not make any such report. The committee left it to this body, but the question was not that we should concur in the report of the committee. Why don't the brother make a substitute for the whole?

DEL. SCHWEND: Did the Chairman rule on my point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken. This matter will stand that we do not take any action until this convention is thoroughly organized.

DEL. LEVOY: I will withdraw my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the report of the committee is now concluded. It would now be proper that a motion be made that all the delegates be seated and that the convention is thoroughly organized.

DEL. WALTERS: I make a motion to that effect.

(Motion seconded and carried.)

ELECTION OF PERMANENT CHAIRMAN.

DEL. FISCHER: I move that we proceed to the election of

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

permanent Chairman. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That would come up next, anyway. Now, the next order is the election of a permanent chairman.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: A committee on rules and order of business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that first?

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Brother Edwards states that it is proper that a committee on rules and regulations be heard first before the permanent chairman is elected. I do not know whether that is correct or not. If there is no objection that committee will now have the floor. Is there any objection?

DEL. FOOTE: A point of order. The Committee on Credentials, then, is discharged?

A DELEGATE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has there been anything left? I do not recollect if there has been anything left to the Committee on Credentials. I believe the Committee on Credentials should not be discharged. It might be that some delegates will arrive tomorrow or the day after, and the Committee on Credentials should stand. I rule upon that in that way. Fellow Worker Thomas has the floor.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND REGULATIONS.

Del. Thomas of the Committee on Rules and Regulations read the following report from that committee.

Your committee on Rules and Order of Business respectfully recommend:

First: That the Convention be called to order at 9 A.M. and 2 P.M., and that adjournment be taken at 12 noon and 6 P.M.

Order of business shall be:

- (1) Roll call of delegates.
- (2) Reports of committees, standing and special.
- (3) Reading of communications and bills.
- (4) Reports of officers.

We recommend the selection of the following committees:

- A, Committee on Credentials.
- B, Committee on Constitution,
- C, Committee on Resolutions.
- D, Committee on Ways and Means.
- E, Committee on Literature and Press.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

F, Committee on Rules and Regulations.

G, Committee on Organization.

We further recommend that some part of a day, when the business of the convention permits, be set aside for the discussion of the good and welfare of the organization.

(5) Unfinished business.

(6) New business.

(7) Nomination and election of officers.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business. What is your pleasure?

DEL. TRAINOR: I move that the report be concurred in.

DEL. BOHM: And adopted.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the report of the Committee be received and adopted. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for and the motion being put, was carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the election of a permanent Chairman. Nominations are in order.

DEL. WALTERS: I move that the Chairman pro tem. be the permanent Chairman of this Convention.

(The motion was seconded, and being put by the Secretary, was unanimously carried.)

ELECTION OF COMMITTEES.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Now, Fellow Delegates, the most important part of our work tonight would be the election of the various committees so that they will be ready to make some report tomorrow and so that we will have something to work upon. Which is the first committee that they have on there?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I just noted, and I did not see it before, that the Committee on Rules has neglected to put in a committee on auditing the books.

DEL. HAGGERTY: Doesn't the Constitution provide for that?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The Constitution does not provide anything of the kind. It provides that the General Executive Board shall audit the books. It is absolutely necessary that we should have a committee to audit the books of the General Secretary-Treasurer, and I ask that that take precedence over all other committees.

It was moved and seconded that the first committee elected be a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

committee to audit the books of the Secretary-Treasurer. (Carried.)

DEL. GLOVER: I move that a committee of three be elected. (Seconded and carried.)

The following nominations for auditing committee were made:

By Fischer: Pinkerton.

By Foote: Herrmann.

By Levoy: Walters.

By Conover: Kettell.

By ———: Isaach.

By ———: Trainor (Declined.)

Delegate Levoy moved that the nominations be closed. Motion seconded and carried.

In response to a question from the Chairman as to whether they accepted or declined, Delegates Pinkerton, Walters and Kettell declined, and Delegate Herrmann accepted. The following further nominations were made:

By Levoy: French.

By Foote: Delaney.

By Walters: Caminita.

By Axelson: Speed.

By Walters: Francis.

By Bohm: Levoy.

(On motion the nominations were then closed.)

In response to questions from the Chairman, Delegates French, Levoy, Speed and Delaney declined and Delegate Francis accepted.

Delegate Levoy nominated Delegate Finnigan. (Declined.)

Delegate Hagenson nominated Delegate Axelson. (Declined.)

DEL. WALTERS: I move that we call for volunteers. (Motion not entertained by the Chair.)

Delegate Walters nominated Delegate Foote. (Declined.)

Delegate Foote nominated Delegate Benson. (Accepted.)

Delegate Walters nominated Delegate Aiazzone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we have four: Herrmann, Benson, Francis and Aiazzone.

Delegate Francis declined.

On motion of Delegate Axelson the remaining three were elected by acclamation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is the Committee on Constitution. How

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

many shall it consist of?

Delegate Foote moved that it consist of five. Motion seconded and carried.

The following nominations were made:

By Glover: De Leon.

By Herrmann: French.

By Cole: Francis.

By Levoy: Pinkerton.

By Francis: Williams.

By Henion: Spettel. (Declined.)

By Bohm: Finnigan.

By Huber: Covert.

By Axelson: Hagenson.

By Spettel: Henion.

By Trainor: Walters.

By Hagenson: Trautmann.

It was moved that the nominations be closed. Seconded.

In response to questions from the Chairman, Delegates De Leon, Foote, French, Williams, Covert, Hagenson and Sec. Trautmann accepted, and Delegates Pinkerton, Francis, Walters and Henion declined.

DEL. FRANCIS: Is it proper that the General Secretary-Treasurer shall be on that committee? Isn't he ex-officio a member of any committee, so that the committee can call on him?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see that there is anything in the Constitution that would bar him.

DEL. FRANCIS: I do not think it is proper.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In order to avoid any confusion or any quibble on this matter, just strike my name off.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Fellow Worker Trautmann declines there are only five nominees: De Leon, Foote, French, Williams and Hagenson.

Delegate Trainor moved that the delegates named be elected as the committee by acclamation. Motion seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next committee is the Committee on Resolutions. I presume the same number. Nominations are in order.

The following nominations were made:

By Fischer: Francis.

By Trainor: Walters.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

By Glover: Liesner.

By Foote: Delaney.

By Francis: Karn.

By Levoy: Aiazzone. (Declined.)

By Axelson: Jones.

By Huber: Haggerty.

By Bohm: Fischer.

By Aiazzone: Isaach.

Delegate Bohm moved that the nominations be closed. Motion seconded and carried.

Delegates Francis, Delaney, Karn, Jones and Liesner accepted; Delegates Walters, Haggerty, Fischer and Isaach declined.

On motion the five accepting delegates were elected by acclamation as the Committee on Resolutions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is the Ways and Means Committee, five nominees. Make your nominations.

The following nominations were made:

By Schwend: Haggerty.

By Bohm: Fischer.

By Axelson: Henion.

By Levoy: Trainor. (Declined.)

By Reigate: Conover.

By Trainor: Cole.

By Aiazzone: Lindner.

By Axelson: Schwend.

By Levoy: Spettel.

On motion the nominations were closed.

The following nominees accepted: Haggerty, Henion, Conover, Schwend and Spettel. The following declined: Fischer, Trainor, Cole and Lindner.

On motion the five accepting nominees were elected by acclamation as the committee.

The Secretary read a communications from F.H. Friedman and Phil Bohm, committee, inviting the delegates to attend a jollification meeting at the corner of Western and Grand Avenues, Friday, Sept. 20, at 7 o'clock P.M.

On motion of Delegate Aiazzone the invitation was accepted.

The Chairman announced that the committees would meet and organize immediately after the adjournment of the convention.

The Chairman then at 5:50 P.M. declared the convention adjourned

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

until 9 A.M., Tuesday, Sept. 17.

SECOND DAY—TUESDAY, SEPT. 17, 1907.
MORNING SESSION.

Chairman Katz called the convention to order shortly after nine o'clock A.M.

The Secretary called the roll of delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any reports of committees?

DEL. FRANCIS: Before we proceed with the reports of committees we have to elect a sergeant-at-arms to verify the members present. I move that that be done.

DEL. LEVOY: A point of information. I would like to know from the delegate what he means; whether to verify the membership of the delegates here or those that are coming in the hall.

DEL. FRANCIS: As I understand, that was done at previous conventions, and therefore I move it simply as a matter of precedent. We have to have a sergeant-at-arms to know whether the members are delegates.

Motion seconded and put, but the Chairman declared the result in doubt, and called for a vote by a show of hands.

A roll call was demanded, but met with dissent on the part of several delegates.

It was moved to vote by a show of hands. A vote was taken, resulting: Yes, 13; no, 9. The motion was declared carried.

The following nominations were made for sergeant-at-arms.

By Levoy: Francis.

Delegate Francis declined, and Delegate Levoy was nominated.

There being no further nominations, Delegate Levoy was elected sergeant-at-arms, and proceeded to verify the membership of the delegates present.

COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed with any further business it may be proper to hear from the committee on credentials. I understand there are some new delegates that have arrived. Have you any report to make?

DEL. FOOTE: The committee on credentials received three new credentials I believe. I suppose Delegate Axelson will have to make the report in the absence of Delegate Pinkerton.

DEL. AXELSON: I turned the report over to Secretary Pinkerton.

At this point Delegate Pinkerton arrived with the report of the committee.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. PINKERTON: (Reading report). The finding of the Credential Committee in the case of local 33, Cleveland, Ohio, is that it was paid up to date and entitled to a representative at the convention. It was moved and seconded that local 33, Cleveland, Ohio, is entitled to one vote, because \$7.50 is credited to them on the books September 13, which was not known to us yesterday.

DEL. PINKERTON: These are the communications from the local in regard to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not need to read them.

DEL. PINKERTON: I believe these other credentials were passed on and the votes were credited to them on the books, were they not?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. PINKERTON: It is not necessary to vote on them again. If they were credited it is not necessary to pass on them again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was there a delegate from Denver seated?

DEL. PINKERTON: Yes. Delegate Ohman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is delegate Ohman present?

DEL. OHMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your name was called this morning?

DEL. OHMAN: It was called on the roll, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further committee ready to report? We are under reports of committees, standing and special.

DEL. OHMAN: I wish to know how many votes the credentials committee granted to me.

THE SECRETARY: Two votes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now then, is any committee ready to make a report?

DEL. AIAZZONE: I believe we left off the organization committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That comes under the head of unfinished business. We are now under the rules and regulations as they were adopted yesterday. If there is no committee ready to report we will go to the next order, reading of communications and bills. Are there any?

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: The secretary will bring them in shortly.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEES.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we will proceed under the head of unfinished business, and continue the election of committees. We elected last night all the committee{s} except a committee on literature and press, a committee on rules and regulations and a committee on organization. It would be proper now to elect a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

committee of five on literature and press. Nominations will be in order. I think it would be wise first to decide whether you want three on this committee or five.

DEL. AXELSON: I move that the committee on literature and press be composed of five members.

Motion seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominations are now in order.

The following nominations were made for the committee on literature and press:

By Trainor: Walters.

By Francis: Desmond. (Desmond not present.)

By Foote: Ohman.

By Axelson: Cole.

By Bohm: De Leon.

By Herrmann: Glover.

Delegates Ohman and Glover accepted and the other nominees declined.

By Liesner: Trautmann. (Declined.)

By Kern: Speed. (Accepted.)

By Hagenson: Axelson.

By Jones: Walsh. (Declined.)

On motion of Delegate Bohm the nominations were closed.

Delegate Speed declined, and on motion Delegates Ohman, Glover, and Axelson were then elected as the committee on literature and press.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next committee is, the committee on rules and regulations. I think we have our committee on rules and regulations, so that that would not be necessary.

DEL. FISCHER: I move that the committee elected yesterday stand over as the committee on rules and regulations.

Motion seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next and last committee is the committee on organization. We must decide first whether it will be three or five. What is your pleasure?

On motion of Delegate Fischer it was voted to elect a committee of five.

The following nominations were made:

By Aiazzone: Walters.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

By Levoy: Speed.

By Delaney: Jones.

By Glover: Rotkovitz.

By Walters: Fischer.

By Bohm: Levoy.

By Walters: Trainor. (Declined.)

By Fischer: Reigate.

By Foote: Yates.

Delegates Walters, Speed, Jones, Fischer, Reigate and Yates accepted the nomination; Delegates Rotkovitz, Levoy and Trainor declined.

By Aiazzone: Katz. (Declined.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There are six nominees and five are to be elected. How are we to vote on them? There is no established rule that I know of.

DEL. AXELSON: I think the easiest way to settle that is to vote by a show of hands on each and every candidate, and the ones that have the biggest vote to be elected.

DEL. GLOVER: It will take us all day for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

DEL. FOOTE: We did not understand the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we vote by a show of hands, and that the five receiving the highest votes are elected. Is that your motion?

DEL. AXELSON: Yes.

DEL. YATES: I withdraw.

DEL. TRAINOR: I move that the remaining five be elected by acclamation—Walters, Speed, Jones, Fischer and Reigate.

Motion seconded and carried, and the delegates named were elected as the committee on organization.

Sergeant-at-Arms Levoy reported that certain members were without their due books, but that the books would be brought in this afternoon.

DEL. FOOTE: If we are under the head of new business I have a motion to make if it is in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment till we see whether we are under that head. We are under the head of unfinished business. Is there any further unfinished business, Mr. Secretary, before the convention?

THE SECRETARY: Communications.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; we left out that order of communications and bills.

COMMUNICATIONS AND BILLS.

The secretary read the following communications:

Communication from Coal Miners' Local in Thurber, Tex.; a local that has been in existence about three months and is struggling against the United Mine Workers. Referred to committee on organization.

Communication from Local 159, Detroit, Mich. Referred to committee on organization.

Communication from Silk Workers' Local, Lancaster, Pa.. Referred to committee on organization.

Communication from J.W. Carroll, of United Mine Workers' Local, acting in the Illinois field, presenting outline of plan as to how the coal miners should be organized. Referred to committee on organization.

Communications from Local 173, San Francisco, accompanied by recommendations and suggestions, the latter not read.

Del. Jones moved that the recommendations be referred.

THE CHAIRMAN: The proper motion will be to receive the communication and refer the suggestions to the various committees, wherever they belong.

DEL. JONES: I make that as a motion.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would suggest that this communication be referred to the committee on resolutions, to be dissected by them and referred to the various committees so as to facilitate matters.

Motion seconded.

DEL. JONES: I understand that all these resolutions are presented to the resolution committee without reading. You are not going to read them here?

THE CHAIRMAN: They will be disturbed by that committee. All in favor of the motion will say aye. Opposed no. The motion is carried.

The secretary next read a communication from the Industrial Educational Club, Butte, Mont.

DEL. AXELSON: I move that the communication be approved of and referred to the organization committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean received?

DEL. AXELSON: I mean approved of and referred.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Motion seconded.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move to amend that we receive this communication and express by vote an acknowledgment of the services performed for the Industrial Workers of the World. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that we—will you repeat that?

DEL. FRANCIS: That we receive this communication and vote an acknowledgment of the good service this club has performed for the Industrial Workers of the World.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion and amendment. What is your pleasure?

DEL. GLOVER: It seems to me that that motion is somewhat ambiguous, for the reason that when you accept the communication it carried of necessity an acknowledgment of it, and consequently to make another motion to acknowledge it, it seems to me is out of order. It is simply doing work unnecessarily. If we carry a motion to accept it and turn it over to the organization committee, that is an acknowledgment of the work done by them.

DEL. FRANCIS: The reason I moved that amendment is that there is really nothing for the organization to do on the communication. They simply give us a report of what they have done for the Industrial Workers of the World, and I think we should receive that and express our action accordingly. That is why I move the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the original motion implies all that is in the amendment. If we approve that action it means just what you say. There may be some things in there which the organization committee can use and recommend to other localities.

DEL. LIESNER: I cannot see the need of referring it to the organization committee. If you accept and endorse it, that settles it. Then what has the organization committee got to do with it? If we accept and endorse it and give the vote, there is nothing there requiring any work on the part of the organization committee at all. Either it must be accepted or received and referred to the organization committee to look up any defects, or pursue the course suggested, which means that it is practically endorsed without the work of the organization committee.

DEL. AXELSON: The reason why we should refer it to the organization committee is this: That the organization committee may find through this communication a way by which they can direct the course of procedure in the future; as a guiding way or a guiding

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

document for their work.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: For a mixed local organization?

DEL. AXELSON: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is the idea.

Question called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion and the amendment to the motion. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) Do you understand the amendment that has been made? The vote is on the amendment first.

The question on the amendment was lost.

The motion to approve the communication and refer it to the committee on organization was then carried.

The secretary then read a communication from John M. Francis, secretary of the Coal Miners' Local at Du Quoin, Ill., and a delegate to the annual convention of the I.W.W. last year. Referred to the organization committee.

Communication from H. Martin, Berlin, Ont., in reference to conditions in Canada. Also reply of the general secretary-treasurer.

Del. Fischer moved that the communication be received and the action of the secretary endorsed. Seconded.

Del. Jones moved to amend that the communication be referred to the organization committee. Seconded.

Del. Fischer accepted the amendment, and the motion as amended was then carried.

Communication from Montreal Shirt & Overall Co., Ltd., in reference to securing the label on their goods.

The secretary stated that the letter was read for the purpose of showing the effect of propaganda work carried on in some districts and that the pressure was felt by employers of labor.

Del. Francis inquired whether Carrigan, mentioned in the letter, was a member of the I.W.W. and all right. The secretary replied that he was all right.

On motion of Delegate Aiazzone the communication was tabled.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Here are a lot of communications. There are some official, bearing a seal. Some are written on the letterheads of the organization without seal, dealing with Bridgeport affairs and charges and counter-charges. It would not be proper to bring this case before the convention. It is necessary that this matter be investigated and that a chance be given to the delegate from Bridgeport to clear these

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

matters up before the delegates to this convention, and they are of such a nature that it would be necessary first to go into the hands of a committee. There are more of that kind.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that a committee on investigation be elected to investigate the Bridgeport affair.

Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be a grievance committee, wouldn't it?

DEL. THOMAS: As a member of the committee on rules I will state that we overlooked that point relative to having a committee on grievances arising in the organization. Therefore we ought to have it specified in the rules as to a grievance committee, and I think it would be better for the committee to sit again and present some new rules.

DEL. FRANCIS: I withdraw my motion.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The convention can do it right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you make a motion? I did not hear.

DEL. THOMAS: I did not make a motion. I only suggested that we overlooked this matter.

DEL. HERRMANN: I make a motion that the convention elect a grievance committee right now. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HAGENSON: I am not ready. I think we should state how many that committee shall be.

DEL. BOHM: I move to amend the motion to make it five. (Seconded.)

Del. Herrmann accepted the amendment.

The question on the election of a grievance committee of five was put and carried.

The following nominations for the committee were made:

By Fischer: Cole.

By Axelson: Haggerty.

By Aiazzone: Trainor.

By Speed: Yates.

By Jones: Foote.

By Liesner: Thomas.

By Reigate: Williams.

By Axelson: Hagenson. (Declined.)

In response to questions from the chairman, Delegates Cole, Haggerty, Yates and Thomas accepted; Delegates Trainor, Foote and

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Williams declined.

The following additional nominations were made:

By Levoy: Keep.

By Reigate: Speed.

By Schwend: Levoy.

By Axelson: Schwend.

Delegates Keep, Speed and Levoy declined; Delegate Schwend accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Workers Cole, Haggerty, Yates, Thomas and Schwend are the five that have been nominated and have accepted. What is your pleasure?

Del. Levoy moved that the five named be elected by acclamation as the committee on grievances.

The motion was seconded and carried, and the five delegates were then elected as the committee.

On motion of Delegate Kern the communications in reference to the Bridgeport affair were referred to the grievance committee.

DEL. SPEED: I make a motion that all these matters of grievances be referred to the grievance committee without further reading on the part of the secretary. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean any further grievances that may come up?

DEL. SPEED: Yes.

The motion was put and carried.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Now, I would like to ask the convention through the chair a question. Suppose a man has been, or several have been, expelled or suspended from a local organization, even assuming that they did not have a fair trial, and they appeal to the convention, shall such appeals be presented to the committee. It is only a question as to how I shall be guided in presenting similar communications. If the ruling goes one way or the other way, I will be guided by the ruling so that I can use some of the documents or all of the documents filed in certain cases and submit them to the grievance committee. There are perhaps one or two cases. I only want to have a ruling on this point.

DEL. AXELSON: I move, in behalf of this request, that all these grievances that are in the hands of the secretary be referred to the grievance committee, every one.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

SEC. TRAUTMANN: These grievances come from members who are yet members of unions connected with the I.W.W., but there are grievances and supposed injustices done them, and it is a question whether they will be recognized by this convention, some becoming members since the grievances have arisen.

DEL. AXELSON: A point of information. Have they been members of the organization?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They have been members of the organization, some of them.

DEL. AXELSON: I move that all these communications be referred to the grievance committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will rule that all these communications will be referred to the grievance committee. If some one is not satisfied with that ruling, he can raise a point of order.

The secretary next read the following communication from Ernest Besselmann, New York:

“New York, Sept. 13, 1907.

“To the Third Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World:

“May your efforts be crowned with great success.

“ERNEST BESSELMANN”

The secretary presented a document from Local Union 157 of New Bedford, Mass., containing by-laws of the local union, submitted for the approval of the General Executive Board.

Delegate Francis moved that the document be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would ask the convention not to adopt such a motion. There are committees or committees will have assigned to them the duty of drawing up by-laws for local organizations. We have to have by-laws to guide the local organizations in their work. We haven't got any now, and I suggest that any recommendations or any reports coming to the convention be referred to the ways and means committee to take up the work of drafting by-laws for the guidance of local organizations. This document is only a sample of such by-laws so that they can be drafted according to local conditions. It would be a good plan to refer them to such a committee so that they would draw {up} such by-laws for the guidance of the local organizations. We already have one set prepared, and it is proposed to suit the conditions in one locality and another. It is a very good set of by-laws. I have read them over. We have a committee on ways and means?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would therefore suggest that this be referred to that committee.

DEL. FISCHER: On constitution.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The constitution committee has enough to do with the constitution and the general organization.

DEL. FOOTE: I move that as a motion. (Seconded.)

DEL. LIESNER: It seems to me that as this has a great deal to do with the new constitution, there is nobody better adapted to this work than the constitution committee. The ways and means committee have no means of knowing at this moment what the new constitution is going to be. The constitution committee is framing our constitution or altering it as they may see fit, and they would be more capable of handing that question, and I think it is entirely within their office to do that work.

DEL. BENSON: We have a committee on constitution which should deal with the by-laws. We have made provision, so to speak, for any action that the committee on constitution may take, and I think there will be no trouble about it. Whatever those by-laws are, let us submit them to that committee, and they will do the best that can be done.

DEL. KERN: I move a substitute for the motion, that this be referred to the constitution committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. FOOTE: I'm afraid the constitution committee will simply have to refer it back to the committee on ways and means. Last year we had such a conglomeration of material to go over that it consumed the biggest part of our time in segregating the matter. It seems to me this should go to the committee on ways and means, and let them report on it in an abstract manner, and then that report should be considered by the constitution committee. That is how I look at it; I don't know; I might be mistaken.

The question was then put on the substitute motion that the matter be referred to the committee on constitution. The vote being in doubt, a vote was taken by a show of hands, resulting as follows: Aye, 16; no, 9. So the substitute motion was carried.

The secretary presented a communication from Local 178, Seattle, Wash., in reference to proposed amendments and additions to the constitution. Referred to the resolution committee for distribution to the appropriate committees.

Also a communication from Local 12, Los Angeles. Referred to committee on organization.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Also a communication from Schenectady Electrical Workers' Union No. 1. Referred to the committee on constitution.

Also a letter from J.W. Hawkins, No. 8, Kansas City, Mo., in reference to work, conditions and supplies. Referred to committee on organization.

Also letter from Clinton Simonton, Pine Bluff, Ark., together with answer of general secretary. Referred to committee on organization.

Also instructions to delegates from Local Unions 15, 91, 95, 130 and 179, and accompanying resolutions. Referred to the committee on constitution.

The secretary read a resolution from Local Union 59, Clothing Workers of New York, which was referred to the committee on resolutions.

Secretary Trautmann next read a resolution or preamble submitted by Delegate Foote, which was referred to the committee on constitution.

A communication from the Bakery Workers' Industrial Union No. 224, of Wichita, Kan., was read and referred to the organization committee.

A resolution was submitted by Delegate Walters and was read and referred to the committee on constitution.

A communication from Local Union No. 164, Laundry Workers of St. Paul, requesting that an organizer be sent to St. Paul, was read and referred to the committee on organization.

Secretary Trautmann then announced that applications for charter{s} had been received from the Bakery Workers' Union of New York City, the Bakery Workers{' } Union of Oklahoma Citq {City}, and the Bakery Workers' Union of Enid, I.T.,² and requested to know the pleasure of the convention in connection therewith.

DEL. FOOTE: I move that the applications be sent to the committee on organization with the request that the charters be immediately sent out. I know of the work that is being done in Enid and Oklahoma City, and I promised them that the charter would be there within ten days.

DEL. TRAUTMANN: It arrived yesterday, you know, so that we could not have acted upon it sooner.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow workers, you have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

²[Indian Territory, later Oklahoma.—R.B.]

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

The question was called for, and being put, the motion unanimously prevailed.

Secretary Trautmann next read a communication from Dawson, Alaska, in reference to the situation at Fairbanks, which, after a brief explanation by him, was referred to the committee on organization.

DEL. TRAUTMANN: Here are the bills ordered paid by the Executive Board, and I will not stop to read them at this time.

The Executive Board decided that resolutions and amendments to the constitution coming from individuals who are members of a local union should not be considered unless the amendments are approved by the local organization of which they are members. Now we have such resolutions coming from individuals and not approved by the local unions and inasmuch as the Executive Board has made that ruling in this matter, I would like to know what the pleasure of the convention is in this regard.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that the convention approve of the decision of the Executive Board.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded that the convention approve of the decision of the Executive Board. Are you ready for the question?

The question was called for and the motion prevailed.

DEL. TRAUTMANN: Those are all the communications that have been received so far.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other communications?

DEL. TRAUTMANN: No, there are none, except the report{s} of the organizers, but they should come in with the officers' reports. The organizers are instructed to give their reports on arriving at this convention, and they have already complied.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the reports of officers. Now, fellow workers, since the report of the secretary is in print, I think it would be only a waste of time to read that long document at this time. The delegates can all read the report at their leisure, and it is not necessary to have it read now. I understand, however, that the secretary has a supplementary report to make on a very important subject and he will be ready to submit it tomorrow. If

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

there is no objection, we will proceed in that manner. Is there any objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Every delegate has a summary of the financial condition of the organization, so that it will not be necessary to read that.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will hear the reading of the minutes of the General Executive Board.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Fellow workers and Mr. Chairman: The General Executive Board will wind up its business this afternoon or tonight, and submit then the report of its last session to the convention. We have decided upon some recommendations to this convention, and they have to be drafted and properly recorded in the minutes before they can be presented here. The minutes of the first session held after the October 4th incident have never been published in the *Bulletin*, although every member has received a copy of these minutes in typewritten form. I will read the minutes now and the final report of the General Executive Board will be given tomorrow.

Secretary Trautmann then read the minutes of the various meetings of the General Executive Board, at the conclusion of which the following action was taken:

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, fellow workers, you have heard the reading of the minutes of the General Executive Board. What is your pleasure?

DEL. EDWARDS: Fellow Workers and Mr. Chairman: In behalf of the committee on revision of the stenographic report, I would like to make this statement: You can all judge somewhat from the time it has taken to read this report that the cost of printing it and incorporating it in the daily report that is submitted to the delegates will be very large, and it occurs to this committee that it will be unnecessary, since the main facts, which facts pertain to the reactionary element found in the last convention, are really in the hands of the members of the organization; and it seems to us for that reason that it will not be necessary to put it into the daily report. If excluded, it will very materially reduce the cost of getting out that report, and if printed, it will be a very voluminous document, and we would ask the delegates to take that matter into consideration.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Workers and Chairman: I would like to ask the chair one question, and that is if anyone has any idea as to what

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the extra expense of printing this report would come to?

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker Walsh is the treasurer. He can probably tell you.

DEL. EDWARDS: It is impossible to even approximate that expense right here on the ground. The whole thing has to be cast up. The number of words included in this report has to be ascertained, which would take considerable time to do, and it cannot be done now. I desire to say, however, that the expense will be very large, and that it will fill at least, in the type we are using, fourteen columns of space; fourteen columns equal to the columns of the *Industrial Union Bulletin*.

DEL. FRANCIS: Have the minutes been adopted?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. FRANCIS: Then I move you that the minutes of the General Executive Board be accepted and approved as read.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion has been made and seconded that the minutes of the General Executive Board be received and approved, and their actions concurred in. Is that motion seconded?

(The motion received several seconds and being put to a viva voce vote, unanimously prevailed.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We come now to the question that has been raised by the chairman of the committee on revising the stenographic report.

DEL. DELANEY: I move you that the recommendations of the committee be accepted and adopted.

(The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.)

SOLICITATION OF STRIKING TELEGRAPHERS.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: Yesterday afternoon, early in the session, G. Dall Jones, who is a member of the Local Executive Board of the Telegraphers, was in attendance at our convention, and while here, spoke to me in reference to the matter of bringing their present situation in the strike against the companies before this convention. The facts given to me, very briefly, by him are these: That the telegraphers are up against it proper as to their financial condition, and that any financial assistance that the Industrial Workers of the World may feel disposed or able to give them at this time will be very much appreciated. I told the gentleman that I should present the matter to the convention, and if any action favorable to their request is

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

taken, they ask that the check be sent to S.S. Ulrich, secretary of the Commercial Telegraphers Union No. 1, 305 Omaha Building, 134 Van Buren street, Chicago.

DEL. FRANCIS: Point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Francis.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would like to know is {if?} Assistant Secretary Edwards is a delegate to this convention? I raise the point of order that only a delegate can bring such a matter up.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say that this representative of the Telegraphers' organization came to me, and I being in the chair, requested Fellow Worker Edwards to bring it before the convention, and since he has the floor of this convention I do not see any reason why he should not bring such a matter up. It is now before the convention. What is your pleasure?

DEL. DELANEY: I move that it be referred to the committee on ways and means.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

(The motion failed of a second.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I would add that there were two gentlemen here, and they said also that they would be glad to receive our committee at their executive board meeting. They meet every day, and it might not be amiss to send a committee there and explain to them the aims and objects of the industrial unionism of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. COLE: I desire to say that I was talking to this man yesterday myself. I believe that Fellow Worker Fisher {Fischer?} was present at that time, was he not? Fellow Worker Jones was present at the time, and I would like to make this statement to the convention: That if the convention in its opinion thinks that the financial circumstances of the organization will not permit them to contribute anything to the general fund to help this fight of the Telegraphers, that we take up a collection among the delegates to the convention and others who are in the convention hall, and let them contribute what they see fit, and then appoint a committee, and let them take it down and hand it to them, because any financial support will be very thankfully received by the Telegraphers.

DEL. FOOTE: This is a matter that I do not think we ought to pass by lightly. The Telegraphers strike is a serious proposition. It represents an action on the part of those men that means much in the American labor movement, and to have a request of that kind brought before our convention here and not have it receive the proper

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

consideration, would seem to me to reflect upon our standing. As far as the organization of the Telegraphers is concerned, we are all agreed upon their misconstruction of their basic principles, but the fact remains that they did act as a man, and against the officialdom in their own organization, if I understand it rightly.

I believe that this convention ought to go on record in expressing greetings to them as wage workers, and that if this organization is in such straits financially as we know it to be, that the recommendation of Fellow Worker Cole be concurred in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow workers, the hour for adjournment having arrived, we will adjourn now until two o'clock this afternoon, and then the matter will be again taken up.

The convention then adjourned, to reconvene at 2 o'clock p.m.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1907. AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention reconvened at 2:15 o'clock P.M., Chairman Katz presiding.

Before taking up the regular order of business the roll was called by Secretary Trautman{n}, at the conclusion of which the proceedings were continued as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: When we adjourned this noon the matter of the telegraphers was under discussion, and we will proceed with that matter now.

DEL. FISCHER: I move that this Convention instruct the general secretary to forward \$50 to the striking telegraphers of this city.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

DEL. AXELSON: I second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded that the general secretary forward \$50 to the striking telegraphers of this city. Are you ready for the question?

(Question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak upon the motion?

DEL. DE LEON: Does the motion imply that the money is to be sent by mail?

THE CHAIRMAN: The mover of the motion did not state that in his motion, but it seems that they requested that a committee be

appointed from this body to attend their meetings, and I believe it would be proper for that committee to bring the money to them.

DEL. FISCHER: That was my meaning.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will include that in your motion?

DEL. FISCHER: Yes, sir, that the Committee forward the money to the Telegraphers.

DEL. DE LEON: In view of the imperfection of the motion I would like to make an amendment, and I want to explain my reasons before I present that amendment.

That the Telegraphers should be assisted financially goes without saying. They are certainly in a desperate strait, and \$50 is about the smallest sum we can send them without seeming to insult them, in view of the much greater sum that they need{;} but it strikes me that we should do more than the mere sending of that amount of cash. Together with that cash we should call their attention to the proposition that they are up against.

I have it from what I consider very good authority that the trouble with the present situation is this: that the companies will make no settlement with the man because the man does not want to enter into a contract. When I say the man does not want to enter into a contract perhaps I put it too broadly; I should rather say that the company apprehends that it cannot hold the man to a contract. In other words, what this man is up against is the I.W.W. proposition. They are affiliated with the A.F.L. The essence of the A.F.L. is that contracts shall be made between the employer and the employe, and the important feature of this contract is not keeping of wages down or anything of that sort; the important feature is this—and that is what these men should be made familiar with—that every time a contract is made, the capitalist can then figure what dividends he can reckon on. Practically it amounts to this, that the working people in that establishment become part of the assets of the capitalist employer.

Just as soon as a contract is made, those men cease to be even working men. They cease to be even wage slaves. They becom{e} part and parcel of the assets of the employer, and with those assets he can tell what to do in point of dividends, the raising of stocks, the watering of them, etc.

Now, it is clear that those men are not going to succeed as to a settlement. The employer wants a clear cut settlement, a settlement not such as we always make, but a settlement of the A.F.L. nature. These men are not up against the regulation trouble or strife; it is not a question of a man starting in and finally bleeding slowly to death on

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

account of his funds being exhausted, but it is on account of the fact that this being a young organization it has not yet gotten sufficiently into the A.F.L. harness so that an employer can place trust in a contract, such a contract as they want, not for a day or two but for several years, so as to become completely a part of the assets.

Now, it seems to me that that should be brought to home to those men. I had an incidental talk with one of them yesterday. It was sad to see how absolutely blind he was to the situation that is confronting them. If they were left to their own instincts, the working people always would act revolutionary, and consequently these men have not yet come to that A.F.L. development where they are up to their contract, and since they are not in that situation they have yet to be licked into shape, and that is the issue before them, and in view of that fact, I consider that this motion should be amended and that that committee or the national secretary should so explain matters to them.

I would therefore amend that motion so that the committee shall consist of the national secretary, the national editor and G.E.B. Member Cole, and that they shall call upon the headquarters of the telegraphers' organization, and hand them those funds with an expression of our regret that we can do no better, and explain to them the position of this body, why it is that we cannot give any more and why it is that we should be glad to make it a \$50,000 check instead of a \$50 check.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment seconded?

DEL. AIAZONNE: I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been made that the committee consist of the general secretary-treasurer and the editor of the *Bulletin* and the member of the General Executive Board, Cole, deliver the donation to the Telegraphers and explain the position of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. DE LEON: What they are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Explain what they are. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HAGGERTY: Mr. Chairman, if it be in order I desire to make an amendment to the amendment, embracing and accepting all that has been put in the amendment, the only change being in the amount that we are to give in response to their request. I desire that the sum be changed from \$50 to \$100. It seems to me that \$100 is a very small amount for a national organization to offer to those who appeal to us. We should give \$100 or nothing at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment seconded?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

(The amendment received several seconds.)

DEL. FISCHER: My fellow workers and Chairman: My idea was somewhat on that line. I thought that we should extend our moral and financial support to them and let the locals give what they could. I do not think it is out of the way to let the convention contribute \$50 and let all locals and sympathizers throughout the country contribute their little mite, whatever it may be, so that these contributions and expressions of sympathy will come from all parts of the country.

DEL. SPETTEL: It seems to me that the locals and sympathizers throughout the country will give what they have to give regardless of what we do here, whether we make our contribution \$50 or \$100.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion and the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. What is your pleasure?

DEL. FRANCIS: A point of information: if this amendment to the amendment carries, have we the funds at hand in the treasury?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will have to give you that information.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would have to scratch pretty hard to get it. We figured on \$50, because we thought we could make that. We have to meet some obligations. I believe, however, if the delegates would cooperate with us, a few of them, and give their share, we could make it \$100. It need not be a collection, but voluntary contributions from the delegates, and we could make up the \$100 and have it sent in the name of the organization, with the understanding that the entire organization will be made acquainted with the situation.

Now, I want to make my position clear, because I hold that in any fight of the working class, whether they are wrong or right in their position, whether the organization is effective or ineffective, the I.W.W. must support such an organization. That is our duty. We have no quarrel with the working class. We have a quarrel with those who are supporters of the capitalistic system of society, and the very fact that it is not a matter of finance, not a matter of \$100 or \$50, but the fact that the I.W.W. in convention assembled recognizes its duty to the entire working class is sufficient to convince the working class that the I.W.W. is fighting for better and higher and larger movements than the old organizations have ever taken up.

I believe if some of the delegates would cooperate, not in the way of a collection, but in voluntary contributions, that we could send this check for \$100 tomorrow to the Telegraphers' Union.

DEL. LEVOY: A point of information: Who were those delegates who asked for this financial aid? Were they from the national

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

headquarters or were they from the Chicago branch or local of the Telegraphers' Union?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It was the Local Union of Telegraphers of this city, but it is immaterial whether it is local or national: that does not alter the case.

DEL. LEVOY: It alters the case with me to this extent, that I would not deliver this money to those men in the office because we would not get credit for it. I do not believe in the fake element at the head of that organization. I would rather deliver it to the members themselves and not to the officers of the organization, because when we deliver it to them, and walk out, they laugh at us. It should be delivered to the members at the local meeting so that the members can understand it, and can know from whom it was received.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say that the delegate who was here informed me that they met every afternoon at four o'clock at the Revere House, I believe. I am not sure whether it is the executive board of {or?} the whole organization that meet each day.

A DELEGATE: The whole organization.

DEL. SPEED: Mr. Chairman, I met last night a member of the board and chairman of the Grievance Committee. They were on the street last night while we were talking, and I was invited to come up before them this afternoon and address them. They said we would be treated courteously and that this message which we delivered on the street was just the thing that they wanted, and they invited us up there to speak to them this afternoon. I will add this as information to what has already been said.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sec. Trautmann wants to make an explanation.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: There are reasons why the general office of this organization has abstained from interfering in any way, shape or manner in the strike of the Telegraphers of America. After the strike was on for about a week, as members and organizers of the organization can bear me out, we had a committee not from the general offices, but a committee of the rank and file, appear and ask for speakers at their mass meetings. When that committee appeared there was a statement in the paper—those who live in Chicago may recollect it—that Samuel Gompers, O'Neill, the labor commissioner, and others were already in conference with representatives of the telegraph lines or the telegraph companies. A statement had been made in the paper that it was only due to the action of the radical aggressive element that no arbitration could be secured.

If the representatives of the I.W.W. had appeared before the

Telegraphers when the enthusiasm of the strikers ran high, and if the arbitration that was then sought had ended in a failure, it would then have been placed to the—not credit, I would not say credit, but they would have made the I.W.W. responsible for the failure of having an understanding with that committee.

It was a critical moment. Some of the best men in the Telegraphers' Union appealed to us, many of whom are good, reliable union men and ready to learn from the mistakes of the past, but if the I.W.W. representatives at that time had interfered when the telegraphers were waiting for a victory, then labor fakers would have immediately hollered that on account of the radical element, on account of the interference of the I.W.W., with their desire to break up the unions, no negotiations could be carried on and the strike would have been lost on account of the I.W.W. interfering.

That prompted every one of us members in refraining from taking part in the matter. I, for one, will not accuse any one of the officers of the Telegraphers' Union of being crooks or fakers. I do not believe, however, that they have experience and knowledge of the labor movement. I even include in that statement the general officers of that organization.

I believe that their statements to the press stated the case fairly; they never understood labor problems, they never learned a lesson from the strike in 1883. They did not want to learn because they were in a bad environment. Today we know that many of them whom we may accuse as being labor fakers, who if possible may have had to be labor fakers, are absolutely honest and willing to learn.

This opportunity presents itself to this organization. We have no fight, no quarrel with the working class. We want to teach them to take advantage of every opportunity. We know that most of us were in the American Federation of Labor; we were in the Knights of Labor; we were in the various societies of the working class, and we might as well, and justifiably so, have been accused of being labor fakers before we saw the light and the way to get out of the mire of the past.

Now, to say that on account of a few individuals among the Telegraphers, that we should deliver the money to the rank and file, is wrong, before we know whether the leaders of the strike in this city are really fakers or not. If they were, they would not come to this convention.

So, fellow workers, I say that we can show through our action that we have no quarrel with any class of wage earners, and when we have an opportunity we are going to gain by the experiences of the past and

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

by our own experiences, and we are going to go forward as fast as we can, and we are going to give our support to the working class in their battle against the capitalistic class.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, fellow delegates, you have heard the motion, the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

DEL. KERN: I would like to offer a substitute for the whole. In view of the fact that the statement has been made here just now of our financial condition, I would like to offer this as a substitute; that the donation of \$50 be allowed, and that a collection be made from the delegates to this convention to be put with that \$50, and that a committee of four instead of three be appointed; that a fourth member be added to that committee to go before the meeting of the Telegraphers, not before the officers, who, as the fellow worker over here says, would possibly laugh at us behind our backs—but go before the meeting of that organization and explain and explain to them the reason why we can only offer the \$50 and the reason why they are up against it.

DEL. THOMAS: I second the substitute motion.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, how big a committee, how many in numbers, is the committee that is to go before this meeting?

THE CHAIRMAN: The original motion called for three.

DEL. AXELSON: And a fourth one, is that it now, by this amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. AXELSON: And the committee as constituted is to consist of the secretary-treasurer, the editor of our journal, and who else?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Cole of the General Executive Board.

DEL. COLE: I myself, fellow workers, do not believe that the fourth delegate should be sent. I think in this case we should be very careful to confine ourselves to the officials of the organization that is donating this fund and the voluntary contribution. For this reason I am talking against this substitute that is now handed in. I think in going before the working class we should always send the representatives who stand at the head of the pure economic organization of the working class. That is my position.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. DE LEON: I regret having to do so, but I wish to say that a substitute for the whole is a motion not known in parliamentary practice. It must either be an amendment, or an amendment to an

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

amendment, and there cannot be a fourth thing. It would bring confusion. Consequently a substitute for the whole is not recognized in parliamentary practice, and if you recognize it now we shall in a measure be taking a most serious step, and as we did yesterday, we will get into a serious tangle. That is my point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken.

Now, there is before the house, the motion, the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment. The original motion is that we donate \$50 and send it to the Telegraphers. The amendment is that a committee, consisting of Trautmann, Cole, and Edwards, deliver the \$50, explain our position and what the Telegraphers are up against. The amendment to the amendment made by Delegate Haggerty is that we make it \$100 instead of \$50. We will now vote upon the amendment to the amendment, that it should be \$100 instead of \$50.

DEL. KEEP: I ask for information on that amendment, whether the amendment is that it shall be a donation from this organization of \$50 or \$100. As I understand that amendment it was that we present \$50 and then take up a collection in order to get the other \$50 so as to make it \$100.

A DELEGATE: \$50.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the amendment to the amendment say aye.

(A viva voce vote was taken, and the Chairman, being in doubt, Delegate De Leon called for a roll call. The roll having been called by the Secretary Trautmann he announced the result of the ballot as follows: Total number of votes cast, 147; 48 voting aye, 79 voting nay, and the amendment to the amendment was declared lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the amendment to the motion will be voted upon.

(The question was then put on the amendment to the motion and it prevailed.)

(The question was then put on the motion as amended, and it was unanimously carried.)

TELEGRAM OF CONDOLENCE TO VINCENT ST. JOHN.

DEL. DE LEON: Is there anything before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now under the head of unfinished business.

DEL. DE LEON: I move you that the National Secretary be directed to forward the following telegram to Vincent St. John, in Goldfield, Nevada.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. CAMINITA: I second the motion. (Laughter.)

DEL. DE LEON: I will read the telegram.

“The Third Annual Convention of the I.W.W., now in session, directs me to express to you indignation at the capitalist class machinations, seconded by their Mitchell-Gompers lieutenants, which, by trumping up criminal charges against you and now falsely claiming they may want you any time in court, compel your absence from your seat at this Convention. The Convention assures you that, though thus deprived of your active cooperation, it is inspired by your sturdy spirit, which has never been found to flinch, to weaken, or to lie low whenever the cause of labor demands the right word and act at the right time and place.”

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

(The motion received a storm of seconds.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the telegram just read be sent to our fellow worker who cannot be present, Vincent St. John.

DEL. FOOTE: Fellow Worker De Leon, after so strongly standing for the Telegraphers, now proposes to send a telegram of condolence to Fellow Worker St. John on a scab wire. (Laughter.) I know it is a momentary forgetfulness on his part, but the laugh is on De Leon.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to call the attention of the delegate to the fact on the contrary, that if you could pile on millions of telegrams now it would compel the employers to give in. The more work you put upon those lines the harder you make it for the few scabs to do the work, as far as that goes, so if I thought of that at all it would be in that light.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: This telegram will not be delivered, at least not in Goldfield. They haven't anybody to deliver telegrams there. We had telegrams from Goldfield on the day of the strike, and they were sent by mail. Now, we can send it through the mails, with a special delivery stamp, and it will get there just as quick as if we sent it over the wire, and we can simply say that it is the desire of the convention to express and dispatch that sentiment as quickly as possible, but owing to circumstances we have to send it by special delivery. It will arrive just as quick in that way as if we sent it over the wire.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that as an amendment.

DEL. DE LEON: I accept the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the telegram you have just heard read be sent by special delivery to Fellow Worker St. John. Are you ready for the question?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

(The question was called for, and being put, it unanimously prevailed.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We are under the head of unfinished business.

DEL. SPEED: As I have been requested to go before the Telegraphers this afternoon, I desire to ask if it is the pleasure of this body that I go, and if so can I be excused now?

THE CHAIRMAN: The body will have to act upon that. The telegraphers meet at 4 o'clock, and in view of the decision we have arrived at, it might not be amiss that Delegate Speed should go there and notify them of the action we have taken, and also notify them that our three national officers have been delegated to come before them and bring the money that was donated to them.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is tomorrow?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, they could not go today.

DEL. SPEED: They told me to be there about 3 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Fellow workers, what is your pleasure with regard to the request of Delegate Speed.

DEL. COLE: Inasmuch as Fellow Worker Speed has been asked to appear before the Telegraphers this afternoon, I believe it would be advisable for Delegate Speed to fill that engagement if he can, and then he can notify the Telegraphers of the action taken by this body this afternoon, to be acted upon by the committee which will be sent there tomorrow afternoon.

DEL. AXELSON: Is that a motion?

DEL. COLE: Yes.

DEL. AXELSON: I second the motion.

DEL. FRANCIS: I make a motion that Del. Speed be excused from further attendance upon the convention this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the motion seconded?

(The motion was seconded.)

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, I understand that Fellow Worker Cole made a motion to the effect that Del. Speed proceed to address the Telegraphers this afternoon. I seconded that motion and I think that motion is before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker Cole did not make the motion; it was Delegate Francis who made the motion.

DEL. COLE: Mr. Chairman, I did not make a motion; I made it as a suggestion, and it would be necessary to make it as a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion to that effect. Does your motion imply that?

DEL. FRANCIS: That is as I understood it.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. KERN: I move as an amendment to that that Del. Speed should be instructed to state that this convention will send them a favorable reply tomorrow and not state the amount we are going to give them or anything else.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is not seconded. I do not hear any second. Are you ready for the question on the original motion?

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion that Del. Speed keep his appointment with the telegraphers and notify them of the action here taken will say aye.

(The motion unanimously prevailed.)

REPORTS OF ORGANIZERS.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Gentlemen, before you vote on the matter of the Coal Miners, I desire to say that those who were considered permanent organizers of the I.W.W. have been requested with the consent of the General Executive Board, to submit reports to the Convention. They are lengthy reports, but in many of them there are valuable points that could be used by the organization committee. The reading of these reports would take about three or four hours, and having three or four copies of each of these reports made, I would suggest that these reports be immediately forwarded to the Organization Committee, in order that they may act on some of the suggestions contained therein. They have the best experience in the field, and they have perhaps seen some of the mistakes and fallacies of the past, and the Organization Committee may be able to learn something from these reports. They are in line with the work that was mapped out by the General Executive Board.

Now, it is up to the convention whether they accept these reports and let the Organization Committee act on them or not.

DEL. FISCHER: I move that the reports of the organizers be received and turned over to the Organization Committee.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded that the reports of the organizers be referred to the Organization Committee. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was put and unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Who is the chairman of the Organization Committee?

DEL. WALTERS: Right here.

DEL. FOOTE: I have a motion which I made this morning, which I think ought to be considered now if you will allow it. I move you—

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Foote, I want to inform you that we decided last night to give the delegate from the coal miners the floor at the earliest possible moment so that he could be properly seated.

DEL. FOOTE: This will only take a moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we ought to do that now.

DEL. FOOTE: I will wait then until after that matter has been disposed of.

DISCUSSION CONCERNING LOCAL UNION 1475 OF THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow delegates, at the session yesterday afternoon, I believe it was decided that the matter of the delegate from the United Mine Workers should be left until the convention was properly organized. It should have been taken up this morning, but was overlooked, and I think it ought to be taken up now, and if there is no objection the delegate from the Mine Workers' Local of the United Mine Workers of America will have the floor. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the delegate has the floor. (Applause.)

DEL. FENNEL: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: On behalf of Local Union 1475 of the United Mine Workers of America, located at Panama, Ill., I desire to say that the miners of Sub-District 6 of District 12, composing the state of Illinois, had a convention in the city of East St. Louis. They had charges preferred against the officers of the union, and I will state one of the most serious charges they had against them.

This was one that started in a mining camp called Livingstone, Ill. They have electric mining machines there. They cut out about four inches of the coal from the bottom of the vein. According to the agreement, or the iron-clad rule, if you would rather call it that, they are supposed to "snub" this down so that when it is shot it will not make so much slack.

They had lost some nine or ten days' work in connection with this matter before they were reinstated. When the boss discharged them, understand, the miners asked him if they could not go down and clean up the coal they had already shot. The boss said, "No, you keep out of that hole." So they had monkeyed with the officers, and they got reinstated after a short time, nine or ten days, and they would not pay them for this time they had lost. So they went to the courts, to the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

capitalist court, and beat the company in that court, beat them in their own court and got judgment for \$80, and the costs of the court was thrown upon the company, and the result was that the coal operators applied to the state office at Springfield, W.D. Ryan, and that scab crew in Springfield.

The result was that Ryan, acting in behalf of the state office there, sent a letter to McDonald and another fellow there, and told them that they had to give this \$80 back to the coal company and reimburse them for the costs in the court, and fined them \$10 in the bargain. (Laughter.)

And said they, "If you don't pay this \$10 you can consider yourselves no longer members of the United Mine Workers of America"—a scab organization. I will just add that to it; Ryan did not say that.

So it went on, and they preferred charges against them, and the delegates from our local seen they way they ruled them out, and they kept their charges in their pockets, for they saw there was no use to monkey with those fakers at all.

Bonnell had charges against them, and one charge was that according to the state mining law of Illinois there is an entry driven up like this, and an entry driven up here. There is supposed to be forty or sixty feet of coal here, and every sixty feet there is supposed to be a cross-cut, and the law says that at no time shall there be more than one cross-cut open, in order to keep the air up for the miners. And from what I know, I understand there were three of these cross-cuts open and that was keeping the air away from the entries.

So the mining committee stopped these fellows from working in there and fined them \$10 for obeying the law.

So our local has come to the conclusion that they cannot do anything in this scab organization and is appealing to this convention this afternoon to do all in its power during the coming year to organize the coal miners of the state of Illinois and bring them into the I.W.W. (Applause.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You stay here. You have to answer questions. (Laughter.)

DEL. FENNELL: All right.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would ask the delegate whether he has with him the latest agreement of District 24 of the United Mine Workers of America with the coal operators. If not, I will get it over here, so that it can be read before this convention. I have it over in the office.

DEL. FENNELL: What did you want to know?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I want to know this one point: whether it is a fact that there is a clause in that agreement between the coal operators and the coal miners that any man who violates the rules, that is, the contract with the coal operators, and rebels against the will of the companies, is fined \$10, and the fine of \$10 is deducted from his wages and equally divided between the coal operators and the coal miners organization? Is that a fact?

DEL. FENNELL: Yes, sir. I will tell you how that agreement is worked. You are not supposed to break this contract in any way whatever, and if you do break this contract, the officer will come to you this way: they will tell you that they will not take your grievance up until you go back to work. In the meantime the operator takes this \$10 off of your pay. It is a regular operators' court. The Miners' Union agrees with the decision of the operators and the miner is fined \$10, and \$5 goes to W.D. Ryan, and \$5 goes to the Coal Operators' Association, and so in this camp at Livingstone, if those two slaves go to work to pay back this money the coal operator at Livingstone has made \$10 out of it.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I have one more question I want to ask.

DEL. THOMAS: I want to make a few remarks in connection with the Pittsburg District along this line myself. Our conditions are almost exactly similar.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put a question to the delegate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

DEL. FOOTE: Would it not follow as a matter of course, that it would be to the interest of the United Mine Workers' official organization and the Mine Operators' official organization, to continue to break the contract?

DEL. FENNELL: Well, it would certainly be to the interest of the coal company. I do not know about the other fellow.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: So that the convention can act on matters that perhaps Fellow Worker Thomas will not bring out in his speech, I desire to ask another question for the guidance of the Organization Committee.

The matter of the Coal Miners is the most serious problem before us, one of the most serious. I am satisfied from the experience I have had, and Fellow Worker Fennell knows that on every Sunday I can get off I go among the miners and every one of them, according to the lists we have received, are ready for the I.W.W. But, is it not a fact, for the guidance of the policy that we have to pursue, so that we may be clear

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

on the subject, is it not a matter of fact, that in the state of Illinois there are just about 20,000 coal miners too many in the field? Is it not a fact that, for instance, the Illinois Central Coal Company, owned by the Illinois Central Railroad Company, when they shut down the mines in the southern district, open the mines in the northern district owned by the same company, and simply work the slaves for three or four months so that they can pay off their debts? As soon as they have paid off their debts and are ready to rebel against the conditions that have been imposed by the company, is it not a fact that they shut down the mines and begin to operate the mines in the southern part of the state so that they can use the miners of the south against the miners of the north, not directly, but indirectly? Is that not a fact?

DEL. FENNELL: You have hit the nail on the head.

DEL. FISCHER: The same thing is true in Ohio and in the Pennsylvania districts.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate will answer that question.

DEL. FENNELL: I work on what is called the Troy & Eastern Railroad, that runs about 25 miles out of St. Louis. It is owned by the Funk Bros. Coal & Coke Company; they own the mines and the railroad. Now, Funk is one of the largest coal operators in St. Louis, that is, he furnishes the city more coal than any other operator in that district. You can have a pretty good business with Funk as long as the winter in {is?} on, but when spring comes and the demand for coal drops off, he starts up a little trouble down at No. 1, at Cuba, and if the slaves rebel against him, he doesn't work that mine, but works No. 2 and No. 3. After he is though {through?} with that he will go down to No. 2 and will start some more trouble there and then he works No. 1. No. 2 has nothing doing. Then he goes up to No. 3 and he does the same thing, and if it was not for the trouble at No. 1 and 2, these men at No. 3 wouldn't work hardly at all in the summer time for that is a domestic coal.

That gives you a clear understanding of what Fellow Worker Trautmann was talking about.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Here is another question for our organizers. I am satisfied that this convention will act right on this question, but is there a chance, with all the promises we may have received, is there a possibility that we can get the miners in sufficient numbers to start the rebellion within one or two months? I know the field is well prepared, but have we enough courageous men to start the rebellion?

DEL. FENNELL: I would not say that you have. You might have. I know it takes lots of agitation. Those operators, you know, use that

check-off system. You understand what it means if your card is taken off in Springfield, you are blacklisted, the same as a railroad company would blacklist Fellow Worker Cole there. You have to have these cards in Illinois, you must be a member of the Mine Workers' Union, and if a man has his card taken off at Springfield, he is up against it. The only thing to do is to go to the state of Colorado, or West Virginia, where they have no union, and if you have the nerve to hit a box car there, it is all right, but if you want to stay in Panama, you have to put up with these things.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You mentioned the state of Colorado. Isn't it a fact that through some officers of the Western Federation, the Mine Operators have succeeded in getting a closed-shop agreement with the Mine Workers? Have you heard about that?

DEL. FENNELL: No.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Isn't it a fact that the I.W.W. men who were ready to join this organization were driven back by the action of Mahoney and others of the Western Federation of Miners? We are up against this very same proposition and we have to deal with it. I want to know whether you know about that?

DEL. FENNELL: I am not acquainted with that, Fellow Worker Trautmann.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I know it.

DEL. FENNELL: Well, you might have been on the inside of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, fellow delegates, you have heard the explanation. Do you want to say anything, Fellow Worker Thomas?

DEL. THOMAS: I do not want to detain the convention, but if they desire it I would like to make a little explanation.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Come up here to the front.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Thomas is also a coal miner from Pennsylvania, and may throw some additional light upon the situation.

DEL. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I wish to supplement the report of the delegate from the Panama district of Illinois. In relation to the condition prevailing, I may say that they are the exact reflex of the Pittsburg district, in that one portion of the miners are set against the other portion in the various districts. In the Pittsburg district we have the same vein of coal, as it were, but of a different thickness. The coal in the thick vein—I have the stipulations of the contract between the operators and the mine workers here in my coat pocket, relative to the price of those two veins—but anyhow, there is about 13 cents a ton difference, and when it is necessary on the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

part of the Pittsburg coal, which is the dominating factor in the Pittsburg district, they will set at naught the desires of any portion of the Pittsburg district when they desire a certain kind of coal, and they will put such coal as they desire into the market.

Again, in reference to the contract that makes the miners in the Illinois district subservient to the well being and the profit-making system of the capitalistic class, it is done in this way: that the example shall be set upon a small scale, but in the event that it should become to a greater extent to affect the corporations, then they bring it in as our delegate here has made plain.

The clause in the Illinois district, and I obtained that through the *Industrial Bulletin*, was to the effect that any person or body of men that prevents or retards the production of coal is subject to a fine of \$10, \$5 of which is to remain in the repository of capitalistic profits, and the balance in the maw of the capitalistic supporting faker—the officers of the United Mine Workers.

Now, there are conditions in the mines that make it such that the capitalistic boss, the superintendent, can dictate conditions whereby it makes it possible that men in their desperation will get up and kick, and if there is a small portion of the miners getting up and kicking against that which is such that it animates a man to carry himself up against the wall of desperation, it is on a small scale with the miner that in a certain entry they do not get a square turn with the balance of the pit. It is immaterial whether a man is an experienced miner or not. He supposes when he goes in the mine in the morning that he will get his share of the wagons that come around in a rotary fashion. As the driver comes in the bottom of the entry and hollers unto the diggers, "Here is your turn, your wagon," you are to have a square turn not only in one entry, but in the whole mine; and it is possible with the operator to make conditions that force some portion of the men to strike, to set an example, to keep the balance of the miners in subjection.

I am working in a mine where the last day I worked I obtained one wagon, my turn, at 50 cents a ton, and probably I could get thirty hundred which would make it 75 cents. That was my day's wages. Other days it might come three or four wagons, but on an average the working class in the mines in Pennsylvania and Illinois do not average \$500 per annum, and with these conditions it is enough to make any portion of the men rebellious.

But if we are to overthrow the yoke of the labor fakers supported by the bosses on the check-off system, we will have to be like the steed,

take the bit in our mouth and challenge the fight.

In my case I wish to state that the check-off system in the mine that I work at is in swing. Some four years ago I had occasion to go out on the road, and asked permission to come back, of course, when my little trip was over. I asked the mine foreman if things would be so that I would get my place when I came back, and I also asked the superintendent. He said, "All right, go ahead," but when I came back there was no place for me. Well, an old S.L.P. member, ex-member now, of course, or rather he is dead since, he said: "Billy, never you mind," he says, "you come back and work with me." I said to him "No, I will not come and work with you and endanger you." I said "You are a cripple and you cannot hit the road as I can, and I will not do it. I will see my mine foreman first and if he allows me to work with you I will do so." Well, I did, and I worked about two weeks and got fired and I have been on the bum for four years insofar as the Pittsburg Company is concerned, and immediately after, misfortune developed in my family, my little boy got killed, and my wife desired that I should not walk along that track any longer, but should come nearer home. I was working four miles from home, in a mine four miles from home, walking eight miles a day to and from work.

So I came back and I asked the foreman if there was a chance of a job and he said, "Yes." Well, I commenced to work and at this period, mind you, he said every man was supposed to be initiated in the Union, forced to become a member. We had another ex-member of the S.L.P., and against the United Mine Workers, insofar as the check-off was concerned, and he was politely told by the mine foreman and superintendent that he had to submit to the dictates of the union and become a member of that organization, and of course he submitted.

I was the first individual following, and after obtaining a position as a miner I was expecting to hear the pit committee come to me and tell me "Here, you must join this Local down here." "Nary."

Not only that, but when the strike was in vogue and the Pittsburg District was divided from the balance of the competing fields, they were told to go to work and scab upon the miners and ship coal into the Illinois Miners' market, and the miners of the Pittsburg District revolted against that and said: "No, we don't feel like going to work and doing that," but eventually they were enticed to go to work, and they were told that they could support the miners of Illinois, Indiana and Ohio just the same by contributing toward their support. (Laughter.) Finally, of course, the assessment came on. And mark you, the feature of the question is this, that the pit committee, or mine

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

committees as you call them, we call them pit committees, do not attend to their functions in looking after any interests of the miners in committee meetings.

The superintendent of the coal company, it is said, had given authority for the assessment of a dollar to be kept off of the months of April, May and June. The money was deducted out of my envelope and I went to my foreman and of course I used a little profanity, I asked him, "who in the H _ _ _ gave those pirates authority to get into my envelope and abstract that which belongs to me by right of my labor?" He said: "Thomas, you keep your mouth shut. You are one of the kickers anyhow." Well, of course he didn't say whether it was from the point of view of the capitalistic employers or the fakers, but anyhow I took it for both (laughter), and in view of that I said "I didn't give a continental. I am going to get that money back if it is possible, and I think it is." He said: "The best thing for you to do is to go to the local union and tell the local union what you desire.

I went and attended the local union and there was no meeting, and there is no meeting. It is just a beer club meeting occasionally in their drunken brawls so to speak, or their drunken condition, and inciting what shall be done in the mines. That is the condition in the Pittsburg District, in the York Valley.

I told the local officers that I wanted this assessment given back to me. "Well," they said, "we can't give it back to you. We haven't got it." "Well," I said, "who has got it?" "Why," they said, "the Pittsburg Coal Company has got it." "Yes, but don't you expect to get it," I said. "Of course," they replied, "we expect to get it." "Well," said I, "I want to tell you this: I want to get that back and if you don't give it back to me I want you to understand that the Pittsburg Coal Company is liable to prosecution in a civil suit for stolen goods, or for stealing money out of my envelope, and," said I, "you are the receivers of stolen goods and you are liable in law, and I want you to understand that." And, I will be hanged, you know,— they submitted, and said "We will consider this," and the result was that we all got our money back. (Applause.)

Now, what I want to tell the miners, is to put the bit in your teeth, and grip the bridle as well, and go along and fight. (Applause.)

DEL. DE LEON: Fellow Worker Chairman, is the discussion of this case completed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the motion that was adopted yesterday was to hear the report of the delegate and then take action. We have heard his report.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to make a motion which is subsidiary to the

motion you will make afterwards upon seating the delegates.

All that these fellow workers have said is highly interesting, and the subject that Brother Thomas brought out, this thing of working the Miners of Pennsylvania against the Miners of Illinois, and vice versa, is very interesting, but those are all facts that can be ascertained from the newspapers by those who are interested in that movement and are following it and are familiar with it.

There was one fact, however, that was brought out by the question put by Fellow Worker Trautmann, with regard to that clause that enabled the company to make \$10 out of each man who had broken any of the company laws. Is that right?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is correct.

DEL. DE LEON: Now that clause is brand new to me, and I know it is brand new to many in America and in Europe who are following this matter very closely. That clause in my opinion should be in our stenographic report literally. Fellow Worker Trautmann asked, "Isn't there a clause to this effect?" and Fellow Worker Fennell did not quote the clause literally.

My motion is that the national secretary be instructed to see to it that in the stenographic report as given, this clause do not appear as he put it from memory, but that the literal {literal?} words of that clause be shown in the report in quotation marks, so that we shall have the actual wording, and we will not seek to verify the statement any further than verification is required.

When a man quotes from memory he may overlook a word or two and I think that that clause should appear literally in the stenographic report and not as it was quoted from memory.

My purpose in this: the action of the I.W.W. at the Stuttgart Convention was the first ratification we had of these international congresses. We certainly left our mark there. Now, Fellow Worker Heselwood and myself have had inquiries from delegates from Russia, and France and Italy and Belgium, and other countries asking for more information, and this stenographic report will be read there, possibly not by thousands, but by those who are the leaders of thousands, and who are the makers of the future public opinion that is shaping itself now in our work, and for that reason I move you that the national secretary be instructed to see to it that this clause appears in the stenographic report not as put by him from memory, but literally quoted from that contract in quotation marks.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHIARMAN: A motion has been made that the secretary see

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

that there be inserted in the stenographic report this clause from the contract of the United Mine Workers, that it be put there as it is literally.

DEL. DE LEON: Put in his question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Put in his question.

DEL. FENNELL: In reference to what Fellow Worker De Leon has said I will show you another part of the United Mine Workers' method.

In the state of Illinois after several years of trying to legislate what is called the shot firer bill, the miners, from what I understand, have spent \$22,000 trying to get this bill through the legislature at Springfield, and after it had become a law, it took effect on the first day of July, 1904, I believe, the operators met on the 16th day of June in that same year and said that they would not pay the shot firer bill. So they locked the miners out. Ryan and the rest of the officers went to Chicago and offered arbitration for the mining laws. The operators took them up, and Judge Gray of Delaware, I believe, was the arbitrator.

In his report he said he did not know what they wanted to arbitrate this law for, but he said "I will just bring it out this way: that the miners pay half of the shot fires and the company pay the other half," which was \$4.25 a day. That was the scale agreed upon between the labor leaders and the other fellows.

That went on smoothly enough until a year ago the first of last April. In the year 1904 we took a reduction of 3 cents on the ton in Illinois to suit Johnnie Mitchell and the gang in Indianapolis. Now, the operators came back in Illinois and stated that they would give that 3 cents back. They gave us the 3 cents back, but they said, "You will have to pay the shot fire bills."

Now, there was one day I kept track of when I was working in a mine in Panama, last spring, where it cost me 19 cents a shot to get a man to light me, while the law says the operator should pay it.

So the miners got no raise at all, and did not get the scale. They are just as bad off as they were three or four years ago.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In supporting the motion of Fellow Worker De Leon, I wish to state that there is another clause in that agreement which also should go into the records of this convention verbatim. That clause is the second last in the agreement between the coal operators of Indiana, the coal operators of Illinois and the United Mine Workers Organization. This clause provides that the United Mine Workers as an organization shall not participate in any legislative propaganda in the enactment of laws that would injure the

interests of the coal operators of the state of Illinois. Is that correct? (Laughter and applause.)

DEL. FENNELL: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I bring this point out so as to show that the shot firers bill which was to a certain extent from my knowledge of mining—I am not a coal miner, but I learned enough through the agitation and propaganda amongst them to know that the shot firers bill was beneficial to the coal miners provided they could have forced the coal operators to pay the bill.

Now, we have papers in our office showing that the check off for two weeks is \$7.80 up to \$10, from \$45 in wages, checked off for various items. The man who makes \$45 perhaps in two weeks has a check off of \$10 for the benefit of the coal operators and the United Mine Workers of America. And not only that, but during the strike in the Cuba mine I was called upon and had to interfere to a certain extent. I took my Sunday off. The drivers in the Cuba mine went out on strike because they would not submit to maltreating the animals, the mules. They demanded from the company better treatment for the mules. Isn't that a fact, Fennell? Isn't that the cause of the strike?

DEL. FENNELL: Yes; it occurs very often.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The mule drivers went out on strike, and W.D. Ryan, of Springfield, Ill., came to the rescue of the coal operators. He demanded that the mule drivers go back to work pending arbitration. They refused to do so.

They started to put scabs into the mines. The United Mine Workers of America, the members of the rank and file, refused to work with one scab and 500 men in the Cuba mine went out on strike in sympathy with the fellow workers who demanded better treatment of the animals.

Then there came the conference of the coal operators in St. Louis. It was published in all the evening papers of America, and the conclusion was arrived at that the United Miner Workers' officials must fill the places of the strikers in the Cuba mines. Failure to do would abrogate their agreement.

The coal miners were waiting in suspense for somebody who would come and give them some attention in order to start the rebellion. What could we do? I was down at one of their meetings and simply told them that they had paid a gratuity of \$100 toward their delegates to the Indianapolis convention for enacting that clause, and that we could not do anything unless we had enough coal miners organized to start a rebellion.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

I have the documents at home where it states that every man who starts a rebellion must be black-listed. It is published in the *United Mine Workers' Journal* that no man should be given employment in any mines in the United States who is black-listed by the United Mine Workers of America. I have the issue at home and can present the document tomorrow.

These miners were driven back to work, and at the next pay day \$10 was deducted from their pay and divided equally between the coal miners' organization and the operators' organization, according to the agreement.

Then they came in a mass meeting, and they said, "What will the Industrial Workers of the World do? Are you cowards?" Well, cowards—it is not a question of cowardice. It is not a question as to whether their case is right or wrong, but the question is, Are the members of this organization as a working class prepared to support the miners when they will rebel? If the organizer from the Kansas district was here he would tell you of the situation of the coal miners in Kansas. In the other states, in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, they at least hear the whistle blow when they are not requested to go to work, but in the Kansas district with the check-off system of contract of the United Mine Workers, they travel, some of them, four or five or six or eight or ten miles to the mine, and when they reach the mine the mine is closed against them and a day's work is lost. A day's work is lost because traveling to the mine and back to their homes again prevents them from taking employment in any other industry.

And yet, what shall we do? Are we prepared to assist these men? Are we prepared to go amongst them? Are we prepared to lead them as in the times when they fought as one, 25,000 members strong, in their rebellion against the interests of today? We know the coal miners have fought better battles than the organization of mine workers have fought. We know that we have able and progressive men among the United Mine Workers, men who would be ready to rebel, but we know the first man who would attempt to rebel would be made a victim of the system that has made the United Mine Workers of America the strongest organization in the Federation of Labor.

And we find the working class at the coal mines divided. Practical experience shows it. We find them reading papers like the *St. Louis Arbiter* and the *St. Louis Worker*. They read that paper. They are afraid that the Industrial Workers of the World are made up of scabs. They know that they are wrong, but they are under the control of this

system, and every labor faker of the state of Illinois, without any exception, and I deny contradiction, is a member of the Socialist party of America. (Applause.) Mention me one exception if you can. You miners know it, and yet when you run up against the men, when you know they are ready to accept the doctrine, when you know that they are despairing because they have lost confidence, you cannot tell me that they even today are not ready to take courage and march as they did in years gone by. There is no better element.

Last summer I was among them for four or five Sundays. I know they have paid their expenses. They have a big treasury fund. They have about \$875,000 in the treasury of Illinois alone, but they are not allowed to touch that money. Here is the stumbling block. Here, then, is almost one million dollars tied up in one state, and that million dollars is used against the coal miners of Illinois—as Fennell and Thomas know. It is the money of coal miners with which they are exploited.

Now, the problem may look all right, we may be carried away with the idea that the Industrial Workers of the World are ready for the task of the organization of the Mine Workers, but we have to consider these things and when you consider them you have to take into consideration the big battle before us and the obstacles that we will have to meet in our progress to bring the workers in the various districts into the Industrial Workers of the World. We all realize that, I believe. Everything may look nice, but when you encourage them to withdraw and start a rebellion then you should be aware of the fact that you must be prepared for it and you must be prepared not only with your courage but with your finances too.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say that a motion has been made and seconded, and we should now speak to the motion. Do you want the floor upon that motion, Fellow Worker Cole?

DEL. COLE: No. I would like to ask Fellow Worker Trautmann a question, if it is not out of order.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All right.

DEL. COLE: I would like to ask if I am clear as to one assertion that Fellow Worker Trautmann made, which said that there was something like \$875,000 in the treasury of the United Mine Workers of Illinois?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. COLE: That money is being used by the Mine Workers' Association.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The total amount, according to the financial report which I have in my possession of the United Mine Workers of

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the World [sic], is as I have stated. The money is deposited in seven banks in Springfield, and all of those banks are interested in coal mines and corporations.

DEL. COLE: That is all I wanted to know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, you have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. THOMAS: I desire to supplement the motion of Fellow Worker De Leon, that the clause referred to be copied literally in the stenographic report, by saying that there is another part of that contract which I think should be put in the stenographic report, and that is the clause in the contract under the head of "Restriction of Market." That says that the coal companies are at all times, provided they pay the scale rates, to be allowed to load railroad cars by whomsoever owned, to be delivered in any market whatsoever. That is as much to say the Illinois miners are compelled to work by that contract when the Indiana and Ohio and Pennsylvania miners are on strike, and they are compelled by that contract to scab their fellow workers in other states.

DEL. JONES: I think in order to settle this matter, that that contract between the Illinois Mine Workers and the Illinois Operators should be inserted literally.

DEL. DE LEON: I must object to that for the reason that that would be a very good way to conceal these two clauses {clauses?}, by copying the whole contract. These two clauses are the important ones and we do not want them buried.

DEL. JONES: I think my motion was seconded, and you can very easily overcome your objection by putting these two clauses in italics if you want to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the amendment been seconded?

(The amendment failed of a second.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has not been seconded.

DEL. FENNELL: I would like to tell another thing that happened at the time that this organization was founded in Chicago, and it happened in the state of Arkansas. Down in Arkansas they had been shipping a lot of electric machinery. From what they told me when I was down there, the miners refused to unload it off the cars because it was hauled by scab electrical workers. So, the company protested against it and the officers came down from the United Mine Workers, and they told them that they must not interfere with this at all, and this is the way they compromised it. That the company would get somebody else to unload the machinery instead of the members of the

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

United Mine Workers. In other words, that meant that one part of the A.F. of L. was scabbing on the other part of the A.F. of L.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will proceed to a vote if there is no one else desiring to speak upon the motion before us. It is nearly four o'clock and there is enough business to be transacted. I presume that the amendment or the suggestion of Fellow Worker Thomas will be included in the original motion, if the mover of the motion does not object.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, my motion was that the national secretary be instructed to see to it that the clause I referred to, is quoted literally in the stenographic report. How can Fellow Worker Thomas' suggestion be adopted with that? It will confuse the thing.

Now, of course, after Fellow Worker Trautmann mentioned some important facts that follow after a motion in the stenographic record, he will see that that clause should be inserted literally, but the Thomas proposition does not hitch on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, you all understand the motion, I presume. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for and the motion prevailed.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we must take some action as to the seating of this delegation from the United Mine Workers.

DEL. FRANCIS: Point of information. I wish to ask as to what they wanted. I would like to have the information whether they want to be seated or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report, Delegate Francis, of your Credentials Committee. They left it to this body. We are now acting on this as a Committee of the Whole. A motion will now be in order.

DEL. DE LEON: I move you that.

Whereas, every corrupt, or weak-kneed, or vacillating element in the Labor Movement is lumped against the efforts of the shackled membership of the so-called United Mine Workers of America to break loose and organize in the I.W.W.

Whereas, The appearance at this convention of a member of the said so-called United Mine Workers Union with the request for admission as a delegate representing his Union:

Therefore be it resolved, That the delegate be seated.

(The motion was received with hearty applause and was accorded an almost unanimous second.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

(The question was called for and put and the motion unanimously prevailed.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I want to call your attention, fellow workers, to the fact that there is an omission in the committees appointed. I see that the committees which we elected yesterday and this morning, together with the recommendation brought in by the Committee on Rules and Order of Business, omitted to provide for a committee on officers' reports to be elected, and we would want to know to which committee this report would go. It would not go to the Committee on Resolutions.

DEL. DE LEON: The precedent established last year in this body, and it worked very well, was that the Chairman acted as a distributing committee and I think that he should remain so. There is no necessity of appointing a new committee for this purpose. The Chairman should act as a committee on distribution.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: A committee has been provided for but not elected.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is not how these things should be distributed, but it has been provided for and there is no committee to which this thing could be referred, because I understand that that committee on Officers' Reports, too?

DEL. DE LEON: It does not go to the committee, the chairman is the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me see that. (Referring to record.) That is the order of business. No, it is not on here.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We will have to elect a committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to elect a committee.

DEL. DE LEON: Point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. DE LEON: The point of order is that the president of the convention is such a committee, a committee on distribution.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The Committee on Officers' Reports, too?

DEL. DE LEON: Certainly, the officers' reports are handed to him and he distributes them to the various committees. There are matters that belong to the Committee on Organization and the Committee on Constitution and By-Laws, and, of course, that would include the officers' reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I understand is that this report should be segregated and given to the various committees. Isn't that right?

DEL. DE LEON: Yes, by the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the Chair stands

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

corrected. I was under the impression that we must have a committee on the officers' reports, but if the report is to go to the various committees elected that would not be necessary.

NEW BUSINESS.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now under the head of new business.

DEL. FOOTE: I wish to move that the national organizers be given a seat in the convention with voice but no vote.

The motion was seconded by Del. Axelson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion has been made and seconded that the national organizers be given a seat in the convention with voice but no vote.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move you that the motion be tabled.

DEL. CAMINITA: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded to table the motion. It is not debatable.

A viva voce vote leaving the Chair in doubt a roll call was had, resulting as follows: Total number of votes cast, 117; 68 voting aye, 49 voting nay, and the motion was declared tabled.

CORRECTION IN REPRESENTATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now under the head of new business. Is there any other new business before the house?

DEL. TRAINOR: Fellow Worker Chairman: Under the head of new business I notice that there is an omission here of two locals, in regard to the delegates in the city of Paterson; that is, of Local 4, flax dressers, which I represent, and Local 22.

THE CHAIRMAN: Locomotive workers.

DEL. TRAINOR: The full amount of votes is here accredited, but it is only accredited to 152.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to state that I saw that omission, and I was going to call the attention of the committee, of which Fellow Worker Edwards is the chairman. The three delegates from Paterson represent a number of locals, and it is all accredited to 152, mixed. It should be 152, Silk Workers; 22, Locomotive Workers; 4, Flax Workers.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, but it is so on the roll call here. We will correct that.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. TRAINOR: That is the way it should be.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It is correct, in the original.

RESIGNATION OF DEL. JONES FROM RESOLUTIONS
COMMITTEE.

DEL. JONES: I wish to resign from the resolutions committee. I move that my resignation be accepted, and nominate Fellow Worker Finnigan for the vacancy.

THE CHAIRMAN: How is that?

DEL. JONES: If my resignation from the resolution committee is accepted, I wish to nominate Delegate Finnigan.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to come to that later. We do not know whether we will accept your resignation.

DEL. WALTERS: I move that the resignation of Delegate Jones be accepted.

(The motion was seconded by several delegates.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the resignation of Fellow Worker Jones from the committee on resolutions be accepted.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Ask him what reasons he has for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the motion is made to accept the resignation.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is all right.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried, and nominations for a delegate to fill his place are in order.

DEL. SPETTEL: I will nominate Fellow Worker Finnigan.

Nomination seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further nominations.

DEL. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the nominations be closed.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made that the nominations close, with the nomination of Delegate Finnigan.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. Now, all those in favor of Del. Finnigan being as member of the committee on resolutions will say aye; opposed, no.

(Del. Finnigan was unanimously elected.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. So ordered. We are still

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

under the head on new business.

There is one thing that ought to come up before this convention now, and that is, regarding when you meet again. You have appointed a number of committees and they certainly will have their hands full, and I do not know whether they will be ready to report by 9 o'clock in the morning; and in order to give them ample time, I think it would be proper that we should adjourn tonight, so that they have ample time to prepare their reports, giving us something to work on.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, I make that as a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

DEL. PINKERTON: I second the motion.

(The motion was seconded by other delegates, as well.)

DEL. FRANCIS: This committee that is going to handle the resolutions and the different amendments, while you do adjourn, I do not know just how this committee will be able to get rid of their work. I think we ought, still, to hold tomorrow morning a session, and by that time this committee will have acted on some matters and have gotten rid of some of their business, and by tomorrow noon or during tomorrow afternoon we will be able to turn work over to that committee. We will be able to turn work over to all the different committees. As far as the work of this committee is concerned, you do not have to adjourn for that purpose. I would like to have the delegates look up matters, and perhaps there is some other work that ought to be done, without adjourning.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate need not have any fear that the committees which have been elected will not have any work from now until tomorrow noon.

DEL. AXELSON: The reason I make that as a motion is this: When the credentials committee was elected yesterday we were trying to hurry through the report, and we could have done better, I think, if we had taken more time; and so, in order to prevent an error of that kind, where an error can be prevented by giving them ample time. I think it is well at this time to give them a sufficient amount of time, so that they can do their work correctly, and to avoid all trouble in the future.

DEL. GLOVER: Fellow workers: I am somewhat opposed to the motion for this reason: While I do not object to giving these committees all the time that they require to do their work, at the same time there is a possibility that some of these committees may be in a position to make a report to this convention before 2 o'clock tomorrow; and, consequently, if they are prepared to make such

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

report, if this convention holds a morning session, they can take up that work and get it over with. Now, I for one want to see the work of this convention done in as short a time as possible, that is, to do it well, and I do not like to see anything done which is going to tend to drag this convention for any length of time; and for that reason I am opposed to this motion.

DEL. KEEP: I think the motion explains itself, because this work of the committees must be done, and they can not do it by tomorrow morning, but if you give them plenty of time, we can meet here at two o'clock tomorrow and do some work. I do not think there is any use for us to come here tomorrow expecting that perhaps some committees may report, and then just come into the hall, and walk out again.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is right.

DEL. KEEP: And you may as well give them that time, and it will expedite more than it will retard matters, because some committee might think they could get the report in, and consequently do it in a hasty manner, whereas otherwise, if they would take the proper time they would do better work.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All day tomorrow.

DEL. KEEP: So I do not see any objection to adjourning until two o'clock tomorrow. That will give them time.

DEL. SCHWEND: Fellow workers, I am opposed to this motion, for the reason that we want to transact the business of this convention just as quickly as possible; and I believe that each and every committee that has been appointed will be unable to get through with the work that has been allotted to them by this convention by two o'clock tomorrow afternoon. However, we know that among the many different subjects that have been assigned to the various committees, each committee can meet this evening and come to a decision on perhaps a few of the subjects which have been assigned to them; and if each committee arrives at an impartial decision they will be able in the morning to make a report, a partial report, and we will have material enough for this convention to act upon and to consider all day tomorrow. Tomorrow evening the committees can sit again, and go over some more of the business that has been assigned to them, and by day after tomorrow they will have enough again to keep the convention working all day. But I believe that it will be impossible for the different committees to accomplish this work and make a complete report by two o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I believe it would be expediting matters to have our regular sessions every day, and let the committees do their work at night. I think they will keep us supplied

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

with ample material to keep things moving along, and we will get along faster.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, didn't this motion carry a little while ago?

THE CHAIRMAN: This question was not put. The motion was made, and we are debating upon it.

DEL. COLE: Fellow Worker Chairman: I would like to state, in support of this fellow worker's argument—I can not think of his name.

THE CHAIRMAN: Schwend.

DEL. COLE: Schwend,—what would be the use of reconvening this convention tomorrow at two o'clock, when a committee must leave the room at three o'clock you would simply get one hour's work done, and no committee could have its work completed. If the committee that is going to wait upon the telegraphers is going to make an appointment with them at four o'clock tomorrow afternoon, we will have to leave here about three or 3:30,—say 3:30. That would give us an hour and thirty minutes to work. Now, let us either meet tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, or adjourn the convention until day after tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, and then the committees can have a complete finishing of their work, and the convention can go on uninterruptedly. Otherwise, to take up the fellow worker's argument, let the committees complete as far as they can their work tonight, and re-convene the convention tomorrow morning at nine o'clock, and let us do what we can until three o'clock in the afternoon, and then we can adjourn the convention and allow them to complete their work. I know that there is one committee, the committee on grievances, that has more work than it can complete by tomorrow morning or tomorrow noon or tomorrow at three, finishing the general report to this convention.

DEL. DE LEON: Is it understood that when that committee meets the telegraphers, this convention has to adjourn?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, not at all.

Now, the motion before the house is that we adjourn until tomorrow at two o'clock, in order that the committees may have a chance to prepare something to report, and thereby we may save time, and not waste it. Does anyone else want the floor on this question? If not, we will come to a vote. All in favor of the motion that when we adjourn tonight we adjourn until tomorrow at two o'clock in the afternoon will say aye; opposed, no.

(A vote being taken, the chair announced that he was in doubt; whereupon a call for the roll was requested, and the roll was called upon the motion. Secretary Trautmann announced the result of the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

roll call as follows: Total number of votes cast, 121; voting aye, 96; voting no, 25.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. Any further new business?

DEL. TRAINOR: Fellow Worker Chairman: I have here a letter from Gold Road, Ariz., from Secretary Schwiedemann, in regard to a donation, or two donations, which were sent to the locomotive builders, in the time of our trouble in Paterson, stating that he had had no receipt from them, and, as Fellow Worker Katz had received all the communications or money that had come there, I gave it to him, and he looked them over, and in his file he could find no communication from him, so therefore we did not get any, and I thought that this was the proper place to bring this up before the convention and have it investigated.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure?

DEL. FISCHER: Fellow Worker Chairman: I move that this matter be turned over to the grievance committee, for investigation.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded that the matter be turned over to the grievance committee for investigation. Are you ready for the question, or do you want to speak upon it?

(The question being called for, the motion was put and unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the number of the local?

DEL. TRAINOR: 124.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further new business?

DEL. HAGGERTY: Fellow Worker Chairman: May I request the members of the grievance committee, and also of the ways and means committee, to meet at this table after the meeting adjourns? The way{s} and means committee and the grievance committee will meet at this table after adjournment.

DEL. DE LEON: The committee on constitution will meet right here.

DEL. FRANCIS: The committee on resolutions will meet here.

DEL. AIZZONE: The auditing committee will meet at headquarters at 7 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates that are on these committees will take notice.

Any other new business? Good and welfare?

DEL. KEEP: I move that we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

(Motion seconded.)

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded, that we adjourn.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: Before you adjourn let me make an explanation.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, we will have the explanation made.

ASST. SEC. EDWARDS: This is for the committee on revision of the report. We have discovered that the printer, in the rush of making up his first report, has misplaced a passage of about twenty-three or twenty-four lines at the end of the report, on the fourth page. Since many of you may have difficulty in placing that where it properly belongs, we wish to state that it follows in the remarks of Delegate Kern, on the third column of the same page, immediately preceding the remark of Delegate Walters. Delegate Kern is saying, "Now, that is concurring"— It stops abruptly there, and it is from that point that this matter should read, "Now, that is concurring in the report of the committee," it says, in the last column. With that explanation you will all understand where that part belongs.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, a motion to adjourn has been made. All in favor of the motion to adjourn until tomorrow at two o'clock p.m. will say aye; opposed, no.

The motion to adjourn was unanimously carried, and the convention thereupon adjourned to tomorrow, September 18, 1907, at two o'clock p.m.

THIRD DAY—WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 18, 1907.
AFTERNOON SESSION.

Pursuant to the adjournment taken yesterday, Chairman Katz called the convention to order at 2 o'clock p.m.

The Secretary called the roll of delegates.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is reports of committees, standing and special.

DEL. DE LEON: The committee on constitution is ready to report. We might as well take them in the proper order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Constitution comes first. I hear that the Committee on Constitution is ready to report. They are first on the list, that is, right after the Committee on Credentials, which, I presume, has nothing to report, or has the Committee on Credentials anything to report?

DEL. FOOTE: We have nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we will hear from the Committee on Constitution.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: The committee met in this hall this morning, and is prepared to report on the work so far accomplished. We first took up the consideration of proposed amendments to the preamble. I will read the proposed amendments and then the action taken by the committee regarding them.

I have here a proposed amendment to the second clause of the preamble of the constitution, submitted by Local No. 1: "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the political as well as the industrial field and take and hold that which they produce by their labor, through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party," to be stricken out and the following inserted: "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers shall unite as a class into one organization, and by their own direct action, on the political as well as on the industrial field, take and hold that which they produce by their labor."

I would like to ask a question of the chair. It is {Is it?} the wish of the convention that I read the reasons given by Local No. 1 for this proposed amendment?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DELEGATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I believe that the committee should render its report, whatever the chairman is instructed to bring before this convention. There may be a very large number of amendments, and they will be discussed anyway and reasons given. That Local 1 is the Schenectady Local, and the delegate from that local is on the floor.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I simply ask the question. Then I shall simply read the proposed amendments and our action.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will debate on it anyway.

DEL. WILLIAMS (continuing report): Amendment proposed by Local 173 of San Francisco, that the second paragraph of the preamble be stricken out and the following substituted: "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until a sufficient number of the wage workers, recognizing that their interests are irreconcilable with those of the employing class, come together in one organization containing within itself all the means necessary to take and hold that which they produce by their labor."

Another amendment proposed by Local 178 of Seattle is as follows: "The preamble as proposed to be amended: 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 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 all the toilers come together on the political as well as on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labor, through an economic organization of the working class with its own political expression. The rapid gathering of wealth and the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trades union unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class, because the trades unions foster a state of things which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping to defeat on another in wage wars. The trades unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers. These sad conditions can be changed and the interests 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. The interests of the wage workers are identical and diametrically opposed to the interests of the employing class, and the I.W.W. will

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

always line up with any section of the working class against their employers. Therefore, without endorsing or desiring the endorsement of any political party, we unite under the following constitution.”

It was moved by Foote, seconded by Hagenson, that the preamble stand as it is. This was carried unanimously. (Applause.)

DEL. DE LEON: I move that we concur in the recommendation of the committee.

Motion seconded by several delegates.

DEL. DE LEON: I shall not say anything now, but as the mover of the motion I shall reserve for the closing argument such arguments as the debate may call for.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion that we concur in the report of the committee. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: I cannot say that I concur, because to myself this preamble is misleading, because of the fact that it establishes in the minds of the working class this contradictory idea: You speak of the political field, and then in the last clause of the preamble you deny any affiliation or the desire for any affiliation with any political party. Now, the question before us is, how are you going to keep the economic movement from the political movement, when you have already provided that it shall be so? Why have this political field? If we can, which we assume, successfully organize and educate the workingmen into the idea of affiliating themselves and becoming members of such an organization as the Industrial Workers of the World, that organization, to my way of understanding the economic problem and sociology today, is the only organization that is competent to accomplish the ideal that we desire, namely, the co-operative system or the collectivist system of the working people. Therefore, to me this political clause has no meaning. You say that it is necessary to organize the working men. I say that when you have organized them and educated them you have the power you want.

Now, this clause says that the workers must operate on two fields. You classify them in this way, that one is the industrial field and the other is the political field. The industrial field takes within itself the industrial conditions in industrial departments and industrial communities, but the political field, they claim, is the field by which you have to operate on geographical divisions. Let us see, now. If, as you propose, as you advocate, you educate and organize the working

class thoroughly, every intelligent working man who is class conscious and understands his class interests will be in the industrial organization; that goes without saying.

Now, how are you going to operate on the political field when you have all the working men in the industrial organization? You have got to take these working men from the industrial organization, so that they will operate on the political field. Doesn't that show that it is possible to confine these duties and confine the working class to one solidified, one class conscious unit of working men? I say it is. I say this is only an assertion, if we make this industrial field two fields. It would be necessary that the workers get together twice. If it is necessary to get together on the industrial field and on the political field, I would be willing to insert one more field: "As well as on the religious field." If it is necessary to have all these fields, let us make them as numerous as possible. But if it is necessary only to unite the working class into one class conscious body, let us do so; that is my position.

Now, let me go further. They say that we must use civilized methods. I agree that civilized methods should be used. I have nothing against a civilized method. But the method I for one believe in using is a method {of} reaching the working men through an educational propaganda. Education, if I understand, is as much a civilized method as anything we have ever seen. Education is thoroughly civilized. Yet there are those of us who believe in education, to whom the name of physical force anarchists has been applied, and those names will be applied to those who are advocating even civilized methods.

They say we must use the franchise, as long as we have a right to use it. But look over the country, and you will find that a great proportion of the working class are today disfranchised. Not because of any statute laws, though in some states they have even laws on the statute books prohibiting them from exercising that right; but it is because of the economic conditions to which these working men are subjected. What I refer to is this: Suppose in the city of Chicago I have employment today. My employment runs out tonight, and I cannot find any employment in Chicago in the line of business that I follow. What follows? I have to take a train, maybe one of these so-called Pullman side-door sleepers, otherwise called a box car. I go to another city. Can I use my franchise there? No, they require me, in order to exercise my franchise, to be a resident of that community a certain number of days, months or so forth. Consequently you see that the vast majority of workers, because of the economic conditions today,

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

cannot exercise the franchise. Another thing is that we can never exercise this franchise except every two or four years. Now, the question is, what are we going to do in the meantime? In the meantime we have to fight our own battle in the best way we can. Consequently the industrial organization will be brought to bear in that battle, and unity will be the only way by which in these cases between elections we can do anything.

Now, these are the conditions that we are up against. Then the question is, can the political expression give us anything? In my way of thinking, in the way I have discovered and followed and analyzed this position, I say it cannot, because, as I showed you a little while ago, they borrow their strength from their economic power as a working class. Consequently that reflection while {which?} they throw upon the political arena is a party strength. I say, keep that strength within the organization, and you will have it.

Another argument for it is this: That if we strike out that clause in the constitution, or in the preamble, we would then be subject to be called anarchists. Now, I beg to differ. We are called anarchists now, and that term has been applied to those members of the Western Federation of Miners, namely, Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone. They called them anarchists before the trial, because the Western Federation of Miners in their preamble say, "We believe in concerted action of the working class." That is not an organization that is trying to dilly-dally with words and imagining that the words mean so and so, because all the men in it are revolutionary men who believe in controlling and taking that which they have the power to hold.

Now, when you say that this political idea is a thermometer by which you register the social movement and tendencies of the revolutionary sort, I say that it is a thermometer that registers the temper and the intent of the working class towards bringing this thing about. I deny that it is anything of the kind. Look over the history of the United States; look over the history of the labor movement in Europe, and you will find that it is nothing of the kind. Realize the situation in the city of Chicago at the present moment. The Socialist party in the city of Chicago only about four years ago cast a vote of 48,000. Two years later it fell to 26,000. In the last election it averaged 16,000, serving to show that this is not a true register of the public pulse and the public discontent; I mean the workingmen's discontent.

Now, I am going a little further, and you will find this: Any man can vote, but we do not want their votes as the politician does; we do not

want their votes unless they are thoroughly in accord, but if you build up a political machine the machine is going simply to ruin the movement, because it will be controlled like the democratic machine, and be in the hands of the shyster lawyer and the rest of the bunch that are only the lackeys of the capitalist class.

So we see we can never rely upon anything on the political field. What we can rely upon is an organized and educated working class, who, if it has the economic power, can control its own condition. What is the cause of our present condition? Is it because President Roosevelt sits in the chair in Washington? No, not at all. It is because we are living under wage slavery; we are living under an economic condition that deprives the workers of the control of the instruments of production and distribution. All you have got to sell is your labor power to another for a price. While you are doing that you are subject to this: You are subject to the law that governs all commodities, namely, the law of cost of production, supply and demand. Now, you know that with the development of capitalist industry the supply of labor is rapidly being replaced by machinery. That has this tendency, that with the introduction of the machine there arises on the other hand a still larger army of unemployed. That army of the unemployed is being rapidly replaced by machinery. This results in a greater struggle against one another than before, and the result is that we see the wage workers the world over-producing more and getting less, day after day. We are losing ground, as I say, day after day, because of this vast development of the machinery of production. What are we going to do? We cannot tell the working men and women to go on dilly-dallying with the political conditions. We have got to remove the cause. We have to educate the working man to understand that in every industry where he finds employment he must unite himself with the other workers all over the country. The working class, conservatively speaking, compose 60 per cent of the American population. That is very conservatively speaking. The remaining 40 per cent belong to the capitalist class. Therefore, you have got within yourselves all the necessary power. The capitalists look upon the working class in this way: "If we give the working men too high wages they will become lazy. If we give them too low wages they become rebellious." So the capitalists, acting in accordance with that understanding, always make the wages so as to keep us in working condition, and you will never get any more.

Now, the question is how are we going to get some more. There is only one way, by a united, intelligent, educated working class, in an

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

economic organization, an industrial organization. That is the whole thing.

While all the prejudice that has been heaped upon socialists, with all the different brands of socialists, there can be no unity of action. In every country of the world there is a different brand of people who call themselves socialists. In the United States we have one brand, in the different countries of Europe we have others. In fact, you might read the report to the International Congress made by the Socialist party of America, and you will find that you have here really a peculiar brand of so-called socialists. These socialists are of all diversified opinions, practices and foundations, and if you are going to follow such ideas, you will render yourselves, in the eyes of the working class, ridiculous. Therefore, I say that we should give expression to the simple idea of this class solidarity in the establishment of the co-operative system of labor, under the name of industrial unionism. Therefore, I believe you should make your position clear by striking out the political clause, making this an economic organization without affiliation without *{sic}* any political party. That is my position. After that I do not care how you vote, because your vote cannot endanger us. If you are economically organized and educated, you will take the proper step at the proper time. So we say it is dangerous for us to affiliate with and hang ourselves on to any political organization. We should always be careful that we have made that point clear. Therefore, in the preamble we should state, "Without endorsing or desiring the endorsement of any political party, we unite under the following constitution." That is my position.

Now, I come to the contradiction. The contradiction is that with that as a foundation of industrial unionism we can appear before a body of working men and talk strictly industrial unionism. Without it we cannot.

Now, in order to make myself clear, I make a motion, Fellow Worker Chairman—

A DELEGATE: An amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house.

DEL. AXELSON: I make an amendment to the motion that the five words, "political as well as the," be stricken out and this clause read in this way: "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the industrial field and take and hold that which they produce by their labor through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party." I thank you for your attention.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

(Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That means that the preamble now is to stand by striking out the words “political as well as the,” leaving simply “come together on the industrial field.” Do you understand it now?

DEL. FRANCIS: As there is a motion to concur, the only thing before the house is to concur in the report, and no new motion should be made.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see why we should start parliamentary quibbles. The amendment is all right, and you can thrash it out.

DEL. FOOTE: Have I got the floor?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. FOOTE: As the mover on the motion on this preamble as it stands, in the constitution committee, I have a statement to make that will perhaps place me in a different position, as well as throw some light on the situation. There was a resolution read before the convention yesterday on the preamble from my local, No. 224. The resolution was referred to the resolution committee. The resolution committee referred it to the constitutional committee, and the constitutional committee took it up this morning. I wish to read that resolution:

“Whereas, The I.W.W. is based on the class conflict in society, recognizing the integral organization of the working class in capitalist industry; and

“Whereas, The I.W.W. does proclaim the commonwealth of labor by and through the co-ordination of the industrial proletariat within capitalist industry in lieu of mass organization within the realm of bourgeois administrative affairs; therefore,

“Be It Resolved, That the I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial administration.”

I wish to state that that resolution is the condensed position of the Bakery Workers’ Local 224, of Wichita, Kan., published in the *Industrial Union Bulletin* of July 13, which I will read, as it is not very long.

“We reaffirm our allegiance to the principles of industrial unionism as expressed by the preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World, and hold uncompromisingly to the spirit and the letter of that article; we hold it to be a correct expression of the interests of the working class.

“A general controversy has been provoked in regard to the interpretation of the preamble, which has, we believe, resulted in a clearer understanding of the economic position of the working class in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

industrial society; especially has this discussion raged around the phrase ‘political’ in that document. It is maintained that political mention has no place in the preamble of an economic organization, and that as a consequence the amendment added by the second annual convention is superfluous also.

“To this we take general exception and hold that the correct interpretation makes of our declaration of principles a scientific purpose for such a program as we propose. We hold that the word ‘political’ has to do with the executive functions of society and cannot be abrogated, whatever we may think to the contrary. As expressed by social organizations known as governments, it represents the interests of the owning classes in society, whether they be feudal, capitalist, or as we propose, proletariat.

“In an industrial society, such as the modern capitalist regime, government is the reflex of industrial co-ordination, finding expression through the capitalist class—who were the owners—in the political state for the control of their material holdings.

“If this be true, it follows that such an economic organization as we propose must of necessity be political in the sense that it controls itself through a centralized executive head, and that upon the taking and holding of industry it must assume the functions of ownership and control, and this ownership and control necessitates the working class, through their organized society, developing a greater political sense in order to assume the capitalist function, with the difference that our political control begins and flows from our economic status as producers instead of from the capitalist status of exploiters; in short, the power is transferred from the apex of industry to the base, from the capitalist class and their political dominants to the working class and their industrial administration.

“Holding to this as the correct interpretation of the central principle of the preamble, we submit that the amendment, ‘therefore, without endorsement or desiring the endorsement of any political party,’ does amplify by giving a definite aim to the I.W.W.”

DEL. AXELSON: In regard to that motion I will—

DEL. FOOTE: I do not care to go into any extended argument on this, simply because the resolutions have been unanimously adopted by the constitution committee. Now, that might seem to conflict, but when we consider it in that sense the resolution in no way affects the preamble, in no way proposes a change of the preamble, and in no way proposes a change of the constitution, but is a construction, a definition, an interpretation of what the political clause in the

preamble means. Consequently I moved and it was seconded that the preamble stand just as it is, and this resolution was unanimously adopted and referred back to the resolution committee, through the proper channel, to the convention, with the endorsement that it be placed before the convention after adoption by the constitution committee. An extended argument was had on this subject this morning, and I simply wish to make a few brief points; I do not wish to occupy the floor any more than I have to. But as the mover of this I feel myself compelled to do it in order to dispel any misunderstanding that might arise.

This resolution simply amounts to this: It means that an organization that is based on political action in capitalist society is abrogated altogether; that the working class, through an industrial organization control absolutely on the inside of their organization their action and allow the capitalist class to assume their field. This is what that resolution means. It means the same thing that Delegate Axelson speaks of, but it gives another position. Delegate Axelson's position is simply that the word "political" has no meaning. I think that the word political has a meaning. In construing a term, in construing a word, it has a definite significance. We cannot have a clear and complete understanding if we fail to recognize the significance of a word. "Political" does have a meaning. If you look in any encyclopedia, if you look in any dictionary, you will see that it has to do with the control, with the executive function of anything.

Now, the point is raised that the working class will not have a "government." With that I might agree, but they will have an industrial administration. They must have that industrial administration and that administration must be political in the sense that it is controlled by the ballot on the inside of your own organization. (Applause.) Take up the two propositions that I think explain the difference altogether. It was agreed in the Constitution Committee that the whole theory of political action by the working class in Europe and America, known as the socialist movement, was nothing more or less than mass organization against the executive functions of the capitalist class. It was mass organization for the purpose of seizing control of government through the universal ballot, as we are told. Failing in that, what was the next step? Nothing more but the bomb. We see it in Russia, where they never have been given the franchise. Mass organization takes the bomb in place of the ballot as the weapon of attack upon Russian despotism. Failing to capture the Russian government, they propose to destroy it. Attempting to capture the

government as the Socialists propose was not to preserve the government, but to disband it. Failing to capture governments by the ballot, then the only thing for mass organization to do is to destroy them with the bomb as the logical conclusion.

On the other hand, I claim that industrial unionism has abrogated both of these. I claim that we have left the field of mass organization and got down to the field of industrial integral organization. I claim that industrial organization as it shall be exemplified by the Industrial Workers of the World is of an organic nature. It has been demonstrated that that is the consensus of opinion of the members of this organization; that it is an organization of the working class. You accept their capitalist society, and consequently become responsible for capitalist society, but apply it to actual industrial conditions, to its material well being, constructing its own organic body with reference to its own economic life from the facts of the material circumstances surrounding us. If that is true, then the only difference between Axelson and myself is that as to a recognition that mass organization is not to continue. We recognize that mass organization is a thing that is to be abjured when we come into an industrial organization. The difference between a mass organization and an industrial organization is that the mass organization is destructive. It proposes to destroy. It proposes first to capture and then to destroy; having captured, to blow it up and destroy it. On the other hand, the industrial organization is constructive. It proposes to recognize the laws in the minutest details that environ, govern and control the working class. They take and do all things necessary to hold the machinery of production. When that is done the capitalist function known as government simply ceases to exist. They have accomplished a revolution when they hold the machinery of production, and not until then. You never accomplish a revolution when you take, but when you hold. The holding is one point that I wish to bring out; just a minute on that.

I say, in the language of the recommendation from the Bakery Workers' Local, that the working class must develop a greater political sense to assume the capitalist function, and I hold that this is true especially if we propose to hold; because the capitalist function is to hold and administer. That function is varied and in many cases complicated. But we must come to the position where we assume the functions and control before we can hope to hold. To simply take and then be unable to handle, simply means that it is a small step from that proposed by the mass organization.

Now, the one point that has given rise to so much discussion

throughout the last year has been the point of the men who propose action on the political field, the field of mass action, and the men who fought the political field, the field of mass action. One held for the ballot, which means that we must adopt a civilized method. The other simply said that the ballot was no good. They did not stand for the bomb, they did not take a position in favor of the bomb, but they did not in fact discourage such action. In many cases they took the position for industrial organization and against mass organization. There is the real difference. I think this is the one central point around which the whole controversy as to organization is swinging, and the one central point upon which the very life of this organization stands today.

There has been too much misunderstanding in the organization in the past. We must clear it up now. We have got to take a position one way or the other. We must receive or reject it. If we reject that resolution, which simply is an interpretation of the preamble, then we leave it in the shape that it was before. And when we do that I am very much afraid that with one more year of this sort of thing the organization will lose sight of its revolutionary character as an industrial integral organization, and through its dilly-dallying and pollywogging, if you wish to call it such, will be turned from the real purpose of organizing the working class upon the industrial field into an industrial organization without a definite program, and that will mean simply that the organization will be disrupted and at least be set back for some time to come. (Applause.)

DEL. AXELSON: The motion I made was by direction and at the command of the local that I am a member of. I say this so that it may go into the minutes. I made the motion at the direction of Local 64 of Minneapolis.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will go in the stenographic report. Does any one else desire the floor upon the question of this amendment?

DEL. FRANCIS: I think that those who come to this convention know pretty well what we want. I think there will be no debate here. Those who formed this organization had experience and considered all these things that have come up. That is all I have got to say.

(At the request of Del. Hagenson the amendment was read.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate that desires the floor? (Del. De Leon arose.) Just a moment, Del. De Leon. I want to announce that we have established a precedent in other conventions, a rule that the members of the committee shall be heard last, so if there is any one that wants to speak to this motion or the amendment he

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

should do so now.

DEL. AXELSON: May I have the close on this amendment, being the mover on this amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: No; the committee on Constitution will have the floor in closing the debate. Do you want the floor, Del. Caminita?

DEL. CAMINITA: Yes, and I will be very brief, because I cannot express myself in the English language as well as I wish to.

I think if you leave those two words in the preamble you decide the death of the I.W.W., and I will tell you why, in a few words. It says that "between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the political as well as on the industrial field." I cannot understand how all the working people can stand together on the political field, because they would be divided into so many fields politically. Suppose I am a working man; another delegate is a democrat; another delegate is a Socialist; another delegate is an anarchist. I want to ask, how can we stand all together on the political field? Evidently a democrat or republican cannot stand together with an anarchist. But I know that my economic interest is the same as that of the anarchist. Then I think that we must strike out these words, because we must promote the best interests of the working people. I know, or I think I know, that the political field is not necessary for the Industrial Workers of the World because we know that the political field is nothing but the shell of the economic system. Then if we want to get the temple we must get not the shell, but the temple, because we know that the shell is behind the temple. If we want the means to combat the capitalist system we want to keep off the political field, because we cannot change the political system until we change the economic system. The society called the Confederation General du Travail in France, being against the government, entered the political instead of the industrial field, and what was the result in France? Nothing at all; and we will not win the fight until the working class understand that if they want to gain something they must stand on the economic field and not on the political field. I know that in France all the working class now stand on the economic field; they do not care for the political field, and they are gaining day by day. I know that in Italy the working class, which is not so educated or intelligent as they are in America, is nevertheless stronger than in America. Why? Because they know they must stand on the economic field, because they know that the political field is nothing else but a play, nothing but a thing gotten up by the politicians.

Then if we want a revolutionary education we must see that they

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

stand on the economic field, not on the political. When they understand that, then they will understand that the ballot is good for nothing; they will understand that they will get nothing by it. The delegates here all understand that if we want the I.W.W. to make progress we must strike on the economic field, not on the political field, because your resolutions are words and nothing but words.

It is said we want to use civilized methods and civilized measures. Yes, but will you explain to me what is civilization? I am civilized because I have a club in my hand. The civilized capitalist will use the club and the electric chair. What is civilization? Can we be civilized against the club, against the gun, against the electric chair? If we want to prevail we want to use the means that the capitalist uses against us. The capitalist uses the club, the gun, the prison, the electric chair. Then we must use our force, because when we use the ballot that is just the same as they use. Socialist governments are just as bad as the others. Therefore, if we want to win we must win on the economic field and not on the political field. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. DELANEY: Fellow Worker Chairman: I would like to speak on the motion. The motion and amendment are mentioned here.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can speak on the motion.

DEL. DELANEY: I want to speak on the motion not as to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Both the amendment and the motion are before the house for debate.

DEL. DELANEY: All right. As to the recommendation of the committee to strike out the word "all," it seems to me that their recommendation is wrong, for the simple reason that no industrial union believes that we will have to organize all the working classes; and that being put in, is taken by the working class to mean that. I do not think the preamble should mean that. I think it is addressed to the working classes. And all this splitting of hairs as to the meaning of words, I do not think it comes in, because the working class understands words in a certain way. They may not mean that in the dictionary, when you say "political" in the sense used here. The poor workingman, who does not consult a dictionary every day, thinks you mean the ballot; and if you do not mean that, for heaven's sake cut the word out and put in what you do mean. I do not believe in putting in words there that mean something else.

I think that the preamble of the declaration of our principles should be clear and to the point, and express just what we mean, so that there can be no misconstruction of it. I do not believe it is that way, with

that word “all” in there.

Furthermore, I think it is inconsistent, in saying that we believe the workers must organize on the political as well as the economical field, in not providing the means. We advise the workers to use their political power, which there means the ballot. You can say what you please about what it is in the dictionary. To the worker it means the ballot. And then we go on and say, “without affiliation with any political party.” Right there is left a chance for division to creep in, for all kinds of things to be advocated, on that very preamble.

These industrial workers can only take a consistent position, that want to advocate political action, by saying what political action, and how that political action shall be expressed.

I believe it cannot consistently endorse any political party in existence. I do not believe there is now, in the United States, a political party which gives the expression of the working classes, because there is no party, no political party here, which has been derived from the economic movement, and that is the only way the working class express themselves—through the movements { . . . }³

Therefore, I think the amendment offered by Local 43 should be adopted, on that question, that the Industrial Workers of the World, or, rather, to read it, to strike out the word “all” and insert the words “with its own political expression,” in place of the words “without affiliation with any political party,” and, also, to cut out the part of the last sentence which says, “without endorsing or desiring the endorsement of any political party,” as superfluous.

As to the amendment offered to the preamble, holding that all wage workers, though belonging to the A.F. of L., will be supported by the I.W.W., in any fight between the working classes and their employers, I believe the I.W.W. should take a definite stand on that proposition, so that there will be no doubt that we always stand behind our fellow-workers, no matter how badly led they may be, because we know that workers going on strike are not dishonest; they are not striking to hurt anyone else. They are striking for what they believe to be their interests, and I believe the I.W.W. will take the position that it favors, and stands behind any section of the working class, in a conflict with the employers (applause).

DEL. SCHWEND: Fellow Worker Chairman: The sentiment throughout the west, at least in my portion of the country, the feeling among the working class, and the great hope of the working class of

³ [Third day, second page, third column. “Pi” and missing slug or line.—R.B.]

the Rocky Mountain Region, as far as I am acquainted with it, is that this convention, by its assembled wisdom, will be enabled in some way to relieve our constitution of the uncertainty and ambiguity which it now contains.

Now, you must all admit that, to the ordinary mind of the workingman, this preamble is ambiguous; and, to explain the meaning of these seemingly contradictory sections in this constitution, as to the average member, is a task of no small proportions; and I for one do earnestly hope that we shall be able, before this convention adjourns, to place a constitution before the working classes of America that will admit of no doubt and no quibbling, a constitution and a declaration of principles with which we need not be afraid to go before any body of working men, with the fear that we shall not be able to explain it to them satisfactorily. It may be all right. I have been told that we must have this political clause in here in order to protect the organization. That may be all well and good. It might be that the government of the United States would denounce us as a band of conspirators upon the rights of private property, without that clause in there; but is not the assembled wisdom of this convention equal to the task of providing some kind of a safeguard, and at the same time making this constitution plain and explicit enough, that we will not be hampered with it in the future as we have been in the past?

Now, I want to say that, as far as I am concerned, I believe that all reference to politics or political parties should be eliminated from this constitution because it creates a false delusion in the minds of the uneducated workers. What I mean by the uneducated workers is not the men who have had no schooling, but even the men with a high school education who belong to the ranks of the workers, but who are lacking in their economic education, cannot understand and cannot interpret for themselves satisfactorily the meaning of that clause in our preamble.

I say that it should be made plain; but, as for myself, I want to say that I do not believe this political clause should be in there at all. I do not believe we should encourage political action, and I want to give you an example.

In the City of Anaconda, Montana, from which I come, we had, a few years ago, a popular uprising of the working class there, under the auspices of the Socialist Labor party.⁴ I myself was a participant in

⁴ [The speaker almost certainly meant to say "Socialist party" rather than "Socialist Labor party," as the latter won no such election.—R.B.]

that campaign. We succeeded in electing a complete ticket in the City of Anaconda, almost, on the Socialist ticket. There we had our political action, but we had no economic organization back of that political organization. And what was the result? Our organization was torn asunder. Our members were scattered broadcast over the country; and today we have but a mere remnant left of that political aggregation.

Now, if it is right to advocate political action, along with economic organization, if it is right to do that, then how are we going to overcome the great danger in such cases as I have just cited to you, where there is no economic organization to back up the political?

The political may achieve a victory, but the fruits are all lost, because there is no economic organization to back it up.

I do not care to discuss this question any further, but I say that I do hope the recommendation of this Constitution Committee will not be concurred in, that it will be referred back to them, and that the assembled intelligence of this convention will be able to give us something better than we have at present.

In your preamble you say that "all the toilers must come together on the political, as well as on the industrial field." To my mind that word "all" should not be in there, because we all know, at least any of us who have ever had any experience in the labor movement knows, that if we postpone the day of the revolution until the day when we get all the toilers together on the political or industrial fields, that none of us, none of our children, or our children's children, or our children's children's children, will ever be able to reap the benefits of a successful revolution.

Now, I hope that the membership of this convention will take these things into consideration, and see if we cannot formulate something that will be a safeguard, that will be protection, and at the same time that will enable our advocates and our organizers to explain to the average workingman the correct meaning and the correct interpretation of our position. I thank you for your attention. (Applause.)

DEL. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: From Cincinnati the locals have instructed their delegates to vote to leave this clause that we are discussing here on this floor in {the} preamble. That is the stand on the members of the I.W.W. at Cincinnati. (Applause.)

My idea is, candidly, and in short, that if you cut out this clause in the preamble of the I.W.W. that we shall not organize on the political field as well as on the industrial field; that the capitalist classes and

their hirelings will be justified in setting us in the electric chair, turning the current on and putting us out of existence, because I believe that we would be an anarchist organization, because of the very fact that we would want to take and hold through physical force, as an industrial organization.

I believe that that should stand as it is. (Applause.)

DEL. KEEP: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I do not wish to be placed in {the} position of objecting to this, at all, and before I begin I would like to say that I have listened to the remarks of those who have been in favor of making this change in the constitution, and it appears to me that they have met with the difficulty that practically every man who speaks for the I.W.W. does, in this, that when you get up to speak for it, when you get through some individual gets up and asks you, "Why don't you take a stand on the political question?"

On Sunday night in Detroit I had the pleasure of being met with that, but the gentleman there objected because you did not have enough words in the preamble. He said that you stopped too short, that you ought to have stated it more fully than you have. And in those cases such individuals would kick if you don't have a single word in the preamble, only the word "preamble" at the top. So far as those people are concerned, it is like a child having the colic. It is bound to have it, it will have it, and it will meet with the ordinary difficulties of a child's life. The more you try to protect it, the more you put it in a glass case, the less of a child it is.

And, so far as that argument is concerned, I do not see that we would do away with any of it by striking out these words. They would pick on something else, just the same.

(Cries of "Good," and applause.)

I have had experience along that line for perhaps ten or twelve years, and if you want the hair-splitter and the knocker and the man who wants to hear himself talk eliminated, you have got to wait for some higher power than we are to do it. We cannot do it. (Laughter.)

Another thing: When you state that they must come together on the political field—and we have listened to the statement that there are definitions of that word "political" in the encyclopedias and the dictionaries—I understand the given acceptance of that word to be "political parties." But this may not mean that at all. When you say, as was said, that we will hold the means of production and distribution, the fact that we are going to hold them, we presuppose that we have taken them. Now, I hear it said that when the I.W.W. is strong enough, and they feel like doing it, they won't walk out of the shops, but they

will simply stay there and work, and what they make they will keep.

Now, is the capitalist, in his political power, going to stand for that? That is what I cannot realize. (Applause.) I may not know, perhaps, as much as some of the others, but I do not know of any class that will sit down and let another class take things away from them. They always made them hump themselves while they were doing it. They made them fight for it. And in the last analysis—history teaches it, our common experience teaches it—we will have to take the things before we can hold them.

Now, then, what is the use of objecting to this? That will be political action, in the common acceptance of the term, won't it? Such being the case, why object to this? We cannot remove any difficulty from our situation by eliminating it. When you get something that really meets the case, and explains it, the more you change it, and the more you want to change words, to other words, the more you become a rag-chewing association, and not an organization for doing effective work. Let it stand as it is. (Applause.)

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Worker Chairman and Delegates: It seems to me that the best thing we can do is to concur, as I concur, with the last speaker. We have, it is true, a political action to take, whether we use it by the ballot or by force; and by changing our preamble, we do not change the facts in the least.

No matter how many ignoramuses you may please, who affect to be unable to understand this preamble, the preamble will still be a puzzle to the ignoramus, no matter in what form you put it. If you put it to the Irishman, and the German, it will puzzle them. If you put it to him in his own language, it will puzzle him until he knows what it means. And I hold that it is far easier, and it is our duty, as we are training the proletariat to the economic movement, as we can interpret the meaning of that political term to him as well as we can interpret any other meaning of our action.

I can see no reason whatever for making any change there at all. I hold that we would only be adding to the confusion, because they will tell us, "it meant so and so last year; now next year it means something else." The first thing you know your preamble will be changed, before we know it. We really won't know what we mean, until the convention is over. If we are going to settle down on anything here, let us settle it. The only thing I see there is the misinterpretation of that political action. Now, I hold that we have today a political reflex of this movement, right here. There are two factions, and they are represented right here, nevertheless; but I hold this also,—that in the

progress of this movement here, the political expression will progress with it; and as we have now a reflex of the labor agitation, such as this undertaking here, both in the A.F. of L. organization and this organization, we have also got it in the political field.

We today hope the day will come, and look forward to it with reason to hope that we will have a unit. We expect, if not all, a majority will become a unit. With that unit, no matter how much {it} is divided up now, it represents the reflex action of one or the other. And it is our work to bring this to a unit, to a head. And, while the economic organization is being developed along those lines, the political will grow, just the same.

You never plucked a ripe apple when it was green. We have green apples and ripe apples, and you know that if you want a ripe apple you have got to wait until it has developed, and that is the situation today, both in the industrial field and the economic field. We have green apples on the outside of our organization here, industrially as well as politically. We have got to wait, and to mature them, and ripen them; and the conclusion will be, the apple will ripen and we will enjoy the good of it; but until then we cannot pluck it.

Now, I am here, myself—the question should not be mentioned on the floor, but I want to state my position, and I believe it is the position of a good many more here. I hear considerable talk on the inside and outside, about S.P., and S.L.P. people, representing two factions of the political expression of the economic movement in this country, if you please. I am here today not in opposition to the S.P., or S.L.P., but to work with them, hand in hand, to bring it to a unit; and we can do that by working together as a unit, and not by flying to pieces upon every little proposition that comes up here. And I am here to support {the} S.L.P., although they are different from me on the political field, and in views, to bring about that unit, and support them where they are right, and fight their side where they are wrong. I hold that that is the manner in which it is necessary to bring unity about.

Consequently, to my mind, this preamble is absolutely correct. You cannot eliminate the political expression, at all. When you do you have got to cut out your economic expression, because the very fact that you organize for a purpose as a body, with the expectation of taking control of things as they are and governing for the benefit of the whole, is a political action, whether it is done by ballot or otherwise.

The ballot is only one of the means; and I hold that to cut out the ballot is just the same as cutting off one of your arms. (Applause.) It may be useless for the time being. It may be, as our fellow worker here

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

has explained, a failure, a fizzle, for the time being, but while he explained that fizzle, he also explained the reason why. There was no economic organization behind it. We today have not the economic organization behind us to accomplish our purpose. What are we here for today but to develop that economic organization? And, in developing that economic organization we are going to develop the political organization with it. The economic organizations in this country are divided. So are the political. If we never come together there will never be anything accomplished. But we are working to bring it together, and when it is brought together we will accomplish it, and not by quibbling over hair-splitting items. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman and Delegates: You will remember that one of the proposed changes in the preamble, as read by me, came from San Francisco, in which they substituted, for the words "all the toilers," which is objected to by a number of the delegates here, the expression, "a sufficient number of the wage workers."

Now, I want to take up that point, for a little bit and show, if possible, the fallacy of the whole proposition. I would like to ask the question, of those delegates who proceed on the theory that minorities have always accomplished the revolution,—and that is the basis of their objection to the word "all"—I would like to ask them the question: Who is to determine when we have a sufficient number of wage-workers ready to accomplish that revolution? Will there be anything else to determine that, except the outcome of the revolution itself? And then it will simply be a historical fact, that is recorded.

For instance, if, at the time the revolution should start in this country, we have ten thousand revolutionists in the field, and the revolution terminates successfully, with their aid, then history will simply record that ten thousand revolutionists were sufficient to accomplish the proletarian revolution in America.

On the other hand, suppose that when the revolution starts, or what we think is to be a revolution, there are ten million revolutionists in the country, and they are unable to cope with the combined power of the employing class, their movement is defeated, and sit {set?} back, then history will simply record that ten million revolutionists were not a sufficient number to accomplish that revolution at that time.

Consequently, we cannot determine in advance how many will be necessary to accomplish the revolution. We make our appeal, not to a minority of the working class. That would violate the principle of

working class unity, which we are constantly trying to inculcate into the minds of the working class of this country. We make our appeal to the whole working class, to all wage workers. And I hold that that is a sound position, stated there in that clause in the preamble. Nothing else will do.

Now, then, another proposed change there was that the toilers should come together into one organization, containing within itself all the means necessary to accomplish its purpose of taking hold of and holding that which the working class produces by its labor.

I hold that it is nothing more nor less than nonsense, to say that one organization can do the business in this country, or any other country. I hold that the two organizations, the political organization and the industrial organization, are not only necessary, but are inevitable; that the industrial organization,—the basis of the unity of the working-class,—will inevitable reflect itself upon the political field, through a political party of the working class. That being the case, I was opposed to any change in the preamble; and I hold that the preamble is sound, as it stands today.

Another point,—a point that has been brought out in a discussion conducted in the last six or eight months through the columns of the *Daily & Weekly People*, under the heading of politics.⁵ The point was there made that we need the political organization, in order to recruit the forces of industrial unionism; that without the aid of that political organization we can never get together that economic organization in sufficient strength to accomplish its purpose of taking and holding the means of life. And I believe that that position is founded upon history, founded upon the experience of the American Labor Movement.

If you go back to the historical days of 1886, in this City of Chicago, and bring to mind the Haymarket affair, and contrast that Haymarket affair and its outcome with the drama which has just closed with the acquittal of William B. Haywood,⁶ in Boise, Idaho, you will see the wisdom of the position taken by the preamble as it now stands, of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Those men in Chicago lost faith in political action, in the action of the ballot. Their ballots were thrown into the river. Their ballot boxes were stolen. They were counted out. And they said, “we have no further use for political action;” and, as Parsons,⁷ himself, in his

⁵ [See *As to Politics*, by Daniel De Leon.—R.B.]

⁶ [Haywood's middle initial was D.—R.B.]

⁷ [Albert R. Parsons (1848–1887).—R.B.]

repetition of his Haymarket speech, admitted that he called upon the workers there to arm themselves. What for? What would they arm themselves for, except to go out and use physical force, the gun, the bomb, against the organized power of the employing class.

When he said that, and when some of the other defendants were shown to have made similar utterances,—although we understand their motives, today,—it was that fact, it was those utterances made by those men, that enabled the prosecuting attorney in that case to make out his case of conspiracy against those men, and to stretch their necks as a result.

On the other hand, when William B. Haywood was tried at Boise, Idaho, the same attempt was made, the same charge was brought against him; but although they gathered every utterance that they could find, they found no utterances there similar to those of Parsons and the other defendants in the Haymarket affair.

Why? Because William B. Haywood had taken the stand upon the plane of civilized warfare. And, although Hawley brought out the charge against the Federation of Miners, that they had tried to control the politics of their respective localities, the attorneys for the defense came back, and showed that that was not a crime in this country as yet; and the farmer jury were unable to see wherein a conspiracy charge had been made out against these men.

Now, I hold that this experience, for one thing, that one experience enabled the Industrial Workers of the World to avoid that extreme, as well as the experience of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, in its close affiliation with the political parties—enabled the Industrial Workers of the World to avoid the other extreme.

And, standing there, on historic ground, on the only ground upon which we can recruit the revolutionary forces and bring them together into one mighty army of emancipation, we must continue to stand and wait for future developments, if any should occur, that make necessary a change in the preamble. (Applause.)

DEL. BOHM: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I have listened to all this discussion. I want to say that previously, when we have been organizing the I.W.W., we had a meeting where there were about 400 present, and we discussed especially the preamble and the rules; and in that lively discussion we found out that each member of that organization, that local, which is now Local 538, was in favor of joining the Industrial Workers of the World because they found the word “political” in the preamble.

If it had not been for that I am sure that we would never have had

this local in our organization. The local went through a whole lot of difficulties. They were in the American Federation of Labor for two years, and what they did not like in that was the fact that they could not move as they wanted to; and finding out that this was also political, that is to say, a revolutionary party, or a revolutionary industrial party, they joined it.

I have been instructed by them that we should accept in this convention the whole preamble as it is. That is my instruction from them, and I believe I should move to the effect that we should accept this as a recommendation, without any further discussion.

DEL. JONES: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: There seems to be more or less discussion, or the talk seems to be, of people finding fault with these two weapons, the strike and the ballot. I believe they are both, these two weapons, recognized as weapons that can be used legally today, both the ballot and the strike.

We as an industrial organization, believing in doing away with all waste, do not believe in having another political party, as an expression, a reflex of the economic organization. There is no need for that. The political expression of the working class is just the result of the conditions in the economic field. And if we use the strike weapon against the master class to force confessions, it is conceded today to be a legal weapon. The ballot is considered to be the same.

Now, if they take the weapon of the ballot away from us why should they not take the strike weapon? They have the power to do so. As long as they leave the ballot in our hands, and the strike weapon, we will use both, is my idea.

There also seems to be more or less mixture of ideas as to whether we shall discard the ballot or not—that is what I would like to be clear upon—whether we will use it to take over the means of production, in the end. Some people believe in using the ballot from day to day. I on my part believe in using it, if it is left to us, to take over in the end, when we are fully organized, or organized so that we can, if it is left to us. (Applause.)

DEL. HAGENSON: Fellow Worker Chairman and Delegates: This question in regard to this clause concerning the political field seems to have various interpretations. Some seem to want it left there as it is, for one purpose, and some for another.

Now, I, for one, am in favor of leaving that clause there. However, I am not wanting that clause, in particular, as a protection, to get away from the capitalist laws. I do not care anything about them.

(Cries of “Good for you.”)

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

They are of no use to me. Laws, in my judgment, are might, and only might. They are only, the laws that exist, the power behind the law to enforce them. If that power that lies behind the law does not want to enforce the laws, they are not enforced. And if the power that is behind the laws wants to enforce something that is not in accordance with the laws, they will do it, when they have the power.

I, as a working man, expect to be set free from the chains of wage slavery, not by the laws that are made by the capitalist, not by the laws that are made by their hirelings, in that sense, the ballot box, or what we call the legal weapon, but by organizing the working class in the workshop.

It has been proven to me that the force that is in the workshop, that is in the economic field, is the force that determines all the balance of it. And if the working class show their solidarity in the workshop, it does not matter what politicians are in the field, it does not matter what a party is called, you will find that they will be really too sweet to them, they will come sneaking around, like any cowardly dog. And what is the reason? Is there any protection there? Or is there any reference to the ballot box action? It has no meaning to me.

But as I understand politics and political action, the minute we assemble here to make any rules, and enforce them, we are acting in politics. As soon as a body of working men come together, and say to society that "these are going to be the conditions by which we work," whether it be hours or it be wages, why, we are already in politics.

As soon as we organize in the workshop, according as we organize in the workshop, we are gaining concessions, at last. We expect to gain concessions. And we will gain concessions by organizing in the workshop. Every concession which we gain means that much defeat to our enemies, to the capitalist classes, and they lose that much ground. And I expect to see us gain more concessions, and more concessions, and still more concessions, until our enemies become weaker and we become stronger. Through that method I expect to see myself set free from the chains that are now binding me.

The only, the really important reason for wanting to leave that clause as it is there,—I do not see that it does any harm,—and furthermore it really and truly expresses our proceeding and our objects. We are a political organization. We are constructing rules governing ourselves, and governing society. For that reason I hope that this preamble will be left as it now is.

DEL. LEVOY: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I do not want to take up too much of your time in the discussion, but one thing was not

brought out, in the whole discussion. One side claims, those who want to throw out the political action from the preamble, that through that, you mislead the working class and you cannot organize it. Others will tell you, if you have a political action in there what political party do you belong to.

On the other hand, I know these men who are against the political action, they go to the working class and tell them, "let the ballot alone; let it alone altogether."

Well, I want to tell you this much: Where I am sent from, Schenectady, once we had about three thousand members in that town. At some other time, later possibly, we will have more than we had before, but we haven't got that now. Out of the three thousand there were not two scientists, what you call scientist socialists, and I don't know—anarchists. There weren't two in the whole bunch. They knew what they wanted, though. If you wanted to go to that bunch of three thousand and tell them, "leave the ballot alone; we don't want to have any ballot," you wouldn't have but the two scientists; you couldn't organize them at all.

That is something that is injected into the working classes today, that great freedom here, and free America, and that ballot, and that you have just as much right to elect your father or your brother or anybody else, to the legislature, or to Congress, and that he will do you good. All right. Well, here it is, the whole thing: If you go to them and tell them not to vote they will tell you you are crazy. They will say, "why shouldn't I vote? That is my right in this country, the ballot."

We can take action in the industrial field. We do not want to organize that, because they do it anyway. But we can organize them so much quicker with that clause in it, than to go to them and tell them "we do not want any ballot," because it is inborn in them. They have lived in it. It is educated into them every day and every hour.

We cannot reach them without that. We cannot talk to them at all.

There are some of these good fellows that do not believe in the ballot, and that go around on the street corners, that will catch a man once in awhile, maybe once in six months. They have been trying that, in this town, with three clubs, and they have got about seventy members. Now, if in twenty years they got 70 members, it will take about twenty million years before they get enough to overthrow the system. (Applause.)

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: My opinion is that ignorance should be guided by intelligence, instead of intelligence being guided by ignorance. I say this, owing to the fact

that a few people, in certain parts of the country, have stated that some men do not understand the preamble. Is that sufficient reason for us to change the preamble, or to change any clause? They say it simply needs the changing of one word. I say no. As I said before, we consider ourselves, industrial workers, as being intelligent men. And why are we intelligent? Because we are revolutionary. Why are we revolutionary? Because we are progressive. And how could we consider ourselves progressive, if we would do away with the political reflex?

I, for one, in the present state of affairs, with all the schemes of the capitalist class, cannot see clearly my way, that is, if not for the present, for the future, if not for myself, for other men, how we could get along, and how we could be successful in the future I do not know—I do not care to state when this will happen, when success will come, when the revolution, when the emancipation of the working class should take place,—if we should get down to such a level as to degrade ourselves and fear the capitalist class, because they consider us anarchists. They are not afraid of anarchists. They are afraid of those who are revolutionists. And no man could consider himself a revolutionist without understanding the political questions of society at the present time.

I furthermore will say, owing to the fact that certain men say—I am sorry to hear them say it—that they fear to give them to people who are ignorant and do not understand—they are not to be blamed for their ignorance. It is due to the capitalist classes, and the present system, that they do not understand. Is it sufficient, is it proper, for us to do away with all the great works, like those of Shakespeare and of Victor Hugo, the great operas of Wagner, and of other great men, is it sufficient reason for us to do away with all the knowledge of men who have been learning all their lives, to the present time, is it sufficient for us to do away with all that knowledge and all that education, and do away with their energy, where they have been trying to do for the people and the working class, is it sufficient for us today, assembled here, as the working class—and I deny the statement which some of those here present have made, at the convention. I say no. We represent the working class. And while we represent the working class, in the near future it is for us to decide what party we are to form under—no Socialist party or Socialist Labor party.

And therefore my opinion is, and this is the position I take, that this clause, or this preamble, should stand, and that not a single word in the preamble should be changed.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. HUBER: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I want to state, the simple clause in the preamble as to political action—I understand that to be used at the present time not as a political party that is to be launched, but it is to be used in the propaganda until the time shall come—we can determine when—when we shall take this action, and then is the time for our political action. That is the point I want to make.

DEL. OHMAN: Fellow Worker Chairman and Delegates: I won't take up much time, but I wish to say, in regard to the preamble, that I am in favor of the preamble standing as it is.

Now, in regard to political action and economic action, as it has been said, I hold that those two are inseparable, inasmuch as if economic action is taken that it also necessitates political. For instance, if the workers are organized, that is, to contest certain rights of the organized capitalists—to take away that which they use, in order to supply their needs—that they are contesting an economic right of the master class; and when they are contesting for that right, they would also have to contest the right of governing society in the same manner; and that, after we take hold of this industry, for the benefit of ourselves, that we will also govern this economical industry that is in our possession, as we see fit. And that certainly would be political.

If we are organizing on the economic field—that is, on the industrial line—our constituency could only be in the industry in which we are engaged; and other men engaged in other industries could have their constituency.

It is to destroy a certain right of the master class, of territorial organization, which we are trying to do away with, so that we can have our representation from the shop, to govern and say how our industry shall be run, instead of the masters having in their possession and holding as private property, on the territorial line. And that is what we want to do away with. We have got to contest against the right of the master class of having a right to own these industries, and also to be the ruler of society.

DEL. SPEED: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: They say that a bad law, or one that is objectionable—the way to do away with it is to enforce it to its uttermost. Now, in the city of Portland there is a lid closed down there on Sunday. The authorities don't like this Sunday closing proposition because they like to indulge a little themselves; so they enforce the law to the highest extent. That is, if one is treating another out of a bottle on Sunday, and is caught, he is liable to be arrested for doing it.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

So, in our present society there are evidently two classes—those who believe in political action, and those who do not. We see on one side those who do not object to the word being put in the preamble. If they want to enforce it, let them look at the capitalist class, as I said, the ruling class, where they are in various communities of the country, endeavoring to curtail the right of franchise. And the non-politicals often say that there is absolutely nothing in the ballot, that it is as empty as empty can be; and if so, I would like them to answer why it is that the fellow that has control of that ballot box tries to curtail the privilege of the men in using it. (Applause.)

I would like to know why it is that they do attempt to do that thing by introducing new primary laws, to make it more difficult for men to get a hearing of their right, and by property qualifications, etc.? If that be the case, it seems to me there must be something in action, political action. And if these men who do not believe in it want that bad thing knocked out, see that it is enforced to its utmost, so that the capitalists will disfranchise us as a whole, and then you will know where you want to go. (Applause.)

That is the way I look at that question. I do not propose to take up any more time. It has been pretty well discussed. But I for one believe that the preamble as it now stands should remain.

DEL. PINKERTON: Fellow Workers and Delegates: As one of the signers of the manifesto, I believe that the preamble of the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World should remain as it is now. My opinion is derived from the opinion of the men in the transportation department, that I come in contact with, for various reasons.

We realize the fact that through various conditions that we have been confronted with, in the first decade, the political situation, especially as it pertains to railway affairs, is about as rotten a situation as any people in any industry could be confronted with.

The slaughtering pens that exist in the industry that I follow, where all of the improved appliances required by laws which have been enacted and are supposed to be enforced, and are not enforced, have left a harvest of death of about 55,000 in the last decade, the last ten years, and 555,000 injured, demonstrating to us the fact that these political laws are of no effect to the working class, employed in the railway industry. But we do believe that the exposure of these conditions, brought on from political causes, are great educators of the working people.

As a signer of that manifesto, I have heard the contention here

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

today that we had arrived at no conclusion as to what political party we should support. If I recollect aright it could not be agreed upon, at the meeting of the signers of the manifesto, that we should support any political party at that time, but that we should build an economic organization, and that eventually we would have a party, to be built parallel to the economic organization, that would reflect the views of the industrial workers, in their economic organization. (Applause.)

We are a little premature, then, in using our endeavors, or, if we are going to use them, to knock out the word "political," as it now stands. We railway men are placed in a very peculiar position, and I believe that we have got to use the ballot that is now, as it stands at the present time, in order to hold what we have got at the present time, and not allow the capitalists to place us beyond the aid of both, the Industrial Workers of the World, on both the political and economic battlefields, as they are trying to do at the present time.

If you would glance back over the history of the past troubles of organizations, at any stage where an attempt has been made by the organization to obtain anything that is of a beneficial nature to its membership, and where that organization has become a menace to the powers that be, there has always been a recommendation made by some of the political bosses that that organization be taken under government control.

That recommendation was made by Hill, of New York, before the Mine Workers came under the control of the Civic Federation. That recommendation is now made by the Democratic party, under the guise of William Jennings Bryan's government ownership of railways, because the railway men, as they did in 1894, are liable at a moment to join the industrial movement, and become a menace to the present system of government.

You must recollect that the railway men in this country, connected with that industry, number 2,196,000; and while we number 2,196,000, we are not all children, we are not all under age; we are all over age, before we secure employment as railway workers.

If we are going to submit to this Government ownership of railways, as promulgated by William Jennings Bryan, what is to be the result? The result is that we would be served with the same notice that the Postal authorities served upon the postal clerks, when they were going to use their endeavors to better their conditions, that is, that we would have to keep mum.

Now, we are not willing to submit to a proposition of that kind, and although we realize that the ballot is rotten, that the political system is

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

rotten, we will use this rottenness to defeat its purpose. (Applause.)

DEL. HENION: As another old railroad man, and also a signer of the manifesto, I agree with Delegate Pinkerton. I believe that that was put in that clause for a purpose, and I see the benefits of it every day. When they ask me what that political clause means, I tell them it means that as soon as a man gets educated enough he will know how to vote right. (Applause.) I, as a delegate, will vote for that preamble to remain just exactly as it is without one single word being struck out, whether it is that part or anything else. I want that preamble to remain just exactly as it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I want it understood that it is the rule that after the Committee on Constitution has spoken there is no further debate.

DEL. GLOVER: I want the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, if any of you have not had the floor as yet, you can have the floor. Of course, I do not mean to encourage you to keep on with the debate, but I simply do not want to have it said there was any gag law.

DEL. GLOVER: I want to say that I am not at all satisfied with the recommendation of that committee to have that clause left as it is, for the reason that it is certainly misleading, and it can be stretched in many ways, and what I desire to see is a preamble that is so definite and precise that there can be absolutely no misunderstanding.

Now, then, if it is true, as some of the arguments presented by the delegates attempted to bring out, that the political is simply the reflex of the economic, then if we have no economic organization built up, if we have no economic structure, then we have no political reflex, and consequently leaving that preamble as it is now, it allows individuals that are using today and have used since the inception of the Industrial Workers of the World, the opportunity of attempting to show that the political reflex of the Industrial Workers of the World is now in the field.

As a matter of fact, one of our delegates attempted to show that, wherein he states that the S.P. and the S.L.P. are both the political expression of the economic organization. I deny that, with the proviso that if it is true that we must have the economic organization built up first before we can get that political expression, then inasmuch as that economic organization is not built up, there is no political expression; and I wanted to so state in that preamble that what we mean by political as well as economic is, that when we get this economic organization built up, then from within that economic organization

will comet he political means to express itself politically. When that is made concise and definite, I am satisfied, but as it is now I am not satisfied, and I do not propose to vote to concur in the report of the Committee.

DEL. TRAINOR: I have heard quite similar arguments in regard to the political clause that is in this constitution. I have heard the argument put up here on this floor that with this political clause in this constitution it retards the movement. That with the organizers going out in the field in the different sections of the country, the movement is retarded because that political clause is inserted in there, and simply because that clause is inserted in there, these people bring here a recommendation that it stops or retards the movement.

Now, I cannot see for the life of me where a man with any common sense at all can come into this convention hall and say that a political clause inserted in the preamble of this constitution will retard the movement of this organization through any section of this country, and there has been nobody any more up against the game so far as this political clause is concerned, than we were in the city of Paterson, New Jersey.

There we have an element who are fighting tooth and nail at all times in regard to this political clause, and when you go to those people who are fighting this political clause and say to them, "Don't you want the ballot?" they will deliberately turn around and tell you that they would sooner lose their religion or life than to lose the ballot. Then why, in the name of God, will those people stand up and want to erase from the preamble of this constitution the clause that will enable them to accomplish their end? I cannot understand for the life of me why people should advocate on this floor to erase a clause from this constitution that is enabling them to get together the working class.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: We have established the rule that no delegate should speak twice while there is anyone who has not yet spoken. Now, you have spoken and there may be somebody else who has not spoken and who desires to do so.

DEL. YOUNG: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you a delegate?

DEL. YOUNG: Yes, sir; Delegate Young of Detroit. I would like to see two words added to our preamble. I am very well satisfied with our preamble, but I think two words would make it more definite.

My experience in agitating among the workers is this: that we cannot be too definite, we cannot speak too clearly or too simply. In

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

other words, we cannot speak in too common and simple terms. The common and simple terms are the only ones through which we can make ourselves understood.

Therefore, I propose or at least I think, that the words "land" and "machinery," those two words should be inserted. In reaching the word where we propose that the workers should come together in industrial organization and take and hold all they produce by their labor—I believe that is correct—that before that statement should come "land and machinery," because those are the concrete things that we need for our freedom, for our emancipation.

Now, then, it has been argued everywhere that the words "all we produce" covers everything. True, but those of us who have studied political economy somewhat, and have been agitating in the socialist movement, well understand what we mean by "all that we produce." We mean the machinery and the products produced by those machines, but the quibbler and the man who is not educated in political economy, he may not understand, this man who is not educated does not understand what we mean by "all we produce."

He might think by starting off and leaving the capitalist in possession of the land and machinery we will say, at a certain period, we will say if it were to start from today, that after today all we produce by that machinery would be ours, leaving him in possession of the land and machinery. Now the ignorant man, or the quibbler, or the politician, might help him along in his ignorance and contend that that was the thing that we were advocating.

Now, then, the quibbler, that helps him, I have heard it argued in our local by some men who are middling well posted, who have had a long, hairsplitting argument about these one or two statements, and I think if those two words were inserted, "land and machinery," it would avoid this trouble.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone else?

DEL. FRENCH: Fellow Workers and Chairman: I agree with this fellow worker here that there is no man, no matter what command of the English language he has or any other language, that can invent a paragraph that will suit all hands. It simply cannot be done.

I have also had the experience that the fellow worker from Paterson, Delegate Trainor, speaks of, and as you all know, I have had a great deal of experience in trying my best to interpret this preamble and in explaining it, and I have not found any difficulty in making clear what is meant there, at least it did not seem to me there was any difficulty in

making clear what was meant there. I have not found in that clause any hitch.

What is more, in reference to what the last speaker said as to the need of putting two words in there, I think that we have quite words enough in there. We have leaflets, we have explanatory matter of all kinds, and we have men sent out to talk on this subject, and anybody and everybody who is able to do any talking at all is able to get an explanation of what is meant by the products of our labors. You do not have to elaborate that to explain what is meant by it, and there is no need of proceeding to try to get that perfect, because it would be impossible, as Fellow Worker Keep said, to get that perfect so as to satisfy everybody.

Now, there has been a discussion about different weapons, civilized and uncivilized and all that sort of thing. Now, as far as I am concerned, I am satisfied with this preamble. We have a preamble that expresses the aims and objects we are after. We are for the abolition of the capitalist system. There are a lot of factors we have to take into consideration and to contend with. Of the things we have got to abolish there are certain weapons that would abolish them. Now, whether those weapons are to get political power, or the strike to force concessions in the shop, or any other weapon that is necessary to be used when the occasion arises, the whole point is that we are able to use the proper weapon that the occasion demands, no matter what it is.

Now, we supposedly all deem ourselves intelligent working men who are endeavoring to protect an organization that will bring us as nearly and as rapidly as possible to the abolition of the capitalistic institutions, and we do not want to waste time quibbling over these points, and we want to see how rapidly we can get down to the work of completing this constitution and getting it in shape and completing our organization, and not get into a squabble over making it exactly perfect so as to satisfy every quibbler, and trying to have it fit the conditions and all conditions that will arise within the next ten or fifteen years.

I think we should be above that, our minds should be too big for that. We should simply determine to get this organization into as good a shape as we can now, and when year after year, when we come here and the new conditions arise, we shall adapt ourselves to them, always having our central proposition laid right out there in our preamble, and the idea being that we are to be able to use all the weapons at our command, in the abolishment of the capitalistic system.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. SPETTEL: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: The fellow workers here who talk about the injury done our organization in its efforts to get members into the I.W.W. by this political phrase in the preamble, remind me of those people who used to throw cold water on my efforts in trying to arouse the working class in 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896, by telling me that there was nothing to be done with a man with an empty stomach. You have to fill the stomach and then you could talk to him. Now, everybody has work and everybody is getting along well, and that same class of men tell me that you cannot do anything with a man when his belly is full. "Wait until he is starving and then you can talk to him." (Laughter.)

I feel sure that if we cut out this political phase {phrase?} from the preamble to satisfy these people who are afraid we are not going to grow fast enough, that they will be here twelve months hence with some more objectionable features in the preamble which are hampering them, and they will be here with their axes to cut out some more, and I think the best thing we can do is to leave the thing just as it is, and save them the trouble of coming here next year. (Applause.)

DEL. AXELSON: I have nothing much to say about this principle, I covered the ground I think when I was up before, but there are those here who have made the insinuation that I did not cover the ground as to politics.

Now, understand me, I believe and I claim that any action pertaining to the interest and the benefit of the working class is political action, but what I do not believe in is going to the ballot box to plant your ballot in the capitalist's ballot box where you do not know whether it is counted or not. That is what I am objecting to.

That is not political action, because as Marx says, every class struggle is a political struggle. I agree. That is my position on that. So the political action of the working class will be the administrative functions in the various industrial departments in which the Industrial Workers of the World have the upper hand, and are controlling the instruments of production for the benefit of the workers and the users of the tools of production. That is my political action.

Now then, the point has been raised again that we acquire concession after concession. I disagree. We cannot, as long as we are commodities, be subject to the rules and regulations that govern commodities. The law of economics, if you please, is just as immutable as the law of gravity, and you cannot get away from it.

The position of the working man is this: that a concession in wages is not any evidence that you are getting a bigger proportion in

curtailing the expense and profit of the capitalists. No, no, the condition of the working class is defeat after defeat, and there is only one victory to be gained, and only one victory to be won, and that is to throw down, to capture and throw out of existence the exploiting class and abolish the wage system and wage labor. That and that alone. When you have abolished that parasite, that class, the individual that stands in between me and the goods, and have as a working class established yourselves in actual possession and in operation and in ownership of what your labor produces, then you have won the victory; then the battle is won and never will it be won before.

Now, the question is raised by one of the fellow workers who says here it is the capitalist who is objecting to our using our franchise. Now, mind you this, if you read the history of the capitalist class, you will find that they are the men of great diplomacy, and they know as long as they can have you dilly-dallying with this little toy you call the ballot, you will never do them any injury. Consequently they hold it before you and try to make you believe that you have the right to use it, so as to instill in your mind the idea that you have to use it. Only stick to the actual fact, that you are wage slaves, and that this capitalist system takes about four-fifths of what you produce and leaves you only with crumbs from day to day sufficient to enable you to make a shadow in the sun, and most of the working men have got to stand up three times in the sun to make a real shadow. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, then, another question was this, as to the quibblers; I have only a word to say: It is not a question of putting anything in the preamble that will satisfy the quibblers. My position is to put something in the preamble that corresponds with the facts. I do not care afterwards what the quibblers say about it, because this is my position: we know there are two different kinds of reasoners, those who take things for granted, and now we must have this document because it must be supreme. You may say the same thing of the capitalist system. If you take that system, would you be enabled to take the position of some of the fellow workers in this convention, and have a revolution? It would be a revolution only on paper. We are not interested in making this agreeable to any individual. If we wanted the majority to agree with us we would go back to the republicans. The question with us is to make it a movement that is scientific, and when you go into your ballot box, vote for industrial unionism.

You say it is a scientific, logical movement, and if you think it should be, let us make your declaration in the preamble and in the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

constitution so that no one of these quibblers can quibble over it; but the fact remains that you have a sound foundation, and as long as you have a sound foundation, let them quibble to the ends of the earth and to the end of history, it makes no difference as long as we have the facts, and we are on a scientific basis, we can always prove what Marx said in one of his documents, "I do not care if there is one or five men with me." Why did he say so? Marx had investigated it and he came to the conclusion he was absolutely right. He was an analytical reasoner, he was always applying his analysis and reasoning to the conditions, and what he wrote can always be proved because his work is a scientific work. As I say, why did he say this? He did not want a great army of men, but he wanted an army of men who understood where they stood and also understood how to progress and to go forward in their development in the interests of the working class.

That is the man who stands as the first man who made this proposition, who made Socialism or what you may call the industrial commonwealth, a possibility, because he discovered how we were exploited and discovered how surplus values were extracted. He discovered also two vital characters {characteristics?} of commodities that no one did before. But, mind you, if you are going to make this movement a scientific movement you must go to the basic principle upon which it is founded. You will remember that he said that certain individuals were interested in misleading or betraying the true interests of the working class. They went so far as to say that the extraction of the surplus value, and the only hour in the whole day's work when the capitalists made any profit, was the last, and lo and behold, at that time they worked sixteen hours a day, and later when they worked twelve hours and eight hours, they still had a profit. Those were the individuals that Marx has exposed to the working men.

All I am doing here today is instructing you and telling you to beware of idealistic doctrines and a great array of words, because if you believe in a great array of words, William Jennings Bryan is one of the greatest word peddlers you have ever seen. (Laughter.)

A movement does not stand upon a great array of words, but it does stand on an array of words in accordance with the facts. A movement does not depend on oratorical ability, but it does depend on oratory in accordance with the facts.

I want to say to those who have taken such an active hand and who tried to expose the ridiculous position, remember that everything we do today is going down in the history of the world, and the working men in the near future, if you please, will look these documents over

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

and if they discover you have been betraying them, beware, they will know you. It is our duty now to make ourselves so clear that we can go with clean hands before the working men and show them that we actually labored in the interests of the working men, and I thank you for your attention. (Applause.)

DEL. LIESNER: I have spoken before in reference to this proposition but I want to refer to a statement made by Fellow Worker Glover. He stated that I had said that the present Socialist party was an expression of the economic movement. He denied that. A man may deny that a tree bearing a green apple exists, but he cannot remove that tree, nor the apple by the denial.

At present, while it is true this present organization did not propagate that political expression, it is nevertheless the natural political expression of the economic movement of today, with this difference, or with the same comparative differences of the green apple, that is not yet ripe. This organization stands today in practically the same position in the economic field. I want that to be borne in mind so as not to be misunderstood.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, if there is anyone who has not yet had the floor—

DEL. CAMINITA: Fellow Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: You gave the floor away to this man. (Indicating.) I wanted to give you the floor and you did not want it.

DEL. CAMINITA: You gave the floor to me?

THE CHAIRMAN: I wanted to give you the floor and you gave it to that man. You did not want it. I wanted to give you the floor, I am here to give you the floor, and I haven't any objection; and if there is no one wants to speak, you can speak again. If there is no objection, the delegate being from the same locality I came from, I would like that he should be heard. If there is no objection you have the floor.

(Hearing no objection it was so ordered by the Chair.)

DEL. CAMINITA: I thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will speak after you. (Laughter.)

DEL. CAMINITA: I want to say just a few words. Some delegate said that many people sympathize with us because this organization is in favor of diplomatic action. I believe the I.W.W. is not in favor of private property and they will come to us, if they don't come today they will come to us later, because we are not in favor of private property. I want to ask you why I am not in favor of private property, and it is because you know that private property is part of our labor. Then what do we care if the ignorant people do not want to come with

us because we have not a preamble in this organization that stands for what they want? I think the most important thing for us is to be true to our principles. If we want a socialistic organization, then why do we not call the I.W.W. a Socialist organization? Why don't we say the I.W.W. is a political organization, if we want it as a political organization? But, if we want the I.W.W. as an economic organization, we must be an economic organization, too, and not just for fun.

Now, I want to tell you that if we strike out the political phase {phrase?}, from our preamble, the capitalist people are ready to send us to the electrical chair because we are the enemy of the capitalist people and they know that if we will not stand for political action that we will not take political power.

Again, I want to ask you, is Mr. Haywood an anarchist? Is Mr. Moyer an anarchist? They are not anarchists, but the capitalists tried to send them to jail, and not only to jail, but to the gallows. Why? Not because they are anarchists, but because they want to destroy private property, because they want to take possession of the economic power.

A delegate said, and he was sincere, it is the first time that I have heard this said here, that we are in favor of the ballot. All right, if you are in favor of the ballot, why don't you say in your preamble that you are in favor of the ballot? Then when you have done that we know that the Industrial Workers of the World are a branch of the S.L.P. But if you are in favor of the ballot, I want to ask you again what is the difference between the I.W.W. and the S.P. and the S.L.P.? I don't find any difference, because the S.L.P. wants the abolishment of private property and it wants the conquest of public power by the ballot. If the I.W.W. wants the abolishment of private property and the conquest of public power, then it is just the same as the socialist labor party {sic}. I do not see the difference between the one and the other.

But I wish that you would consider the effect of political action. You will see that after thirty years of struggle of political action, that the revolutionary spirit is lost day by day. We see in France that we have a socialist government; we see in France that Clemenceau is a socialist, and Jaures is a socialist. They were socialists before going into power. Now, they say they are socialists no more. Why? Because they went into power by the vote of the socialist party and now they are bourgeois.

Now, then, when you open the door to the politician and say to them, come to us, and we use the ballot and send the politician into office, they will say to us, "I am no longer a socialist, I no longer believe in the I.W.W.," and that is the thanks you will get.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Delegate Trainor said if we go among the people who believe in the ballot and say, "Don't believe any more in the ballot, never mind the ballot," that they will not come to us. Well, I do not say that the I.W.W. must go among the people and say, "Never mind the ballot; I do not vote for so and so," but I say that the I.W.W. must not talk about the ballot, just as the I.W.W. does not talk about religion. We did not put religion in the preamble. When we go among the people we do not talk about religion, and when a man asks me what do I think about religion, I answer, "I do not think about it at all, but I feel hungry and my stomach is empty." (Laughter.) I don't know anything about religion, and when people ask me what I think about the ballot, I say to them, "I do not think anything about the ballot, because my question is an economic question and not a political question," because I know that every time the people change the economic system they change the political system.

You go to Italy, where the people are very poor and the economic system is very poor. You go some other place where the economic system is very poor, and you find the political system very strong and against the people. You come here to America, where the economic system is better than in Italy and the political system is, maybe, a little bit better. Why is it better? Because the capitalist is nearer to God? No, but because the economic system is better here.

Suppose, for instance, that tomorrow or in the future, you give to the capitalistic people political power and you take the economical power. Then you will see that the capitalistic people will not be as strong as they are today.

I hope that my few words will go home to you. I cannot express myself as I wish, but I hope that you understand me just the same, and I hope that you will strike out from the preamble that one word where we are talking about the political field; but if you do not want to strike out the political field from the preamble, I tell you to be sincere and explain what you mean by the political field. (Applause.)

If you mean {the} ballot, then I have the pleasure to tell you that the I.W.W. is a political organization. If you do not mean the ballot, you do not say that I am against the political action because I am in favor of political action, but not in your way. What is my way of political action? Suppose tomorrow the capitalists were to send Moyer and Haywood to jail. The I.W.W. would declare, if they were strong enough, a general search {strike?} and compel the capitalist people to give back to us Moyer and Haywood. Now, don't you think that is a political action? I think so. That is a political action, but if we trust in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the ballot when we go among the people to give us liberty, they will say to you, "Yesterday I worked for this man, and he will give me liberty, he will give liberty to Haywood and Moyer. Mr. So-and-So is in power and he will give them liberty." And Mr. So-and-So will come to us then with a club and hit us on the head, or put us in the electrical chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Williams, will you take the chair?

(Delegate Williams here assumed the chair.)

DEL. KATZ: Now, fellow delegates, I did not want to speak, but due to the fact that Delegate Caminita and Delegate Trainor are from the same town, representing the same locals I want to go on record as speaking in favor of the motion and against the amendment. It is true that in the city of Paterson, a certain percentage of our membership, which at this time may be about three thousand or more, perhaps feel themselves the way the delegate who has spoken does; but there is also a very large element that feels the other way, and of course it is very hard to find out which is the majority, because at the meeting where we were supposed to be instructed in this question, when this question came up there were only a few in the hall and the matter was practically not discussed at all and the motion was laid on the table.

I am glad that Caminita is here in order to express the sentiment that prevails in certain quarters.

Now, all the men I have heard seem to take the stand that unless you are in favor of physical force, pure and simple, you are not a revolutionist. Now, I believe it is not the man who believes in physical force who is the revolutionist.

I believe, and I know, that when the days of the real battle will come, that the men who today stand for a unity of the working class on the political field, will be in the first ranks of the fighting men. (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, we had examples in the city of Paterson. We had a large strike there when the militia turned out and where were the men who were the leaders? I am telling Caminita here that if I were to be in Paterson tomorrow and there was to be a strike and the police were after me, I would not run away like one man did. I am there to stay, and yet he was the only revolutionist.

Now, twenty years ago, thirty years ago, men came over from Germany. They said, "Ballot nichs laus." They organized military clubs and they had certain parks where they were trying themselves in using them. Now, these little German companies were drinking beer and practicing with rifles, and when an Irish policeman turned up they all disappeared. That is a fact. (Laughter.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I say that I am a revolutionist I mean it, and I know what it implies. I know that it not imply talk. You have in this city a daily newspaper and have had for the last twenty-five years, that has been preaching physical force. What did they accomplish in the line of physical force? Why the railroad companies in these United States have killed more men than all these anarchists killed bed bugs in this country. That is a fact. (Laughter.)

Now, then, if I were to declare today that I did not believe in political action, if I would take the stand that I did not believe at all in anything but physical force, I would go and do it. That would be my stand. I would be consistent. I myself was a member of the physical forcists when I first came from Europe in 1887, and when the martyrs in this city were hanged.

Caminita says they prosecuted Moyer because he wanted to establish an economic organization that would destroy capitalism. Let that be true. True it is, but isn't it a fact that our fellow workers twelve years ago, because they did not take the stand that Haywood did, were hanged and Haywood was not hanged? Doesn't that prove that it was a wise policy? How can a man compare our political stand and the political stand of the Socialist party with their vote-catching schemes?

If I, in the city of Paterson, should be elected into the common council, I would not act like my friend did some years ago. I would not stay there one minute. They would put me out and I could speak to the people and show them what a working class representative who is a revolutionist can do for the working class. It would open their eyes. That is our position. How can a man compare the stand of the Socialist party and call Clemenceau, or whatever his name is, a Socialist? With the same amount of right I could Mr. Roosevelt an anarchist.

DEL. AXELSON: He is.

DEL. KATZ: He is! That is Axelson. That is your man who takes the same stand that you do.

Now, Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, there are two factions in this working class movement. There is the pure and simple political socialist who does not see anything but votes, who dreams about votes, who knows nothing but votes and who is willing to sacrifice anything for votes, whether there is a man behind that vote or a monkey. (Laughter.) Now then, there is on the other hand, the other extreme, who sees the dangers, who sees all the great dangers, in the organization that advocates the vote, and who sees a great danger in the corruption of the politician which exists, but he does not see on the other hand the corruption among the physical force element, he does

not see the Orchards and the McFarlands who develop on the other side of the house.

Mr. Chairman, that is the position this organization recognizes. I don't care whether you call it socialist, anarchist or anything else—this organization recognizes the fact that the workers produce all wealth and are entitled to all wealth, and that we are going to get it and we are going to use all means in our power to get it, and we are not going to throw away at this time the peaceful possibilities of solving the question.

We know that we may not do it peacefully; we know that the capitalist class and their lackeys in this country will not submit peacefully; we know that the time will come when this question will be perhaps decided elsewhere, and it will not be decided at the ballot box; but we are using the political agitation to disarm opposition on the one hand and to protect us from the capitalist class declaring our movement to be a conspiracy.

Caminita says, why don't we tell them if we stand for this preamble, what we are? We have had that preamble in the constitution since it was organized, and Caminita was a member and Caminita spoke with me in all the shop meetings in the city of Paterson, and we did not advocate any political parties, and we do not advocate any political parties today, but he heard me say, and I made that same explanation, that is the way I explained the preamble when it came to the question of endorsing a political movement or the necessity of a political movement without endorsing a political party. I told them as in the law of physics, if that glass can only stand in one place at a time, that if the working class is organized in a revolutionary class-conscious, economic body, that we do not have to worry how they will vote.

In the city of Paterson we had a strike, we organized a shop, and afterwards the boss thought he could do with his men and women like men do with people who are organized under the American Federation of Labor, but a committee came down to the office right away. He said "I don't want any committees. Get out of here. I want to deal with my men individually." All right, the committee went upstairs and the men, women and girls came down in a body into the office.

Now then, that demonstrates that in spite of the fact that we had a clause in there, it was a revolutionary act, that is, in the way in which the workers will become educated, and if I will go down on election day and register my vote for a party that does not stand for vote catching as the Socialist party does, if I cast my vote for a party where back of every vote stands a man, I am doing a revolutionary act that is

far more revolutionary than to talk physical force with no physical force behind it. (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, we have in the city of Paterson 3,500 organized workers. No doubt there are a number who are standing strictly for what Delegate Caminita is in favor of. There are those who stand strictly for what I represent. The large bulk of the working class recognize simply and instinctively that this organization is builded upon proper lines.

What is it that brought this organization into being? What brought us here together? What brought the I.W.W. together? This very preamble issued by the signers of the manifesto, and how can a man argue that the very thing that brought us together is going to drive us apart? (Applause.)

(Delegate Katz here resumed the Chair.)

DEL. AXELSON: Will I be permitted to ask one question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Now then, no one has the floor except the representative of the committee.

DEL. AXELSON: May I ask you one question?

THE CHAIRMAN: You want to ask me a question?

DEL. AXELSON: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

DEL. AXELSON: The question is, does the speaker know of any force except physical force?

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to answer that question: when I speak of physical force, I am speaking of not of what you may twist the term into, but what you mean by that term and what is generally understood, just the same as when I speak of the ballot. (Laughter and applause.)

DEL. DE LEON: Before entering into deep water on this subject, I wish to devote just a few words in discussing the propositions brought forward by those delegates who have submitted amendments.

Those who would like to have the word "all" left out, those who would like to have the words "land and machinery" put in, I wish to tell them briefly, that in my experience in the work of editing documents of this sort, the more they are edited, the more you invite editing. Leave the editing alone and not try to compromise, or you will have editing galore.

Take, for instance, the editing that this delegate proposes about land and machinery, so as to make it common sense. If you have to deal with a subject of this nature and not use technical language, but come down to common sense, then a man will rise here on this floor

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

and say: "In the name of common sense, should not the house in which that machinery is located, as well as the land, be also included?" and you will have no end of discussion upon that subject. It means the machinery, the means of production, and you had better stick to the technical term, including everything that goes with it.

Now, crossing the bar and going into deeper water, I was delighted that the discussion was not closed. I know that unless we settle this thing now and for all time, planting ourselves squarely with both feet and without any quibbling of terms upon what experience tells us is the field of civilization, then indeed this body would have gone to pieces, and that is quite the reverse of the manner in which it was suggested by one of the delegates.

I am delighted that the leading objectors were given twice the time, that is to say, they were allowed to speak twice, so there would be no question about gag law or that they were not given an ample opportunity to be heard.

There are two principles underlying their position. One a principle that I thoroughly sympathize with, and another one a principle that is utterly mistaken. Before taking up those principles, however, and so as to lead to them, I wish to take up the incidental errors that cropped out from their arguments. Your name is Axelson (addressing Delegate Axelson).

DEL. AXELSON: Yes, sir; Axelson.

DEL. DE LEON: Axelson, to my great delight, praised Marx, considered him the leading man whose every thought should guide us. Now, Marx did not write the bible {sic}, out of which you can take what you like and leave out what you do not like. Marx was a man, as you justly say, who wrote coherently and consistently, and you will not find in Marx one passage kicking a previous one, therefore he who quotes Marx quotes all that Marx said, and among the things that Marx said was that only the economic organization can set afoot the political movement of labor.

Now, I did not throw over the church in which I was born to stop kneeling before one Pope and then kneel down before another. I am not down on my knees before Marx, but I am on my knees before that talent whose utterances have proved to be correct. Marx is right, not because he is Marx, but Marx is right because experience proves that all he said was correct, and it is passing strange that anyone who quotes Marx should not be an advocate of political action, when Marx was a confirmed foe of that anarchistic propaganda that has caused so much blood to flow, and he declared himself upon that position which

it has been the privilege of American men to be the first to take the position that recognizes the necessity of political action, and knows that without political action economic action is not worth shucks; not worth that much. (Snapping fingers.)

Now, I pick out these errors in the hope that I may make some progress in the minds of those who are welded to them. There is a contradiction, they say, in the preamble, where it talks about the political field and then decides to take and hold without affiliation with any political party, and also orders the G.E.B. in the constitution never to engage an organizer from any political party. You call that a contradiction. Well, if that is a contradiction, then whatever is the natural result of existing conditions is a contradiction.

The I.W.W. preamble is built upon present conditions and the men who organized the body realized that it would be premature, and it would be throwing the apple of discord into our ranks, to attach ourselves to any political party. In consequence it was a recognition of existing conditions to order the G.E.B. not to engage any organizer of a political party as an organizer for the I.W.W., because by doing so you introduce in advance of time a question that should not now be introduced, and the position of the I.W.W. is that when the day shall come it shall itself project its own political party. (Applause.)

There consequently is no contradiction in that part of the preamble, but I have endeavored to explain how correct, according to Marx' own principle, it is that you must take and hold without affiliation with any political party.

The error has gone abroad that a political party can take and hold. It is an error because you cannot legislate a revolution. A political party cannot do it. The nature of its organization prevents it, and that clause was put in there deliberately as a blow in the face to those fellows who imagine that a political movement is capable of a revolutionary act. So far and no farther.

The brother said what he thought about political action. Now, I care not if the day after the election there is not a vote outside of mine cast, for whatever political party I may cast my vote; I am a revolutionist, and I know the agitation that I have made has done good. The delegate said here the capitalists are such diplomats that they are trying to take away the ballot from us so as to make us anxious to get it. Do they try to take your wages away from you to incite your appetite for wages? That is too far fetched. Why should you forget? Fellow-worker Trautmann yesterday read to you from the agreement of the Mine Workers' Union where they were pledged not to take part in legislative

action. Every man who lives with his eyes open knows that the capitalist class fears the political agitation of the working people. They feared because if we place ourselves upon that plane of civilization, of a theoretical peaceful solution, we can demand anything we want, whereas if you do not put yourself on that plane then they can do whatever they choose. The vote is not the essential part. If you strike out that political clause and leave there the clause to take and hold, you place yourselves entirely upon the plane that has come to be known as anarchist, and then good-bye to the I.W.W.

When I said anarchist I should perhaps make a correction. I do not believe that he is an anarchist. I do not believe that the I.W.W. thinks he is an anarchist (laughter), because the word anarchist properly means a man who denies literally that there is a head, and we have here a chairman, a head.

Caminita says that if we are strong enough we need not bother with politics. Of course not, that is begging the question. A child in its mother's womb remains in a bag for a long while, and when the child has grown strong enough it breaks that bag and comes wholly before the earth, before the light, and until the day when he is strong enough to break that bag, that bag fulfills a necessary function, it is a shield under which that child can develop.

It is begging the question to say that we want political action. I come back to this, I refer to the general strike. We want our political reflex on the day that we are strong enough, but we are not quite strong enough for political action now, we need a political shield.

Then the delegate said, "What do we care if we are called anarchists?" Wonderful argument. During these twenty years I have been called all sorts of things. I have been charged by some with being a Jew and denying it and by others I have been charged with not being a Jew and claiming to be one. Samuel Gompers charged me with having received \$50,000 from Tom Platt to set up a daily paper. The gentleman in Denver who originated the term "coffee and doughnuts propaganda," charged me with having sat at the feet of Sam Gompers at the Briggs House. These are slanders, but what would you think of a man thus being slandered who says, "Well, I will hobnob with Tom Platt and Samuel Gompers?" No, I am not going to give them a handle to justify the slander just because it is a slander; I must be careful not to give them a handle to justify it. I have denied those charges and if I were to hold to that philosophy I will be charged anyhow; why I could associate with Tom Platt and with Gompers, and I think they would be very much delighted to see me sitting there. That sort of argument

won't do. If a charge is false against us we must see to it that that charge has no hook upon which it can be hung, and failing that, we fail in our duty.

Now, as to the errors that crop out of Caminita's brain. He certainly is perpetrating a joke or else he is woefully misinformed.

He said if you keep the political clause in here, then it is a socialist organization, but if you will strike out the political clause, then you will be greeted as an economic organization. Why, that is a brand new discovery. Socialism is the gospel of the labor movement. Socialism says that labor produces all wealth, but under the capitalistic system of production it is not a human being, it is merchandise, and there is no hope of anybody recruiting his wages and capitalism will lead to worse and worse conditions. That is Socialism, and Socialism says that the emancipation of the working class must be brought about by the collective ownership of the means or production. That is Socialism.

To say that we do not want to be a Socialist organization is an absurdity. It must be our pride to be a Socialist organization and to imagine differently is a denial of the best literature upon the subject.

He said in France the working class were winning. That is not my information. I know I get it in the neck day after day. It was only the other day when battalions were called out on the streets of Paris.

He said in Italy they are so strong that any day they like they could start a general strike. Why, my dear sir, I am afraid you slander them without knowing it. If they were strong enough for a general strike, they would be cowards if they did not strike. And by a general strike I understand not simply getting out, but doing something, and the fact that they are not ready is shown by the fact that they are not doing it, and it will not do in cases of this solemnity to fritter time away on such words as that as they are misleading.

He said if we leave the word political there, we open the doors for the politician. Yes, if we say that alone, but if we strike out the word political and leave physical force alone, then we open wide the doors for the agent provocateur, and it is not a thing that is imaginary. It was shown in the Reichstag of Germany by documents there that it was a Prussian minister who furnished the anarchists of Europe with money to get bombs to be exploded in Berlin. It was shown that where an anarchist had thrown a bomb in France that he had two letters, one from Rothschild the banker, and another letter from the Archbishop of Paris.

Two years ago at the I.W.W. convention there was a delegate from Barcelona who was an anarchist, he told me. I met him in San

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Francisco in April of this year and I said to him, "Are you still an anarchist?" Well, he shook his head. A Spaniard came to the office and brought me some papers from Barcelona and in those papers were documents showing that men who are imprisoned in Barcelona as anarchists were not the men who had furnished or manufactured the bombs, but they were manufactured by the college of Jesuits in Barcelona.

Yes, strike out the word{s} "take and hold. Strike out the words that indicate the necessity of economic organization, and you have invited the scheming politician; you have invited the man who will logically be elected on such a ticket. Do that, and you certainly open the doors to the politician, but strike out the words "political action" in the sense I use them, and leave the words "take and hold," and then as it was correctly put, instead of the capitalists wishing to hang Haywood, they would have hanged him by this time, and who knows how many of us would have been on the road to the gallows as well.

Then the delegate asked how do you expect to unite those men who are in the republican and the democratic parties, into a political party. I would ask him, how do you expect those workmen who are democrats and republicans today to united in an economic organization to overthrow the democratic and republican capitalists? The political action is the wedge to get in amongst those men, it is the wedge that emancipates them from the thrall of political errors, and when all political errors are removed from their minds, then we have a negative united political action, we at least would stand negatively united upon the political field, and when it comes to that, the man who cannot vote right will do everything else wrong. To imagine that you can leave those men there in this position, that you can leave them there and try at the same time to organize this body, why, it is the old story of Madam Malaprop trying to sweep the Atlantic ocean away from her back yard. You cannot do it.

You may united a republican and democratic workingman in a pure and simple economic organization that stands upon the principle of the brotherhood of capital and labor and says, "I ought to have more," but never can you unite democrats and republicans into an organization that says, "Ours is the earth and the fullness thereof, and we want the whole of it." Before you can do that you must emancipate their minds of the political errors and the political movement necessarily does that work. (Applause.)

He asks what is the difference between S.P., S.L.P. and the I.W.W. I will stop a moment upon that, because the question indicates such a

fundamental misconception of matters. The I.W.W. is built along the lines of industries. A railroad knows no state or county line. That is its constituency. The I.W.W. organizes the miners wherever the vein runs, and there is the constituency, whether it is Colorado or Pennsylvania, or any other state. The I.W.W. organizes the cotton workers, wherever cotton is raised, regardless of geographical or political demarkation, that is the constituency. In other words, the I.W.W. is organizing the future constituency of the government of the working class. (Applause.) The I.W.W. is establishing that constituency or those constituencies which will elect their delegates, and some day instead of being a convention hurrying through its work in one week, it will be able, at its leisure, to sit as a parliament or congress of the United States. The I.W.W., accordingly, is an association of organized new opinion, the opinion of the proletarian.

The S.P., or the S.L.P., or any other political party, cannot do that, because they are organized upon geographical demarkations, and the bricklayer or shoemaker may go with me to vote at the same ballot box. A political organization cannot perform a revolutionary act, but a political organization can carry on a revolutionary propaganda. I can get on the stump and say, "Vote for the principle that will overthrow the capitalist system. Vote for the principle that will put the railroads and all the capitalist institutions of the land into the hands of the workers. Vote for the principle that will make the man who does not want to work, shall be compelled to starve, and when I do that I am free, I am safe. But let me say on the stump or elsewhere, "Let us go and take and hold," and I will have to go then into rat holes and carry on my propaganda; and keep this in mind, the labor movement is one that takes in the masses and the masses cannot be addressed in rat holes. The masses have to be addressed in the open, and the sun of the twentieth century civilization frowns down upon the man who would propose physical force only and reject absolutely the theory of an attempt at a peaceful solution.

As has been well said, the first man who ran away from this convention was an anarchist, Moore. We who are not anarchists know it, and by the way, I forgot to mention this, it is said that this preamble must be more accurate, more exact, than it is ambiguous. It is, is it? You ask Sherman whether he thought it was ambiguous. You ask McCabe whether he thought it was ambiguous. You ask all the pure and simple economic crooks and their doubles, the pure and simple political crooks, whether the platform was ambiguous. It was so clear that no sooner was it enunciated when all those crooks put their heads

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

together to give us a licking, and we licked them. (Applause.)

Caminita said that our platform is revolutionary on paper. I want to tell you a joke that Marx cracked on a gentleman who spoke as Caminita did. Marx said that physical force is the midwife of revolution. Anybody who imagines that the ruling class will stand up and peacefully let them do it, is mistaken, but you must exhaust all practical means, and Marx said, "Physical force is the midwife of revolution." Then an anarchist arose and said, "You say physical force is the midwife of revolution. Why, let us take physical force alone?" "Why," Marx said to him, "if that was so, if I want a child all I have to do is to go and get a midwife." (Laughter and applause.)

Now then, we were asked what is civilization? Civilization means that men shall deal with one another as each expects to be dealt with. Civilization means that we shall utilize all the conquests of the human race that have enabled us to do what we are doing here today, talking, although we may disagree, peacefully, without jumping at one another's throats.

The delegate from Indianapolis made use of the remarkable expression, "Shall we bother with the capitalist ballot?" That is the vein with which I utterly disagree, and I wish now to take those two things, and Caminita said virtually the same thing.

There is no such thing as the capitalist ballot box, any more than there is such a thing as the capitalist ballot, or such a thing as capitalist free speech. These are all conquests that the human race have wrung from the clutches of the ruling class, and for the same reason that I walk proudly and freely on the highway, and for the same reason that we advocate and exercise free speech, for that same reason we stand by the ballot box, not that it is the ballot of the capitalist, but it is the ballot of the civilized man. The battlefield where we may go and vote and expect to come out without having our bones broken, and the other fellow's bones broken likewise.

The vein with which I agree is this: I am sure these delegates feel to a great extent the way they do, unknown to themselves, because of the corruption that we know has sprung up in all the parties of labor, and Delegate Young's reference to the Anaconda experience I think covered the point sufficiently. That political movement sprung up; there was no economic organization back of it. It was a rudderless ship, but to say that because political action leads, as we know it does when it is pure and simple political action and not corrupted, therefore, to go to the other extreme is to forget the experiences that we should not forget.

The labor movement began first with the anarchistic method of physical force, and swung back to the other extreme, the pure and simple, and it has been oscillating back and forth until the time when the I.W.W. came, and not until the I.W.W. came could that position be established where we have the political action in its right place and the economic action, the necessary basis which gives its reflex to the political, necessary to start the political and necessary to make the political triumph a success.

Now, perhaps it is not simply for us here in America. I apprehend that the circumstance of my birth, having fallen on this side of the waters, is what made me think we had to do it in America. Marx said it was a revolution in the United States that rung the knell of capitalism, and I came to the conclusion that it was so, and during the last three years in the conventions and congresses I have attended, I have come to the conclusion that it is our duty, and that it would be a crime on our part if we neglected the experiences of the past. Europe needs the education that the I.W.W. is imparting to it. Those young men who are growing up in Europe now are the superiors of anything Europe has ever seen, and they look upon the I.W.W. as the angel of light, and they look for America to give in this generation the signal which was given in seventeen hundred and something against feudalism in Europe.

Don't let us strike out that clause "political action." Let us on the contrary understand what it means and carry that information among the working people. Do not let us yield to the sophistries of the pure and simple politicians who talk about neutrality toward the labor unions. Let us stand upon the square jointed principle which Heselwood, your delegate, and myself advanced before that congress, and although our time was limited, we got, outside of our two and a half votes, eighteen votes, the majority of the votes of the French delegation and three votes from the Italian delegation. That resolution says that the industrial organization is the embryo, the seed of civilization.

Without political organizations we can do nothing; we can never triumph because we array ourselves for a civil warfare, and without economic organizations, the day of political triumph would be, today, that of political defeat. Political socialism in Europe has shown that backward trend; don't let us give a hand to that, by ourselves going back, but let us take a long step forward today, so long that this same question cannot be brought in here again.

DEL. CAMINITA: I want to ask a question.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the regular order of business be proceeded with now, and the regular order is the roll-call.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this is an important question.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, it is no twenty-five minutes to six.

DEL. CAMINITA: I rise to a point of order.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The next thing in order is the roll-call and after the roll is called, the question will be legitimate.

DEL. CAMINITA: I rise to a point of privilege. You cannot deny a delegate to right to ask a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will proceed now with the roll-call. The Chairman in making this decision will make this statement, after having consumed the afternoon and after everybody has spoken I don't see what additional light can be thrown upon this subject now. Proceed with the calling of the roll. The question is on the preamble. The motion is that we concur in the recommendations of the committee that the preamble remain unchanged. The amendment to the motion is that we strike out the four words preceding the words "To get together on the industrial field," so that it will read "Between these two classes, the struggle must go on until the elements get together on the industrial field," etc. This amendment will come to be voted upon first, to strike out the words as before stated. The secretary will now read the roll and the delegates who are in favor of striking out those words vote no. To make it clear, in voting for the amendment you are striking out four words preceding the words "get together on the industrial field."

(Vote is here taken.)

DEL. FINNEGAN: I would like to change my vote. I intended to vote no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Correction received.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Total number of votes cast, 128; 109 voting no; 19 voting yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Amendment is lost.

We now come to the vote for the original motion, that is, that we concur in the report of the committee. What is your pleasure, do you want a roll call?

VOCIES: Yes, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, all those in favor of the original motion that we concur in the report of the committee will answer yes and opposed no. That is, those in favor of the preamble standing as it is now the vote will be yes and those opposed no.

(Vote is here taken.)

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow delegates, I am requested to announce from the floor of this convention that Fellow Delegate Axelson will speak this evening at Feldt's Hall, corner of Chicago avenue and Wells street. There will be good speakers in English and Swedish. This will be a Scandinavian meeting and Delegate Axelson will speak in Swedish.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I wish to announce a Polish meeting of the Iron and Steel Workers in South Chicago, Saturday night, at Gominski's Hall. Also a meeting of the Stock Yards workers, Polish people, at Kochinski's Hall, on Ashland avenue near Fifteenth street somewhere, I do not know the address.

THE CHAIRMAN: The total number of votes cast is 128. In favor of the motion, 113; opposed, 15. I declare the recommendation of the committee concurred in. The hour of adjournment being near, I now adjourn the meeting until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

FOURTH DAY—THURSDAY, SEPT. 19, 1907.
MORNING SESSION.

Chairman Katz called the meeting to order, and the secretary called the roll of delegates. The following were noted as absent: Delaney, French, Keep, Levoy, Rotkovitz, Spettel. Later delegates Levoy and Spettel appeared and requested to be noted as present. Del. French also arrived later.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is reports of committees, standing and special. There was on the floor last night the committee on constitution. Before we proceed I want to announce that there were some mistakes which Fellow Worker Walsh points out where the stenographer got the wrong names, so I would call again the attention of the delegates to the necessity of announcing their names when they begin to speak.

DEL. BOUSCHE: I would like to make a motion that we limit discussion hereafter to ten minutes. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made that there be a time limit of ten minutes and that no delegate shall speak longer on any one question than ten minutes.

DEL. DE LEON: I would like to move an amendment that no delegate be allowed to take the floor more than once. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment made that no delegate be allowed the floor more than once on one question or motion.

DEL. FOOTE: Does that mean that we shut off the parliamentary rule as to the mover of the motion having the last voice?

DEL. DE LEON: No.

DEL. FOOTE: Then I accept that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee will always have the floor as the committee. Now, a motion has been made and seconded that there be a time limit of ten minutes to speakers, and an amendment has been made that delegates who speak shall only have the floor once upon a question. What is your pleasure?

DEL. AXELSON: Wouldn't it be well also to insert in this amendment, with the consent of the mover, that if a delegate has an important question which he cannot cover in ten minutes he will be given an additional ten minutes or any other time that he may need to take to cover it. I think that would be fair, because it seems to me we cannot wish to cut off any man in the midst of his presentation of his idea. I think we should be the judges as to what is best for this organization. We should not be governed by minutes, but should be governed by logical facts.

DEL. DE LEON: The reason why I cannot accept Delegate Axelson's suggestion is just because of the principle involved in the last words of the speaker. We are here for facts. Now, if every one is to be allowed to rise and ask questions, instead of giving facts, the time will be consumed and we will be here at the end of the week, but will not be down to the work we are here to do. Now, if Brother Axelson has had any experience in conventions at least, he will know what I know, that it is not an infrequent thing for members to rise under the guise of asking a question and inject a speech; and if, after a discussion such as we have had, anybody wants to ask questions, in nine cases out of ten it is not a bona fide question. I do not mean to abridge the right to ask questions on the part of any members that want to put them. But in view of the regulation method and that the suggestion would be giving the floor to a person who has not the floor in order to put a question, we should have to decide whether it was a question that should be put or should not be put. For that reason I can not accept that suggestion.

DEL. SCHWEND: I think it would be unwise to limit speakers in this convention to ten minutes. I for one have come here to learn, and I believe that the welfare of the industrial movement depends upon a full and free and fair and unlimited discussion of the questions that may arise. Now, for instance, I came here with the impression firmly fixed in my mind that we should eliminate all reference to political action from the preamble of this organization, and if those who were on the floor yesterday in the discussion on the preamble or the changes suggested in the preamble had been limited, the facts that were brought out in that discussion, and to which I listened very attentively, would not have been brought out, and the result would have been that I perhaps, although open to argument and conviction when this discussion would have closed, would not had have the opportunity to listen to the argument and would not have had a chance to have all this matter before me, and would have remained under the same conviction under which I labored when I came into this convention. I believe now, after listening to the free argument that was produced yesterday, that we acted wisely. I am willing to submit to the majority, but if we are going to limit this discussion in this convention to ten minutes it may be that in the future questions that arise there will be many who were in my position and would be open to conviction {conversion?}, if the argument were properly presented. But under a rule such as this, which I regard as gag law, as something foreign to the Industrial Workers of the World, as a method more appropriate to the domain of the czar than to any organized body of

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

men such as we are, I say I most emphatically object to the adoption of this ten minute rule.

DEL. HAGGERTY: I rise to state that I am opposed to both the motion and the amendment. It is not necessary in this assembly to do anything of the kind. (Applause.) There has not been a single abuse of the privilege of speech since this convention met, and any man who is unwise enough to speak at unnecessary length makes no impression upon the delegates and his position is thoroughly unsound. Let the discussion be free and open. I want to suggest, as the brother there says, I never heard such an elucidation in my life as I heard here yesterday on both sides of the question that came out. We are not a lot of children that have to hedge ourselves around about with rules and build walls to protect ourselves from ourselves. If there is a flagrant abuse, then it is time enough to apply the remedy, but not until that time. (Applause.)

DEL. LIESNER: I coincide with Fellow Worker Haggerty, but I want to add this fact. Suppose a man spoke his ten minutes, and just at the time the ten minutes expired he was just about to make the main point of his argument, would he have to sit down and just choke off in the middle of a word?

THE CHAIRMAN: He is allowed to finish his sentence.

DEL. LIESNER: He should be allowed to finish his argument. Here is another thing: I protest against both the motion and the amendment for this reason also: If there is a ten-minute rule established, then none but expert, trained orators can get up here and make an argument within the time. We are not composed of such intelligent and capable speakers as Fellow Worker De Leon, and the result is that such a man will be able to express in five words what most of us would need fifty words to bring out, and the consequence is that it gives him the whole argument. Another reason is this: We are supposed to do away with capitalistic methods. Capitalistic methods require gag rule and time limits. It is far better for us to maintain our present rule and take if necessary a week or two weeks or a month and accomplish our purpose properly, than it is to save a week but do so by gag rule. Time is not the measure of the progress of this movement. What I mean is that we are not to measure the progress of this movement against a few hours of time. It requires six months sometimes to thresh things out properly, and if so I would be willing to take it.

DEL. FRANCIS: Under the circumstances at present I am not in favor of this rule, but I am thoroughly in favor of the amendment of Del. De Leon that a man shall speak only once on the question. I

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

repeat what I said yesterday, that all of us who are present like myself pretty well know what we want, and I think no amount of wind jamming will be necessary here. We know pretty well our position, and if everybody who speaks once on the subject it is good enough for me.

DEL. CAMINITA: I think the amendment is good, because we find some person who cannot speak well and he needs not only ten minutes, but twenty minutes. One who has the privilege of knowing the language very well can express himself in ten minutes or in five. One who has the privilege to be intelligent enough to be a lawyer or a doctor does not need ten minutes; he needs two minutes. But we are working men, and when we speak on a question we need time to explain our ideas. I do not think you can limit the time. For that reason I think the amendment is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? If no one desires the floor we will come to a vote. We vote first upon the amendment that no one shall speak more than once on one question. All in favor of the amendment to the motion that no delegate shall speak more than once on one question will say aye; opposed, no. (The result appeared to be in doubt.) A roll call will be taken. The amendment is that delegates can speak but once upon one motion.

DEL. AXELSON: The amendment implies, does it not, also that the speech will be limited to ten minutes?

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: This amendment to the motion does not imply that. You can accept the amendment and not limit the time. If you do not want the amendment, vote it down. It simply means that the speaker can speak any length of time, but not more than once. That is what the amendment implies. The secretary will now proceed to call the roll.

The roll was called by the secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: While the secretary is counting the votes I want to announce that the proprietor of this hall has informed Secretary Trautmann that we cannot have this hall on Saturday afternoon. There is to be an entertainment that evening, and he must make preparation in the afternoon, so at the proper time we must take action and see that we do not adjourn before doing so. We will take no action now; I simply make the announcement.

The result of the roll call was announced as follows: Total number of votes cast, 122; yes, 93; no, 29.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is carried. Now we come to the motion. The motion is that the time of speakers be limited to ten minutes.

DEL. FRANCIS: A point of information. Is it not a fact that when the amendment carries the original motion is lost?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at all. An amendment that would be such as to destroy the original motion would be out of order in the first place. An amendment can only add to or take away from the original motion. Now we will come to a vote.

DEL. KEEP: The motion as it now stands is that speakers are limited to ten minutes and only speak once?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the motion before the house.

DEL. WALTERS: A point of information. This delegate has just asked if the vote taken was that the time be limited to ten minutes and the delegates only allowed to speak once. You said yes. That is incorrect. The time is not limited.

THE CHAIRMAN: You misunderstood.

DEL. KEEP: You misunderstood me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, all in favor of the motion that the time of delegates be limited to ten minutes will say aye. Opposed, no. We do not need to call the roll on this. The motion is lost.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: But they can speak only once.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. The rule now is that the time is not limited, but delegates can speak only once upon a question. Now we will proceed with the regular order of business, reports of committees, standing and special.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Should not the communications be read and referred to the committees so that they can work on something?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am simply reading the order the way the committee on rules and regulations has placed it. Reading of communications and bills.

COMMUNICATIONS.

The secretary then read the following named communications, and they were respectively referred as noted:

Communication from Moyie, British Columbia, signed by V.C. Barclay, recording secretary; Charles Martin, secretary-treasurer; John T. Martin, president. Referred to committee on organization.

Communication from F.W. Makeweight, secretary of Coal Miners' Union at Virden, Illinois. Referred to committee on organization.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Several letters from the steel workers in the Pittsburg district, among them one from C.J. McCarthy, secretary of Iron and Steel Workers' Local at Monaca, Pa. Referred to committee on organization.

Also a communication from a committee of group of Italian workers in Chicago in regard to the establishment of a daily paper; the communication endorsed by the Italian printers local. Referred to committee on literature and press.

Also a letter from Delegate Rotkovitz in regard to the financial affairs in connection with the strike of the Cleveland tobacco workers. Referred to the committee on ways and means.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN: We now go under the head of reports of committees. Has the committee on constitution and further report?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman, we have here a resolution on the preamble from Local 224, which the committee on constitution acted upon.

“WHEREAS, the I.W.W. is based on the class conflict in society, recognizing the integral organization of the working class in capitalist industry; and,

“WHEREAS, the I.W.W. does proclaim the commonwealth of labor by and through the co-ordination of the industrial proletariat within the domain of capitalist industry in lieu of mass organization within the realm of bourgeois administrative affairs; therefore, be it

“RESOLVED, that the I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial administration.”

Resolution in regard to resolution of Local 224:

“WHEREAS, the proposition does not contemplate a constitutional change or an altering the wording of the preamble, but is simply the utterance of an interpretation of the organization; be it

“RESOLVED, that this committee recommends the adoption of the said interpretation as correct.” (Unanimously carried by the committee.)

DEL. FOOTE: I move you that the report of the committee be concurred in. (Seconded.) I would like to have the floor for a brief explanation, and request that I have the last talk on the resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: As representing the committee?

DEL. FOOTE: As representing the committee and as being the delegate who was instructed to present the resolution to the convention by my local union.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we concur in the report of the committee. Do you wish the floor now?

DEL. FOOTE: I desire it, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And also to close the debate, you say?

DEL. FOOTE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Representing the committee? Now, I do not know whether that is in conflict with the position that we have just arrived at.

DEL. FOOTE: That is what I asked when the amendment was proposed a while ago.

DEL. DE LEON: I do not wish to limit him, but I am willing to have him speak because I do not anticipate that there will be any discussion unless it is invited by some remark.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to explain my position. You asked a question before the vote was taken before, if a member was only to speak once whether that would apply to the committee.

DEL. FOOTE: To the mover of the motion is what I asked.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have here a rule that the committee which in this case recommends this resolution will have the last say. Now, if you represent the committee, understand, and if the committee has elected you to act for them, I want to know whether you want to do that as a member of the committee or as an individual?

DEL. FOOTE: The committee has not taken any action on that, as I understand.

DEL. DE LEON: No. Just a few words to explain the matter. The precedent has been established at the previous two conventions that the chairman of the committee of a member delegated to act shall present the closing remarks from the committee. I am perfectly willing to yield my place to the brother if he wants to close the remarks. I do not expect that there will be any discussion on it unless it is invited by a new argument, but since he presented the resolution I think I would let him have that opportunity.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, I will not make any opening remarks, but simply will reserve my remarks for the close. I do not think there will be any extensive discussion. I think, after the discussion of yesterday, that the delegates fairly understand what the resolutions imply.

DEL. DE LEON: I think it is necessary to state to this convention how this matter came before us. If you notice, these are resolutions. We have no jurisdiction over a resolution, unless the resolution implies a constitutional change. This resolution was passed to the

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

committee on resolutions, and that committee in its wisdom passed it over to us. Now, we did not care to send the resolution back to the committee, so we considered the best way to dispose of the proposed resolution by recommending its adoption on the ground that the resolution does not contemplate any change whatever in the preamble, as stated in the closing words of the committee's recommendation. Will you kindly read the closing line?

DEL. WILLIAMS: "That the I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial administration."

DEL. DE LEON: "That the I.W.W. seek its political expression only in its own industrial administration," and that embodies the spirit of the preamble, namely, that the I.W.W. is a way out of which everything else would have to develop. And we therefore proposed that action so as to save time and prevent this from being sent back and forward.

DEL. LIESNER: Do I understand Fellow Worker De Leon to say that that resolution is passed to the committee on resolutions?

DEL. DE LEON: No, I stated that it was sent to the committee on resolutions, and the committee on resolutions sent it back to us, and we did not want to return it to them, so we acted on it.

DEL. KEEP: I cannot understand that thing yet. I would like to have it read. I cannot get it through my "noggin," and I want to have it read.

DEL. FOOTE: I have had a few copies struck off, so that it will save this discussion if you pass them around.

(The copies referred to by Delegate Foote were passed around among the delegates.)

DEL. KEEP: Well, is this the resolution?

DEL. FOOTE: That is the resolution.

DEL. KEEP: I would like to state that I voted yesterday that the preamble be changed. I know we are up against this game, and I am opposed to this definition. In the first place, it is one that, to me at least, is involved and will cause just as much discussion as the previous one. The average working man when he reads that language will pass it up and not know what it means. We want to tell him in plain English what he wants. I don't like any of these things when you have a preamble which is a plain exposition in plain language, to come along again and explain that in other words and involved sentences, and for that reason I am opposed to it. I understand perfectly well that we Marxists have got to use certain terms and certain words, but we can do that in our explanations of this. Now, yesterday, before we voted everybody understood what this preamble meant. Here were

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

two contending forces or factions. One wanted this thing changed. The other did not want it changed. Now, then, to satisfy those who wanted it changed they got this thing up. I am going to vote against it for the reason that I do not like the English; I do not know what it means. I really cannot understand it, and I do not see the use for it at all so long as the preamble has been left as it is, and I am going to vote against it.

DEL. LEVOY: The way it seems to me I am opposed to it for I am unable to grasp it. It says "In its own industrial administration." That is what the "bunch" wanted yesterday. Now we put up this—

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Levoy, when you speak of any delegates please do not refer to them as the "bunch." That is not the proper way.

DEL. LEVOY: All right. This is just what they were after yesterday. They said that when the time came they were going to have their own political action in their industrial administration. I am not clear on the whole matter. In the preamble "political" don't amount to anything, according to that resolution. We want the preamble clear so we can understand it, and this is more complex, ten times as much as the preamble is. You have got to have a dictionary to understand it. When you go to the people that belong to the I.W.W. you will have to take a dictionary to know what it means.

DEL. LIESNER: In the discussion that was carried on yesterday on this floor all the speakers acknowledged the fact that the Industrial organization was the organization from which at the right time would come that political reflection. Now, that is all that this implies. That is what this resolution wants to state clearly so that there won't be any misunderstanding of this preamble. That is the intention of this resolution, and not as the Fellow Worker over here is trying to make out. It was an attempt to strike out the word "politics" because of the fact that it left ground for claiming that it might assume the form of a pure and simple organization. But that would not have been the fact. But that is what they all said. Now, in order to explain ourselves and to show that this is not going to be and will not be and could not be a pure and simple organization, this resolution is offered. We want to give it the best explanation we can. You know how men will read the Bible. A minister will take the Bible, and if he is a good talker he will preach a good sermon from it. Another will take it and preach a different one. The same with this clause: to one man it will mean one thing, and to another man it means something else. Now, what we want is a clear explanation, and we get it in that last clause of the resolution: "Therefore, be it resolved that the I.W.W. seeks its political expression in its own industrial organization." That is clear. That is

what the Fellow Worker from Montana wanted yesterday. That is what was wanted, if I remember, in the communication received here from some silk workers who objected to some of those socialist interpretations because there aren't so many that I don't blame them. We want to make ourselves clear and to set out a program of principles in the agitation that we carry on among the working men. My position is this, that there are two political parties and we must not and cannot allow ourselves to be mixed up with either as long as there are two political parties. Let us make it within the organization. Let us have a united organization. Let us establish unity, and not before you have that unity will you be able to carry the day. Therefore I hope that the delegates present, recognizing the necessity of this explanation of the preamble will act so that in the future when we appear before the working men and one man asks "What political party do you belong to?" you can present the matter clearly and you can proceed with your argument on economic and industrial unionism, unhampered by any question because this explanation will define our position. I thank you for your attention.

DEL. FRANCIS: A point of information. According to the motion, does that imply that that resolution that has been presented will practically be a part of the constitution of the I.W.W.?

DELEGATE: No.

DELEGATE FRANCIS: Good and well: that is one thing. Now, as to the recommendation of the committee, it is all very nice to bring out all kinds of technical rules, at least technical rules that are supposed to guard us against certain quibblers or certain questions that may be put. Those rules are put down in this resolution and questions on this thing may come up as some future time, but at present when you go to organize the working class, when you call meetings you tell them how to improve conditions, and you also state the ultimate object. In doing that, that is all they want to know. A thing of this kind raises quibbles. Latin quotations and all those things, although I may know something about Latin, nevertheless it is out of place here. I tell you that all you have to do is to tell the working men how to fight the capitalists, and you can do it better than by talking about political expression. If you mention political expression they will get up and ask you what you mean. I think we should make the thing as brief as possible and leave out all the quibbling.

DEL. AIAZONNE: I think this is only a repetition of the discussion that was had yesterday. This resolution will overthrow the vote that

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

you took yesterday. It implies too much, and I am going to vote against it.

DEL. JONES: Take this second clause of the resolution: "Whereas, the I.W.W. does proclaim the commonwealth of labor by and through the co-ordination of the industrial proletariat." We already proclaim the commonwealth of the workers. We say that the I.W.W. would do that. This clause need not be adopted by this organization. The preamble covers the thing thoroughly as it is. Now, Delegate Axelson read the second clause in this manner: "Therefore, be it resolved that the I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial administration." He said "organization." He practically means by that word "organization" the same as "administration"; that we will use the political expression in our own organization to destroy the capitalist system. I cannot understand the preamble then, or this interpretation of the preamble, and I will vote against it.

DEL. SPETTEL: It seems to me this was very well settled yesterday, and I am surprised that it should be brought up again. It reminds me of the straw grasped by a drowning man, and I will vote against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

DEL. CAMINITA: As the delegate said, it is not the time to explain to the people what we mean by political action. I remember I went to a restaurant and asked the proprietor, "Do you trust today?" He said, "No, I trust tomorrow." I went back the day after and asked, "Do you trust today?" He said, "No, I trust tomorrow." And every day he said that "I trust tomorrow," and every time we want to change something here let us do it tomorrow, because now is not the time. We go and present industrial unionism to the people, and if they are not intelligent enough today they will be intelligent enough tomorrow and they will understand it. If they are not intelligent enough today to understand what is meant by the abolition of private property, that is no reason why we should drop the abolition of private property. We can go to the people and explain day by day what we mean. Then it is necessary to go among the people today, not tomorrow, because tomorrow they may change and become reactionary against us. But today go among the people and explain what we mean by political action.

DEL. BENSON: I think that the resolution only complicates matters all the more than they are at present. If the workers do not understand this preamble as it stands, they will never understand it any better by reading this resolution. To my opinion it does not explain the preamble any better than it is as it stands.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. BOHM: I am much opposed to this resolution, because yesterday afternoon we discussed the matter long enough and we came to the conclusion then that it is not necessary to change the preamble, so therefore I oppose this resolution.

DEL. GLOVER: I was opposed to the recommendation of the committee yesterday to leave the preamble as it was, for the reason that it was not explicit enough, and allowed individuals to interpret it and come against you with the proposition, "Does it mean this political party?" Another individual would come up and say, "Does it mean this political party?" I would say "No," but he would say, "What party do you mean?" It is very difficult to make him understand that we believe in and propose to have that political expression come solely and wholly through the economic organization itself. But how can we expect to go amongst all the individuals of the working class and make a personal explanation of it? How can we hope to get the workers in sufficient numbers to teach them in the form of economics and through that teaching give the explanation of our position politically? How can we wipe out these barriers that are coming up before us? Why do we allow these barriers to be brought up for the sake of overthrowing them? Why can't we put ourselves in a position where we will not have these barriers come up before us? In voting ultimately for the recommendation of the committee yesterday it was on the understanding from one of the committee that they proposed to bring in an explanatory clause or resolution which would be so definite and concise that we could simply point to it and say, "There is our position." And there it is, right here, that "The I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial organization." Now, when an individual comes to us asking whether this means this political party or that political party, we can say, "No, we don't mean anything; we can point to this resolution and say that there is the position definitely and concisely, prohibiting and excluding any argument upon the part of any individual connected with the organization or outside of the organization. That is why I feel the necessity of such a resolution being embodied in our work in explanation to the outsider.

DEL. OHMAN: Fellow Worker Forberg expresses a desire to speak on this resolution, and I move that she be given the floor to speak on this particular resolution. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I am in doubt whether that would be a proper procedure or not. A motion has been made and seconded that Mrs. Forberg, a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, I believe,

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

shall be given the floor. What is the object?

DEL. OHMAN: To speak on this resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: To speak on this resolution. What is your pleasure?

DEL. AIAZZONE: We passed on that the first or second day when that came up as to organizers.

THE CHAIRMAN: We did not pass on that at all.

DEL. LEVOY: If we give one member, one outsider, the privilege of the floor, any member of the Industrial Workers of the World will have as much privilege, and it would only make hard feelings. I believe nobody has a right to speak on this floor except the delegates. If we give one member of the I.W.W. a right to speak we should give everybody else a right. If we do not there will be only hard feelings on the part of the rest of them.

DEL. KEEP: If anybody is to speak in this convention it should be the elected delegates. If we open the doors to let non-delegates speak where are we going to stop this? I think it is out of order, and I make the point that it is out of order. Nobody can speak unless they are given that privilege as delegates to speak for the organization. If somebody that was not elected a delegate at all has the to come here and speak, then what is the use of sending delegates?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not want to take the stand that the motion shall not be entertained, and he leaves it with the delegates as to whether they should at this time give that lady the floor. So far as I am concerned, personally, I would have no objection to giving an organizer the floor that had something relative to the organization, some report that he has to make. But I think, so far as I am concerned personally, that it is highly improper on the part of any of the members of the organization who were not elected as delegates, and it is highly improper on the part of a paid organizer or ex-paid organizer especially to demand privileges that others are not given.

DEL. KEEP: I made a point of order yesterday or Tuesday that an organizer be granted the floor, and I understand it was voted down.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; I want to state that the voting down of that motion did not mean that the organizer could not have the floor at no time and on no subject. That meant simply that he should not be seated with a voice and speak on anything; but it did not mean that on certain things the organizer would not have the right or that the courtesy should not be extended to him or to her to speak on something relating to the organization, some report in connection with the organization. But I simply do not want to rule this motion out of

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

order. I want to leave it to this body to decide. The best thing is that you come to a vote.

DEL. HERRMANN: As I understand, Sister Forberg is not only a member of the I.W.W., but she is also a member of the Advisory Board, and with the rest of the Advisory Board members, has a voice in this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the General Executive Board that the constitution provides shall be seated in this convention. We will take a vote. All in favor of the motion that Mrs. Forberg be given the floor upon this question will say aye. Opposed, no.

The result apparently being in doubt, the Chairman called for a roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, while they are counting the votes, is there anybody else that wants to speak on the motion before the House?

DEL. SPEED: Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied and thoroughly convinced that he who would quibble would quibble, no matter what construction you might put on a proposition. Being satisfied of that, I would like to move that the whole matter lie on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain this motion at this time.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order. A motion to lay on the table not being debatable, cannot be preceded by debate. You can refuse to put the motion at this stage. Otherwise you would be compelled to vote.

DEL. AXELSON: It seems to me better to decide that before Delegate Foote closes the debate.

DEL. DE LEON: That does not exclude that.

THE CHAIRMAN: In that case I hold that he may have the close of the debate.

DEL. DE LEON: Before the motion to lay on the table?

THE CHAIRMAN: To lay on the table. In case the motion to lay on the table is put and carried, that would not give Foote a right to speak in closing the debate.

DEL. DE LEON: There is a precedent established that he who makes a motion shall have the right to close. Consequently his remarks do not come under the head of a general debate. When a motion is made to lay upon the table, it means to close the debate, and consequently that speaker has the floor anyhow. You cannot rule him out without you suspend the rules, and a motion to lay upon the table is not a motion to suspend the rules; it is simply a motion that the general debate shall end. Now, that motion was improperly made by

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the fellow worker because it would cut off the right of speech. So I hope you will not put that motion now. However, I withdraw my point of order.

DEL. AXELSON: The question was raised in regard to the rulings of last year's convention. There are those here now who did not know and do not know what the rulings of last year's convention were. How am I to know that an individual in this convention is to be bound by the rules of the last convention or by a rule that he himself assists in imposing on the convention now? I want to have an explanation made.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will announce the vote.

The vote on seating {hearing?} Fellow Worker Forberg was announced as follows: Total number of votes, 127; yes, 29; no, 98.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is therefore lost.

We are now again on the question of the resolution.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Although I voted in committee in favor of the adoption of this resolution, I want to say that on further study I am opposed to it. I am opposed to it because it opens up again the question of what this preamble means, and I don't believe that this body has any right to make a definite interpretation of the meaning of that preamble. I do not believe that this body can do that, that it can give an interpretation that will be satisfactory, and that will avoid in future the discussions that we have had in the past regarding the meaning of the second clause in the preamble. I shall therefore vote against the adoption of this resolution.

DEL. CONOVER: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: In explanation of this clause of the preamble to the working people in my agitational work when I am asked the question personally or by the people attending the meeting, what stand does the I.W.W. take in the political field, I explain it in this way, that as soon as the economic or industrial organization becomes powerful enough, or when the working people see fit in this industrial organization to cast out a political reflex as a party, we will do it within the organization. As I understand it, this resolution expresses my idea and sentiment that we have a political party of our own right from the rank and file of our organization. That is my idea of it. Now then, if this is carried we must, at this convention or at some future convention, proceed to have a political party of our own right from the convention. That is as I understand it.

DEL. THOMAS: I wish to say that I cannot for the life of me see that this interpretation will satisfy the wants of all the people that we may

come in contact with when upon the soap box propounding our ideas. There is as much opportunity for quibbling upon this resolution as there is upon the preamble itself. If we have not intelligence enough or a conception of things clear enough to know what we are after, we would be in just as big a muddle in voting as to what we wanted to do. This resolution, in my understanding of the question, is but to satisfy the wants of a probable minority of the convention in regard to the matter that they were defeated upon yesterday, but we could not in any way satisfy the majority if you carried this today; and as to the government of our industrial administration, which the opposition calls the administrative association or organization—it says here industrial administration—there is no doubt that the moment the condition arises where we have absolutely our industrial organization, there is no doubt that the reflex will crop up instantly. Therefore I say this resolution is superfluous at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there no other delegate who wishes to speak upon this resolution Delegate Foote will have the close.

DEL. WALTERS: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this resolution. It looks to me as if we were gathering all the elements that oppose political action, and when I say political action I mean civilized means of warfare in use at the present time. It says in this resolution, "Therefore be it resolved that the I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial administration." We had this illustrated here yesterday by the faction in the convention that is opposed to political action when they told us that politics meant not only the ballot but that politics meant that when in our industrial organization we elected officials at the head of the department to conduct the industrial administration then we were resorting to politics. I understand that this clause means that and that only. It means that we must exclude the ballot and only resort to politics in our own industrial administration. In other words, elect the heads of these departments to carry on our own administration in {the} co-operative commonwealth. I may be wrong, but I understand that these clauses mean this, and if they do I am utterly opposed to it. I would not dare to go back to New York City and face my constituency after voting for such a resolution. They would make it so hot for me in New York that I would have to get out of there. I represent a revolutionary element, an element that is not flying with one wing, an element that wants the revolution, that wants the co-operative commonwealth, an element that is using every means in their power to obtain that co-operative commonwealth. Therefore I am opposed to this resolution. I believe in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the ballot as the civilized means of warfare as the proper means of propaganda and as the best means of carrying on the education of the working class.

DEL. ROSKOVITZ: (?) I concur in the delegate's argument and I want to say that I am more opposed to it because it is adding more difficulty to that which seems already hard to understand.

DEL. WILLIAMS: (?) I voted for this resolution on the constitutional committee and I am for this resolution at the present time. I believe that this resolution is actually needed and I cannot for the life of me see where there is any ground for stating that this does not make things clearer. There are a few among the clauses that are and make them sufficiently clear, so that there will be no need of further quibbling. It has been said that the rank and file will not understand this resolution any more than they understand the preamble. I would say that if they seek to understand this resolution or if they seek to understand the preamble they will understand both, but that is not the question so much; the main importance of it to me is this: That we need something that will make it clear just where we stand. For instance, I have seen in many cases men that go on the platform representing the Industrial Workers of the World, and they present all kinds of construction of the position of the Industrial Workers of the World, all arising from this political question that we discussed at length yesterday. In some cases I have known men from the platform of the Industrial Workers of the World announce, for instance, in one case, if any one had anything to say as to the Industrial Workers of the World and Socialism—that was announced on the platform in my presence that the Industrial Workers of the World were a political organization but they did not know with which party they would go, and so forth. Now, in order to offset these things and make it clear where we are in regard to them I am heartily in favor of adopting this resolution. I believe it expresses the views of the majority of this convention as to our stand on the political question. I believe it is the correct stand to take and the stand that we must take sooner or later.

DEL. HENION: Mr. Chairman, I cannot get next to this game at all.

Here are several delegates in favor of this resolution, in favor of changing that preamble so that we can bring members into this organization. That appears to be their contention the way I look at it. Now, I would like to ask every one of those delegates who are in favor of this resolution wasn't that preamble good enough for them to join this organization on, if they didn't like that preamble what are they

doing in this movement? They came in with this preamble there. How did they get in here? Did they make any of this fuss and talk before getting into the movement? It was good enough for them to come in under and good enough for them to join under. I am an old war horse in this labor movement. I have been at it pretty nearly forty years, belonging to nearly everything there was that I could belong to. I have got to something now that is good. The reason I quit those organizations was this: Before 1894 I was a member in good standing for fourteen years in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Then I joined the American Railway Union and went out in that strike and I lost as much as any one did in that strike. I have been through the Socialist party and through the whole lay-out, but I never could see my way clear until I got here to Chicago and helped to form this organization, the Industrial Workers of the World, under that preamble. That preamble was good enough for me when I joined the movement, and I have worked with the movement ever since. I have brought in a few members, perhaps as many as any of these delegates have brought in. It suits them. It suits everybody who belongs to my local. That preamble suits them perfectly. It is a prayer-book to them; they could not ask for anything better. So I do not understand it, why should they change it? I cannot get next to the game.

DEL. PINKERTON: Yesterday I voted for the preamble to the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World remaining as it is. I joined the Industrial Workers of the World, not having any affiliation with any socialist party, but I joined it as a craft unionist looking for greater power to be expressed in economic ways and to develop the wage system. Since I have joined this Industrial Workers of the World I have been able to see no solution to the problem of the wage system but its total abolition. In order to explain to you the understanding that I have in regard to administration and eventually what that administration would tend to in the Industrial Workers of the World, allow me to draw you a picture of the existing form of government as I see it at the present time. In doing so I will use the similitude of our present form of government which is a common expression in speaking of it, when we term it the ship of state. Let us glance at this ship of state of the United States as it is handled at the present time and as it has been handled in the past. We have on the bridge of this ship of state Theodore Roosevelt, the representative of the capitalistic interests; we have also, looking out for Theodore Roosevelt, to see that he properly guards their interests, the heads of the various industries throughout this country. We have the representatives of the Morgans

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

and the Hills and the Harrimans. We have the Platts representing the insurance and express companies, accepting their \$10,000 a year to legislate in the interests of the express and the insurance companies. We have Harriman subscribing \$250,000 to elect to the presidency of the United States the proper kind of man to help secure for them the legislation they want. In other words, people representing the capitalistic interests. We realize that in every act of these legislators, wherever they have been passed, we recognize that there is nothing of material benefit to the working class of this country. And why should the working class of this country expect that such a government would legislate equally for rich and poor alike? Now let us take this ship of state, construct it under an entirely different form; let us that the industries of this country, irrespective of state divisions; let us organize the railway workers of the country into the Industrial Workers of the World, recognizing no craft division between them. Let us organize all other industries and departments of public service in the same way, and let these men learn through the economic organization of the Industrial Workers of the World; while they are advancing themselves under their respective committees elected from the respective departments of the great industries which will finally terminate in the one great industry that will control the ship of state, and that while they are using their best efforts in the Industrial Workers of the World it will eventually end in political salvation by taking control of the whole ship of state as well as the industries in which they are employed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless there are further speakers, Del. Foote will close the discussion.

A DELEGATE: I should like to be heard.

DEL. FOOTE: Do you want to ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: If Del. Foote is willing to give way, I am satisfied.

DEL. FOOTE: First, I want to state that I am not and never have been opposed to political action. Let that go down here and now. This resolution which some of these men who have been in the labor movement for years and who have read and studied economics and who have studied every phase of the political situation and come up here and confess that they don't understand it—it is all bosh and nonsense.

I will take up first this clause: "Whereas, The I.W.W. is based on the class conflict in society, recognizing the integral organization of the working class in capitalist industry."

I submit that that is what the industrial movement is founded

upon—the integral organization of the working class by capitalist industry. I submit that the working class has been co-ordinated into an industrial phalanx that supports the present industrial system. When we state that we propose to organize on the capitalist method of organization that is just what we mean, only we propose to take the workers where they are organized by capitalist industry and place them in the same situation only in revolt against the master for the purpose of taking hold of the industries in which they work. I submit that that is the position of the Industrial Workers of the World.

“WHEREAS, the I.W.W. does proclaim the commonwealth of labor by and through the co-ordination of the industrial proletariat within the domain of capitalist industry in lieu of mass organization within the realm of bourgeois administrative affairs.”

If we do not proclaim the commonwealth of labor within the domain of capitalist industry then why is there an economic organization in existence? Why have an economic organization? If we are not to consider the economic condition of the working class why are we in existence? If we are not to consider the necessary functions that we will have to assume in order to take and hold the whole of industry why are we in existence? I submit that this is the whole proposition: “In lieu of mass organization within the realm of bourgeois administrative affairs.” To those men who have been in the political movement I wish to submit this question. Is not that movement known as the Socialist movement in this country and throughout the world a mass organization of revolt against the capitalist class, not against the industries of the capitalist class but against the so-called governments and the places where the administration of affairs of the industries over which the capitalist class have control, are held? Is it not the fact that all there is to the political organization of revolt against capitalist domination is mass organization? I submit if this is true there comes the proposition of your tactics in mass organization. The question of civilization has been brought up here and a fellow worker stated his position yesterday very strongly and I want to corroborate it by a quotation from a man who perhaps some of these men who talk loud and long on this preamble have not read but who I venture to say they should read, no less than Guizot who lectures on the history of civilization in Europe. After commenting on the various social factors that make for so-called civilization, he arrives at this conclusion: “Civilization is the effect of progress, of development. It presents at once the ideas of the people marching onward not to change its place but to change its condition.”

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

That is all there is of civilization. If that be true I want to ask, What economic factor in the world today, what is the representative of progress? Is it the capitalist class with their administration of affairs? No. It is the working class. And what part of that working class is the most progressive? It is you here I hope, consequently I claim that this organization is on a high plane of civilization.

Take our theory of the ballot. Talk about destroying the ballot. What is the ballot? A paper wad? Then you can destroy it by throwing it away. But the ballot is not a paper wad. The ballot is a principle coming to us up and through this progress, this civilization according to this theory of Guizot. But it is a thing that we must understand; that we must know how to use. Where should we use the ballot? Where do we use the ballot? Don't we use it here? Is this not a place of balloting? Are we in favor of destroying the ballot? Not a man in this room would say so. Above all what we demand first, last and all the time, what we will have and must have is the ballot, and we must have it and will have it because it is a principle of civilization. So much for the destruction of the ballot.

Now, as to the capitalist ballot box. Fellow Worker De Leon said it was not a capitalist ballot box. That is true, it is not a capitalist ballot box, but it is true also that the capitalists have control of it now because they have control of the instruments of production. I went into the theory of mass organization somewhat yesterday and I do not care to dwell much upon that today because I do not wish unnecessarily to occupy the time of this convention. I realized that this resolution would meet with the opposition that it has met with but I make the statement here today that as the organization grows in strength this position will be adhered to. The theory of mass organization known as the political movement or as the anarchist movement or as the syndicalist {syndicalist?} movement of Europe which is an attempt at industrial organization, owing to the fact of lack of industry in Europe they cannot get down to the basis that Eve strived for—this mass organization is one and the same thing in connection with the various arguments advanced for it. Mass organization first strives for the ballot, but what is the use of the ballot in capitalists' hands? The ballot box is now in control of the capitalist movement. The theory of mass organization or political movements is to so get the franchise and place the will of the people in the ballot box so as to gain control of that institution. That is the theory as I understand it. Now as to the point made by Fellow Worker Speed of California yesterday: Why does the capitalist continue to maintain a

closer and closer watch over the ballot box if it is no good? Why do we continue to hold closer and closer watch over the ballot box here? Why is it you men refuse to allow a member of your organization to come here and speak upon any proposition who is not a delegate? Why, it is the reason of the capitalist. He does not want to have you dabbling in his affairs, and that is our reason for it.

Failing in preserving that piece of paper which is to capture and destroy the governments of the world through the capitalist ballot box, what is left for a mass movement to do? The bomb. That is all. Why is the bomb used in Russia? Why are political crimes committed? Because it is their last resort in a mass movement. It seems to me a wrong position to take for the men who hold to the mass movement to quibble with a man who refuses to vote in a mass movement, but proposes to shoot in a mass movement. Which is the most effective so far as a movement is concerned? Why, ostensibly the shooting. It kills men. When we discover that the mass organization is for destruction absolutely, then we see that in order to accomplish anything we have got to have a definite program to go by. The one function that the mass movement does perform and to which I give you credit, is agitation and propaganda. I have no strictures to pass upon the mass organization of the working class in the past. Far from it. I have been a part of it. But since this organization has been formed with a definite program of industrialism, or a definite program with regard to the integral conditions of the working class under capitalist society, I submit that this organization has within itself all the essential qualities that are good for the working class that a mass movement ever had, and that it abrogates all the bad ones. Fellow Worker De Leon called the attention of this body to a quotation from Marx, where he said that economic organization could only be set on foot through political movements. That is true, but when we understand this organization we know it. What is the idea of political movement? Is it mass organization? Never, or I am out of the Industrial Workers of the World. We have to get a program of integral organization for this movement. Shall we bring in mass organization to destroy our own efforts? Are we fools? The capitalist class in their political functions, in their political action, do not act in mass; they act integrally in their manipulations. Every definite condition that is necessary for the administration of the capitalist class flowing from their industrial control is considered and weighed in the parliaments of the world. It is not mass action on their part. It is integral political action and integral administrative control. That is the true position, as I conceive it, of the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Industrial Workers. They also should take into consideration every factor by which we are environed in our industrial condition, and the consideration of every factor will show the necessity for political action, and that political action must flow from those factors themselves and not from some ideological theory, killing somebody or capturing something you have not the power to capture.

The great trouble with the men who have been in the socialist movement, and I do not exclude myself, is that revolution has not been in the domain of industry, but in our own heads. We must transfer that revolution from theory to facts. We must consider, when we consider that fact, every relative condition of the fact, and when we do it we become conscious of our needs. What is political action for in connection with an industrially organized working class, may I ask? I have to recite a condition that I am very familiar with, because my union was a party to it, that I recited before the constitutional committee some days since. In the first populist administration of the state of Kansas, when Governor Lewellyn was in power and the farmers were in control of the Legislature, a law was put upon the statute books of Kansas that no five cent loaf of bread should weigh less than one pound. The populists were men of action. The law shortly after its adoption was enforced in one instance that I know of against an old baker boss that I used to work for in Kansas City. He was fined a sum of money, the amount of which I forget, and since that time it has never been enforced and is a dead letter on the statute books of Kansas. So much for mass organization in the political field. You all know that the price of flour advanced this last spring and summer very greatly, and in connection with that comes the force of my illustration. In the town where I live and in the industry in which I work, the bake shop industry, the loaves of bread that we make have been scaled to fifteen ounces. The loaf of bread being scaled fifteen ounces in the dough, bakes out an ounce and a half, leaving the loaf to weigh $13\frac{1}{2}$ ounces, in face of the state law of Kansas. That loaf is sold for five cents each. First it goes from the bakery boss to the grocery man. The groceryman pays for it and gets thirty loaves of bread for \$1, and sells the bread for five cents a loaf. He makes 30 or 40 per cent off the bread. The consumer pays five cents a loaf. When the price of flour went up the baker bosses were between the devil and the deep sea. The groceryman was the devil, the deep sea was the bakers' union. They didn't know what to do but they made up their minds that they had better cut the size of the loaf and leave price the same to the groceryman. My boss so instructed me and that night at the meeting of

local 224 the proposition was taken up. It was discussed at length and we made up our minds that if the cut was to come anywhere it should come off of the groceryman and that the groceryman should pay four cents a loaf for the bread and that it should remain the same in weight, or be increased in weight but that it should not weigh less when sold for five cents. The next morning when we went back to work my boss came to me and said "Don't forget to scale the bread an ounce in weight." I said "I have not forgotten it and I won't do it." He said, "Who is running this place?" I said, "You are running the front end and the union is running the back end." And it stuck. The size of the loaf was never cut; they never raised the price and that condition still exists. Now I submit to you that that is political action. Is there anything else to it but political action? Is the law on the statute books political action from the working class standpoint? So much for that phase of political action.

Now, you take an industrial plant from the capitalist position and from the position of the industrial masses of this country and analyze it. What do you find? In the town where I live there is a large planing mill which has several subdivisions. That planing mill is a part of the planing mill and lumber trust of the United States. It is a part of the same trust against which the strike was carried on in Portland, I understand. In that industry in that town you go into one of the mills, one of the subdivisions of the industry there and what do you find? You go in through the corner of the building and find the offices, perhaps as large as this room. You see in that office the clerical force necessary for the carrying on of the operations of that industry. You go on into the shop and there you will see that the men are placed just where they belong in that industry. No man has the choice of doing one thing for a while and then doing another thing. He has his one work to do. That plant is organized by the capitalists. It is not what they call organization, but it is the correct term; it is co-ordination. Every man in that plant is a part of that plant. Every man is a unit, a cell in that plant, and the functions of that industry under the domination of the master class. Go on out through the office again and we see that that office is a nerve center from which all the orders from higher sources are conveyed and through which all the conditions which exist are reported to those higher sources. Those nerve centers operate through all the industries of that lumber and planing mill trust and those nerve centers are what control that industry and trust. Then there is the condition locally and nationally that that industry has to look out for. There is the protection which that nerve center locally

demands and which the larger nerve centers nationally must have. Then again there is the demand of that nerve center for proper co-ordination with every other nerve center in the other industries, and that demand is cared for by the national organization. And what is the demand of that nerve center? It is the political reflex of the industry and that is your capitalist system of government. The policeman with his club is a lackey, put there for the purpose of enforcing the mandates from the higher sources of capitalist government. To discover the source of capitalist government you must go down to the roots. The conditions necessary for co-ordination between these nerve centers and the reflexes thrown out are found in local social political conditions as it is found in national social political conditions. So much for the capitalist and his administration. Take the same plant and take the co-ordination in the shops of that plant of the workers there. Take the organization of those workers as it exists in that plant, and how to control it so as to take hold of that plant, is the thing that we have got under consideration.

Now, it is well enough to get out on the soap box—I wish to get away for a moment from the plant and show you what I believe to be a fallacy. I have been ridiculed by a number of my old acquaintances and find I am still ridiculed for my position, but I care nothing for that. In taking this position, however, I do not ridicule the man who differs from me, remember that. I consider myself above anything like that. But for a man to get out on the soap-box and shout revolution is, in some cases, to develop his pipes and in some cases to satisfy his own mind, and it used in some cases to scare the capitalist class, but it does so no longer. The theory of industrialism I conceive to be the negative position on the subject; the actual conditions necessary to industrial organization I conceive to be the positive. And that is not wind jamming on a soap box. It is not revolution in the brain of the so-called industrial revolutionist. A man whom I have known more or less for a couple of years and who was associated with me in the political movement wrote to me at Wichita, Kansas, and he said “Foote, the movement is growing in Wichita, I understand”—and it was at that time until some of these industrial revolutionists who have revolution in their heads, destroyed it—he wrote to me and said, “I understand the movement is growing there, and I want to ask you what per cent of that movement is socialist or revolutionist.” I wrote back to him and said, “Your question shows that you lack conception of what industrial organization means.” He got very angry at me, he is angry now, and I presume will continue to be angry. But it shows that a man who has

got ideology in his head, that has become a circle, and has become vicious will refuse to accept anything else, he has got room for nothing else. When revolution is in his head there is room for nothing that would remove it. There is no solution for that difficulty.

The theory went out first, and I accepted it, when the Industrial Workers of the World was first launched, that it should be based primarily on socialism and be composed of socialists. Because I was a Socialist I got into it in a hurry, just as quick as I could. I found out later that the theory for converting the working class to the socialist position could not be made part of the industrial movement if it was to be builded upon the lines of economic organization, if it was to get at the basis of the industrial movement. In trying to get at what it should be I was compelled to give up the theory that it was place to corral the working class in in order to inoculate them with our pet theory of socialism. But when I got over that I was still in the dark. I wanted to know what was the dynamic force—if that dynamic force is too hard for these gentlemen here—these fellow workers here—I beg your pardon. I did not mean to address you in that way (laughter), if that dynamic force is too complex a word I will substitute this and say, What is the impulse? What is the generating force that will carry the working class into the industrial movement? Thus it was that I was compelled to take up a definite industry, analyze that industry and carry it down through the management of the industry with which I am somewhat conversant, go out into the shop where I am also conversant with the details and discover the capitalist class co-ordinated the forces gathered there. When I went into that industry I saw that they were organized by the capitalists. I saw that they were co-ordinated and acted as a unit for their master except when they were in revolt. From those premises it must logically follow that we cannot demand from the men in that industrial plant if we are going to stick to industrial organization, that they accept our various theories, and that those who do not accept our theories should not come in, or if they should come in should have no voice and know nothing about our organization. It followed that we could not accept that position, and it must also follow that we have to accept the working class as we find them in an industrial plant and not accept one portion, but accept all the workers in the plant whether they were republican, democrats, religionists, fakirs, Christian Scientists, or fools. They were all wages slaves in an industrial plant, that is a connective link in the capitalist system of society. To take them all in has been the logical manner of operation, not as a body particularly, but to recruit them into mixed

locals. The idea in recruiting them into mixed locals was to educate them. How? About the conditions necessary for them to find coordination with their fellow workers? No. But to instill into them the revolution in the head the same as we have had it, absolutely preventing these men getting in touch with other men in condition to act with them, without compelling them to act upon a single theoretical line that seldom, if ever, meets the conditions under which that particular industrial unit must act. I submit that the education that these men talk about is in many cases a false education. I submit that the education necessary and that will flow from this movement will flow from the conditions that generate the force of this movement, the dynamic force, as I put it, and that is the force of the unit organization that compels it to unite with the other unit, organization in a certain industry and then that industry uniting with others to take in the entire working class. And there comes the proposition in the preamble. If there is anything meant by industrialism it is not a half-cock{ed} revolution. It means, if anything, that it must be complete in itself. If the working class movement is organic and the industrial formation of the working class movement is against the mass theory then the industrial movement resolves itself into a definite organic body, and that organic body must take in the entire working class and after the capitalist class has been destroyed as a class they, too, must come in in an industrial system when all classes are done away with.

To get back to this resolution, I have made this somewhat lengthy statement wishing to make my position clear if I could, and if I have not got it clear before my fellow workers I hope they will read the stenographic report aside from reading the clauses in the preamble; that at least they will consider the stenographic report in relation to reading the clauses in the preamble: "Therefore be it resolved, that the I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial administration." Now, if my premises are true that industrialism is an organic thing, then you are vitiating your own position, kicking yourselves in the face and then swallowing your own foot.

A DELEGATE: May I ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: There will be no speaking after Delegate Foote has spoken, either in the form of a question or anything else.

THE DELEGATE: That is not speaking to ask a question.

DEL. FOOTE: I don't care anything about it. I will answer a question if it will do any good; but it is my candid opinion that it will do no good. The stenographic report will cover that all.

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Your opinion is not ours.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. FOOTE: Now we have this clause: "Therefore, be it resolved, that the I.W.W. seeks its political expression only in its own industrial administration."

Now, I want to ask where the I.W.W. should seek its political expression? This is absolutely as I understand it, the position of Fellow Worker De Leon—is it not, Fellow Worker De Leon?

DEL. DE LEON: Not with your present explanation.

DEL. FOOTE: This clause here—

DEL. DE LEON: I say not with your explanation.

DEL. FOOTE: Well and good. Then I will ask the question: Where should the Industrial Workers of the World seek political expression? Should it seek it on the field of capitalist political action? Or should it seek it from its own organization, taking into consideration the factors that give forth those political reflexes from its own organization. I hold that it cannot leave its own body. I hold that the soul of this movement must be confined to this movement. I hold that the soul of this movement cannot go and mingle with the capitalist class in the political field. I hold that we must deal with our own political reflexes, with their organization against capitalist industry and against capitalist class government. I hold that that is where class lines are drawn, that that is where the class struggle is resolved and crystallized, that there is where the battle is fought, and until we get to that line, the line of demarcation in the class struggle, we are still in the air, the revolution is still in our head and we are not in the actual realm of industry. I hold that this movement will control the working class on our side of the class struggle.

Now, as to the necessity for the ballot, let us take that up and then I am through. Fellow Worker De Leon yesterday took the position that the ballot box is not a capitalist ballot box. I concur in that statement. However, it is apparent to all of us that the capitalist has control of the ballot box and the manner of gaining that control from him is the matter that we must take into consideration. What will compel the capitalist class to surrender to us the full franchise, the full power of the ballot box? Mass organization? No. Control of the industrial forces and its industrial management? Yes. And what will control? What did control the weight of bread and the price of bread in the instance I have cited? Did the bakery boss control it? No, he could not help himself. We took it, we controlled it; we enforced our law and that is the basis for political action as I understand it; and that must continue to be the basis of working class action because it compels the same action in a like industry, and that finally will compel political action,

and you will get what you now demand but do not get. The capitalist ballot box is the ballot box of civilization that the capitalist class has control of. It is not a myth. It is not a thing in the air. It is an actual fact, an actual condition by which the capitalist class control their affairs in their domination of us, but to say that we have access to that ballot box is to state a thing that is simply not true; it is demonstrated that it is not true. The manner of getting access to that ballot box is a condition under consideration. I fail to grasp, after a careful study of the position of the editor of *The People*, I admit I fail to grasp just where he differed from me in this matter. I do hope that I may have a long talk with him, or better still, that he will at some time state fully his position on the question here involved. It is not a point with me of an arbitrary state of mind. It is my desire to get myself down with the working class and to have the working class down on their feet; to have the working class understand that it is down on its feet, acting from the base instead of the apex of industry. That is my desire, and I do not believe that the delegates in this convention would do me the injustice of saying anything to the contrary.

Now, as to the present attitude of the organization on this preamble, I wish to touch upon that as a condition that I believe will have its effect upon the organization. We know that there has been a struggle, a conflict of opinion around the word political. I don't believe that in the essence of things the difference of opinion on the preamble is as to the ballot box or the ballot. I believe that every working man in this organization believes in the ballot; I know he must. I believe that he believes in the ballot box when he can use it effectually. So I hold that it is a misconstruction or a different construction of the word political as used in the preamble that causes all this difference. Now, with the action of the convention yesterday and with the action of the convention today, if they act upon this resolution as they have announced so many of them before me they would, then the same obscurity, the same condition continues to exist and the same problem will bob up for settlement. What do we mean by the word political? It has a definite meaning. It has to do with administration, that is my conception of it. I believe I have shown the fallacy of mass organization. I believe I have shown the fallacy of political action as it is termed on the capitalist field outside of our own movement. I have shown, I believe, the necessity of political action inside our movement, taking into consideration every factor that bears upon that movement. I hold that the political is the reflex of the economic. I hold that that is true of the capitalist true. I hold it is true of the working class, but to

say that the political reflex in the working class arises from the capitalist class, is to deny our whole position. If it does not flow from our industrial administration then why have an industrial administration? I for one could not think of placing myself outside of my own economic movement into a congress of capitalists. In the first place, I don't know what I would do there except to get thrown out. I am satisfied now that I would not sell out. There are only two positions for me to take. Agitation is the thing you consider. If that is the only thing I ask you, is not the integral organization of the working class the force that compels agitation among the workers? Is not the power flowing from the joining together of those units the same force that will force this organization to go ahead and accomplish the revolution by taking the whole industrial organization? If that is not true, if it is not the joining together of those units, if we have to inoculate the dead mass with life, then we deny all science of evolution. Life was not born in man through his nostrils, it is not inoculated into him, it is a generative and productive force which is flowing up through the organic movements of society. And this is true with your theories of society taken from the standpoint of socialism. So it is with the economic determinism. In that theory we find what we call the materialist conception of history. That generative force is always there. You cannot destroy it, but you can disrupt and tear apart its work and compel it to do its work over again, but we cannot inoculate that force in anything. The force is born of itself and when we deny that we deny the economic movement of the working class.

Now it is immaterial to me from a personal standpoint whether you accept this resolution or not. I am clear in my estimation of the preamble. To those who think on the opposite side that they are clear, well and good; but one thing I pledge myself to and the one thing I ask of my opponents is that I myself will continue to be open to conviction and will continue to measure everything that comes into connection with this organization and will draw my deductions accordingly, and if they will do that also I have no quarrel with them. I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we shall have the vote on the motion. I shall have to call on the stenographer or someone to repeat the motion.

DEL. WILLIAMS: The motion is that the committee recommends the adoption of said interpretation as correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to concur in the report of the committee and accept this resolution.

DEL. LIESNER: I have a question that I wish to ask and I want a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

ruling. I cannot vote intelligently upon this question without an answer to my question. If I am denied the explanation that I wish I want to know where my rights and privileges are.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say that your resolution which was passed declared that each one should speak once and I do not understand why you should come in and demand the floor again. There are fifty delegates here and each one is entitled to the same privileges and if every one should ask a question where should we be? We should be here discussing this one question for two weeks, and that is not what we are sent here for by our constituents. We are sent here to deliberate and come to a conclusion and act and my constituency would not be satisfied if we should be quibbling here about these things forever. The man who listened to the discussion here yesterday and the discussion here today, and who does not now see his way clear, might ask a hundred questions and then he would not see his way clear. We will have a roll call.

The roll was then called on the resolution.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The total number of votes cast on the resolution is 128. 104 voted no and 24 voted yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion to concur in the report of the committee lost. The hour for adjournment has about arrived and the convention stands adjourned until two o'clock this afternoon.

THURSDAY, SEPT. 19, 1907.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Chairman Katz called the convention to order at 2 o'clock P.M.

A roll call by Secretary Trautmann showed the following absentees: Foote and Kettle.

TIME OF DISCUSSION.

DEL. KEEP: I want to make a motion, fellow {sic} Chairman, and before I do so I would like to make a little explanation as to why I make it. The motion I want to make is that during the debate hereafter each member who speaks be limited to ten minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the motion seconded?

(The motion received several seconds.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded that we have a time limit of ten minutes for each speaker.

DEL. KEEP: Now, Mr. Chairman, I make that motion for this

reason: I realize the fact that the majority in this convention are men who work for a living; that we have a week to stay here perhaps, the majority of us; that we have a certain amount of money with us, and that that money is growing smaller in amount each day we stay here. Now, we as workmen also realize the fact that for the man of action very little talk is required; that for the man of talk, he wants all the time he possibly can get to talk in, and I don't want to be unfair to anybody and I especially do not want to be unfair to myself, and it would be unfair to me to expect me to stay here longer than is necessary to do the business of this convention.

I came here to do the business of this convention. If I want to listen to lectures I can go somewheres and listen to them, but here after a year between conventions, after discussion of things taking place in the paper, and everything of that kind, I do not see that there is any necessity to listen to long winded talks; and I have noticed in my experience with conventions that where you attempt to be fair to a man who wants to talk and talk and talk, he does not consider that fairness at all. He just thinks you are easy. (Laughter.)

Another thing, in trying to be fair as quick as the business can be transacted, and I think there are more such as that will declare he was not fairly treated if you give him ten years' time in which to talk. He would still say that you treated him unfairly. That is my experience.

I want to get away from here just as quick as the business can be transacted, and I think there are more who feel the same way as I do, and that is why I make the motion. I have not seen a question come up here yet, and there are only two real questions, and we have just started in on the constitution committee's report—that every man could not have said what he did say in ten minutes. Furthermore, the best talks that have been made here have been the short ones, as they always are; those that are too the point. The longer a man talks the more he gets involved, and you are not hurting any man by limiting him to ten minutes, and you are only being fair to yourself when you do that. And, not only being fair to yourself, but you are being fair to the organization that sends you here. That is the reason I make the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Pinkerton.

DEL. PINKERTON: I voted against the previous motion on the same subject, but since I have listened to a number of delegates and

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

saw the position they are placed in, the long winded speeches that have been brought before this convention remind me of the convention of last year, and the tactics of McMullen and McCabe, when the “doughnut” expression sprung up, where the men attending that convention tried to freeze those men out.

We had a fellow worker in this convention who said he could afford to stay here for six months. Now that fellow worker used that expression in all sincerity and I do not presume for a moment these delegates who spoke at length on any question that needed expression, had any intention to employ the tactics of McMullen and McCabe, but I will support this motion now because of the fact that the majority of the men present cannot afford to stay another week at this convention to listen to argument{s} on which they have already made up their minds as to how they desire to act.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion that we have a limit of ten minutes in our discussion, will say aye.

(The motion was carried by a practically unanimous vote.)

ILLINOIS COAL MINERS' CONTRACT.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed with the regular order of business.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Mr. Chairman, I was instructed by the convention to get the exact wording of the Illinois Coal Miners' contract relative to the \$10 fine and the legislative measures, in order that it might be embodied in the stenographic report, and I have brought it along together with a copy for the stenographers, so that it can be inserted in the report this afternoon. I have the original here and the first clause I refer to reads as follows:

“Any member or members of the U.M.W. of America guilty of throwing a mine idle or materially reducing the output by failure to continue at work in accordance with the provisions of this agreement, shall be fined ten dollars (\$10.00) each.

“All fines collected as above shall be paid, one-half to the state treasurer of the U.M.W. of America, and one-half to the treasurer of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association, and under no consideration shall any fines so collected be refunded.

“All violations shall be reported immediately, and an investigation

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

shall be made at once by the state officers of the two organizations. A decision shall be promptly made and the fine checked off and paid as provided above.”

The second clause referred to, although there are more important clauses here, after looking over the document, the second clause that was to be embodied in the stenographic report is as follows:

“CONTRACT BASED ON EXISTING LAWS.

“This contract is based upon existing mining laws, and neither party to the contract shall initiate or encourage the passage of laws that would in any manner affect the obligations of this contract or abrogate its provisions, except as may be mutually agreed to.”

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not require any action.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No, that can go in the report in the proper way.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now on the reports of committees. The committee on constitution had the floor this morning. Have you anything further to report?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman, I would suggest, before I announce the next order of the committee’s business, that each one provide himself with a constitution and a copy of *The Bulletin* containing the recommendations from the different locals, so that you can follow this without making mistakes or misunderstanding the action that is to be taken.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All the delegates have received a copy of *The Bulletin* containing these resolutions, and what constitutions were needed we have brought along. I do not know whether I have enough or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary of the committee on constitution will proceed.

DEL. WILLIAMS: You will notice in the recommendations of Local 43 of Buffalo, New York, on the fourth column of *The Bulletin* there is a proposed amendment to Section 2 of Article I. The local propose{s} to amend that by striking out the words “Thirteen National Industrial Departments, National Industrial Union, and by striking out paragraph{s} ‘d’ and ‘e.’”

The recommendation of the committee is that the constitution remain as it is with regard to those clauses.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. DE LEON: I move you that the recommendation of the committee be concurred in.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded that we concur in the recommendation of the committee that the constitution regarding these two recommendations remain as it is. Are you ready for the question?

There is one thing before you speak; I want to make an announcement: In case someone wants the question, it would not do for one man to call for the question, but before the previous question can be put, a motion to that effect must be made.

DEL. HAGENSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, I wish to go on record as voting against the recommendation of the committee on constitution and to that clause. I desire to have this recommendation considered, and for that reason I hope that you will let it come before the convention for consideration. I believe there is a weakness in the departments that should be cut out.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should say it would be proper for the representative of that local to explain his position.

DEL. DELANEY: As a representative of that local, I wish to say that the reason that that was put in was because the members of Local 43 do not believe that we need thirteen executive boards. We do not see why there is any necessity of any more than one executive head to the organization, and if we should proceed now to lay out our plans and try to organize along those various lines it will just bring about in {?} crises, thirteen possible different kinds of action. We do not think that is necessary.

Together with that recommendation there is a provision there for industrial secretaries to do the necessary departmental work of each industry, but we want one executive head, and that should be the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World. I cannot see why the different things that will come up in any industry cannot be settled just as well by a referendum vote, and I think this thing should be thoroughly discussed.

We are now in a position where we can make these changes without tearing down. If we go much further, we cannot do so without tearing down something we have built up. I would like, perhaps, to say something more after the discussion has brought out any new ideas which the delegates may have.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot do that.

DEL. DELANEY: Cannot I speak twice on the same subject?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: No, not under the motion which we carried this morning.

DEL. DELANEY: Oh, I did not know that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, you have heard the motion. What is your pleasure?

DEL. FRANCIS: I move the previous question.

DEL. HAGENSON: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: You have spoken on the question before. The previous question has not yet been seconded. Now, is there any delegate who desires the floor on this motion? If not we will come to a vote.

DEL. GLOVER: I would like to make this inquiry: Would it embrace the doing away with the thirteen departments or just the executive board or heads of those departments?

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, I do not know what the movers of that amendment had in mind. I could not say that. Perhaps Delegate Delaney could explain that.

DEL. DELANEY: What is the question?

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is whether your amendment would imply that we do away with all departments, that is, we would have the departments but these departments would not have any executive board.

DEL. DELANEY: The full recommendation as submitted by Local 43 are that the department{s} consist merely of the Locals in one industry and that they elect an industrial secretary who would act with the General Secretary-Treasurer and who would be the representative of that industry on the General Executive Board. Your General Executive Board would alone have the executive power of the organization. It would not be frittered out in thirteen or fourteen different sections. That is the intention of the recommendation, to concentrate the body of the organization so that its executive power shall be in one head.

DEL. KEEP: I understand the amendment is to strike out the thirteen national industrial departments, and the thirteen national industrial unions. Is that it?

DEL. WILLIAMS: No; Section 2, strike out the thirteen national departments, national industrial unions, and strike out paragraph{s} “d” and “e.”

DEL. KEEP: I want to find out if it is the intention to do away with these departments and have an assistant secretary attached to the office of the general secretary, and if that is the intention, I do not see

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

how you can do it. I do not see how that would accomplish what you want done.

DEL. DELANEY: As a matter of personal privilege I ask to have read out all the recommendations made by Local 43 under that head, so as to make it clear. That is only part of the recommendations submitted.

DEL. PINKERTON: Fellow workers and delegates: As I construe Fellow Worker Delaney's suggestions in regard to the resolution referred to here, it is that each industrial department would have an assistant secretary in the general office of this organization, representing his industrial department, and that would place a greater burden upon the organization than it has now by having an executive board. That is only an executive board when it is called into being to further the interests of that department of the organization that it is necessary to have represented at headquarters. It is not the intention of the industrial department, as I understand it, in the Industrial Workers of the World, to have autonomists or to crown a king which we voted to abolish at the last convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

All that we ask in representation in these departments is that from the various departments or the various unions that are an integral part of our industries, when we elect our representative from the Local field, that he can be at the call of this organization as our executive officer. That it is necessary to have him there just the same as we have our executive officer there of the transportation department of the Industrial Workers of the World today. That is an integral part of this organization, and he is working just the same as I am down in the railroad yards, and when he is needed on any subject he is called to headquarters, and he is not there as an assistant or general secretary, who is there as a fixture drawing a salary.

These are only mythical lines for the purpose of the administration of the Industrial Workers of the World, and they are of no moment, nothing that can injure the organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, this morning we went to one extreme when the majority voted against the limiting of time. I was in favor of limiting the time, and now after the eloquent address that has been made in favor of limiting the time of discussion, we are going to the other extreme.

Now, the position of the Committee on Constitution is this: we have

certain departments now. How came we to have them? I am pleased to say that it happened at the last convention, as those who read the stenographic report know, and it is for the benefit of those who were not there that the stenographic report was gotten up, and I say those who saw this stenographic report and those who were there should know what happened, and they are aware of the reasons why these thirteen departments were left.

We have to go back to ascertain why the thirteen departments were put in there. When this body was organized we were of the opinion, the correct opinion that an executive board must be a small body. That a large body cannot be executive, but naturally develops into a deliberative body, and we intend that the executive board should be an executive body. Very obviously the national unions in the various trades are so numerous that if each had a representative, as of course, they would want to have, on this body, then this executive board would simply have been throttled by its own constitution. It would have been too large, and too many men or organizations would have had their executives in that executive board. It was a pure makeshift that caused the Committee on Constitution to recommend this action, and the discussion will be found in the stenographic minutes by those who were not there. It was done to obviate this thing that the Committee on Constitution proposed to the convention after discussion to accept the thirteen departments.

Haywood was against the departments, and Foote was against them, but I showed him that {what?} the effect would have been if it had been done otherwise, to have had a representative from each Union, and that the amendment of which he was in favor would have retarded the development of the organization.

So we decided to lump the unions into departments and in that way reduce the possible number of members of the Executive Board so as to enable it to be an executive Body.

During the year that followed you saw the evil result, not of our plan, but because the very best plans will go to the dogs if you put them into the hands of McCabe or McMullen or other men of their kind. They did their work. The situation was such that we could not without playing directly into their hands and extending the time indefinitely, go into such a radical change of the constitution as would abolish the departments, and the members of the Committee on Constitution of which Foote was one, will bear me out in saying that we favor the abolition of the departments because we found there was another way to accomplish the same thing, viz.: to have the executive

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

body elected from the floor of the convention in the nature of a cabinet, as it were.

But it would have taken too long, so we have left the departments as they were and tried to obviate or tried to shut the door to the evils that crept in.

Now, the position of the delegates here would necessitate an extensive discussion here and a much more extensive amount of work on the part of the Committee on Constitution, because you must remember that the constitution is like a chess board, you cannot move one single man on a chess board without you affect all the others, and we consider that it would be taking up too much time to throw that discussion into this convention.

What Brother Delaney says is true; this thing will have to be changed, but where I for one would, and the Committee on Constitution would differ from him, is this: that we do not consider there is any danger between now and next year of our having to handle this question, and we have not got six months to stay here and discuss that matter, and thresh it out, and so we thought it would be better to leave things as they are and proceed to make such other changes as are of the greatest importance.

DEL. HAGENSON: I rise to a question of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your question.

DEL. HAGENSON: In rising before, I just wanted to make a statement that that was a report from the committee that I was on, and I did not consider I was speaking on this motion, and for that I reason I would like to have the floor if the Chairman will allow me, on this question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chairman wants simply to comply with the rules set up by this convention, and I understand that the last speaker represented the committee, and it was decided here this morning by the convention that the committee shall have the last word on the question. That is an established precedent. Now, I have given the floor to the delegate from Buffalo who explained his position. If he has not done so so that the delegates correctly understand him, that is not my fault. We will now proceed to the vote.

The motion is that we concur in the report of the committee. All in favor of the motion say aye.

(The motion was carried by a unanimous vote, only one delegate voting in the negative. {sic})

DEL. WILLIAMS: Now, fellow delegates, turn to the recommendations of Local 259 on the first column, number 5. "That

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

the last clause in Constitution (Art. 9) be stricken from the constitution.

The recommendation of the committee is that the constitution remain as it is with reference to that clause.

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, I move that it be concurred in.
(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the Committee and the motion made. The motion is that we concur in the report of the committee, and the motion is seconded. That is, to leave article 9 stand as it is. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for.)

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, do I understand that they imply that we adopt the constitution as it is, as a whole?

DEL. WILLIAMS: No, leave it as it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: This clause, Article 9, to be left as it is, the last article in the constitution relative to amendment.

DEL. DE LEON: The reason the Constitution Committee says to leave that as it is, is because of the fact that of all the committees the Committee on Constitution is the one that should never start to work until all the proposed amendments have been submitted.

Now, it is not alone the Committee on Constitution that should know what the propositions are; the membership at large should know what they are. We might change the constitution and provide that all the proposed amendments shall come in on the last day and be in print the day we meet, and then the Committee on Constitution would know of them. But, the membership is entitled to know it too, because many members of many organizations want a change and they propose a change which they would not propose if they saw in time that a similar proposition had been presented. It happened in this Committee as it happened in others, that a number of propositions came in on parallel lines. It is hard to distinguish the difference between them, and yet each has to be taken up separately and the time of the convention consumed thereby. When the propositions were sent in when this convention opened and Delegate Williams stated he had refused to accept them, because they had not been in two months previously and in print as the constitution provides, some of the delegates objected to the technicality.

Well, unless we are technical we get ourselves into worse trouble. There are people who have the constitutional mania, the lightning change, and at the last convention, and again I would refer Delegate Axelson to the stenographic minutes, he will find the name of Duncan

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

there with great frequency, and he was there to bring home to us the evil of that sort of thing.

He kept on drumming that into us and then at the last day that clause was put in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

(The question being called for the motion was put an unanimously carried.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: Turn back to the first proposition of Local 259: "Resolved, that during this, the constructive period of the I.W.W., no portion thereof shall enter into any strike, unless conducted in an industrial plant, which is thoroughly organized in the I.W.W., or at least 90 per cent of the workers in such plant, and shall first be approved by G.E.B. or L.E.B."

The recommendation of the Committee regarding this is that the constitution shall remain as it is.

DEL. DELANEY: I move that the recommendation be concurred in. (The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made that the recommendation of the Committee be concurred in. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for.)

DEL. AXELSON: The recommendation from this particular committee on local union to my mind is simply ridiculous, because we cannot put down on paper any rule that is going to govern a hungry lot of men who are up against a difficult proposition, because economic conditions is the only law which will at all times have to determine our duty. Consequently this amendment wants us to go on record as stating that an industrial department must be complete before you strike. You can never effect anything in that way. Therefore I hope that this proposition will be voted down and that the constitution will stand as it is.

DEL. YATES: I was instructed by my Local to vote for this proposition, but we understood at the time that the necessary two months' notice was not altogether what we would like. We would have liked to propose an amendment to this proposition, but the time was too short between its being published and the time we met in convention. Consequently the amendment we have to this motion could not have been considered. That is the only explanation I have to make and I was instructed to vote for the proposition.

DEL. LIESNER: I just wish to ask what the Committee's recommendation was. I did not catch it.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Not to accept the amendment. To leave the constitution as it is.

(The question was called for and being put by the Chair it prevailed.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: Take the second proposition from the same Local: "That conventions of the I.W.W. shall be held two (2) years apart; provided special conventions shall be called whenever decided upon by referendum vote or G.E.B. between regular conventions."

The recommendation of the Committee is that the constitution remain as it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the Committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. GLOVER: I move you, Mr. Chairman, that we do not concur.
(The motion was seconded.)

DEL. DE LEON: Point of order, Fellow Worker Chairman, my point of order is that that motion would bring confusion.

What the delegate wants to accomplish can be accomplished just as well if he votes no. But on the report of the committee the chair can entertain no motion except to concur or refer back.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will hold your point of order well taken.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move you, Fellow Worker Chairman, that we concur in the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?
(The motion received several seconds.)

DEL. KEEP: Point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. KEEP: I understand that when the chairman of the committee brings in these reports he shall move its adoption, so that later on they can have the floor if necessary. Now, why not leave the making of the motion in the hands of the committee? I think that would be the best plan to pursue.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you mean is that a member of that committee shall make the motion to concur?

DEL. KEEP: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that will be the proper way to proceed. Now, wait a moment, let that motion be made in that manner.

DEL. FOOTE: I move that the report of the committee be concurred in.

DEL. DE LEON: As I understand the proposition the member of the committee who makes the report and who gives the recommendation

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

of the committee, his action amounts to a motion of concurrence, but he might complete his statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would still further simplify matters. That is, the report of the committee means that the motion to concur is before the house. Now, what is your pleasure?

DEL. AXELSON: In regard to the recommendation of the local, I wish to say this, that I think it is not advisable for us at this time to go on record as keeping our conventions two years apart, because as long as we are in the building up, the constructive period, we must always be ready to make rearrangements and adapt ourselves to changed conditions. Therefore, I think that the convention should be held annually as provided for in our constitution, and I think further that these conventions are the best means by which we as delegates can get in communication with one another, and can arrive at a common understanding. For that reason I hope that everyone here will vote down that recommendation from this local union.

DEL. GLOVER: Fellow Worker Chairman: I feel it necessary for me to say something in regard to this, owing to the fact that our local took up that very proposition and instructed me to work for its adoption. The reason why they instructed me to work for its adoption was that we thought perhaps it would not be necessary to hold these conventions annually, and inasmuch as there was that proviso that the Executive Board could call a convention if it was necessary, we could get together anyway. Consequently we feel that we would be perfectly safe in going on record in favor of holding our conventions every two years, with the provision that when it is necessary the Executive Board can call a convention. For that reason I must necessarily vote not to concur.

DEL. LEVOY: I would vote that we should not have a convention every year. It is too much of an expense on this organization, in the first place. There is money expended here that we could use for better purposes. On the other hand, I do not think that the General Executive Board should have a right to call a convention at any time they see fit. They could call a convention every six months the way this is worded. I believe it should be worded that through a referendum, if it is necessary to hold a convention every year, it should be held then. That is, if it was decided that it was necessary to hold a convention within a year, it should be held by a referendum, but not that the G.E.B. should have the right to call a convention every time they think proper.

DEL. DELANEY: Fellow Worker Chairman: It seems to me that this provision for a referendum in calling for a convention is rather

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

constructive. It seems to me to be simply a safeguard, and therefore if we wanted to have another convention, it is up to the Executive Board. If they do not take action, it is overlooked and we consequently do not have a convention. I think the constitution should state the date.

DEL. HAGENSON: I cannot agree with my fellow workers that we should not have a convention every year. I certainly agree with them that we are an organization that is expecting to progress and to meet the general conditions that may arise we must have an opportunity to adapt ourselves to these changes.

In order to do that I believe it is essential to have a convention at least once a year.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

(The question again was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we concur in the recommendation of the committee that the constitution remain as it is and the convention be held every year.

(The motion was carried unanimously, with the exception of Delegate Glover, who stated that he desired to be recorded as voting no.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: Turn to the third recommendation of Local 259, "That all locals shall establish labor libraries for the benefit of the members. Books such as are handled by headquarters to be given preference."

The recommendation of the committee is that the practical application of this recommendation be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, that stands as a motion before the house. What is your pleasure?

(The question was called for.)

DEL. AXELSON: I do not know as I understood the motion in regard to establishing libraries. It said that they should be established if possible. Is that the wording of it?

DEL. WILLIAMS: That the practical application of this recommendation be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.

DEL. AXELSON: I believe that these educational institutions are essential in every locality where this organization is established, but the question is whether we should leave it to the Executive Board or

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

not. I think that we as delegates to this convention should now voice ourselves, and say what action should be taken, say what we believe, and thereby instruct the Executive Board what we as delegates from the respective locals assembled here wish.

Therefore I do not think that we should refer it to the incoming Executive Board, but that we should take the floor and say what we think now. That is what I would want to strike out of the motion, the matter of referring it to the Executive Board, and instead of that insert that we take action in the convention now.

DEL. FOOTE: I would like to put the question, is not the function of the committee on press and literature to concern themselves in regard to this, and would not their recommendation come through the convention and go to the Executive Board in relation to that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

(The question was called for.)

DEL. HAGENSON: I shall make an amendment to this motion, that this be referred to the committee on press and literature.

(The motion was seconded by Delegate Axelson.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded that this be referred to the committee on press and literature.

DEL. KEEP: That seems to me to be beating the devil around the stump. This resolution or amendment to the constitution is one matter, and the other matter is this, that in 999 cases out of a thousand it would never be lived up to anyway. I think lots of you belong to organizations where they have such a clause that they shall secure labor libraries, etc., and you have them, but you go around to the various places and they do not have them. It don't make any difference at all whether you have it in the constitution or not, if the local is of that kind that they want a labor library they will get it without our telling them to have one, and they won't get it if we do tell them. So I cannot see the necessity of it at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? If not we come to the vote.

The amendment comes first. All in favor of the amendment that this be referred to the committee on press and literature will signify by saying aye.

(The motion was put to a viva voce vote and lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the motion as presented by the committee on constitution. You understand the motion?

(The question was called for, and being put, it prevailed.)

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. WILLIAMS: Proposition No. 6: “The G.E.B. by a two-thirds vote shall levy a special per capita assessment when subordinate parts of the organization are involved in strike, and the conditions of the treasury make such action necessary. But no special assessment shall exceed fifty (50) cents per member in any one (1) month, nor more than six (6) such assessments in any one (1) year, unless the vote of the entire membership has approved such action.”

You will notice that that is a shortening of the clause in the constitution in Article II, Section 7. Beginning with the word “provided,” and the recommendation of the committee is that this proposed amendment be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands as a motion. What is your pleasure? Would it not be well for the secretary to now read the section in the constitution as it would read, Section 7?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Get your constitutions ready. Article II, Section 7: “The General Executive Board shall, by a two-thirds vote, have power to levy a special assessment when subordinate parts of the organization are involved in strikes and the conditions of the treasury make such action necessary, but no special assessment shall exceed 50 cents per member in any one month, nor more than six (6) such assessments in any one year, unless the same shall have been approved by a referendum vote of the entire membership.”

That is virtually where the proposition of Local 259 stops. They change the wording of the last part, but not the sense of it, and the constitution reads on here:

“Provided that, in case special assessment be levied, the same shall be paid from the treasury of the local unions and national industrial unions chartered by the Industrial Workers of the World, and provided that, when special assessments are levied for the benefit of unions, or organizations, the members directly involved in strike shall be exempt from such assessments.”

DEL. KEEP: As I understand the committee then, I am simply asking a question now, that would strike out all beginning “provided special assessments be levied,” down to the end of the section? Strike out all of that?

DEL. WILLIAMS: That is right, strike out all of that.

DEL. KEEP: Then under this amendment, the men on strike would be assessed also. If the recommendation of the committee is adopted, the men on strike will be assessed also. Is that the sense of the Committee?

DEL. DE LEON: The Committee realizes that members on strike

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

cannot be assessed. It is superfluous to cover that ground.

DEL. KEEP: In answer to that I would like to state this: Take for instance, the city of Columbus, they have a strike there that has lasted a year; a strike of the molders, and those molders who are on strike receive \$7 a week, and out of that which they receive, they have to pay all the dues and assessments levied by the National Association, so the result to them is something like \$5.25 instead of \$7. Now then, a provision such as this leaves it so that there is no provision made that they shall not be assessed, and there might be a time when they are assessed, and thus it would really cut down the strike benefit given to those people. So I do not see any harm in inserting in there the wiping out of all the other, and leaving that last in, and I will amend the report of the Committee, offer the amendment that following the word "membership" these words be inserted: "Provided that members directly involved in strikes shall be exempt from assessment."

DEL. AXELSON: I will second that motion.

DEL. KEEP: I will offer that as an amendment to the report of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment seconded? You have heard the amendment to the motion. What is your pleasure?

DEL. WILLIAMS: It seems to me as Fellow Worker De Leon has said, that such an amendment is entirely superfluous. It is taken for granted, as a matter of course, that men involved in a strike cannot be assessed, and it is in order to simplify that particular section in the constitution that the committee makes its recommendation. We regard that whole section there as superfluous.

DEL. KEEP: Mr. Chairman, withdraw the amendment so long as that is generally known. I only brought it up to have an understanding, anyhow.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the withdrawal?

DEL. DE LEON: I speak as a delegate and not for the committee: I can understand how an organization affiliated, for instance, with the A.F.L., would have such a proposition presented before them, but how a sensible organization organized for the purpose of fighting capital, should have a proposition that shall say while fighting they shall take from the pittance allowed them an assessment, is I think superfluous. Nevertheless, if there is any doubt, I will vote against the amendment, because I think it is an insult to the common sense of an organization of this nature.

DEL. AXELSON: I seconded the amendment, and being the seconder of the amendment, I want to make a motion so it is still

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

before the house, because I believe we ought to go on record as stating directly what we mean so there will be no confusion. For that reason I make the motion that the words that the fellow worker moved to insert following that which was recommended by the Committee on Constitution, be inserted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Since you were the seconder of that amendment and you will not consider it withdrawn we will vote upon it. Is there any further discussion? If not we will come to the vote.

The amendment was put to a viva voce vote and the Chair declared himself in doubt as to the result.

DEL. FOOTE: I move you that we count the votes by the raising of hands. That is quicker than a roll-call, I believe.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would be a very bad precedent to establish, because a man can insist on a roll-call if he wants to, and if we allow it in one case you must allow it in another.

The roll being called by Secretary Trautmann he announced the result of the ballot as follows: Total number of votes cast, 130; 61 voting aye; 69 voting no, and the amendment was declared lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: We come now to a vote upon the original motion. All in favor of the motion to concur in the report of the Committee, signify so by saying aye.

The motion was carried.

DEL. WILLIAMS: The next proposition is number seven: "That no member of the I.W.W. shall speak for the organization unless he has a card of authority from headquarters or subordinate parts of the I.W.W."

The committee recommends the adoption of the following: "That no member of the I.W.W. shall represent the I.W.W. before a body of wage earners without first having been authorized by the G.E.B. or a subordinate part of the I.W.W."

DEL. AIZONNE: I move we concur.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is understood. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. AXELSON: I do not believe that this convention really wants to concur in anything like that proposition. Suppose in one locality a body of men stand willing and ready to affiliate itself with the I.W.W.;

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

you have a local union in that locality and they demand that an organizer or any man go before this body of men for the purpose of setting before them the principle of industrial unionism. If you have to go to the G.E.B. in order to get that, those men have gone to the four winds before you get back. So you only tie your hands, handicap yourselves, and make yourselves helpless.

I recognize that any man representing the I.W.W. should be a man capable of doing it, but when there is in one locality a local union that is established and organized, the very fact that they belong to the I.W.W., entitled to membership and in good standing, shows that they are a part of the I.W.W., and I say to you that in a case such as I am speaking of, you should give the man from the local union the privilege of going before them.

I will cite you a case in my own experience. In the city of Minneapolis we have a local union, number 64, of which I am a member. A communication was received by the Secretary of Local No. 64 from Hudson, Wisconsin. They did not know the name of the Secretary or President, or any one, but it was addressed to the Secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World at Minneapolis and was received at No. 64. In that communication they requested that a man should be sent up to a certain meeting two days after this communication was received, at Hudson, Wis., to appear before the car workers of Hudson and set before them the ideas and principles of industrial unionism.

Local No. 64 acting upon the communication sent me as a representative down there to represent the ideas of industrial unionism. I came there before a body of over one hundred wage workers, and the result was that I sold about 52 pamphlets, the *Handbook on Industrial Unionism*, to those boys. Of course, I recognized that we were unable to organize them because of the nefarious and underhanded work of the fakers of the car workers' union, who when I left there, organized and established a nucleus, so that at the next meeting where I was to appear before them they said, "You cannot come in on this floor because we are already organized." But this was apparent, when they debarred me from the floor at this meeting, the members of the newly organized car men's union of North America immediately became discontented with the ideas and the action of the fakers of that organization. They invited me to come down to them three months from now and said, "you will find willing men to go into the Industrial Workers of the World."

Therefore I say if we adopt this we only tie our own hands, so I hope

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

you will not adopt it.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: One question, if Fellow Worker Axelson will permit me. Is not Axelson selected as organizer for Minneapolis by the joint locals?

DEL. AXELSON: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: If such a letter arrives and he is selected he goes as the representative of the unions of that locality, and so he stands under the supervision of the locals. But, supposing that letter should have been sent to him as an individual?

DEL. AXELSON: I could only act as an individual.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You would naturally have to report these facts to the local of which you are a member?

DEL. AXELSON: Certainly.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That was the sense of the recommendation.

DEL. AXELSON: No, if I understand the sense of the recommendation correctly it is that no one can speak before any body of working men unless he is sanctioned or endorsed by the G.E.B. (Cries of "No, no.")

DEL. WILLIAMS: No.

DEL. AXELSON: That is a misunderstand on my part then.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will and the recommendation once more and then you have the floor.

(The recommendation of the Committee on Constitution was again read by Sec. Williams.)

DEL. AXELSON: That would imply then a local union?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. AXELSON: All right; that is all I wanted. All this talking for nothing.

(The question was again called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion to concur in the report of the committee, say aye.

The motion prevailed unanimously.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Now, fellow workers, there are three propositions from different locals regarding the initiation fee for local unions. You will find them here in *The Bulletin*. Local 23, Cleveland, Ohio, first clause, wants the initiation fee abolished. Local 1, Schenectady, N.Y., wants the limit of the local initiation fee placed at \$2. Local 84, St. Louis, Mo., wants to limit the initiation fee to \$1.

The committee recommends that the proposition of Local 1, Schenectady, N.Y., be adopted.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, that stands before the house as a motion.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, Fellow Worker Williams put the construction of the last words there. I supported that proposition before the committee, that it not exceed \$2, and that is how I understand it.

DEL. WILLIAMS: That is the proposition, to limit it to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

DEL. LIESNER: Has a motion been made? I did not hear one made.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have adopted the rule that the recommendation of the committee stands as a motion before the house.

DEL. BENSON: I would like to make an amendment that that be left to the local unions throughout the country, for this reason: Where I come from it is necessary that we receive at least \$5 initiation fee in order to keep up the treasury. That is the limit; we cannot go above that; but it is necessary that we have a \$5 initiation fee, and the workers out there can afford to pay it. We have a benefit in our local; we pay \$10 a week sick benefit and for that reason it is an expense to keep up the local and it is positively necessary to have this \$5 initiation fee.

DEL. LEVOY: As a representative of the local which presented this amendment to the constitution I wish to say that it states here, the way we put it in, that Section 5 of Article V, shall be stricken out, and I do not know if the action of the committee is with regard to that or with regard to Section 4, and I want to find out. Section 5 of Article V, and Section 4 or Article V; was that adopted by the committee, to strike out Section 5?

DEL. WILLIAMS: We are considering this one proposition of the initiation fee now.

DEL. LEVOY: That has to do with the initiation fee, Section 5 of Article V. It reads: "National Industrial Departments and Unions shall charge for initiation fee an amount now {not?} exceeding \$5.00." That is right after the first amendment.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman: I can say that we did not take these up in regular order, and if we have considered that proposition it will come up later on.

DEL. LEVOY: I believe that the two of them should be acted on at the same time for the simple reason that if we belong to an Industrial Union or to an Industrial Department we will have to pay \$5 initiation fee, where another man can derive just as much benefit from the organization and only have to pay \$2.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

The constitution states here that the initiation fee for members shall not exceed \$1, and we want that \$2 for universal fees. Section 5 says the union shall charge an initiation fee in an amount not exceeding \$5, and the fourth proposition is we don't want to have this \$2 with the \$5. We want to strike out Article V, Section 5.

DEL. AXELSON: There is a motion and an amendment before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion. The amendment has not been seconded to my knowledge.

DEL. AXELSON: Oh, the amendment has not been seconded, and the motion is in regard to the \$2 initiation fee. I am not in favor of the \$2 initiation fee because I do not believe it is necessary to charge an initiation fee as an initiation fee, and my position is this: that we charge every man who wants to become a member of the Industrial Workers of the World an initiation fee, or so-called initiation fee at present of fifty cents, to cover a yearly subscription for *The Industrial Union Bulletin*.

I want to explain why I want this: In order to build up an organization that is going to be thoroughly familiar with that organization; and all the workers of the organization must have *The Industrial Union Bulletin*. Otherwise that individual does not know the workings of the organization, and so my amendment will be, whatever the subscription price of *The Industrial Union Bulletin* may be in the future, if it should be changed, that the initiation fee of the newly elected members will be a sum covering a yearly subscription for *The Industrial Union Bulletin*.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I rule that amendment out of order. It does not belong to this motion at all; it has no bearing upon it. This is simply a question of the initiation fee, how much it should be, and if any one wants to make an amendment that the initiation fee should be turned over as a subscription to *The Bulletin*, that is an entirely different question.

DEL. GLOVER: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Glover has the floor.

DEL. GLOVER: I want to say that in the presentation of the amendment to the constitution by Local 33, there was also a clause pertaining to the fifty cents being charged a member to apply to a year's subscription to *The Bulletin*. I did not hear that read.

DEL. WILLIAMS: That will come up later.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will come up later under a different head.

DEL. GLOVER: Well, I want to say that in starting out with the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

formation of Local 33, of course, we went along the lines of the old organization, having been members of it, but for some reason or other, I don't know what, it suddenly flashed upon us that here we had been hollering and bellowing about this I.W.W. being a revolutionary organization, and then we went out and said we wanted the workers to line up with us and build up this movement, and then we threw up a bulwark and said, "No, you cannot come in until you pay this tax."

Realizing that, in order to be true to that revolutionary spirit, we see the necessity of throwing the doors wide open and making it easy of access and doing away with the initiation fee altogether, as being simply a craft idea and no part of an industrial organization.

DEL. YATES: Point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of information?

DEL. YATES: Does that clause say that positively all members initiated shall pay an initiation fee?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would amend the recommendation of the committee so that it reads this way: that the initiation fee of members from local unions shall not exceed \$5.00.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment that the report of the committee be changed and that the initiation fee shall not exceed \$5.00. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow workers, if it is in order, I wish to say that I do not like to see the amount raised so high. Let us come as near the middle between the two extremes as we possibly can. I favor amending it so as to make it \$2.00, including a year's subscription; the initiation including a year's subscription to the *Bulletin*.

DEL. FRANCIS: Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: You will get the floor as the mover of the amendment. Delegate William has the floor now.

DEL. WILLIAMS: The theory advanced by the fellow worker over here about a revolutionary organization throwing down its fences and holding out its arms to the working class may sound all right to a man who has had no practical experience in the work of building up an industrial organization, but when you come up against the real proposition that faces us everywhere, you will see very readily the necessity of having some initiation fee; and the constitution provides—and I am willing to accept the amendment of Fellow Worker Francis on that proposition too—it provides simply for the limit of the

initiation fee, the maximum.

Now, if a mixed local or any other local with a revolutionary idea of bringing in all the workers for nothing, inviting them all in does not want to charge an initiation fee according to that provision in the constitution it may do so; it may leave out the initiation fee, or if it wants four bits, fifty cents initiation fee, it may have that, or a dollar, or a dollar and a half. If we adopt the amendment in some sections of the country it may be advisable and may be easier possibly to get just as many members on the basis of \$5.00, as it will be on the basis of fifty cents; but we have got to have that revenue coming from the initiation fees in order to carry on the work of organization. We cannot get along without it. Experience shows that.

Now, I was out in Hoquiam, Washington, last April with Fellow Worker Heslewood, a member of the Executive Board, and we had the proposition of two locals: one in Hoquiam, and one in Aberdeen. The Hoquiam Local charged \$1.00 initiation fee; the Aberdeen Local had no initiation fee. You simply paid four bits and got your stamp on your card.

We held meetings there with the result—of course, the result might not count the same always, but the result was, we got exactly as many members in Hoquiam with the \$1.00 initiation fee as we did in Aberdeen with the no initiation fee. Now, it is possible for those workers out there on the Coast and in other parts of the country to pay that initiation fee of \$2, and even \$5 in some cases, and the Local can fix it according to its needs and according to the conditions under which it has to work.

Therefore, I am not in favor of this proposition of dropping down your fences and inviting the workers to come in on the basis of nothing. You invite a lot of rag chewers to come in who do not intend to work, who never did work in their lives, never had any kind of work, and they come in there and simply talk and talk, and talk revolution, but we have got to have the revenue to carry on the work of building up the organization. So I am in favor of the initiation fee and I am in favor of the amendment proposed by Fellow Worker Francis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Francis asked for the floor.

DEL. FRANCIS: While I come from the east, nevertheless I am not afraid at all what the result will be, and I am most certain this amendment will carry. As Delegate Keep said, what is the use of beating the devil around the stump? We know today that in the I.W.W. there are Locals charging \$5 initiation fee. And we also know under the physical condition of the United States that there are certain parts

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

of the country, particularly in the west, where any man can did down and put up a five spot. What is a five spot out west? When a man is working he can give a five spot any time.

On the other hand, in the east we are sensible enough not to ask \$5 initiation fee. We cannot get it. The conditions are such that it would be ridiculous for us to ask for it. Besides, the adoption of the amendment does not imply that it is compulsory that everybody has to pay \$5. It is explicit. It says it shall not exceed \$5. Therefore, all those that organize, all those that unite, and especially those that carry the work of the organization, they are supposed to know the conditions and the requirements of the time, and they certainly will not ask for \$5 where they know they would not get \$5.

Now, this is a proper proposition and I hope there has been enough quibbling about it. In the first place, as I said before, there are certain locals that pay \$5, and in the second place, this question of initiation fee is not compulsory.

DEL. THOMAS: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment. Delegate Walters has asked for the floor.

DEL. FRENCH: I asked for the floor, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot recognize your asking for the floor when somebody else is speaking.

DEL. WALTERS: Fellow workers, this matter pertains to one of my instructions. I am in favor of the amendment of Fellow Worker Francis, that the initiation fee shall not exceed \$5, but I would like to make an amendment to the amendment and that amendment to the amendment is that the initiation fee go into the general treasury of the general committee of the industrial unions. If that motion is seconded I will state my reasons.

DEL. FISCHER: I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain the amendment for the simple reason that that would have to come up in a different manner altogether. We have not dealt with the form of amendment relative to industrial unions and we cannot take that matter up at this time. I therefore rule that amendment out of order.

DEL. THOMAS: Insofar as the recommendation to concur in the report of the Committee is concerned, to amend the constitution to the effect that \$2 shall be the maximum rate of initiation fee,—is that the proper understanding of it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. THOMAS: Then it does not state what shall be the minimum.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. WILLIAMS: Nothing.

DEL. THOMAS: Again, in the matter of the amendment it gives the maximum initiation fee of \$5, but it does not specify what shall be the minimum.

Now, I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that the miners in our locality are so situated that they have to support the United Mine Workers' faking association, and in order to get members to join the I.W.W. we can see why the constitution says \$1.00 shall be the maximum fee, that it shall not exceed \$1.00.

Now, the question is this, that we miners seeing our condition and being so interested in drawing people into the organization, with their burden of the United Mine Workers have to carry we must violate the law, because if you come down to a minimum and say "We will admit you for nothing," you come in direct conflict with the constitution.

(The speaker was interrupted by several delegates crying "no.")

DEL. THOMAS: (Continuing) Certainly, for this reason: If you do not charge at all there is no initiation fee. There is the point. Now, the miners in our local have resolved that we will admit all miners or mine workers into the local by paying the amount of 25 cents initiation fee. But of course we will have to pay his 25 cents for his admission in the organization. Now, if that is the understanding, that you can come down as low as you please but not go above the maximum, then I agree with that amendment; but if the understanding is that you must pay exactly what it states there, then I do not agree with the amendment and I vote in opposition to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will explain now that it will be left to the local union. They must not charge any higher than \$5.

DELEGATE FRENCH: I would like to understand from the committee if the recommendation is in that particular that you will amend the section wherein that one dollar is charged {changed?} to two and the rest of the section be allowed to stand; in other words, the amendment is to change that one to five and let the amendment stand?

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes, sir.

DELEGATE FRENCH: There are two errors in this as it was. We would have saved trouble if it had been edited right. I myself wrote the amendment to that section last year and made that two dollars, but it was printed one in the stenographic report. Also, where it is fifty cents it read one dollar. In the amendment submitted to me in the Albert Ryan case was one that requested me to make it not to exceed one dollar, so that locals out there could charge one dollar for monthly

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

dues and the locals in the east could charge anything they wanted less than one dollar; and in editing it this other clause supposed to be altered by Section 5 was allowed to remain, so they had two kinds of initiation fees because of the error in editing.

Now, if I understand it, this one dollar simply is to be changed to five dollars. If it is permissible, I would request Fellow Worker Francis to embody in his amendment that the word fifty cents be changed to one dollar.

DELEGATE FRANCIS: If the second to my motion is willing, I am.

The delegate who seconded the motion acquiesced in the request.

DELEGATE FRENCH: Not to exceed one dollar.

DELEGATE FRANCIS: Let it stand as it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: What amendment do you want to make?

DELEGATE FRENCH: That the words one dollar where fifty cents now appears in Section 4, be inserted.

THE CHAIRMAN: In Section 4.

DELEGATE FRENCH: Section 4, Article V. It is an error of printing and I want to make the proper correction.

A DELEGATE: I rise to a point of order. That has reference to dues. At this time we are discussing initiation fees.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that the motion before the house is that the initiation fee shall not exceed \$2. The amendment to the motion is that it shall not exceed \$5, and the amendment to the amendment is that it shall not exceed one dollar.

DELEGATE FRENCH: No, no. My amendment is—let the Francis amendment stand, that the words five dollars be in the place where one dollar is; that the words one dollar be where fifty cents is, as amendment to Section 4; that is what I understand the committee's report, that Section 4 be thus amended.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand now.

DELEGATE FRENCH: I want to amend Section 4 so it will be explicit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment to the amendment seconded?

A DELEGATE: I second the amendment.

DEL. KEEP: I rise to a point of order. The point of order is that the amendment to change to one dollar has not been submitted for two months.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is made on the recommendation brought in by the committee.

DEL. KEEP: I rise to a point of order. They have got two things here

under this last amendment—the motion to amend the initiation fee, to change it to \$2, and the other amendment to change to \$5. Now, the amendment comes in to change the dues to one dollar per month.

THE CHAIRMAN: This last amendment is to change dues.

DEL. FRENCH: To amend the section to read that way.

The way I look upon it I understand that the committee on constitution recommends to amend Section 4, Article V, and in view of the fact that the initiation fee and the dues are contained in that section, I think that the amendment to the amendment is in order.

DEL. LEVOY: Inasmuch as this affects the amendment we want to put in, I want to know where the error comes in to make it \$5. For instance, at Schenectady there is a shop there where a man is making \$25 to \$30 and another \$12 to \$30 per week. There is another shop there on textile industries where the employes are not making more than \$5 to \$7. Those girls there in the shop, should they be organized, would be in the same locality. To raise their initiation fee to \$5 would keep other girls out. I know of locals there under the old constitution where the fee was \$5, and they were not making as much money as other locals where but one dollar was charged. It would keep people out of the small industries. The consequence is that they would join some other locality and go in there and it would conflict. I believe \$2 is enough.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are degenerating into the depths of simpleism. I know the condition he illustrates there in the pure and simple unions does exist today and will exist in our organization if we do not prevent it.

DEL. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, comparing the list with the unions that have been mentioned, I don't see how you can compare it with them, because they have a fee as high as \$100 in a good many of their organizations; whereas, if we make the fee \$5 it ought to be {left} to the locals to go as low as they wish, according to the circumstances—the wages the workers are getting in the locality where they are being organized generally governing. Where I come from the wages are as low as \$4.50 a day and the highest \$8, and it does not take but one day's wages to pay that one initiation fee, and it is absolutely necessary to have a man in the field as an organizer, because it is a floating population and people coming in there inside of a month, if we did not have an organizer in the field it would soon be filled up with non-union men, and in order to make enough to keep this man in the field we must pay him a regular salary. For that reason it is necessary to have this initiation fee. This should not prevent the locals from cutting

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

it down as low as they like. Besides the initiation fee we will also charge one dollar a month dues. We could not get along with any less. If we did we would have to cut out one delegate and it would allow our organization to run behind.

DEL. PINKERTON: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the same conditions could exist where the rate is \$2 or nothing at all, that exist where the rate is \$5 and is nothing at all. An applicant for admission at Cleveland, where there was no initiation fee, they could also take their application to Schenectady and the conditions would exist the same as if they charged \$2 or \$5.

I am a western man myself. I put in twenty years in the western country, and we must be governed by the conditions confronting us, and it is absolutely necessary that locals in the west, where the local population is not settled down to a steady element as in the eastern country, to have a basis upon which to work, and we men of the western country, where I hope to be again in a very short time, are not above assisting our fellow workers. We have local conditions to contend with. Therefore, taking everything into consideration in regard to the east and the west, I would support the \$5 initiation fee because of the fact that we can take them in for nothing if we want to or \$5 if the conditions demand it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to speak upon this question.

Delegate Williams took the chair.

DEL. KATZ (Chairman) said:

I want to speak in answer to Delegate Glover from Cleveland, a fellow worker, where he thinks we are not revolutionists if we change the initiation fee now. I believe that is ridiculous, or if we do not throw our doors open, and keep a man out because of the initiation fee. Now, the fact is that if you take that stand you will not be allowed to take any views for the same reason. This organization in order to go on must have money—in order to have organizers and in order to have money in the treasury to keep the organization intact—keep in going; and there are, of course, conditions we do not like, such as Levoy has mentioned, that a man may join one local organization where there is no initiation fee and go to another organization where there is an initiation fee. There is not provision that you can adopt here—no provision in the constitution—that will satisfy everybody and be perfect. We have in our city a number of locals, where one local charges \$2 initiation fee—where the local blacksmith helpers and the local silk workers charge only 50 cents initiation fee. There is no

danger of any of the silk workers going into the locomotive works. There is no danger of the locomotive men going in and weaving silk ribbons for the ladies to wear. They do not conflict at all. I agree fully with Delegate Pinkerton that it gives an opportunity to the local to charge 50 cents, 25 cents or \$5 if conditions allow, and the same thing with the dues. I think the motion should be adopted.

CHAIRMAN KATZ resumed the chair.

Call for the question.

DELEGATE RATKOVICH: Mr. Chairman, I agree that the initiation fee should be left to the surroundings and conditions, but the dues I think should be universal—should be to all alike, for instance, a member in Chicago the dues should be 50 cents or 40 cents. If he happens to go to New York and there pays one dollar he will say to them in Chicago we pay 50 cents. It will cause confusion. Why should we pay a dollar here when we pay in Chicago 50 cents? Therefore I am against the amendment to the amendment.

DELEGATE HAGENSON: Mr. Chairman, in reference to this amendment to the amendment regarding the initiation fee, I am very much opposed to it regarding the dues, in the first place, because it has not been complied with in accordance to the provisions of the constitution, and if we had to go on record here at this time is not according to the constitution at all. We must go back to the rank and file of the Industrial Workers of the World and tell them that we have no constitution; that this convention ignored the constitution that had been enacted by a referendum vote of the rank and file of the Industrial Workers of the World, because it is establishing a precedent and would give us a black eye to the rank and file. This is one reason why I am opposed to this.

On the other hand, I hardly see why there should be any necessity anywhere of charging over 50 cents dues.

Now, then, in reference to the initiation fee I believe \$2 is high enough, and \$5 may be all right some places; but it is giving a chance to those who want to build up as the pure and simples are doing. It is giving them a chance—those who could hardly dig up \$5. For that reason I believe in the long run it will be more detrimental than it will be a benefit.

DELEGATE GLOVER: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there have been words that have been put into my mouth as coming from me. It is very evident that there has been a misconstruction and you do not seem to catch my idea. It simply forces to me try and illustrate and to

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

take up some time which I have no desire to do. Now, what is it that we want? We want to organize the working class first. If we adopt anything at all that is in any way a barrier to that working class becoming organized we make the work so much harder for us to do. My experience has been in the crack organizations where they have different initiation fees, where those initiation fees have been reduced by special permission of the general organization of the Grand Lodge officers, even that has not worked successfully; they have not been able to build up the organization, and the organization has been up and down like a jumping jack; there has been no stability to it.

Now, as for getting funds, it is not the amount of money that you are going to ask the worker for, that is not going to build up the organization. I claim that the fund will come by increase of numbers we get—by the dues they pay. It is numbers we want. My experience has been if we throw up this barrier you prevent men coming in. I could mention an instance where a man came voluntarily without being approached by any one and asked about the organization and what its dues were—what the rates were and everything, and when he knew what the initiation fee was he was unable to pay it despite the fact that he is a machinist and all that and supposed to get pretty fair pay, but it was the conditions under which we had to live that made it impossible for him to pay that amount.

Now, I claim that by abolishing the initiation feature, having the universal rate of dues in accordance with the universal transfer, we can build up the organization and get that membership which will produce funds to carry on that work which is essential. The Chairman says that if we abolish the initiation fee that we abolish the dues. That is impossible. It is a ridiculous proposition, for the fact that it is necessary to have funds to carry on the work. My contention is that you can get more to carry on the work not by putting on a high initiation fee but by the dues that are paid in by a large body of men and 50 cents I claim, and it has been demonstrated time and time again that 50 cents is sufficient to keep up organization.

DEL. JONES: I move the previous question.

{THE CHAIRMAN: The previous} question has been moved. There is a delegate who wants to ask a question.

A DELEGATE: I want to ask the Chair a question in connection with the remarks of Fellow Worker Hagenson. He said that the institution of an initiation fee in any local Industrial Workers of the World would mean virtually a closed shop. Would the Industrial Workers of the World support a closed shop? I am asking the question.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you ask me that question?

THE DELEGATE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair as an individual certainly does support a closed shop. I believe in a closed shop and an open Union.

The previous question has been called by Delegate Jones. All in favor of the motion that the previous question be now put say aye.

The motion was carried, and so announced by the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: We now come to a vote upon the amendment to the amendment.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would like to embody that in my amendment to the amendment.

A DELEGATE: I call for information. If I vote no upon this do I thereby, in case it carries, do I raise the dues to One Dollar a month.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. This amendment to the question is to strike out of Section 4, Article V, in the third line, the regular monthly dues shall not be more than Five Dollars per month and to read that the monthly dues shall not be more than One Dollar per month. This is an amendment to the amendment. All in favor of this amendment say aye.

DEL. DE LEON: Do I understand this is the amendment only?

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment was to strike out in Section 5, Article V, the 50 cents, and insert a dollar in the matter of dues.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that that amendment is not germane to the question. The question before us is initiation fees. I am opposed to the form of that amendment such as we have before the house. I ask for a vote upon that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I ruled on this same question before and I have taken the stand that the recommendation of the committee, amending Section 4, Article V, was in order.

DEL. FRENCH: You did not explain it right.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will vote now by roll call, and before doing so I shall read the whole section again. The Committee on Constitution reported that the initiation fee for members of local unions shall not exceed—where it says One Dollar, that that be stricken out and Two Dollars inserted. This was amended by Delegate Francis to be \$5 instead of \$2. a further amendment of the same section was made by Delegate French striking out in the third line the words 50 cents and placing there One Dollar. Now, we are voting upon that amendment by roll call. All in favor of this amendment will answer the roll call Yes.

DEL. FRENCH: My motion is that the amendment to the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

amendment also includes the striking out of One Dollar and making it Five Dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did the amendment to the amendment include that?

DEL. FRENCH: That the section shall read—shall not exceed \$5 in that second line—

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment was made by you and the other amendment was made by Francis, how could it include both? Go ahead, call the roll. The amendment to the amendment is to strike out fifty {cents} and insert one dollar.

A roll call was thereupon taken, upon the amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The total vote on the amendment to the amendment is 112 votes; in favor, 75; against, 37. The amendment to the amendment is carried.

Now, we come to the amendment made by Delegate Francis, that is, to have \$5 instead of 2, the section to read: “The initiation fee for members of local unions shall not exceed \$5.” That is the amendment.

DEL. AXELSON: Question.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of this amendment will say aye. Opposed, no.

The amendment was unanimously adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Carried unanimously.

DEL. HAGENSON: I wish to be recorded in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hagenson wishes to be recorded in the negative.

DEL. DELANEY: I will, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: And Delaney does.

DEL. DRESSLER: I wish to be recorded also.

DEL. KEEP: This amendment, on its face, does not in any way vitiate other portions of that section which say, “Provided no part of the initiation fee or dues above mentioned shall be used as a sick or death benefit, but shall be held in the treasury as a general fund to defray legitimate expenses of the union.” That is not vitiated by this? That stands?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

DEL. KEEP: They have no right to use that money.

THE CHAIRMAN: No portion of that money. They can have their auxiliary fund, if they wish. Now, we will proceed.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. JONES: I have a request from the organization committee, and I would like to be excused, as I want to prepare a chart which will explain matters which will come up, upon organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not understand you.

DEL. JONES: I wish to prepare charts that will explain matters which will come up, from the organization committee, and I wish to be excused.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

DEL. JONES: To prepare those.

THE CHAIRMAN: You wish to be excused from the session?

DEL. JONES: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are excused.

DEL. AXELSON: I move that the request of Delegate Jones be granted.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the delegate is excused.

The secretary of the committee will proceed.

DEL. WILLIAMS (secretary of the constitutional committee): We have a proposition from the local of Cleveland regarding providing for uniform dues. I suppose that, in view of the action just taken, this will not need to be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is it?

DEL. WILLIAMS: I say that we have a proposition from the local of Cleveland providing for uniform dues for members of the local unions, but in view of the action just taken this will not need to be considered.

DEL. DELANEY: Is that a recommendation of the committee? If so, I would like to speak upon it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not understand you.

DEL. DELANEY: I would like to speak, if there is a motion before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no motion before the house.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Regarding the proposition from Local 86, which you will notice in *The Bulletin*—that our constitution be so amended at our next general convention as to provide a per capita tax of five cents per month per member to the general office, in addition to the fifteen cents per capita to the general fund, said 5 cents to constitute a publishing fund, and that *The Industrial Union Bulletin* be sent in bulk to each local, according to the number of members reported in good standing each month.

The recommendation of the committee is that the constitution remain as it is.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the motion before the house. What is your pleasure?

DEL. DELANEY: I wish to speak, not on that motion, but on the point that was brought up before.

THE CHAIRMAN: That point is passed over that was up before. That has been settled by the amendment to the report of the committee.

DEL. DELANEY: I wish to rise to object to the methods being pursued by the constitution committee, of bringing in half propositions. On the proposition of Local 43 they brought in all the constructive part, and never read one part of it which was put in. They have also done that way in another case. Now, I think that if we are going to act intelligently, we have got to get the whole thing, and I want to record a protest against that action, and especially the action on the recommendation of Local 43.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you refer to this recommendation?

DEL. DELANEY: I refer to the tactics being used—

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not understand the delegate, as to what he means by tactics. There is now before us the recommendation of the committee on constitution, that the per capita tax shall not be increased. Now, is there anything else that that local has offered, in connection with that section?

DEL. WILLIAMS: No.

DEL. DELANEY: I merely meant the methods. I did not mean to insinuate anything about tactics.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can the delegate from Buffalo,—this recommendation now brought in by the committee on constitution, I do not know what local it comes from—say whether that local has brought in anything else in connection with this? Can the delegate inform me?

DEL. WILLIAMS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will consider this motion. The motion is that the constitution remain as it is, on that point, of course. All in favor of this motion say aye; opposed no.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

DEL. FRENCH: Does the chairman understand that section 5 of article V is now obsolete, owing to the adoption of the new form of section 4? Can we have that understood so that nobody will quibble about it six months from now?

THE CHAIRMAN: We haven't any National Industrial Departments, anyhow. I do not see how we could. Go ahead.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Delegate Williams proceeded with the report of the committee on constitution as follows:

There are one or two propositions regarding by-laws which have been proposed to the constitutional committee, and our recommendation is that all by-laws fall within the province of the General Executive Board, and that consequently we refer the matter to the G.E.B.

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands as a motion. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. KEEP: In this making of the report I think that, for instance, where he says that there have been some propositions made to the committee regarding the by-laws, while I do not care so much, yet I would like to know what those propositions are. I am not opposing the motion to concur, but it seems to me that the report would be more explicit, it would give the facts in the case a little more clearly, so that we would understand just exactly what we are turning over. And in the other cases, if the report had been of such a nature that all the subjects concerned in an amendment, all the things concerning these sections, had been brought out by the committee, it seems to me that we could have gotten along a little better. So in this case let us have what it is which is to be referred to the executive board.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Well, Fellow Worker Chairman, I lost the reference here. It is not in the *Bulletin*, but it is from the suggestion of local union 173, of San Francisco, which has been turned over to the constitutional committee, and the suggestion reads that the convention adopt a general system of by-laws for the government of local unions, in order that, as the explanation is given, there may be a uniform system of carrying on business between the different local unions. That was what we took action on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, are you ready for the question?

DEL. DE LEON: I would like to ask the secretary of the committee if there was not another by-law that was also acted upon.

DEL. WILLIAMS: What is that?

DEL. DE LEON: Was there not also another by-law?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes, you are right. From New Bedford, Mass.

DEL. DE LEON: Yes. You might also state that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you read that? What was that from New Bedford?

DEL. WILLIAMS: It was just simply a model set of by-laws.

THE CHAIRMAN: Give us an explanation.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. WILLIAMS: It was simply a model set of by-laws, the same thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: A model set of by-laws, the same thing?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the motion to concur in the recommendation of the constitutional committee will say aye. Opposed no.

(The motion was duly carried.)

Delegate Williams continued with the report of the committee, as follows:

Here is a recommendation of the committee itself, that is, an amendment proposed by the committee, an amendment to section 14 of Article III, in reference to delegates to the convention.

We wish to add to Section 14, which reads as follows: "Two or more local unions in the same locality, with a total membership of 500, or less, may jointly send a delegate to the convention, and the vote of said delegate shall be based on the representation hereinbefore provided for"—and here is our addition:

"Provided said delegate is a member of one of the locals so sending him."

DEL. SPETTEL: That's the stuff.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The recommendation stands as a motion.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would move an amendment to this recommendation. I would move as an amendment this following addition:

"And provided that the election of said delegate has been held jointly at a special or mass meeting of those locals."

DEL. YATES: I second that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is made and seconded, to add "providing that such delegate has been elected at a regularly called joint mass meeting of all the locals in that locality."

I do not think that we can—

DEL. FOOTE: I do not exactly catch the drift of the amendment. I would not presume that we are to imply that this is intended for any special condition, but for general conditions. But I wish to state that I have three votes here. One is from Kansas City. Now, I haven't been in Kansas City for five years. It would be impossible for them to have a mass meeting, in Wichita, or Kansas City, and have all the locals

attend. Now, if we are to consider that a delegate can only represent one close district, that is a different proposition; but if, according to the constitution, in the same locality or in the district, they can jointly send a delegate, why I believe it is all right, simply because many of these locals in that way would not be represented on the floor of the convention at all; and the one thing that they do like, above all, is to have some representation on the floor of the convention. And I cannot, myself, see where it does any harm, as long as the vote is limited, the number of votes.

DEL. YATES: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: As the seconder you will get the floor.

DEL. PINKERTON: I believe in the adoption of the resolution as there adopted by the committee, for this reason: The amendment, as applied to the cities of the east, where such a plan is feasible, is all right, but in the western country, where our fellow worker there hails from, there are locals that are growing up, all over that sage brush district. Some of them are up in Siskiyou, and some of them are over in Winnemucca, Nevada, and some of them are down in Sacramento, California. Now, from that country to Chicago is a long way to be paying transportation for representatives from each one of these little locals, and the natural one for them to send would be an organizer, who was probably selected by another one of those locals, whom, if they would find he was elected by his own local, to represent it, then they would also, throughout this entire district, ask him to represent them.

It would be an impossible proposition for those people, scattered out through that western country, to come together, because they might as well all come to this convention, in order to be represented, as to have to come together in mass meeting (applause).

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that Fellow Worker Francis ought to withdraw his amendment, because it is ridiculous.

DEL. FRANCIS: I submit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we have the original motion. That is, to concur in the report of the committee. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. YATES: I wish to explain the reason why I seconded the amendment, and it is this: The local in New Bedford asked the cooperation of the locals around that city in the matter of sending delegates to this convention, and these locals replied that their financial condition did not admit of their doing so; and we, in our estimation, were holding to the strict letter of the law, or the spirit of the constitution, by not asking these locals to furnish this

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

representative of the local unions whom we might send, or the delegate we might send, to use their credentials. Now, we consider that if these locals did not participate in a joint meeting, on account of not joining, we could not ask them to furnish us the credentials, so that this delegate could use those votes, for that purpose. And I think, myself, that votes are used in that manner, and I do not agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now come to the vote. All in favor of the motion to concur in the report will way aye; opposed no.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Carried. Any further report from the constitutional committee?

DEL. WILLIAMS: The constitution committee recommends that the following amendment be added to the constitution:

“All national organizers must be members at large, during their incumbency.”

DEL. AXELSON: I second that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will stand as a motion. What is your pleasure?

DEL. KEEP: Cannot the committee give us reasons for those things?

DEL. WILLIAMS: They will be brought out, in the debate.

DEL. KEEP: I do not wish to be considered as too strict, or anything, but I would like to have the reasons why they ask for this amendment. It would save time. Why do they recommend this amendment? As it is, it is just simply that the committee recommends it. Cannot the committee say why they recommend it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you, Fellow Worker Williams?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Let the chairman speak on that.

DEL. HAGENSON: Can I speak on that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you a member of that committee?

DEL. HAGENSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. HAGENSON: The committee made this recommendation, because their organizers employed by the national organization we considered should not be entitled to be elected as delegates to the convention because it would incur danger. In case you had an executive board together, with a set of organizers that were crooked, they would be able, perhaps, to be elected by a great many of the locals throughout the country; and because, being under the control of the Executive Board, the Executive Board would also, if they were crooked, very likely get such organizers as would be in accordance

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

with the Executive Board. Now, then, in order to prevent these organizers from representing the local throughout the country, they make this recommendation that they must become members at large, as you see we have previously adopted a clause that reads that a delegate must be a member of one of the locals by whom he is elected; and therefore you see that one of the national organizers could not be a member of one of these locals. He would have to be a member at large, and therefore could not be a delegate. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now you have heard the motion. Do you understand it?

DEL. CAMINITA: May I have the motion explained.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want the motion explained?

DEL. CAMANITA: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that in the future national organizers should be members at large.

DEL. WILLIAMS: During their incumbency.

THE CHAIRMAN: That they should, for instance, Delegate Trainor or you, or anybody else from Paterson, should be made national organizer, you would no longer belong to 152 of Paterson, but you would be a member at large, and would have to pay your dues to the national secretary.

DEL. THOMAS: I presume that this was to apply to delegates who live in a locality where they believe they could do some work—

THE CHAIRMAN: No. The amendment to the constitution states clearly “national organizers.” That would not imply that local organizers would come under that head, would it?

DEL. HAGENSON: Not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Only national organizers. All in favor of the motion say aye; opposed no.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is unanimously carried.

I want to ask the secretary of the constitutional committee a question. There were a number of amendments of the constitution published in *The Bulletin*, which came from the various locals. One came from the local that I represent, relative to the taking in of children. Have you taken that under consideration?

DEL. WILLIAMS: What local do you represent?

THE CHAIRMAN: 152, Paterson, N.J.

DEL. HAGENSON: Not yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not yet?

DEL. WILLIAMS: We haven't touched that.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: But it will come up. All those that have been published will come up?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes. And, by the way, Paterson also, some time ago, had a proposition before the General Executive Board about the women.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. And children. That is why I am asking about that.

DEL. DE LEON: That was news to me, that Paterson had any proposition published in *The Bulletin*.

DEL. WILLIAMS: No. It is not in *The Bulletin*.

DEL. DE LEON: And I was informed that all the proposed amendments have been published in this issue.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: It is not published in this issue, and we have not considered it. That relative to the children, which the chairman has mentioned, will not come before us, at all. It is news to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will come before the committee.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That may be an oversight on our part.

DEL. DE LEON: As a matter of fact, it is not before us.

DEL. DE LEON {SEC. TRAUTMANN?}: As a matter of fact the Paterson local had submitted a proposition on those lines about six months ago, and it was approved by the General Executive Board, subject to the approval of the convention, but we failed to have that proposition printed in *The Bulletin*, because it had been acted on already. It was not published. It was published in the minutes of the advisory board.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was published as a suggestion from Paterson, some time ago, in the June number of the *Bulletin*.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, that is just exactly it. That is one of the reasons why we failed to put it in.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We will see to it. Have you anything further to report?

DEL. WILLIAMS (for the committee):—In Section 7, in the suggestions from Local 84, St. Louis, the committee recommends that that section be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is that?

DEL. WILLIAMS (reading): “Resolved, that Article VIII, Section 1, be stricken out, and obligations to new members be printed on application blanks.”

THE CHAIRMAN: What section is that?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Article VIII, Section 1.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 1?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Section 2—initiating members.

THE CHAIRMAN: The change is, that the obligations should be printed on the application blank.

DEL. HAGENSON: As a delegate from St. Louis, I wish to have the floor on that. There were several times when quite a little difficulty arose in the local in regard to the obligation of membership. According to the present constitution, it provides that the presiding officer must read to a member the preamble of the constitution, together with the balance of the obligation which is in the constitution here, and which therefore it is not necessary for me to read, I believe. Now, then, there were some cases, where men sent in their applications, who were working nights, and could not attend the meetings, and in other cases they were prevented from attending the meetings. These men had studied the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World, and were recommended by members of the organization as men that were all right to be taken in, and so forth, but by reason of the fact that they were not there they could not be taken in.

Now, we believe that that is something that should not be necessary, and for that reason we believe that application blanks should be adopted, which would contain a question such as this: "Have you read the preamble?" If you stated "Yes," and the balance of the principles—the fact that he signed his name to the application blank, and that he had read those principles, the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World, should be sufficient. We considered that he should not have to attend that meeting, in order to get a card from the Industrial Workers of the World.

To overcome these difficulties it was considered, and it was requested that this be taken up, and I hope you will refer it to the committee on printing, with the instruction to provide such an application blank, and abolish this other.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

All in favor of the motion to concur in the report of the committee on constitution will say aye. Opposed no.

(The motion unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Carried unanimously.

DEL. WILLIAMS (continuing report): Here is a recommendation from mixed Locals 91, 130, and Industrial Unions 15, 95 and 130, regarding the label:

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

“Resolved, that the label, as evidence of work done by I.W.W. men, be abolished.”

That was referred to us, and of course that virtually strikes out Article IV of the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: How does the committee act on that?

DEL. WILLIAMS: The committee recommends that the constitution remain as it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the motion before the house. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. FRANCIS: Fellow Workers: I can state for Local 59, that I have been instructed to vote for the abolition of the label, as a sign of commercial enterprise, that is, seconding the movement {motion?} of those five locals. I will now state why I think this label should be abolished. Before I proceed, I wish to be understood that the label should stand as the emblem of the organization, in the matter of literature, and in matters of transaction of business with reference to official documents of the organization, but for commercial purposes, to advertise the goods, the merchandise, or anything in the manufacturing line, produced for the capitalist, I consider that the efforts put in to meet the demands from the different locals, whatever the Industrial Workers should supply—I consider that it is so much waste of time. And then one local comes in and says “Can I put any label on a chunk of coal?” And another delegate comes in and says “Can I put a label on quartz?” And so on and so on.

I say that experience teaches us that all efforts put in on the label question finally come down to what? That there are some delegates holding the job on the labels, with whom it becomes a sacred affair—“don’t touch it,”—because the fellow might lose his job.

Now, I hold that while it is true that there are localities where the user of the label stands for something, the argument will hold good, nevertheless, if you take everything, and combine all the industrial features of these United States, it does not require a label.

We are not trying to organize to protect the industries of the capitalist business men. They are dead ones, any way. But we are trying to proceed with the work of the organization with as little hampering as possible. Now, I for one, the way I understand the label, to meet the different wishes, I think the general office, if the organization extends and becomes larger, will require to have a regular side office, a side show, designers, and chemists, and so forth, to get a label to stick to certain commodities, and that label will not stick to another commodity.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

This may be a laughing matter, but it is a fact. Labels are not easily handled. We had them in the New York Industrial Council—just because there was a certain word in that label, and I don't know what amount of money was expended on it. The delegates wouldn't handle it. That doesn't cover the point. I reiterate what I said previously, that while it might be that in some particular localities a label would hold good, on the whole, and for the industry as a whole, I consider we should do away with it, and I hope that the delegates will see it in this light. We will save lots of work for the general office, and save lots of debating in the general councils, and lots of trouble in the local unions, and incidentally we will do the work, now. It will be much easier to do the work now than to do it at some future time. (Applause.)

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Workers: I am in the same position, and hold the same views as the preceding speaker; so my remarks on this will not be long. I hold the same as he does, that the emblem should be preserved on literature, and on all things pertaining to the official documents of the organization, but as to the labeling of any goods, and merchandise which has been produced by the Industrial Workers of the World, I do not believe in it.

We are interested in getting all working men to come and affiliate with us, and we want as many as will come. We are not trying to say, "In order to be a good Industrial Worker you have got to patronize a label." No, we cannot say that. We are interested in getting all the working class. We have to do away with that little scapegoat which the A.F. of L. hung themselves upon; and we must not hang ourselves on account of that piece of paper on a certain piece of work. So, as for us, as working men, we should recognize that we are producing goods, in one line and in another; we have nothing that we could logically base ourselves on, and no reason why we should adopt the label and stick it on our goods.

So I hope that this convention will go on record for abolishing the label, and set themselves free, in harmony with the principles of true sociology, showing that you are interested in the welfare of the whole working class, and not peddling a label for a few working people.

DEL. KEEP: Fellow Workers: I do not want to concur in the report of the committee on this matter, for the reasons that have been partly stated. I do not like that label. I cannot see where the label is useful, in an organization such as this is. I think it leads to a good deal of misconception regarding the organization, also.

Some time ago, about a year and a half ago, we received a letter in Columbus, or Chicago, I do not know which, concerning the fact that

they wanted and organization of cigar and stogie makers in Newark, Ohio. I was sent over there to see the gentleman who had presented the matter to the organization, and this man was a little cockroach stogie maker.

He had two girls and himself and the boy there. The boy picked up tobacco and swept out and ran errands. This gentleman had been in conversation with Mr. Debs. That is the way I understand it. He had the idea he could send to us and get the label, and getting the label, he could spread his goods; and he wanted to know from me what he had to do. I says, "Why, you? You have nothing to do. I understood that you were a working man. I didn't understand that you were a manufacturer." The form of organization that I outlined to him was that everybody working there should have come into the organization. He says, "Even the boy that sweeps?" I says, "Yes, so far as I understand; and then they could use the label; but if you want to make a deal with me just to use this label, we can not do that at all." He dropped the matter.

The very fact that we had the label led to that misconception upon that man's part. Now, the label, as used today by the pure and simple organization, leads to this,—that the members of that organization have faith in the label, or try to have, or hope that it may do something for them, and they have made that faith possible, or the hope of it, by saying that if we refused to patronize anything but labeled goods, then the organization would be built up, and in that way help to knock out the idea of the strike upon the part of the workingman. They claim they can do their work in another way; and the whole thing has that tendency, to make workingmen think that we intend to better their condition, with the use of the label.

Now, I cannot see where you can, and it simply leads to this misrepresentation of us, and this misconception of us on the part of such individuals as this cockroach capitalist in Newark, Ohio; and I, for one, for that reason, not to have that false conception placed upon us that we might—I do not say, you understand, that there would be any tendency to use us, but that we might be used; and the average workingman understands how this label has been used time and time again, and therefore I think that the best thing we can do is to abolish it, for those reasons; and I am not in favor of concurring in the committee's report.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Will the delegate answer one question?

DEL. KEEP: Yes, sir.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: In going to Newark, Ohio—that was the place?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. KEEP: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Were not the instructions specific?

DEL. KEEP: They were.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That it is a label to be used by the employes in the shop, and not to be given to the employer?

DEL. KEEP: Yes, sir.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Were they not specific?

DEL. KEEP: Yes, and they were specifically carried out.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And this was prior to this time, it was about one year and a half ago. Now, the gentleman is a member, or has been a member, of the Socialist party, and as such he wrote to Debs, whether he could get the label of the Industrial Workers of the World. Then, when we received that letter, the instructions were given through me to you and the Columbus locals that, when the label be granted, that the label is the property of the employes in that shop. Isn't that correct?

DEL. KEEP: That is correct.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Well, I am going to argue on that point. Later on I want to speak on that question.

The Chairman called Delegate Haggerty to the Chair, and took the floor, to speak upon the motion under consideration. He said:

The delegates from Paterson have been instructed on this question. They have been instructed to retain the universal label. We knew that it would come up, and it was brought before the meeting, where the delegates were instructed.

There has been a good deal said about the universal label. Our organizers were speaking about it, and it is pretty much known today that this organization has a universal label. Now, there is no one in this body, in this convention, who will believe that the label is the means of emancipating the working class, or bettering our conditions, or anything of that sort. I look upon it simply as a means to use it against the fakir organizations—the pure and simple organizations. Today they have labels. And, since you have admitted that you want a label on your literature, now, why do you want it there?

You recognize the fact that the label has a certain standing, whether you agree with it or not, among the working class. And you can talk as long as you want with the average working man, and it would be easier to convince him that labor produces all wealth, and that the I.W.W. is the proper organization, than to convince him that the label should be abolished. You go among workingmen and you will find that.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Now, I hold that the working class as a whole, or the majority, do not understand the label, the way it has been handled by the reform organizations. They do not understand it.

You run off an affair of some kind. The tickets, they are not literature; but, according to your position, no doubt your cockroach printer would have that label. The label would be put on the tickets. That is not literature. But it would be there. It would be on the letter-heads of the general secretary. That is not literature. But it would be there. And there is in that perhaps something bowing before the superstition of the whole working class.

But, if you are compelled to do it there, why not in other things? Now, I belonged to another organization, before this was launched, that gave up the label, and I found, in the town where the proposition came from to abolish the label, where they were the ultra-revolutionaries, they stood up so straight that they fell backwards. When I came into their town and went up to their headquarters what did I find? I found a box that contained cigars with the label, after our label was abolished,—with that blue label, of the rottenest organization in this country, the Cigar-Makers' union. (Applause.)

And it will continue. If you have no label today, the result will be that our membership will patronize, whether we tell them to or not, the labels put out by the fakir labor organizations. If we will go on and control the field, well, maybe we will need no labels at all. We will have the co-operative commonwealth. But at the present time we do need the label, simply as a weapon. And that is all that we look to it for.

Now, of course, we are not going to go to the manufacturer, and sell him the label. We are not going to allow, like the Cigarmakers' International Union does in Boston, the making of an agreement, as they did with the liquor dealers' association, they to sell their blue label cigars, and the cigar makers to see to it that they threw the dope into the whole working class of Massachusetts and had them support the capitalist ticket on election day.

That is impossible in this organization. It is impossible that the label should be used for any such purpose here. It will simply be used as a method, as a means of reaching the working class. And if you abolish it you will have your membership support the other labels.

In our city our membership is not educated to that extent, and will not be for some time, where they are able to understand this proposition correctly. And I dare say that there is not more than one per cent of the Industrial Workers of the World that would understand this position clearly. And that when to go into a place, and they are

offered something for sale, they would say, "No, I don't want that label. I rather want something without a label altogether." There would be only one per cent of them that would do it; and the rest of them, if you haven't a label of your own, will support a label that is a labor fakir's. (Applause.)

(The Chairman resumed the chair.)

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Worker Chairman: I wish to say a few words, along the same line. I concur with Fellow Worker Katz on the label question, and only want to enlarge somewhat upon it. I am here to tell you, right here, that while I realize the fakir unions, and the rottenness of their label system, as well as any of you, I am right here to tell you that I will buy everything that has got a rotten labor fakir label on, as long as I cannot get it with the I.W.W. label on.

I am going to explain to you my reasons. I want to do it to show the rank and file that I am sincere in helping men in their efforts. At the same time I will point out the rotten sources of and conditions under which their label is issued, but I will not give them a chance to come back at me and say that I am not loyal to them.

It is the common worker that I am striving to help. Now, I do not want to have a label abolished, and go out on the market and buy goods that are manufactured and put on the market by prison labor and by any kind of labor whatever that is not making any effort to better its conditions, in preference to those who have a label of some kind that indicates, at least, that they are making some effort to improve their condition, whether that label is issued by a fakir organization or not.

I only do that for the purpose of showing my sincerity, not to sanction those labels or the conditions under which they are issued. And I also hold that it is necessary for us, until the co-operative commonwealth is established, to carry this label as an indication of the goods being made by our fellow members of the I.W.W.

That is my stand, and I stand for the label, once and for all, until the co-operative commonwealth is established, and the competitive system is wiped out, when we will no longer need a label.

DEL. KERN: Fellow Workers: I would like to say that while it has taken us a good while to understand the meaning of that label, that I pretty much coincide with what you stated there. In fact, I agree with everything that you stated, but my local has instructed me to vote against the label. (Applause.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Fellow Workers: In my report to this convention I cited one case, the case of the bakery workers of Detroit, and the organizations there having a delegate here. I thought I would

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

go out and just show what the organization was up against, and why it became necessary to use, in that one instance, in the fight, the label of the Industrial Workers of the World. We did not provide for it, and we had in one day three telegrams, to send men as quickly as possible, from men who before this time advocated the abolishment of the label altogether.

Now, in this instance we find the bakery workers, the Polish bakery workers, engaged in a strike, and the International Union {of} Bakery Workers put out their own label. They advocate the abolishment of this label of the I.W.W., or, even, if they be on strike, that that strike is not a recognized strike, the men have no grievance, no justifiable demand.

The bakery workers, our bakery workers' organization, had to put out their own label. They were engaged in a strike against all the bake shops, the Polish bake shops of Detroit. The label was used immediately as a propaganda medium during that strike. They had to have it to show that the few who were compelled to raise their wages \$2 a week had at least conceded the strength of that organization.

And from that time on, the propaganda that they carried on in the different houses—they compelled one firm after another to accede to the demands of the bakery workers of Detroit; and today, if I am rightly informed by the delegate and by the secretary, we have only three bakery shops in Detroit engaged in the conflict.

The propaganda for the label during this conflict has forced the issue before the workers, and the matter has been explained. They immediately took sides with the strikers. The bakery bosses of Detroit immediately adopted their own label. It looked similar to ours. It was even red in color, but it did not have the emblem of the Industrial Workers of the World. In order to offset that we had to get our label out as quickly as possible; and only through that alone, although it is not a medium to win anything we forced the workers of Detroit to investigate the matter, to inquire into the matter, and the final result was that through that thing we temporarily won some concessions for the bakery workers; and it is through that record that has been preserved that we will be able to reach the other workers in that locality.

And we have another illustration. The only place using the I.W.W. label on garments is a firm in Victoria, British Columbia. The Western Federation of Miners, the members of that organization, have carried on for the last ten years a propaganda for the label, for the American Federation of Labor label. You will find these labels advertised in the

Miners' Magazine. Every mine worker has been trained to ask for labeled goods, as the expression of the working class organization.

In British Columbia we have a garment workers organization. Near to that factory, in which I.W.W. workers are employed, is another factory in which A.F. of L. workers are employed. The I.W.W. employes are receiving about, as I understand from their secretary, and from our organizer in that district, approximately \$2 a week more wages, and they are working an eight-hour work day.

The American Federation of Labor factory works nine hours, with the A.F. of L. label, United Garment Workers' label, and their wages are about \$2 a week below those of the I.W.W. workers. That is a suggestive proposition, for the Western Federation of Miners, that caused the company to give some improved conditions to the employes. We are not in a position to say to the Western Federation of Miners, that their propaganda for ten years was for naught, that the label was no good. We cannot say that they should have abolished the label. In the western district they have had a chance to understand it, and we would be running up against stone walls, to expect that in one or two years we would be able to abolish the label.

I know every delegate in this convention, and I do not think I can exclude any one. If he goes to a place to buy cigars, he is going to take blue label cigars in preference to the cigars that are made by a trust shop. At the same time, when he patronizes that blue label he would be aware of the fact that by patronizing that blue label he is helping the labor label fakirs and he is helping them to fasten the chains upon the cigar makers of this country.

We have found that the cigar makers of this country, in the International Union, by a referendum vote, have decided that every cigar maker who is a member of the Industrial Workers of the World has been expelled.

THE CHAIRMAN: Correct. That is what they have decided.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They have decided that, by a referendum vote. And in Denver, Colorado,—if the delegate will bear me out,—the best Industrial Workers of the World, revolutionists, as well as you may be, they were compelled to beat the road, and could not get employment in any factory, except they paid their \$100 fine.

Not only this, but men who stood up for Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, in their propaganda, in the International Cigarmakers' Union, the were fined \$100, and upon their failure to pay it, it made them scabs in the eyes of the fakir-ridden Cigarmakers' International Union. We have some of those men, perhaps, in this convention.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

The only thing to upset that propaganda is the propaganda, temporarily only carried on for our own label. We can show that we are organizers. We have a medium by which we can propagate, and show that the universal label of the Industrial Workers of the World means universal solidarity of the working class. (Applause.)

I have seen disputes, have seen the propaganda carried on, during the days of the social trade and labor alliance {sic}, in the days when this very thing cropped out, and they thought that theories alone would be able to penetrate and batter down the fortress of capitalist interests. They failed to do so.

And if we abolish the label altogether, if we think that we can get along without the propaganda, for the idea that is expressed and embodied in that universal label, then we will have a harder road to travel, and many more of our men, who are members of the Cigar Makers, and members of other organizations, would be compelled to beat the road, because we cannot set up against them another label. (Applause.)

I say to you that as long as we have the red label of the I.W.W. and we have a factory of cigarmakers of the Cigramakers' International Union, we are compelled to pass an amendment by a referendum vote to expel the I.W.W. But since we abolished that practically, they are become bold, and every cigarmaker in the United States who joins the I.W.W., although he may pay his dues to the International Cigramakers' Union, is a blacklisted man and can walk the road because he is a man who fights for his principles. If we want to show the frands {frauds?} and that their label stands for craft division, that their label stands for a capitalist institution of which the label is only an expression, if we want to bring the workers together in an economic organization, we must abolish the label altogether. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Q.) All in favor of the motion to concur in the report of the Committee—

DEL. GLOVER: What is the report?

THE CHAIRMAN: To retain the label.

DEL. GLOVER: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: All who are in favor of retaining the label will say aye. Opposed no.

DEL. WALTERS: Inasmuch as I am instructed on this matter, I wish to go on record as voting against the recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Walters wants to be recorded in the negative.

DEL. KERN: I also.

DEL. FRANCIS: Francis, also.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. AXELSON: And Axelson.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would like to ask whether that means that they are voting according to their instructions or according to their convictions.

DEL. KERN: According to instructions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The Committee may have some further report.

DEL. WILLIAMS (reporting for the Committee): Here is a recommendation from Local 179: "Resolved that the General Secretary-Treasurer and the Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer shall be elected from the floor of the Convention and that they take office at once." The Committee recommends that the Constitution remain as it is.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It does not state what that is an amendment of. It is an amendment of Section 2, Article 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the recommendation of the Committee is that the Constitution stand as it is.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes.

DEL. AXELSON: I would like to make an amendment to that motion, to the effect that not only the General Secretary-Treasurer and the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, but also the editor of the *Industrial Union Bulletin* be elected in the same manner. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other provision in the Constitution that deals with that?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is it? I want to read it to see whether that is in order.

DEL. FISCHER: It is in Section 8, which states that the editor shall be elected by the Convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, this being a different Section of the Article, that properly you should move that as a motion later on or bring that before the committee, to strike out Section 8, to make it agree with Section 2.

DEL. AXELSON: It seems to me that should come under the same head. Now, as the official editor of the *Industrial Union Bulletin* is going to be elected by the Convention—I don't believe that difficulty arose last year because the Executive Board was under the control of the Sherman faction, but I can remember that for myself I did not vote on the referendum vote for the editor of the *Bulletin*.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No.

DEL. AXELSON: They did not?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No.

DEL. AXELSON: That is a point I wanted to bring up. Probably the officials could go on the referendum and be voted for by referendum in the same way as the others, and if adopted here we could strike out the other reference.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will accept that as an amendment. Of course, if it carries this does not in any way do that, but this motion that you amend would be to strike out that Section 8 of Article 2. That would be your amendment; not the whole Section, but simply the part referring to the editor of the *Industrial Union Bulletin*.

DEL. AXELSON: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The motion is that Section 2, where it states that the editor shall be elected by the convention, and shall receive such compensation as in the judgment of the General Executive Board is just an proper, shall be amended to read that the editor shall be elected the same as recommended by the Constitution Committee as the secretaries are.

DEL. KEEP: The Committee recommends that the Constitution remain as it is, do they not?

DEL. HAGENSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or it would be better understood that in Section 8, Article 2, all reference to electing the editor shall be stricken out, and that in Section 2 the words "General Secretary-Treasurer and Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer" shall be followed by the words, "And the editor of the Official Bulletin." All in favor of the amendment to the motion, namely, that the editor of the *Bulletin* shall be elected by referendum, will say aye. Opposed no. The majority has it unless a roll-call is demanded. That strikes these words out of Section 8. Now we come to the motion as amended, that the Constitution shall remain as it is, that the Secretary-Treasurer and his assistants shall be elected by referendum.

DEL. FISCHER: Does this action make the editor an administrative officer?

DEL. AXELSON: It makes him the editor.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see as it changes his position any. I do not think so. Now, you understand the motion, that the Constitution remain as it is, this Article 2, Section 2, that the "General Secretary-Treasurer and the Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer shall be nominated from the floor of the convention and the three candidates for each respective office receiving the greater number of votes in the convention shall be submitted to the general membership of the

organization for election.{"} That is before the house. We are voting upon that to remain as it is.

DEL. FRENCH: A point of order. Would this not make a national officer of the editor of the *Industrial Bulletin* by inserting those words in there according to Axelson's amendment? This Article 2 is under the heading, "Officers—now selected {how elected?} and the duties thereof," and you include in that Article the name of the editor of the *Industrial Union Bulletin*, and you thereby make that editor one of the administrative officers of this organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see what you mean by raising that as a point of order.

DEL. FRENCH: The contention was made that it did not.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: He becomes a member of the General Executive Board.

DEL. FISCHER: Not unless you change the Constitution.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I believe he should be. That is not the question but it is only that there is such an understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will come up some other time. I do not see how we can settle that now.

DEL. LEVOY: A point of order. If we change this with reference to the editor it would conflict with the officers, the Secretary and Assistant Secretary as Executive Board Members. The way it is, Section 8 of Article 2 refers to the editor only, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. I do not see where your point of order comes in.

DEL. LEVOY: By electing the editor and putting that in the same section with the Secretary it will conflict with the Constitution. He would be one of the officers, elected as one of the Executive Board members.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will read that section again. (The Chairman read Section 1 of Article 2, as to the general officers, and also Section 2.) It certainly does not come in there properly.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would suggest that this section referring to the editor, Section 8 of article 2, simply remain as it is, and that the Section 8 read this way: "The editor of the official organ shall be elected in the same manner as the General Secretary," and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: After we have voted upon the amendment you can bring that up. All in favor of the motion to concur in the report of the Committee on Article 2, Section 2, remaining as it is, will say aye. Opposed no.

DEL. FRANCIS: Would that motion or suggestion be proper now?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

A DELEGATE: Not after the motion is amended.

DEL. FRANCIS: It would square things, I think.

DEL. FRENCH: You would have to reconsider the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would have to reconsider the amendment if you want to do that. The amendment has been made.

DEL. KEEP: Instead of reconsidering the amendment, I move that the Committee that gets up the new Constitution insert this amendment in Section 8, that the editor be elected in the same manner as the General Secretary-Treasurer, and Assistant General Secretary-Treasurer. (Seconded.)

DEL. AIAZZONE: I wish to have an explanation. Does that make him a member of the G.E.B.?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, this would come in Section 8, Article 2, at page 11. Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the motion will say aye. Opposed no. Carried.

DEL. WILLIAMS (continuing the report): Here is a proposition from Locals 91 and 179 and Industrial Unions 15, 95 and 130: "Resolved, that the General Secretary-Treasurer and his Assistant have a voice but no vote in the governing bodies of the I.W.W." The Committee recommends that the Constitution remain as it is with regard to this.

DEL. WALTERS: These delegates have been instructed by these locals to bring this matter up for a specific purpose. In the first place, we have a general executive board of five and a National Secretary-Treasurer and Assistant. This National Secretary-Treasurer and Assistant have a vote on the Executive Board. Now, understand me, I do not mean to insinuate or imply anything against the National Secretary-Treasurer or at the Assistant. I am merely bringing this matter up as a precaution. Now, there is a proposition that comes before the General Executive Board of five members. This proposition, we will say, is something that is wanted to be pushed in the interest of the officials, the National Secretary-Treasurer, and his Assistant, something to their interest, something, we will say, for graft purposes. All that these officials have to do on that Board of five is to get two men with them and they have a majority on that Board and they can manipulate the whole organization any way they see fit. That is something the Industrial Workers of the World should guard against. We know that Trautmann is perfectly honest, but we may not always have a Trautmann at the head of this organization. In organizations like this where we grow we get an element in it of men who are intelligent, men who are good talkers and who make themselves good

fellows, men who get around the rank and file and are pushed into office, and then when they are in office they can manipulate this thing in any manner, shape or form they want to. That is something that should be taken into consideration. The General Executive Board of this organization is scattered about the country. They only meet here, or are supposed to meet here, once in six months. They have not met in six months in this last year. The General Executive Board of this organization in the last year never met at all, and the General Executive Board in the last year of this organization were a lot of figureheads. I mean to imply by this, not that they were not competent, not that they were not capable of carrying on the business. Every man on that Board was competent and capable. But there was not a member of that Executive Board in the twelve months between the two conventions that ever had a chance to carry on any of the Executive business of this organization. The General Executive Board was shut out by the Local Advisory Board, who carried on all the work of this organization over the head of the General Executive Board. That is something that cannot be denied. I understand that the General Executive Board members—and I think I am right, and if not I wish to be corrected—only received one proposition to act upon during six months, and that proposition came up a short time before this convention convened.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is right.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, these matters must be taken into consideration. I am opposed to a Local Advisory Board, and this matter will be brought up under the report of the Organization Committee. But I hold that it is our duty, the members who are entrusted by the rank and file to come here and represent them—it is our duty to guard this organization in every manner, shape and form. It is our duty to see that the General Secretary-Treasurer or his Assistant have no vote on this matter. It should be left to the General Executive Board themselves. The General Executive Board, when they are scattered about the country, are in communication with the General Secretary-Treasurer and his Assistant. They can carry on the work of this organization, and if anything arises, they can meet if it is necessary. If it is not necessary to meet they can be in communication with one another, and this will eliminate any chance of fraud or graft on this organization. I thank you.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Before I start to speak, I wish to make a correction. The former speaker stated that the members of the Executive Board only voted on one proposition. As a matter of fact, the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

members themselves, including the Assistant Secretary, voted on three propositions on very important matters, and every member of the Executive Board with the exception of one, voted on all the transactions of the Advisory Board. I explained my reasons and my opinions and why the Advisory Board has been created, at the last convention. This is only in the form of a correction. I may later on come back to it. But I agree with the former speaker that neither the General Secretary Treasurer nor the Assistant General Secretary should have a vote in either the General Executive Board or in the conventions. They should have a right to voice their opinions and should participate and deliberate with the delegates or with the members of the General Executive Board, but they should not have the power to vote or participate in the decisions of very vital points. I will be frank to say that this has been prompted by experience in the past. I have seen in my experience in the Labor Movement the very thing that we fear may again evolve within this organization. It is for this very same reason I thought that the general organizers of the organization, if they fully agree with the position of the organization, should have no vote at this convention, but should have a voice on all matters appertaining to the work of organizing the workers of this land. They have had experience, and they are in entire touch with the workers. The General Secretary-Treasurer himself is a servant of the organization, and nothing else. The organization has entrusted the General Executive Board with the enactment of the laws that you pass at this convention. I think the General Secretary should have no more than administrative power. He should have no executive power. No law, nothing, should pass except through the General Executive Board. They should control all transactions within the organization. I agree fully with that. That we cannot carry out this plan is due to the fact that the last convention ran from the one extreme of autocratic rule to the opposite extreme of democratic rule. That is the proposition or argument presented in the last constitution, in hope that the difficulties might be averted in the future. We tried to construct, to build upon the experience of the past, and for this reason I hold and I urge that the delegates to this convention should not concur in the report of the committee, but should concur with the proposition of the delegate from New York.

DEL. AXELSON: Do I understand that we are dealing with all the officers of the Executive Board?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Just the two Secretaries.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is that the Secretaries shall not have a vote

in the General Executive Board.

DEL. AXELSON: I think that is sufficient.

DEL. HAGENSON: A point of information. What is before the house now? I think it only deals with the election of the Secretary and Assistant Secretary.

DEL. WILLIAMS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You must have been rather occupied, for we passed that some time ago. This is a new proposition.

DEL. HAGENSON: What is the proposition?

THE CHAIRMAN: That the General Secretary and his Assistant shall not have a vote on the General Executive Board; that they shall have a voice but not a vote, and shall not have a vote in this convention, only a voice.

(Delegate Williams, on behalf of the Committee, read the pending proposition for the benefit of the members.)

DEL. KEEP: The mover of the motion made the statement that all the General Secretary-Treasurer had to get to carry a proposition in the General Executive Board was to get two other members. If they have a general Executive Board of five I think he has got to have three and not two. But if he is able to get two he will be able to get three. If he is crooked he can get more.

DEL. DE LEON: Would it not simplify matters to allow the amendment to come to a vote? Suppose the amendment is defeated, you will have to vote over again. Suppose you allow Walters to make his amendment and have a vote on the amendment, and then we will be where we would be with one vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would not making an amendment be in the nature of a negative vote? Isn't that what we were trying to guard against in the first place? The recommendation of the Committee was to be regarded as the original motion before the house.

DEL. DE LEON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The original motion is that we leave the Constitution stand as it is.

DEL. DE LEON: Suppose someone moves to amend that we do not leave the Constitution as it is, as a substitute motion for the whole?—that we do not leave the Constitution as it is in that respect, but add certain words. The object of one vote is to get the sense of the House.

DEL. WALTERS: I move to that effect, to simplify matters.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that the resolution be adopted, presented by the delegate from New York. Now, in voting aye

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

you are voting not to give the Secretary a right to vote. All in favor of the amendment will say aye. Opposed no. Carried. I want to be recorded as voting no on this proposition. Have you got anything else?

DEL. WILLIAMS: (Continuing report) We have another resolution from the same Local: "Resolved, that the G.E.B. shall meet every three months." The Committee recommends that the Constitution remain as it is.

DEL. DRESSLER: I would like to ask how much is the expense of a General Executive Board meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: That depends very largely on where they come from.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Five hundred dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean at the present time?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: At the present time, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Five hundred dollars for one meeting?

DEL. DRESSLER: I would be opposed to that. It would amount to two thousand dollars a year.

DEL. WALTERS: If I speak on this motion now, will it exclude me from speaking afterwards?

THE CHAIRMAN: You have a right to speak if you want to.

DEL. WALTERS: Then I won't do so now.

DEL. FRANCIS: There may be some who do not know why the recommendation of the Committee comes before the House, but I know there is something else coming afterward, but it would take too much time for those committees to report and read over the whole proceedings so that we might get a line on what is coming afterwards when they bring the whole thing in. If the meetings of the General Executive Board cost \$500 the recommendation of the Committee should be concurred in. I do not think that is the whole proposition. There is something else behind it, and I think when the report of the Local Advisory Board comes up, there will be the real joker. I think we should simply refer that back until we decide here on the Local Advisory Board and then we will be able to handle the General Executive Board question much better.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion to refer is always in order.

DEL. WALTERS: Would it be in order to move to refer this matter to the Organization Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a matter that belongs to the Constitution Committee.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You cannot refer it to your own committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you a member of that committee?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. WALTERS: I am a member of that committee, and the reason for doing it is that it pertains to organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would state that it would be improper to refer something that belongs to the Constitution Committee to another committee unless done by the general body.

DEL. DE LEON: As one member of that Committee I would like to have it come to the Committee. I did not know that there was a joker in it, and if there is, I would like to have all the cards. I second the motion to refer it to the Committee on Organization, that part.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will entertain the motion, and if anyone is opposed to it he will have to appeal to the House.

DEL. KEEP: I understand the motion was to refer back to the Constitution Committee until such time as we hear from the Constitution Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was the original motion, and I said we could refer it provided no one opposed. Francis made a motion that it be referred to the Constitution Committee, whereupon Walters moved that it be referred to the Organization Committee. If Francis is will to take that in his motion and refer to the Organization Committee instead of to the Constitution Committee, the Chair has no objection, provided the Body has none. Now, it is up to the Convention. If there are no objections this motion will be entertained.

DEL. FRANCIS: What motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: That the matter be referred to the Committee on Organization.

DEL. FRANCIS: I did not understand that as the motion.

DEL. WALTERS: As the seconder of the motion, I object.

DEL. KERN: I move to table the motion.

The motion to table was put and lost.

DEL. WALTERS: I move to amend the motion of Francis as to this last amendment. I move an amendment that this matter be referred to the Committee on Organization. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved to amend that this be referred to the Committee on Organization.

DEL. KEEP: A matter of information. This seems to me to make a change in the Constitution necessary, and it goes properly to the Constitution Committee, so why refer it to the Organization Committee? I would like to have some further light upon it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have stated that as the Chair looks upon it I think it goes before the Constitution Committee, but if the Committee

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

on Organization or this body have no objection I would let it go to that Committee. That was my position, as I stated.

DEL. KEEP: It seems to me this matter can be referred to the Constitution Committee, and if they don't care to report now the Constitution Committee and Organization Committee can get together and go over it, and then the Constitution Committee can make a report that will cover the case. But I cannot see why we should send it to the Organization Committee. They will have to send it back to the Constitution Committee.

DEL. DE LEON: In these matters you cannot draw the line clearly. Some things obviously belong to the Committee on Constitution and others obviously belong to the Committee on Organization. This is one of the matters that belong in either committee, as I see it. I infer as much from the statement in regard to the joker. Now, since that Organization Committee has this matter in hand with reference to the Advisory Board and you consider this connected with this matter that has come before us, and since we are not aware of anything of the sort, and were not aware of what was before us when we sent that to the Committee, we can let the Committee report and then the Convention acts upon it, and that matter is settled. What is there to refer back to the Committee on Constitution? There is nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we should vote upon it, and that will be the best way to decide. The amendment to the motion is that it be referred to the Committee on Organization. All in favor of this amendment will say aye. Opposed no.

A roll call was demanded.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the motion is carried. Unless someone demands a roll call I declare the motion carried. It is then referred to the Committee on Organization. Is there anything else?

DEL. WILLIAMS: That also includes the recommendation regarding the Local Advisory Board, does it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. WILLIAMS: (Continuing report.) We have another resolution here: "Resolved, that whereas the industrial union is the unit of organization, we instruct the delegate to secure a ruling from the convention that all initiation fees be paid into the treasury of the industrial union." Our recommendation is that the Constitution remain as it is.

DEL. AXELSON: I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: A point of information. Did you move the

adoption of the Committee's recommendation?

DEL. AXELSON: Yes.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, we have a specific reason for this in New York, and it should apply throughout the whole country. Industrial Unionism, as we understand it, does not imply merely a name or something to send a lot of organizers throughout the country with—a whole lot of different ideas on industrial unionism. Industrial unionism implies a systematic form of organization, and we in New York have a systematic form of industrial organization. Now, I am going to take up the building trades in New York, so you will understand what I am driving at. In the building trades in New York, Industrial Union No. 95 is divided into branches. These branches elect delegates that form a general committee of {the} industrial union. That is the unit of organization. The function of the general committee is to carry on the agitation of the industrial union and perform the functions of the union and carry on all the routine work as well as the organizing work and so on. Now, there is one incident in New York, and that is this: While we have this form of organization the branches, or some of the branches, absolutely refuse to turn over the initiation fee to the general committee, or unit of organization, the industrial union. They keep that in their branch and they tied them up in such a manner that the industrial union can have no funds to carry out its functions. I will give you an illustration, in Local 95, we have a portion of that Local, as we have in most all industrial unions, that are men that are trying in every manner, shape and form to build up the building trades in New York. They are hampered for want of funds. While some of these branches hold in their treasury money to the extent of \$150, other men in the organization are continually digging in their pockets, depriving themselves and families in order to carry out this work. Industrial Union Local No. 95 has put an organizer in the field. They are paying this organizer \$18 a week, and he is showing results. The burden is borne by a very few men in that organization for the reason that they can not get at the treasuries of the branches. The men in that union, especially in Branch 4—twenty-seven men have carried that burden now for thirteen weeks alone, and for two weeks alone, and for two weeks they had the assistance of Local 15 of the Machinery Local, Industrial Union. They have contributed five dollars. Now, these twenty-seven men for thirteen weeks bore the burden of \$18 a week besides getting out literature to aid the organizer, besides carrying on other work, besides hiring halls and doing the whole work of the organization. Am I not right, Trautmann?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, that is correct.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, that being the case, such a thing should not be allowed. The industrial union is the unit of organization. The initiation fee of the branches should go into the industrial union, and the industrial union then would be in a way to carry out its agitation work, and keep the organizer in the field. If this motion does not carry, the organizer must be discharged within a week or two at the best. They can no longer carry this burden on their shoulders. You understand that the men in the building trades, although they make \$4.50 to \$6 a day in the east or in New York at least, yet these men do not work continually; they do not average more than seven or eight months a year. Consequently their wages are not so high as you would think by the amount that they receive a day. Now, you know that is a burden on the men. You also know that it retards the growth of the movement. Therefore I hope that you will in your wisdom in this convention, decide this matter. This is the most important resolution that we bring up. I have been given specific instructions from five different locals, and they told me not to come back if I did not get this through. I hope this matter will carry. It will facilitate matters for us, and it will facilitate matters for all the industrial unions throughout the country and enable the money to go into the general committee of the industrial union.

DEL. DE LEON: I would be very sorry indeed if Walters would have to stay away from New York. I listened with much attention because this matter interested me, being there in New York. But I failed to hear from him one argument for bringing such a thing before this convention. He should have first shown some clause in the Constitution, or some regulation that he demands a ruling on. He does not ask for a ruling. He asks for a change of the Constitution. We are here to legislate for a constitutional body. He should have first shown that the Constitution as it now stands interferes with the proposition that he wishes to see enforced. He has not done that. I think I am somewhat posted on the Constitution, and in view of the fact that the building trades question was one of the burning questions at the last convention—I refer Delegate Walters to the stenographic minutes—in view of the fact that that was one of the burning questions, the Constitution was framed with an eye to that. What are the facts that Delegate Walters has mentioned? If we allow ourselves to be drawn into legislating in such cases there will be no end of legislation. What are the facts mentioned? There is a building trades union. That building trades union consists of branches. One of these branches is

affluent. Other branches are less so. These branches send delegates to a central committee of the union. The central committee appointed a walking delegate at a certain salary. Thereupon one of the constituent bodies of that union refused to pony up, refused to support that delegate. Only five dollars could be extracted from them. That would simply mean that that organization has failed to organize in the proper way. The Constitution now as it stands would compel these various branches to surrender to that central body the monies that they have paid. If that central body is not paid those monies it is not the fault of the Constitution, it is the fault of those who organized them in that way. Now, Walters says that unless we do as they want and amend the constitution as they want it they will have to dismiss their organizer. I say that if things stand in that way in the building trades local, that the organizer will have to be dismissed anyhow, because if we should fall into the error of piling on ⁸{amendments to the Constitution at the de}mand of this and that body there would be no end. It follows that that branch will, the moment we have a new constitution, simply secede. A body that is framed as Walters says, and as I infer from what he said, that body is not going to buckle under. It has been wrongly organized. It is not a branch body, it is an excrescence, it is a warped body, it is a tumor. I say that a branch that refuses to obey the orders of the union as represented by the delegates, that branch is not going to submit to you, but is going to secede. We should establish the precedent that every weakness in the local is not to be cured by a special constitution. It is for this reason that the committee decided that the constitution should remain as it is.

DEL. FISCHER: If I am not mistaken, that recommendation or amendment was sent in by these locals for the reason that there were no by-laws which governed the industrial union. What we want now is some by-laws to work under. When you go to any locality and organize an industrial union the men you are bringing into the organization ask you, "How shall we be governed?" After you have your industrial union established in the large centers it becomes necessary to organize branches. Are there any provisions in union branches? Not at all. These resolutions were drawn up by the industrial union in New York, Local 130. They were based on the ruling or constitution adopted in this organization that the industrial union only shall be organized in one locality. After that it became necessary in New York that we consolidate several organizations, in some instances five and six under

⁸[One line is missing at this point.—R.B.]

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

one heading. Those organizations naturally belong to the building trades. We have painters, paper-hangers, carpenters, {structural iron workers, and so on. You see, it is simply a craft organization. According to the convention proceedings we have to have one industrial}⁹ union. Now, as the convention decided that only one industrial union shall be organized, it was logical that that industrial union should be the governing body, not alone in matters concerning industrial development, but that it should be the governing body of the finances of the organization. Now, when you attempt to go to the industrial union—

THE CHAIRMAN: Brother Fischer, it is now five minutes to six, and I have an announcement to make, and if you are to speak longer than six o'clock I would ask you to stop here.

DEL. AXELSON: I move that he be given time to conclude his remarks.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, it will be so understood.

DEL. FISCHER: When you take in any member in any industrial union it is logical, it is in accord with our form of organization and with the spirit of our preamble, that these men do not go into a branch, but become members of that industrial union. The industrial unions carry on the propaganda. Now, how are you going to get the necessary finances to do that work when the treasury in Chicago is continually depleted? If this plan had been adopted or the plan we are proposing in New York, the industrial organization would have been in a position not to send begging letters to Chicago asking for an organizer to come and work; we could have done the work ourselves. You must understand why these men are revolutionary; 75 per cent at least have little to pay into the organization, and that is the reason why there is no money in the treasury, and when you come for the per capita tax they cannot pay it. This is not a sentimental proposition. This is a so-called business proposition. They get the money in the industrial union, and we cannot get along but simply appeal to give us something. It becomes compulsory. That initiation fee complicates the case, and there is no question about it. We have a ruling established in some of the organizations in New York City that works all right and there is no kick, and that is that they must not pay in the transitory period. You take men before you organize them and tell them that these are the rules and they come in under these rules, and you have the money. That is what you need to carry on your propaganda. I do

⁹[Bracketed lines inserted upside down in the form.—R.B.]

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

not care what the rest of the people may say. Hundreds of letters are received continually in the General Secretary's office asking for an organizer. We in New York discarded that. We take the money from the general headquarters and get along ourselves. That is the proposition with which we are going to help ourselves, and we have got results. Otherwise we will always be begging money from headquarters where there is none.

DEL. KEEP: Do I understand that this matter is settled?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. KEEP: I would like to ask as to this clause in the Constitution that the initiation fee of members of local unions shall not exceed one dollar and shall be held in the treasury as a general fund to defray the legitimate expenses of the Union, doesn't that mean that the treasury of the local union is not the treasury of the branch? Therefore the initiation must be turned in to the local instead of to the branches, and the Constitution covers that.

The hour of six o'clock having arrived, the convention adjourned until 9 a.m., September 20th, 1907.

FIFTH DAY—FRIDAY, SEPT. 20, 1907
MORNING SESSION.

The convention was called to order by Chairman Katz. The roll was called by the secretary, and showed the following absentees: Caminita, Finnigan, French, Huber and Jones.

Delegates Foote and Levo called attention to some corrections to be made in the printed report of the proceedings. A motion was carried that if there are any corrections to be made in the future, they be called to the attention of the committee on revision.

COMMUNICATIONS.

The following communications were read by the secretary:

From Omaha Union No. 86, as follows:

“Fellow Workers: We regret to report that our elected delegate, F.H. Alexander, could not be present at the convention on account of financial limitations. Recruiting Union No. 86 sends fraternal greetings to this the third annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, wishing the convention the full measure of success. We must stand for the solidarity of the working class. We must know our class and understand our class interests, as such knowledge will lead to class solidarity and complete the revolution. We must deal with the fakers and traitors to the working class as we dealt with them at our second convention. Our slogan should be, ‘No compromise, but the unconditional surrender of the capitalist class.’

“Yours for industrial freedom in our time.

“FRED KISSEL,

“A.L.A. SCHIERMEYER,

“F.H. ALEXANDER,

“Committee.”

Also from Thurber, Texas, local, as follows:

“Thurber, Texas, Sept. 16, 1907.

“Dear Comrade Trautmann:

“As there will come to Chicago as delegate Ludovicu Camanita of Paterson, N.J., editor of the paper, *La Questione Sociale*, and he being one of the more influential men among the Italian miners in Thurber and surrounding camps, his paper being so widespread and read by nearly all in this section of Texas, according to my view, he would be the very man that could awaken the dormant workers of this part of

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

the land. It is due to him that we have the fortune of having one local here in Thurber and one in Lyra. I am convinced that if you would influence the delegates to the convention to send him as an organizer, he being half way here and the expenses being therefore reduced accordingly, he would do a splendid work and revive the already born spirit of revolutionary unionism, and if ever the I.W.W. have spent money for a good cause it would be in sending him here for a few days. I could tell you many other things which would show the great necessity of having him here, but I think it is unnecessary. Hoping you will do your best to enable us to obtain such an organizer, I remain,

“Truly yours,

“F. PIETORIA.”

Communication referred to the committee on organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is the reports of committees, standing and special. Del. Fischer was on the floor at the adjournment.

REPORT OF CONSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEE.

DEL. WALTERS: A point of information. I would like to have the matter that is before the house, the motion, and if there is an amendment I would like to have it read.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I believe the matter referred to the paying of initiation fees into the local treasury. The resolution is: “Whereas, The industrial union is the unit of organization; be it resolved, that we instruct the delegates to secure a ruling from the convention that all initiation fees be paid into the treasury of the industrial union.”

DEL. KEEP: What is the recommendation of the committee?

DEL. WILLIAMS: The recommendation of the committee was that the constitution remain as it is.

DEL. WALTERS: Is there an amendment to this recommendation?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not remember.

DEL. WALTERS: I move to amend, that this matter be referred to the grievance committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded as an amendment to the motion, that this matter be referred to the grievance committee. That means that this question is referred to the grievance committee in order to get a ruling from this convention. What is desired is not an additional clause in the constitution or amendment; it simply desires a ruling to interpret something which is in the constitution already. Are you ready for the question?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. FRANCIS: I do not know what this means. I fully agree with what Fellow Worker Williams said last night. It is not for the purpose of getting a ruling from this convention, but through our speeches to get the delegates on record, because they know the recommendation will be carried. But we will be on record by the speeches so that when they go back to their industrial locals, having a divided crew and not willing to submit to discipline, they won't keep up their locals. I want to tell you right here, no matter what you say here or what the debate or speeches, it does not mean anything of the kind. What is an industrial union? It is so that local matters may be brought to this convention. You have got to get together in the way the bosses get together; that is the way you have to discipline your industrial unions. Del. Walters belongs to Local 95. I belong to Local 59. We also have an industrial union, and I can tell you right here that with any such strict enforcement, and such strict interpretation of the constitution, when the members of the committee itself do not agree, if it is not willing to agree it will never do. In our industrial union we have a local requirement that a branch, a subordinate part of the industrial union, shall pay a dollar or two dollars initiation fee, and if you put this interpretation on the constitution the chairman of the central committee of the branches will get up and say that this constitution means so and so. I will simply say that I can not concur in the recommendation of the committee, and the delegates from New York will not be able to go back to New York and get the industrial union to be willing to submit to the discipline which is essential in this organization. The reason is because they have got the different elements in those unions. Those locals were formed during the time of Sherman, who was trying to issue as many charters as he could so that his favorites could get a commission on them. There is no reason to doubt that. In due time they will have to do as De Leon said, get out or submit. They won't be coming here and kicking, and you won't have to send someone to enforce the ruling. I tell you, let us concur in the recommendation of the committee and let us leave it to the membership, according to their intelligence and according to their realization of what industrial unionism means, for enforcement.

DEL. PINKERTON: Fellow Worker Chairman and Delegates: I want to be set clear on this proposition from New York because of the fact that we are likely to be confronted with a similar proposition in Chicago. If I understand it the industrial trades union in New York—is that the trade?

DEL. DRESSLER: Industrial union.

DEL. PINKERTON: (Continuing) The industrial union of New York is composed of various trades as a component part of that industry, and that one general union is supposed to have jurisdiction of this industry. In becoming a part of this industry are these locals allowed to take in under the constitution applicants and charge them an initiation fee as designated under the general constitution?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. PINKERTON: Now, it appears to me if we are to make a decision on this position that it is assumed here at the present time by the delegates from New York, that these locals, in conformity with the provisions of the constitution that we have given them now, would say "We do not need to charge any initiation fee at all, and we are not going to contribute this \$5 to the general union, and we will take in the membership for nothing." I want to be set clear on that position. If that is the position, then I do certainly vote for the constitution remaining as it is. But if all applications were to pass through this general union and this general union was to support the local unions for their hall rent and other actual necessities of that kind, that is to assist them in starting the movement—I do not presume they are going to pay for every month or anything of that kind—then, perhaps, I might be in a position to favor what the delegate from New York stated.

DEL. HAGENSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, there is no question but what some regulation is needed in reference to the relation of the industrial union to the branches, but that regulation should be that the industrial union could receive the initiation fee seems to me not to be the proper thing. There would rather have to be some regulation in reference to the dues, for the simple reason that you do not know whether you will have any initiation fee or none, and for that reason I believe it would be the proper thing to refer this to the constitution committee to provide some regulation in reference to the revenues of the branches and locals of this organization.

DEL. KEEP: In reference to Section 4, Article V, it seems to me that these branches are simply co-ordinated or a conglomeration that act as integers or integral portions of this union instead of acting in the manner intended. Now, what is the difference between an integral and a mass organization? The integral portion of the organization wants to go on its own hook; the mass organization wants to go somewhere else. Here is a consideration covering that case. If you have the integral part of the organization—if that is the right term; I do not know the English of it, but I think it is in here—then the subordinate

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

branches acting co-ordinately can accomplish more than the individuals can accomplish; so that under this clause of the constitution these co-ordinate branches shall act together instead of acting on their own hook as a mass, and collect their dues accordingly.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish first to protest against the use of the words by Walters when he asked for a ruling. A ruling upon a clause indicates that the clause is doubtful. If that clause were doubtful the committee on constitution would have found it necessary to legislate. Now, that clause is not doubtful, and consequently it is not a ruling that they are after. They came here with a grievance, I think a justified grievance, and if we allow in the stenographic minutes any such thing to go in on objections that what we have done here is to give a ruling on the subject, then we have implied that the constitution is not clear enough.

Now, as to what Francis said, substantially that was correct. But he made a point about another matter that was wrong. He said he was in favor of adopting the report of the committee on constitution, which implies that he is against the motion to send this over to the grievance committee. Now, the position that I hold is that the motion made by Walters this morning is an amendment, not a substitute motion at all, and that if the amendment is carried you will have to put the motion as amended, and that what we should do, what I shall do, is to vote in favor of both, to vote in favor of the motion to send this to the grievance committee, and thereupon vote to sustain the recommendation to concur with the recommendation of the committee, and in that way both things are accomplished. If I understood Francis correctly, he would vote against sending this to the grievance committee, where it should go; he would simply vote for ignoring a state of facts which these men have brought out.

Now, as to the matter of how the constitution stands and what is an integral part of it, it amounts to this: A union consists of all the members whose labor converges towards the production of a certain thing. The men in an establishment which produces the merchandise bread are all members of one industrial local union. Whether they are working at rolling barrels, or at making apple pies, or at making loaves of bread, or at scrubbing the floor, or at heating the factory, their labor converges towards making bread, and they all belong to the union. An integral organization means not an organization of fractions; it means a combined organization of all these men so that they will all move as one man and act as one. The craft organization divides the various branches I mentioned into autonomous bodies, and an integral industrial union is impossible under those circumstances. We organize

them so that the rollers of barrels—I do not know if there is any such subdivision, but there is a bread factory not far from where I live, and I see so many men engaged in rolling barrels that I suppose that there must be some craft of barrel rollers—under this principle, whatever craft, whatever special department there is, is in a separate union. Under the integral form of organization every single individual in that factory belongs to one union, the Bakers' union. But since they have specialized information they have divided them into barrel rollers and bread kneaders, so to speak, and the rollers will constitute a branch. Yet they are all members of the Bakers' Union, and the treasury of that Bakers' Union is the treasury of every one of these branches.

That is an integral organization. It is called integral because the action of one man becomes the action of all. It is not of the paralytic nature of craft unionism, in which one branch moves and the rest remain unmoved. When last year's convention was in the throes of struggle we had it from New York that complaint came that Sherman was interfering with this matter of organization. Now a complaint comes here against what the men are doing, showing to me that our brothers of New York have failed to do what we are finding fault with Sherman for not doing. They should have struggled to organize in the proper way. I do not mean to rebuke them. I understand from what Fischer said that these men came in from pure and simple unions. Surely we should not refuse raw material and give it a chance to become a part of the Industrial Workers of the World. You have got to get the men in and educate them, instead of coming here and asking us to amend the constitution—because that is what it amounts to—by piling regulation on regulation. I want to warn this convention against piling up these so-called rulings or additional clauses in reference to central principles. I suppose more than one of you was a member of the K. of L. Do you remember the result? The constitution consisted of the interpretations of the general master workman until it became a book four times this thick. (Holding up book.) In other words, the constitution should be the constitution, not the interpretation of the constitution. We should stick to the central principles that were clear enough to the rank and file. It is our duty to make it clear to them, and when in New York or anywhere else raw material is brought in it is the duty of the unions in that locality to instill our principles into the minds of those men. Let them do that kind of work, and if they can get any assistance from us, very well, let us give it to them, but not in a way that would accomplish more harm than good for the convenience of some one locality.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

I therefore strictly urge on this convention that it sustain the amendment proposed by Walters and seconded by myself, that this be referred to the grievance committee. The grievance committee is not to enact a new constitutional clause, nor does it proceed to give a ruling. Let them report, and let us carry that motion or adopt or concur with the recommendation of the constitution committee which emphasizes the fact that we do not need any further legislation upon this principle.

DEL. WALTERS: Just a few words. This matter, in my estimation, was never supposed to go before the constitution committee. It is a matter simply asking for a ruling on this clause in the constitution. Industrial union 95 thoroughly understands the constitution and agrees with that clause, but this branch takes exception, and Local 95 has made and enacted by-laws that cover that point as well. This branch, Number 7, do not agree and will not live up to the by-laws of the industrial union; that is the point to be considered. This is merely in the sense of a grievance. We wish an interpretation put on the constitution or on this clause, so that all industrial unions—we do not mean merely to make this a local matter; we mean to have this ruling be the ruling of the whole Industrial Workers of the World in this matter.

Now Branch 7 of Number 95 is willing, if we get this interpretation, to abide by it. But if the convention will not give a ruling on this clause in the constitution, as we desire, then we will not only have this state of chaos in New York, but you will have it throughout the whole country; you will cripple the industrial unions; your industrial unions will be without funds and they cannot carry on the agitation and the organization work of the union. For that reason I hope this matter will be referred to the proper committee.

DEL. FRANCIS: May I ask a question of Delegate Walters?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. FRANCIS: The question I want to put to him is: He mentions the by-laws of the local industrial union. Who makes the by-laws?

DEL. WALTERS: The by-laws of the local industrial union were made by the local industrial union itself.

DEL. FRANCIS: You cannot make a motion then.

THE CHAIRMAN: You asked a question and got an answer. We will now come to a vote if there is no further discussion. All in favor of the amendment to the motion that this matter be referred to the grievance committee will say aye. Opposed, no. Carried. Is there anything further to report?

DEL. WILLIAMS: I will say, Fellow Worker Chairman, that that

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

practically completes the work of the constitution committee up to date. We have some other important matters that will be reported on later.

DEL. LIESNER: I think there is a mistake there. There is another resolution coming from one of the locals I represent, to be acted on there.

THE CHAIRMAN: They will report on that later. This is simply all that they have acted upon so far.

DE. LIESNER: All right.

DEL. FOOTE: I would like to ascertain, with regard to the rules of order, when all the reports of organizers are to be read and the report of the organization committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the organization committee would be next in order, I believe. I think that is second. No, I see by the rules that the committee on resolutions is next.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER.

DEL. HAGENSON: I want to make a motion before we proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Upon what? Go ahead.

DEL. HAGENSON: My motion is, to reconsider our action in reference to the recommendation of the local 43, Buffalo, New York.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: What about?

DEL. HAGENSON: It is in reference to the departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: How did you vote on that question?

DEL. HAGENSON: I voted in favor of it; in favor of our action at that time.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. What was the action?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That the constitution stand as it is.

DEL. HAGENSON: Yes, that was the action.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the motion seconded?

DEL. AXELSON: I seconded the motion.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: A point of information. Is the seconder supposed to vote in favor of that motion that has been passed already? Suppose the seconder votes in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: How did you vote, Axelson, on that proposition?

DEL. AXELSON: That is more than I remember.

DEL. HAGENSON: There was only one vote recorded against it.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And that is the vote of Delaney. It is so recorded in the records, if I remember right—one vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right; we will let it go.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. HAGENSON: Now, I consider this a very important question, but I consider it was not given just consideration, and for this reason bring it up. The department, in my judgment, is a thing that is very dangerous. I think from the experience at the last convention we should have already enough of departments. The constitution provides for thirteen different heads of the departments, as you may call them. Now, that means that each one of these different departments, their officers, from the secretary down, are in closer relation with each other than are any other parts of the organization, or of the whole organization, and for that reason, if the secretary of one of these departments is a crook and desires to form a ring through this department for any purpose whatsoever, it is an easy matter to get organizers such as he desires to have, and also officers through this department, and through that in an easy manner he can control that department in such a shape that the first thing you know you have another department withdrawing from the Industrial Workers of the World. For that reason, it looks to me as something very dangerous. I believe the present way of working in the way of chartering the locals directly from the headquarters is the proper way of doing. You probably will argue that these various departments, owing to their industry, owing to their covering the whole of the industry, are the most suitable and are needed in order to carry out things beneficial to the department. But all the industries are so closely related, and it is working class solidarity that we need. If it should be that there is any part of any industry that requires action of national interest, let the part of the industry present the case to the whole of the working class and not to part of the working class. It was argued in favor of the departments here at one time that they wanted a department organized in order that in case the national head went wrong, in case the whole of an organization went wrong, that they were still able to stand and have an organization of their own. Now, this certainly shows that it will only lead to a clash sooner or later, and for that reason I believe that these industrial departments are but little better than your international craft unions. For instance, the bricklayers will want their international craft union in their own interest, and so will every other craft union. What we need is something that will bind the working class together into a solid organization; but I want to build up an organization that I expect to stand, and not an organization that will blow to the four winds of the earth by the time we have built it up.

DEL. KERN: I move to lay the motion on the table.
(Seconded.)

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to make a motion you cannot make a speech yourself. A motion has been made and seconded that this be laid on the table. All in favor of this motion will say aye: opposed, no. The motion is carried. We will now hear from the committee on resolutions.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. FRANCIS (chairman of the committee on resolutions): We have a resolution from Mixed Locals 91 and 179, and Industrial Unions 95, 15 and 30, as follows:

“Resolved, That we instruct our delegate to ask convention to congratulate Australasian socialist on the action taken by the socialist federation of Australasia in endorsing the preamble and accepting the necessity of the Industrial Workers of the World.”

You committee submits the following resolution:

“Whereas, We, the delegates to the third annual convention of the I.W.W., assembled this 20th day of September, at the city of Chicago, Ill., note with pleasure the results of the industrialists’ efforts at the unity convention of the Australian socialists in bringing about the endorsing of the preamble of the I.W.W. as adopted at the Chicago convention, July, 1905, by the said convention, and acknowledging the necessity of the I.W.W., therefore, be it

“Resolved, That we do hereby invite them and the workers of the world to take part in organizing and pushing to its final conclusion the Industrial Workers of the World.”

DEL. KERN: I move to concur in the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not necessary.

DEL. KERN: That is understood?

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation of the committee stands as the motion. What is your pleasure?

The recommendation was unanimously carried.

DEL. FRANCIS (continuing report): Recommendation from the same locals, 91, 179, 15, 95, 130. The resolution reads as follows:

“Resolved, That the I.W.W. take part in the proposed convention of advanced and industrial economic organizations called by the Western Federation of Miners, but that no decision arrived at by that convention shall be binding upon our body until ratified by referendum vote of the I.W.W. membership.”

The committee recommends as follows, that the same be adopted

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

with the following addition:

“Be It Further Resolved, That in case the Sherman clique are recognized as a fraction of the I.W.W., our delegates are hereby instructed to withdraw at once from said convention.”

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I think perhaps a little explanation may avoid a lengthy discussion on the subject. Above all, the Western Federation of Miners' proposed convention can only be held if the rank and file of that organization ratifies the action of the convention of the Western Federation of Miners. That proposed convention was to be held through the United Mine Workers, the United Brewery Workers and the Industrial Workers of the World. The Industrial Workers of the World have not received an invitation to participate. The United Brewery Workers have received an invitation to participate, and their Executive Board, in a session held on September 5, or 6, has practically decided to ignore that invitation or lay it on the table, for the reason that the United Brewery Workers have made application to be reinstated in the American Federation of Labor, and have elected five delegates to represent them at the next convention of the American Federation of Labor. The United Mine Workers as an organization can only participate with the understanding that the agitation of industrial unionism among the coal miners must be stopped. The United Mine Workers knows that our propaganda has practically shattered to pieces the machine of craft unionism, and the officers of the craft unions know that they will lose their positions if we continue our propaganda. Whether the United Mine Workers of Illinois, or District No. 12 will participate I do not know, but if they do they will participate on the same lines as they did in the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. There were there six delegates from the United Mine Workers, representing 65,000 miners in the State of Illinois. They were given the floor; they were given a voice and a vote at the convention, and when it came to ratifying the action of the convention, when it came to the point of installing the organization as an integral part, the United Mine Workers' delegates simply voted against installing the organization in the I.W.W. and tried simply to destroy the work of that first convention. You will have identically the same condition if another convention shall be held. I am safe to say that the so-called Sherman faction has been invited, but we never have receive any communication. The Brewery Workers have received a communication, and their delegates to one of the central bodies in this city—which can be verified by the delegates to this convention—have

already announced in that central body that their executive board have decided to have nothing to do with any proposed convention which would start a rival organization against the American Federation of Labor. Is that correct? Wasn't that the report to the central labor union of Chicago?

A DELEGATE: Correct.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Now, here are the conditions. Even if the Western Federation of Miners ratifies by referendum vote the action of that convention, there will only be here the delegates from the Western Federation of Miners and perhaps a delegate or two from the so-called Sherman faction. If this organization sends delegates to that proposed convention, in case the referendum carries they will be confronted with the same situation as were the delegates from the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance at the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. Those who were at the first convention perhaps had a chance to look behind the scenes. All the transactions behind the scenes have not been brought to light as yet, nor were all the actions of the Manifesto Convention or conference brought to the knowledge of the workers, a knowledge that they should be entitled to and that will be given to them when the proper time arrives. But in that very same convention of the Industrial Workers of the World there was behind the scene{s} a propaganda started to keep the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance delegates out from the convention, and it is for that very reason that A.M. Simons stated upon the floor of the convention—and it can be verified from the minutes of the first convention. The Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance delegates came there with power to make the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance an integral part of the I.W.W. That was the question put and that was the answer by the delegation, that they came there with the power to install. And in answering the question it was understood that the Trade and Labor Alliance should abide by all the rulings of that convention. They had already pledged their word as delegates from the alliance to become a part of the I.W.W. and participate in all the deliberations and ratify and enact and enforce among their membership the actions of that convention. As a matter of fact, when all the records of the organizations were put before us there were just about 3,000 members of the American Labor Union in the I.W.W. We have left them nothing but a nucleus of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance as a start for this organization. There were represented at the convention of the I.W.W. 1,400 men. When we went over the books we found 1,200, and they ratified the action of the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

first convention and became an integral part of the I.W.W. One of the unions had only seven members; today it is one of the largest organizations in the I.W.W. Likewise other organizations that had been a part of the American Labor Union were found to have twelve members, while today they have about 1,000.

Now, if we go into that convention, if the convention should be held, the first question that will be put to the delegates of the I.W.W. is this: "Will you abide by the decision of this convention, and will you abide by the action of the convention, immaterial of what the rank and file says?" If you are ready to do so, go into the convention with the same delegates that were present at the first convention of the I.W.W. from the United Mine Workers who were known grafters and fakers. Well and good; you will be swamped by the delegation that comes from the United Mine Workers; you will be swamped by the delegation from the United Mine Workers and you will be swamped by the delegation from the Western Federation of Miners, because there is not a solitary man except Haywood, among them who is known as being a revolutionist. If you are ready to go into that convention and be swamped, well and good. If you give up the propaganda for uncompromising industrial unionism, within two years from now you will have to go through the same experience you went through a year ago. (Applause.)

DEL. KERN: As a member of that committee I would like to be made clear before this convention, for I see all those forces at work, but as my local union instructed me to vote that way I had to vote, and that is why I voted with the committee to concur in that.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: In regard to the action taken in the convention held some time ago of the Western Federation of Miners, you know that there was an element there which proposed to hold a convention, I believe, in the city of Chicago, the first of October, in which they invited to participate the United Mine Workers, the Brewery Workers and the Industrial Workers of the World, never stating which part of the Industrial Workers of the World, but leaving you to guess at that.

DEL. DE LEON: There is only one.

DEL. AXELSON: There are two on paper. I hold that there is only one, but you have two on paper, though the outside world is not familiar with that. Now, what is the reason? Why do they advocate a proposition to hold such a convention when they recognize and know that there is an organization representing industrial unionism and all its principles as well as any organization can represent them? Why have another one? If they believe in industrial unionism, if they are

sincere, they would not go to work and advocate such a convention. It is only because of the traitor, of the betrayer, of the misleader of the working class, that they advocate such a policy. That ought to be clear to any man here. Consequently we as the Industrial Workers of the World, as Trautmann has set out and clearly pointed out, if we go into that convention with all those reactionary elements while we are revolutionary in mind and action, what will we have to do? Being a small minority, having to submit to the rules and decisions taken by this convention, we will be snowed under so we won't know what we are. If we do that, all we will have to do after the convention has adjourned will be to go and form a lot of groups again and start a nucleus of an industrial organization once more. I say that is our position and that is what we want to save ourselves from. We have right now the nucleus of an industrial organization. Let us stick to that and stick to the uncompromising principle of working for and advocating working class solidarity, and I tell you that as long as we do that we will find them with us and the other fellows will have to come to us in the end. We don't care if we have not millions of workers with us. What we want to care about now in the constructive period of the Industrial Workers of the World is that we are correct in accordance with industrial and economic conditions and that we go on educating the working class, advocating the right principles, and in the end it will result in our benefit and in the benefit of industrial unionism such as we are advocating now.

So I say to you, fellow delegates, who are going to vote on this proposition, vote not to participate in that convention, because if you do you have gone to your doom, you have gone to your destruction, and if you want, and believe in, industrial unionism, you will have to go through the same experience that we have once been through before. We ought to learn by the past; we ought to be guided by experience in the past, and now let us take this lesson; let us beware of participating in such a way as to render us helpless. That is my position, and I hope you will all vote in favor of not going into that convention.

DEL. LIESNER: As a member of the resolution committee I want to state my position in order to make myself clear. When that proposition came up I did not favor taking a part in that convention, for the reason that we were not invited and I understood that the other element, the so-called I.W.W., were invited. But it occurred to me that perhaps I might be mistaken, and by adding these words to the resolution, "that in the event of the Sherman element being recognized our delegates

would retire," I thought perhaps that would avoid any possible mistake. But the discussion that has taken place here this morning has cleared my mind as to several points, particularly the statements made by Fellow Workers Trautmann and Axelson. I now feel as though I should withdraw my support to that resolution and shall vote against participating in any manner with the former speaker.

DEL. AIAZZONE: Inasmuch as we have not received any invitation, I think all this discussion is out of order.

DEL. SPETTEL: Of course, it is. It is wasting time.

DEL. DE LEON: The fear expressed by Trautmann that if we participate in that convention we shall be swamped by the votes of the corruptionists is not a fear that I share. On the contrary, theoretically and by experience, I know that the reverse is the fact. My experience in the labor movement, in which I have been very regularly in the minority in all such instances, has confirmed for me the deep philosophy of an anecdote told of classic times. There was in Greece a celebrated general called Epaminondas. He was as celebrated as a military genius as he was a thinker and a philosopher. On one occasion, as his army stood facing the army of the enemy, night came upon them, and both rested on their arms. Epaminondas took his shield or sword carrier along with him and started to reconnoiter, and presently they got beyond their own lines and got in among the enemy. The shield or sword carrier of Epaminondas drew near to his master and whispered, "Sir, we are among the enemy." Epaminondas whispered back, "Oh, no, the enemy is among us."

Do you remember that first convention of the I.W.W.? And again I wish to refer Delegate Axelson to the stenographic minutes, and do not propose to have anything that is private information. The revolutionary element was a slim minority, and yet we know that that revolutionary element won out. It is idle to imagine that in a mass convention the majority are absolutely crooks. It is with such bodies the same as with society at large; there is a small progressive element, a larger reactionary and correct {corrupt?} element, and in between them is a mass of unleavened element, and the revolutionary element can always leaven that mass. And so, at the first convention we won out so completely that they claimed it was done by trickery.

Then came the second convention. You know what happened there. They had been organizing ever since the first convention adjourned. Trautmann tells me that he had not quite left the hall when they were already holding caucuses as to how to settle our hash, and instead of our hash being settled, theirs was settled. You know that as far as the

majority was concerned we would have been out-voted, but it was the votes of that middle element that leavened this mass. Sound argument, properly advanced, correctly pushed and otherwise proceeded upon proper lines, will in nine cases out of ten carry the day. That has been my experience, and consequently I do not share the conviction of Trautmann. And as a proof that my experience is correct, the fact stated or indicated by Aizzone, that we did not get an invitation shows that they have at last found out that a majority of crooks do not count against a majority of straight men. They have not invited us, and since we have not been invited it is not a question of whether we shall go or not; it is a question now whether we shall appear and be kicked out. Having the experience that they have, they would be simply idiots to accept us, not having invited us. We won't have an opportunity of being there.

When the proposition was made in the convention of the Western Federation of Miners, those of you who read the article I wrote upon it in *The People* will remember I said, "Blessed be the peacemaker." I always have understood their proposition differently from what it has panned out. I read it by the light of a letter I have in my possession written by William D. Haywood as to where he stood on the subject, and he stood unqualifiedly for having nothing but contempt for that man who could speak of the ballot as a "paper wad," as did Sherman. In that letter he refers to that element as the 22-calibre men, and used other classic references to those men. He was about to be acquitted, as I confidently expected, and I interpreted that proposition by the light of that letter, and so interpreting it I could not have resisted an invitation to the so-called Sherman element. It would have been an effort to show that there was no purpose to agitate the situation, it being an attempt to show that while both elements came together nothing worse could have happened to the so-called Sherman element than to be invited, because we knew there was none of them to go. (Laughter.) But for whatever reason, I care not now, the invitation has turned out to be something else from what I interpreted it, and from even what the letter of the proposition justified us to infer. The way that proposition has been handled by the element of the Western Federation of Miners which has been hobnobbing with Mitchell, which has been getting ready to endeavor at least to get the miners into the A.F. of L. while attempting to see if Gompers cannot be induced to leave the A.F. of L. so that they can come in without having to compromise themselves—that element is suited to imagine that we were against Gompers, and as such, being against Gompersism, that

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

element realized that we object to Mitchell as much as to Gompers, for the reason that Gompersism is Mitchellism and Mitchellism is Gompersism. That element of the Western Federation of Miners which is back of this convention is not there to make peace; that element is not there for the purpose of harmonizing at all. That element is there for the purpose of sandbagging the working class, and the fact was undenied on the floor of the Western Federation of Miners when it was documentarily proven that the acting president was a director of one of the wildcat gold mines of Goldfield, Nevada. One man said that "while I was in Goldfield, Nevada, it was shown to me that out of 700 shafts, or carry shafts, as they call them, there were very seldom any that were legitimate, and the others were nothing but wildcat affairs."

Now, when such elements are in charge, when such elements introduce a proposition and then are left in full charge of carrying it out, with the promise that was held out to the working class, or to those of us who are closely watching it, contained in that letter of William D. Haywood, when those are belied, what is there for us to discuss; what is there for us to do? We surely won't go there because we are not fools enough to attempt to go where we won't be received. It is not in their hearts to receive us. They won't receive us; but I disagree with Trautmann; we know that if the revolutionary I.W.W. men went there we would mop the earth with them. We have done what is for the best and will continue to, and consequently, I hope that the motion will not be entertained in the minds of the delegates, but not for the reason given by Axelson. He says we should not go, that we should vote not to go, that that would be very undignified. The recommendation of the committee is that under certain circumstances we do go. Now, I for one shall vote not to concur, and shall vote against the motion to concur. We have not received an invitation and the action of the men in charge of that affair proves to us that there was no intention, and there is at least no intention now, of establishing harmony upon the only basis on which harmony can be established, namely, the solid foundation of industrial unionism. We should not concur with the proposition. No invitation has been sent, and as far as I have any information I do not know that they have sent any to Sherman, but if anyone knows that they have sent any to Sherman, that is an additional proof that they have rendered themselves a collection of crooks for the purpose of deceiving, to the extent that they can, public sentiment. Now, they cannot do it. When this convention adjourned last year they had the whole press of pure and simple unionism, Socialism and capitalism to lie about us. The papers

had pictures of Sherman, and said that they were all and we were nothing, and we know that that is nothing on that side. When those men extend an invitation, when those men stand for false principles, there is nothing there and they know better, then we have been warned. It is not an accident that no invitation was extended to us. No invitation will be extended to us. For this additional reason I mention, I shall vote not to concur with the recommendation of the committee.

DEL. FRANCIS: Fellow {Worker} Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, wait a minute. Is there anybody else who wants to speak on this question?

DEL. SPETTEL: I would like to say that within twenty-four hours after that proposition of the Western Federation of Miners was received in St. Paul every member of our local knew how every delegate here should vote, and I knew as soon as I read it how I should vote. I am not here to get the advice of any delegate here on how to vote on that. They ought to kick me out if I don't know how to vote on it. What is the use of wasting time on this? They will be making a doughnut brigade out of this affair before they get through with it.

DEL. FRANCIS: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: While I do admit that if the committee had had all the information at hand that has been given here this morning, perhaps this recommendation would have run off smoothly in the committee, the fact remains that what the committee based its action on is publicity, and we believed that when we sent a delegation of square, sincere men, such as we are supposed to have—and we have them, no question about that—who want to go there and appear before that convention, they can defend our side and by putting certain conditions in the recommendation we felt that we were protecting our side.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I move the previous question.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we come to a vote. All in favor of concurring in the report of the committee say aye.

DEL. DE LEON: I ask for a roll call.

DEL. FOOTE: What is the report of the committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

DEL. FOOTE: I simply want a brief statement of the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are voting to concur in the report of the committee. Do you want the recommendation read?

DEL. FOOTE: No, I want just a brief statement of it.

DEL. FRANCIS: For the benefit of those who want the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

recommendation read, it is as follows:

“Resolved, that the I.W.W. take part in the proposed convention of advanced industrial organizations followed by the Western Federation of Miners, but that no decision arrived at by that convention shall be binding upon our body until ratified by referendum vote of the I.W.W. membership.”

And we state the following recommendation:

“Resolved, that in case the Sherman clique are recognized as a faction of the I.W.W. our delegates are hereby instructed to withdraw at once from said convention.”

DEL. KEEP: Let us vote it down unanimously.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will please call the roll. I want to explain how to vote so that it is not afterwards said the delegates did not know how to vote. Those who are in favor of not sending any delegation there to take part in the deliberations will vote no; that is, not to concur in the report of the committee. Those who are in favor of sending a delegation or representation there to take part will vote yes.

DEL. FOOTE: I desire to ask a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

DEL. FOOTE: The question is how did the referendum terminate in the inside of the Western Federation of Miners, or is it known?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not known. It was defeated in Butte, we know that.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It was defeated in all the locals of British Columbia. I have their votes over in the office.

The roll call was then called by Secretary Trautmann, and before announcing the result of the ballot, the following explanations were made by the delegates as to the reason for voting as they did:

Delegate Delaney announced that in view of his instructions he desired to be recorded as not voting.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Trautmann and Haggerty cannot vote.

DEL. WALTERS: I wish to go on record as voting yes, inasmuch as I am an instructed delegate to vote that way.

DEL. FOOTE: I would like to explain my vote no, on the ground that I am not conversant with the conditions on the inside of the Western Federation of Miners and do not know what the effect of this referendum was upon the membership, and consequently cannot bring myself to any determination upon their will. But as far as this convention is concerned, I passed here last night and saw over the door here the word “Vaudeville.” I hope that the headquarters in Bush

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Temple will not have over its door the word “Vaudeville.” (Laughter.)

DEL. LIESNER: I take the same stand that Delegate Foote takes.

DEL. KEEP: Mr. Chairman, I voted no, because I don’t care what they do. (Laughter.)

(Secretary Trautmann then announced the result of the ballot as follows: Total number of votes cast, 123; 105 voting no, and 18 voting yes.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to concur in the report of the committee is lost. The chairman of the committee on resolutions will proceed with the reading of the further resolutions.

DEL. FRANCIS: The next is a resolution from mixed Locals 91, 179 and Industrial Unions 15, 130 and 95, on so-called political action:

“Whereas, the I.W.W. recognizes the necessity for political action on the part of the working class of this nation; and

“Whereas, There does not as yet exist in this country a true and direct political reflex of the I.W.W.; and

“Whereas, We hold, as Marx has stated, that ‘Only the economic organization (trade union) is capable of setting on foot a true political party of labor, and thus raising a barrier against the power of capital;’ be it therefore

“Resolved, That we instruct our delegates to bring before the convention a resolution calling upon the Socialist Labor party of the United States and Canada and the Socialist party to disband their organizations so that the field may be left clear for the I.W.W. to create its own political party—the political reflex of the only true economic organization of the working class; and,

“Whereas, Said two political parties meet in national convention in 1908, be it further

“Resolved, That we instruct our delegate to use all in his power to have the I.W.W. convention place said proposition before said parties not later than at their coming national conventions in 1908.”

The committee recommends that said resolution be tabled.

DEL. AXELSON: I second that recommendation,

THE CHAIRMAN: I don’t know whether I am right or not, but I believe that if the committee does not approve of a resolution, why we need not go to work and read the whole thing. If it recommends that it be tabled, as the chairman of that committee, I will simply say that a resolution to such and such an effect from New York was not concurred in, and that the committee recommend that it be tabled.

(The question was then put on the motion to table the resolution and it was carried.)

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. FRANCIS: We have a further recommendation from Locals 91, 179, 95, 15 and 130, which reads as follows:

“To ask convention to instruct General Secretary-Treasurer to write the Socialist Federation of Australia, urging them to do all they can toward founding a continental division of the I.W.W. there, and offering whatever assistance we can give them for this object.”

The committee recommends as follows: That this resolution be tabled.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: What is that resolution?

THE CHAIRMAN: The resolution is, that we request the Socialist party in Australia to do all they can towards founding a continental division of the I.W.W.

DEL. AXELSON: I move that it take the same course of procedure.

DEL. KEEP: I would like to know whether that committee made the motion that they table this resolution themselves, or whether this is a recommendation to this convention that it be tabled.

DEL. FRANCIS: That is right.

DEL. KEEP: This simply was a recommendation for this convention to table the resolution, and that is open to debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation of the committee is the motion.

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes.

DEL. KEEP: No, the recommendation is the motion, and then the advisability of doing what they request, it seems to me, is open for debate. Now, if they can bring in here—I am simply making this point of order, you understand, not talking about this matter at this time—but if they can bring in here a recommendation that it be tabled, I do not see that that goes as a motion to table which must be adopted. Their recommendation is simply the recommendation of the committee, and if that action was pursued it would choke everybody off from saying anything, for if every other resolution they have there was recommended to be tabled, under that ruling it would shut off all debate.

Now, I want to know whether they did that in their own committee, or do they make a recommendation to this convention that we table it. If that is the recommendation they make, the point of order I make is, that that recommendation is open to debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would decide that the committee on resolutions should bring in any resolution which they do not favor, that they should simply say that the committee does not concur in the resolution, and then we can do what we want to. I realize it is not

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

properly a part of that committee's action to bring it in in the present form.

DEL. KEEP: I move that it be tabled.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. FRANCIS: There was a motion before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was not seconded.

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes, it was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair did not hear that seconded. If anyone wants it seconded, it is proper that they do so now.

(The motion received several seconds, and the question being put, it was carried.)

DEL. KEEP: Now let us have a ruling before the next matter comes up from this committee. Is it understood that the motion is simply to concur in the recommendation of the Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will not accept from the Committee on Resolutions any recommendation to table. They either recommend the adoption or they recommend the rejection of a certain resolution.

DEL. DE LEON: I make another point of order. The motion to table indicates hostility to the motion that is proposed. Now, the Committee recommends adversely and the motion is made to table, and if that motion is carried, it means that we are hostile to that proposition. My point of order is that a motion to table is not in order when the committee recommends adversely. As it stands now we are all committed that the convention is not in sympathy with that resolution, that all of us do not favor it, and that is not so.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee will proceed with the next recommendation.

DEL. FRANCIS: We have another resolution from Mixed Locals 91, 179 and Industrial Unions 95, 130 and 15, which reads as follows:

“(1) To ask convention to investigate the excessive charges by organizers for meals and hotel bills.

“(2) To ask convention to expel organizers found guilty of overcharging or graft.”

The recommendation of the committee is as follows: That said resolution be returned to those locals as no definite charges are attached to said resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will stand as the motion of that committee. That is the motion before the house. What is your pleasure?

(The question was called for.)

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. LEVOY: There was a lot of discussion about this in my local. I believe I would sooner not have it referred back to the Local, but on the contrary, I think somebody should take it up here, for the simple reason that we should, in my opinion, give the organizers in certain localities a certain amount of wages, \$4 a day or \$5 a day, or \$3, or whatever it amounts to, and pay his railroad fare. When we do that, and pay the organizer \$25 or \$20 a week, I do not see why he should get his meals and wages and railroad fare and other expenses. They are working for wages just the same as we are working in Schenectady, and I do not see why the organizers should charge up meals at 20 cents, or 30 cents, or 50 cents. I believe we should give him a certain amount of wages and then if he wants to buy a meal and wants to pay \$1.00 for it, or \$.25, or \$.15, let him do it.

Therefore, I think this should be referred to a committee to investigate, and I believe that we should give the organizers a certain amount of wages and his railroad fare, and no more. I make a motion that this be referred to a committee, with that recommendation, and that will end the matter, that will settle it once for all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, your motion is not clear.

DEL. FISCHER: I move that this matter be turned over to the Committee on Organization.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been recommended to refer this to the Committee on Organization.

DEL. KEEP: Fellow Worker Chairman, are there any definite organizers mentioned, or any definite charges made?

THE CHAIRMAN: None at all.

DEL. KEEP: Then how can you refer something that is not definite to a committee for action? Delegate Levoy here makes a statement that he knows that men have done these things, but who has done it?

DEL. LEVOY: All of them. (Laughter.)

DEL. KEEP: Well, that is something definite.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I hope that the amendment will prevail to refer it to the Committee on Organization. I deny absolutely that any one of the organizers of the I.W.W. have grafted on this organization. The very fact that that suggestion is brought out is indirectly a charge of grafting. I would be frank and to the point. I think the Committee on Constitution has a right to go over all the reports of the organizers, and they will be prepared today, and when they find anyone has charged excessive amounts as mentioned in the remarks of the former speaker, that committee will be ready to make a report about it and

then the committee can take up the matter on the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Pinkerton has the floor.

DEL. PINKERTON: Fellow {Worker} Chairman and Delegates: The delegation is here to be enlightened a good deal on the conditions existing in the different parts of the country. Now, I could not agree with Delegate Levoy that a standard should be set for the national delegates of five or six dollars a day, because that standard would give the delegates in some parts of the country an opportunity to live off of five and ten cent meals, when if you were to drop into Needles, California, or some of those other places out there, that same representative, who would be getting a standard of four or five dollars a day, would have to pay 75 cents and \$1.00 for his meals. Consequently I could not agree with a standard of that kind at all. I just simply mention this on account of its being referred to the Committee of {on?} Organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment to the motion is to refer it to the Committee on Organization. Is there any further discussion?

DEL. FRANCIS: I want to speak for the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to inform the chairman of the committee that he has the privilege to speak upon the question, but if he hasn't anything to say, that it is not absolutely necessary.

DEL. FRANCIS: You don't know what I have to say, Mr. Chairman; leave that to me. I hold that this should be referred to the Committee on Organization, if there is anything to it, but experience has taught us that this kind of resolutions sent in to bodies such as this, do not bring good results. This is too indefinite, why don't they name the organizers, say it was Tom, or Jim or somebody else?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Levoy says it was all of them.

DEL. FRANCIS: I hold that you should simply concur in the recommendation of the committee and send it back to them. If they want to go to work and put themselves on record by sending ridiculous things here, in my opinion we should as least have the satisfaction of sending it back to them. It is a ridiculous idea to talk of referring it to other committees. What can they do with it?

I cannot see why Fellow Worker Trautmann should go to work and try to pile up work on the other committees. I think that is wrong, because it hasn't any leg to stand on; and as to paying fees to the organizers, that comes under a different head. But, in the present instance we should teach the local that this convention is not going to accept any such kind of White Cap assertions, and that is the only position for this convention to assume.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will explain why I made that remark, if the Chairman will permit me.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment that this be referred to the Committee on Organization.

(A viva voce vote leaving the Chairman in doubt, a vote was taken by the raising of hands, and the Chairman declared the motion lost.)

DEL. FISCHER: Fellow Worker Chairman, some of the delegates here represent ten votes and some of the other delegates only represent one.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is your privilege to call for a roll call. I told you that before.

(Cries of "It is too late.")

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not too late, at all. The vote will be by roll call.

DEL. FRANCIS: That is just wasting time.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Do you want a roll call on that question?

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

(Cries of "No.")

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the rule of roll call?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It depends on the rule laid down.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was the rule at the last convention?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It required that three delegates support the motion for a roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of a roll call will raise their hands.

DEL. WALTERS: Point of information. Does the delegate of the General Executive Board want a roll call?

THE CHAIRMAN: He has just as much right to demand it as anyone else.

DEL. WALTERS: No, I say, does he demand it?

DEL. FISCHER: I would like to have a roll call.

(The motion for a roll call not being supported by a sufficient number of delegates, the Chairman declared it lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we have the original motion.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to go on record as having voted no on the proposition to refer, because I am emphatically opposed to an action that is very common to the labor movement, to make indefinite and unsubstantiated charges, and I am opposed to buzzing.

(The question was then put on the motion to concur in the report of the committee, and it was adopted.)

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. FRANCIS: The committee wish to say that that is all they have at present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then I will go to the next committee. Delegate Haggerty is the secretary of that committee.

DEL. HAGGERTY: I believe the chairman has the data and he will kindly read it. Brother Henion is the chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: If that committee is not ready to report, we have something else that we could take up now, and it would be under the reports of officers; the report of the editor of the *Industrial Bulletin*.

DEL. HENION: The Ways and Means Committee is ready to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The editor may have something to report which may be referred to some of the committees, and since some of these committees have not reported, I think it would be proper to hear his report at this time and if there is no objection, the editor of *The Bulletin* has the floor.

DEL. FRANCIS: I wish simply to ask, since the precedent has been established, inasmuch as the Treasurer's Report and the General Secretary's Report have been omitted here, the reading of them, should we not do likewise with this report?

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to tell the delegates that the report of the General Secretary appeared in print, and the report of the editor did not appear in print, so we want to hear it read at this time.

(Editor Edwards submitted the following report.)

EDITOR'S REPORT.

To the Delegates of Third Annual Convention, Industrial Workers of the World:

Fellow Workers:

The morning of October 4, 1906, found the official representatives of the Industrial Workers of the World without means of communicating with the members or local unions; its journal, *The Industrial Worker*, together with all records and subscription list of the paper, had been seized by the reactionaries, who sought to perpetuate their inglorious rule over the organization for another year. It was only after the lapse of many weeks that anything approaching a working record of local unions could be restored. The subscription list of the *Industrial Worker* has never been completed, although efforts were made continually to get in the names and addresses of old subscribers. The names, when received, were placed on the subscription list, some six to eight hundred having received all

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

publications issued. Many of the old subscribers, recognizing our difficult situation, promptly sent in new subscriptions for anything that might be printed, so eager were they to obtain reliable information. The need of some medium of communication with the membership was pressing and imperative, owing to the false and groundless reports which were started and given currency in papers representing the Socialist party, the Western Federation of Miners, as well as in capitalist newspapers, all equally vicious and misleading. The General Executive Board therefore decided to publish, as occasion required and finances permitted, a bulletin of information, to be mailed to local unions and individual members, as far as they could be reached.

The first of these bulletins was sent out October 6. It contained a truthful narration of the intolerable conditions that prevailed in the convention and the necessity for the action of the loyal delegates, which resulted, to the benefit of the organization, in the separation therefrom of the reactionary element. This was followed by the printing of three other bulletins at intervals of two or three weeks, a total of some 40,000 being put out. There is no question that these occasional publications were material aids in bringing the organization out of the chaotic state into which it had been lunged by the reactionaries.

The very valuable services rendered to the organization during those days, and since, by the *Daily People* of New York should not be overlooked or forgotten by loyal industrial unionists. While we were assailed by an avalanche of abuse, and every act of ours was misrepresented with a mendacity unequalled in the American labor movement, the *Daily People* was practically alone among the entire working class papers, in the English language, to give us a square deal.

Other papers, in different languages, which have consistently aided our cause and thereby earned our support, are:

Graham County (Ariz.) *Advocate*.

People's Press, Chicago.

Il Proletario (Italian), Philadelphia.

Nepakarat (Hungarian), New York.

Arbetaren (Swedish), New York.

Der Arbeiter (Jewish), New York.

Ragione Nuova (Italian), Providence, R.I.

Giornale Aurora (Italian), Houston, Tex.

Arbeiter Zeitung (German), Cleveland, O.

Questione Social (Italian), Paterson, N.J.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Il Lavatore (Italian), Pittsburg, Kan.

Three publications have recently appeared which are supporting the organization and industrial unionism. They are the *Nevada Workman*, of Goldfield, Nev.; *The Labor*, the latter a Japanese advocate which says "we organize for the Industrial Workers of the World." It is published at San Francisco. Also, the *Industrial Worker*, Nome, Alaska.

In February of this year preparations were made for publishing a weekly paper, and this appeared in the first week of March, with the name of *The Industrial Union Bulletin*. The organization is to be congratulated on the results of this venture. It is one of the unmistakable proofs of the working class spirit and growing class consciousness which animates and binds the membership of the Industrial Workers of the World. Its success is a complete answer to those who had so confidently declared that the I.W.W. was dead and that there was nothing left of it since the act which separated an incompetent and reactionary clique from revolutionary industrial unionists was accomplished. It is also a sufficient refutation of the falsities contained in the report of the Socialist party of America to the Stuttgart Congress. The notable fact is that *The Industrial Worker*, prostituted for a few months to the ignoble purposes of the reactionaries is dead, while *The Industrial Union Bulletin* lives and has supporting it an ever-increasing number of workers who are loyal to their class interests, and, consequently, to their own press.

The Industrial Union Bulletin literally circulates around the world. It goes to England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, France, Sweden, Roumania, Hungary and Australia. We are now printing 7,000 copies per week, a number nearly equal to the list of the old monthly at the time the convention of last year assembled. Of this total, 3,700 are individual subscriptions, and 2,800 go to supply bundle orders. The average circulation of the paper, including sample copies and exchanges, for the first twenty-six weeks was 6,800.

The General Secretary-Treasurer's report gives in detail the financial account of the paper, and shows a total of \$1,885.86 received. The receipts for the paper could doubtless be materially increased by the organization of a systematic canvass of the shops, mills, factories and other places of exploitation.

Very much of the space of the paper has necessarily been used for printing official matter. There is some opposition to the inclusion of such reports in a publication which, it is contended, should be given up entirely to a propaganda of principles. It seems to me, in this

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

connection, that one of the most commendable, as it certainly is one of the most distinguishing features of the I.W.W., is, that it had nothing to conceal from its membership; that it gives in almost minutest detail reports of what its officials are doing. This policy should be continued, if not in the columns of *The Bulletin*, then in a special report printed monthly or quarterly, as this convention or the proper officials of the organization may determine. The use of *The Bulletin* for official reports has saved the organization large sums of money. Whether economies in this respect would be more than counterbalanced by the sole use of the paper for educational purposes should be decided by the convention.

I recommend that the subscription price of the paper be retained at 50 cents per year, and that no deviation be made from that rule, believing that members of the working class who can be induced at all to subscribe will as readily pay 25 cents for six months, or 50 cents for a year, as 35 cents for the longer period.

There are some requests for the issuance of subscription cards, similar to those used last year for the monthly journal. Our experience with subscription cards last year was unsatisfactory. A large number of cards sold and sent to headquarters were never accounted for, thus compelling us to supply the paper to the purchasers of cards at a loss. This was due mainly to the fact that the cards, having passed out of the seller's hands, no record remains and the transaction is forgotten.

I recommend that for the purposes of a systematic canvass the local organizations be supplied with receipt books containing a stub, insuring a record of each transaction, to be retained by the canvassers.

In conclusion, it is interesting to note that, while we are now receiving an average of over 100 subscriptions a week, if this number is doubled and there are sent 200 yearly subscriptions, the entire expense of producing *The Bulletin* will be practically covered and the general fund relieved from the deficit which it now necessarily bears.

I have endeavored at all times to conduct the paper in such a manner as in my judgment would best serve the general interests of the organization. If in doing so individuals have felt that any injustice was done them, I can but assure them of the entire absence of intention to wrong any single member of the organization.

Respectfully submitted,
A.S. EDWARDS, Editor.

(At the conclusion of the applause which greeted the reading of the report, Delegate {sic} Edwards continued as follows:)

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. {sic} EDWARDS: My attention is called to an omission in the list of newspapers that are supporting this organization. It is one, however, of such recent starting that I had entirely overlooked it. It is the Nome *Industrial Worker*.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Can I wind up the work of the General Executive Board before this convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute. According to a former ruling, the report of the *Industrial Worker* {sic} will go to the various committees. That is all the action necessary to take on our part, and if there is not objection, it will be received and so ordered.

DEL. LIESNER: Why not settle that right here and save time? I see no reason why it should go to any committee whatever. I believe we ought to vote to concur or receive the report and approve it.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The report is received, Delegate Liesner, and there are several recommendations in that report. There are recommendations as to the price of *The Bulletin*, there are recommendations as to other matters which will go to the committee on press and literature. That is what we have that committee here for, and the Chair will rule that he will receive no other motion at this time.

ADDITIONAL MINUTES OF THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I desire to read the last minutes of the General Executive Board, to wind up our minutes.

(Secretary Trautmann then read the additional minutes of the General Executive Board.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the minutes of the General Executive Board. What is your pleasure?

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Workers, in regard to one item in that report, it seems to be the same old nigger again, that no man as an organizer representing the Industrial Workers of the World shall go out unless in full accord with the preamble. Now then, the question comes up again, what is the interpretation of the preamble, and what is the ruling of this convention?

DEL. KEEP: Point of order on that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. KEEP: I understand that these reports of officers and of the General Executive Board are to go to the various committees for recommendation later, and that action need not be taken now.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. AXELSON: Is that right?

THE CHAIRMAN: On a former ruling it has been established that all reports of officers go before the committee, as well as the reports of organizers. This has been done in the past and will be done in this case also.

DEL. FRANCIS: In the matter of the minutes, I move you that the minutes be received and approved.

(The motion was seconded.)

DEL. KEEP: We are not the Executive Board, and we cannot say about those minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendations in the minutes will go to the various committees. The report will be received and the recommendations therein will go to the various committees.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now is the Committee on Ways and Means ready to report? Fellow Worker Henion, are you ready to report?

DEL. HENION: I am all ready, Fellow Worker Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. The Committee on Ways and Means will report now.

DEL. HENION: Here is a resolution from Local 86 of Omaha, Nebraska:

“Whereas it being necessary that every member of the Industrial Workers of the World should receive a copy of the *Industrial Union Bulletin* in order to keep posted on the work and in full touch with the movement; therefore, be it

“Resolved, That our constitution be so amended at our next general convention as to provide a per capita tax of 5 cents per month per member to the general office in addition to the 15 cents per capita to general fund; said 5 cents to constitute a publishing fund and the *Industrial Union Bulletin* be sent in bulk to each local according to the number of members reported in good standing each month.

“Carried, April 30, 1907, after being read at three regular meetings of Local 86, I.W.W.

“Fred Kissel, Rec. Sec.”

The Committee reports, after carefully considering this resolution that we recommend that the *Bulletin* be supported by individual subscription for the present.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will stand as a motion before the house. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. LEVOY: Fellow Worker Chairman: I am instructed to vote for that resolution for the simple reason that in Schenectady we charge half a dollar. That is, we charge \$1.50 initiation fee to the members, with the understanding that they pay a yearly subscription for *The Bulletin*. A lot of them claim that a man will get it and will not read it. Now, we can have yearly subscriptions, but I think it is necessary for the members to read *The Bulletin*, and I know the working class in America read something, and if they pick up a *Bulletin* they will get some knowledge out of it, and so if you let them subscribe for *The Bulletin*, where there is a membership of 1,000, possibly, in the I.W.W., 100 will get *The Bulletin* and the rest won't know anything about it, and if they get it I believe they will read it some time. So I would be in favor of not concurring in the recommendation of the Committee.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: I am a good deal of the same opinion as Fellow Worker Levoy in regard to this matter. As the resolution suggests, five cents additional per capita tax will be taken out for the purpose of establishing a publishing fund, and for the purpose of sending out papers to the Local Unions. Sending out papers in this way, a number of papers will be sent corresponding with the number of members in the Union in good standing.

Now, all members of the Union are not always in good standing, and the same members are not always in good standing, and consequently we are supposed, as I understand this, to give this paper to those men who are in good standing. Now, a month from now this man who got the paper and was in good standing, possibly may not be in good standing and consequently he does not get any connecting idea of the movement.

So I hold that the recommendation inserted below this clause of deducting 5 cents, should be adopted, and for the present that we instruct members to subscribe for *The Bulletin*. When you have subscribed for *The Bulletin* as an individual you have it coming to you week after week, and there is no hitch; there is no week where it puts you out of possession of two or three copies, or even one copy, which in a good many cases loses you the trend of what was published in the paper before, so that you do not understand all that is going on.

Therefore, I hold that it behooves every member, if you believe in the Industrial Workers of the World, that you should subscribe to *The Bulletin*. We have on our emblem the three stars. I understand that is interpreted to mean, Education, Organization and Emancipation, and

if the members of the organization believe actually in that, their first duty as industrial unionists is to subscribe for the *Industrial Union Bulletin*, because without that *Bulletin* you cannot carry on your education, and without that you cannot formulate the right organization, and without either of the two you cannot accede your emancipation.

Therefore, I hold that every member as an individual should subscribe for *The Bulletin*, and then all difficulties will be erased and foreign to us.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Will the chairman permit me to ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: How about our foreign reading members? We have about four thousand of them and they cannot read English.

DEL. AXELSON: I will say in regard to that, being on the committee of literature and press, we recommended that all papers published in any foreign language that has been mentioned—we don't know the languages, we don't know the paper—but we said all papers which were advocating industrial unionism, we suggest that you subscribe for them. So that covers that point.

DEL. KEEP: The locals, or at least those with which I come in contact, do urge their respective members to subscribe for *The Bulletin*. It is an enormous expense upon the organization, or would be an enormous expense upon the organization, if the proposition should be carried out that every member should receive the paper. Take, for instance, in the western country, where you have a large floating population, where the members are coming and going continuously, and you would find in these locals a bundle of *Bulletins* piled up, unsold and unread, and it is absolutely ridiculous to endeavor to furnish every member with a *Bulletin*.

The proposition of a subscription is the only practical proposition upon which we can get the readers. Otherwise you will have your *Bulletins* piled up unread.

It is the duty of the members of the respective locals to urge the members who belong to those locals to take out subscriptions for *The Bulletin*, and to urge all those with whom they come in contact to do likewise, but to try to forward bundles of *Bulletins* in proportion to the membership of the local is ridiculous, because you will have them piled up there unread and undisposed of.

Therefore, I think the only practical proposition we can work on is the subscription by paying for it individually, each member paying for

his own subscription.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman, I want to add just a word to what Fellow Worker Keep has said, from my own experience.

Now, in the lumber district, where I have been working for the past year, we have in those camps, members of the organization, who are constantly shifting; they may stay a week or a month in a particular camp where they are working, and then they drift to some other camp. Now, if you subscribe for *Bulletins* to cover the membership in good standing in your local, you will find those men receiving the *Bulletin* perhaps for a week or two, and then going somewhere and not reporting the fact that they have changed their residence, and the paper does not reach them.

Now, the organization is paying for a paper that does not go to the subscriber, the member who is supposed to receive it.

Furthermore, my experience teaches me that we have got to depend upon the individual subscriber. The men who will subscribe for *The Bulletin*, as a rule, will read *The Bulletin*, but the man who will not subscribe for *The Bulletin*, who has it sent to him, may read it or he may not read it. We cannot depend upon him. We can only depend upon that membership which voluntarily wishes to educate itself, and I believe the experience with the movement generally teaches us that we have to depend upon voluntary subscriptions.

DEL. FRANCIS: There is one point which has been overlooked; this resolution, as proposed by that local, means simply the giving of money to the express companies and to the postals, and having all kinds of dead weights on the hands of the secretaries of the respective locals. Delegate Trautmann raised the point about the foreign element. I for one cannot see the reason for passing such a recommendation and then compel the foreign element, the element in my local, for instance—they cannot read *The Bulletin*—compelling them to take *The Bulletin*. How can you ask a man to take a paper if he cannot read it?

Now, I for one hold that we should continue it as it is, but it does not prevent any local, or any branch of a local presenting such a motion as this local in Schenectady has presented. When the members want to deduct as an initiation fee the subscription price, that is a proper effort and that can be done; but simply to make a general resolution as is presented here, of sending *The Bulletin* to every member, would merely mean the giving of a lot of money to the express companies and the postal companies, and I am against it.

DEL. SCHWEND: I am in favor of concurring in the report of the committee, for the reason that I am convinced, from practical

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

experience in this line, that their recommendation is for the best interests of the organization.

Now our local some time ago, after we got in line again where we properly belonged, sent in an order for fifty copies of *The Bulletin*. They came to our financial secretary-treasurer in one bundle. We meet every week on Saturday evening. *The Bulletin* is published on Saturday, and the result is, that meeting on Saturday evening, we get our *Bulletin* for that week about Tuesday of the next week, so that our membership is always in the position that *The Bulletin* is a week old before our membership has a chance to get it. That is one objection that I have to this bundle proposition.

Another objection I have is, that our membership is scattered around the town and the vicinity of the town, and we never have a full attendance at our meetings. While we have a very good attendance, considering our number, there are a number of members who are unable to attend the meetings more than once a month, and the result is that the membership, although we have a bundle of fifty *Bulletins* coming every week, do not get the benefit of the instruction that is contained in *The Bulletin* for the reason that they have to attend the meeting in order to get the papers, or they have got to hunt up the financial secretary, who has that bundle in his keeping, in order to get it.

Now, if we had individual subscribers, if we had fifty individual subscribers there in our local, each one would receive his *Bulletin* regularly and get it more promptly through the postoffice, and I believe that the educational advantages would be vastly greater if we had individual subscribers than as it is, although we try to avail ourselves of all the benefits we can from that bundle proposition. We have the bundle brought in at our meetings and every member there gets one, and those that remain, we see to it that they are distributed, given away. We put them into the hands of the pure and simple trade unionists as much as we can, and I want to say that the result has been gratifying, and I think it will not be long before we can go out among the simple and pure trade unionists, the old line craft unions of the A.F. of L., of Anaconda, and be able to get subscriptions for *The Bulletin*, but that does not alter the fact that this bundle proposition is not what some people would have us believe it is. I believe we should concur in the report of the committee.

DEL. AXELSON: Can I offer one suggestion?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Cole has the floor.

DEL. COLE: I wish to say in regard to this matter of *The Bulletin*,

this is the way that Local 17 handles this: When we take an application for membership to the Industrial Workers of the World in our local we just take enough money to give that man a subscription to *The Bulletin*—50 cents. We tell him what it is for, it costs him so much to join the organization, including one year's subscription for *The Bulletin*, and that don't deter them at all.

Then we have his application and he has got *The Bulletin*. That is the way we work it out there in Local 17, and it can be worked that way in every local union; just make it a part of the initiation fee and it settles the whole question.

I agree with the fellow worker here that we would be in the position he speaks of. A part of our members are on the Illinois Central next winter, and a part of them are on the Rock Island, and it would be absolutely impossible for more than a portion of those members to get to a meeting more than once a month, and those men would only get one *Bulletin* and miss three, and it would be of no use to them.

For that reason alone I am against the sending out of *Bulletins* in a bundle. Every local union attached to the organization should simply think *The Bulletin* a part of the initiation fee, the yearly subscription a part of the initiation fee, and that would make the whole thing as plain as day.

DEL. TRAINOR: In regard to the *Industrial Bulletin*, I concur in the report that Fellow Worker Levoy has just stated here. We find in the city of Paterson that almost every branch that is attached to our union subscribes to a bundle of *Industrial Bulletins*. The consequence is, that when they come there to a meeting, whatever number there is in that meeting it is handed among them, but the remaining part of the *Bulletins* are left on the table and eventually you will see them stacked up in the corner, and that stack of *Bulletins* then is of no use to anybody.

Now, when Local 22 became a part of this organization, we decided that it was necessary, in order to educate or help to educate the membership of that local, that there should be in the hands of every member of that organization an *Industrial Bulletin*, so we finally drew up a resolution in the meeting that we should charge \$2 initiation fee and 50 cents of that initiation fee would go as a yearly subscription to *The Industrial Bulletin*, and then have that *Bulletin* sent to the members' houses, so that they could not get away from not taking it, and when it is in the house, and some time or another those people will read it, if they only read a part of it, they will read it, and I think that would be the proper course to pursue in regard to *The Bulletin* in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

order to get it in the hands of the membership of the organization.

DEL. AXELSON: Can I offer a suggestion?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask a question: The whole local subscribes at one time, don't it?

DEL. TRAINOR: As soon as we take an application for membership, as soon as that application is paid, we subscribe for an *Industrial Bulletin* for that applicant.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They send the postoffice address in, I believe your local does, and we send it right to the house.

DEL. TRAINOR: Right to the house and not to any official.

DEL. AXELSON: The suggestion I want to offer has not yet been covered, and it is this: that the suggestion that every individual become a subscriber does not compel him to be such, and another thing is, in every local union, if they can dispose of an extra bundle they can order them sent to the headquarters if they want to. I think that covers the ground except the sending of *The Bulletins* where they do not know whether they can dispose of them or not. In this way every local takes it upon itself to see that they are used to carry on the propaganda.

(The previous question was moved.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute.

DEL. LIESNER: I agree with the proposition of individual subscriptions, and also agree with the initiation fee containing the subscription for one year's *Bulletin*, and I only want to say for the benefit of those who argue that they stack the *Bulletins* up in their local meeting rooms, that that is a neglect on their part, and I want to call their attention to it, because that paper is published for the purposes of propaganda, and you are neglecting your duty in the propaganda by leaving them stacked up there. (Applause.) I want to tell you that I do not leave them stacked up in my home. They go out; everything I get goes out when I get through reading it, unless I want to preserve a copy of it for some certain purpose.

DEL. TRAINOR: I would like to answer that question raised by the gentleman. I did state that there was a stack on hand and I still claim there is a stack on hand, but, remember, in those organizations and those branches every individual is not an active worker. There are a few active members in each of those organizations and branches who have got to carry on practically all the work that is done in them. Now, here is an additional piece of work that you want to stick onto these people, and I say that by providing for a subscription in the initiation fee you will abolish that, and those *Bulletins* will be used and will be

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

read, because when a man gets it in his home and reads them he will naturally take them out and give them to somebody else.

DEL. KEEP: If this motion is adopted, that does not prevent them getting bundles if they want to get them, and it does not prevent them doing the other thing, so what is the use of discussing these minor points?

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be left to the local union. That is it. There will be no further debate. There is a recommendation of the committee that the matter be left as it is, be left to the local union. All in favor of that motion say aye.

(The motion was carried.)

DEL. LEVOY: I vote no, for the reason that I am so instructed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, has the chairman of the committee on ways and means any further resolutions or recommendations?

DEL. HENION: I have the following communication:

“Chicago, Tuesday, Sept., 17, 1907.

“To the Ways and Means Committee:

“Fellow Workers:

“Local 22, Locomotive Workers, of Paterson, N.J., recommend that a system be established to collect dues by electing a shop committee in each and every shop or other place of employment, the duties of said committee to be to collect dues at their respective shops in order to keep the membership in good standing.

“CHAS. E. TRAINOR.”

The committee recommends to the convention that the various locals adopt their own plan of collecting dues.

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands as a motion before the house.

(The question was called for, and being put, the motion was carried.)

DEL. HENION: We also have a communication regarding indebtedness to parties in Cleveland.

The committee recommends that this communication be turned over to the convention for explanation from General Secretary-Treasurer W.E. Trautmann.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: As to the debt of \$1,000 that the organization owed to individual members of the Tobacco Workers of Cleveland, \$260 have already been refunded by a remittance of dues to the organization. Is that correct?

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: Yes, sir.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We agreed with the Unions, after they had won the strike, that they would simply be credited with a certain amount for dues every month, and the money would be repaid from the Local Treasury to the various members. But, they have had several different strikes since then in the various clubs, and have had a very hard struggle with the employers of labor, and it was impossible to carry out their plan at this time, and thus liquidate the balance of the debts to the parties who had advanced the money during the strikes.

The last convention decided that the money {debt?} should be liquidated. We had then in the funds of the Industrial Workers of the World \$1,217 in the Prairie State Bank, and the Metal and Machinery Department had \$2,900; \$2,600 was drawn on the very same day, as I understand it, on the check of Kennedy and Patrick, and were squandered by the officers of that department, and when finally it was decided to sell the furniture, etc., it was discovered that they did not have a cent left of the \$2,600 that was in the bank at that time. Then as you know, we had our own difficulty in meeting bills, and the matter of retaining that note was forgotten and neglected altogether until recently Fellow Worker Rotkowitz wrote your secretary that something should be done to liquidate the indebtedness of \$745.

Well, the only way I could see my way clear was to have the matter brought up before the Convention and advise them to do so, so that the convention should recognize it, and effort be made to repay it. It is a legitimate debt and should be repaid, but the organization was not in a position to do it, and that is all the recommendation I can give.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the Secretary. What is your pleasure?

DEL. FRANCIS: I move you that this matter be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

(The motion received several seconds.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. What is your pleasure?

DEL. HAGGERTY: Fellow Worker Chairman, if the motion that has been made has been regularly seconded, I presume it would be permissible now to make an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes,

DEL. HAGGERTY: I move an amendment to that, that this convention first of all recognize the debt.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment is made that this convention

recognize the debt.

DEL. FRANCIS: Point of information: Is it necessary to recognize a debt when it was recognized at the last convention?

DEL. LIESNER: Point of information: I wish to ask if this debt was contracted in a legal form: It is true, perhaps, that the last convention passed on it, but they may have overlooked that point. The reason I ask it is to avoid any future trouble of that kind. I have had some experience in that line myself.

We advanced some money to the I.F.M. {sic} during the last strike and had considerable trouble about it, because they claimed it was not advanced in legal form, and a bona fide debt, although they recognized that the money was advanced.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary has explained that. The Secretary claims it was advanced in legal form.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The last convention recognized that as being a legitimate debt incurred during a very important strike of the I.W.W. We did not have the money at that time, and there were 200 men on that strike, and the whole matter was referred to the Executive Board, and I was instructed to pay it as soon as our financial condition would permit. We had 200 members in the organization there, and we expected that they would continue along after the strike and remit their dues every month and gradually liquidate the debt, but they could not do it because they had other strikes and were just strong enough to keep their membership together.

Now, if that debt is again recognized—it is recognized in fact now, and the only question is how it should be paid, and your Executive Board have that in their hands, it is for them to make arrangements.

DEL. KEEP: I offer an amendment which I think will be acceptable to all. These men want their money as soon as possible, and as I understand it, the motion is now that the matter be referred to the Executive Board, and I would offer as an amendment to that that they make arrangements to pay it as soon as possible.

DEL. FRANCIS: I accept that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would cover your amendment also, Delegate Haggerty. The motion now would be that the matter be referred to the incoming Executive Board with instructions to pay the debt as soon as possible.

(The question was called for.)

DEL. AXELSON: As I understand it, the communication referred to the payment of \$100.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: \$100 a month is the request in the communication.

DEL. AXELSON: I would like to ask Fellow Worker Chairman what is there before the house, a motion for an amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is only one motion before the house, and that motion is just as I have stated it; that the incoming Executive Board be instructed to pay this money as soon as it can, as soon as is possible.

DEL. AXELSON: That is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the motion.

DEL. AXELSON: That is all.

DEL. WALTERS: I move the previous question.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: I had the floor before, but it was stated someone else had the floor ahead of me.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you want the floor you must get upon your feet.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: I want to say, fellow workers, that this is a kind of a surprise to me. I am of the impression that the Industrial Workers are sacrificers, as I claim to be. I don't know whether sacrificer is the word or not, but I claim to be one.

It has been proven and I can prove it by Secretary Trautmann at the present time.

I will say that Fellow Worker Trautmann stated that at the time he came to Cleveland an arrangement was made. As I understand it, no such arrangement was made to pay this out of the dues. He was under the impression that we had 200 members, but we had 200 strikers, and we believe that they would be members for all time, that the bosses had learned a lesson and would not bother us any longer. We were not under the impression, however, that we were to pay this, however, by deducting the dues.

Now, after six months has gone by and the men are asking for the money, and I tell them we cannot get and money from the headquarters of the Industrial Workers of the World, that they are not in a position to pay at the present time; they were not satisfied, and so we informed or wrote Fellow Worker Trautmann about it.

Fellow Worker Trautmann wrote to us that we did not have to send the per capita to the headquarters, but all money that we collected for dues we should pay to the men, and we did that; we paid out several hundred dollars. The sum really due these men, as has been stated, is \$745.

Now, I am under the impression, I understand it that way, that an

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Industrial Worker cannot be an Industrial Worker in the right sense of the word if he is not a sacrificer to a certain extent. We cannot sacrifice more than we could afford to, but I know if there was not a man that would make some sacrifice in time or in money, that nothing could be accomplished, and we in Cleveland consider ourselves as such.

Those fellows who advanced the money were promised by the headquarters of the Industrial Workers of the World that they would be repaid in six months. We did it merely to help along those who are oppressed by the capitalist class. There was no great necessity for our doing it; we could get along with them just as well, but it was more of a principle, a revolutionary spirit which those men possessed, which led them to advance that money.

Now, when the question is up before the Third Annual Convention, for the second time before the Industrial Workers of the World, I am surprised to hear some of the fellow delegates rise and say, "We recognize that that is a debt," and I am glad to hear a fellow worker say, "This has been recognized once and what is the use of recognizing it once more?"

The question now is whether this shall be paid or not, and the pending motion is that we refer this to the Executive Board, and the Executive Board shall pay it whenever they feel like it, or something to that effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: You understand my *{sic}* motion, don't you? I said it clear and plain that the recommendation to the committee was to pay it as soon as possible, not as soon as they felt like it.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: I beg your pardon. I misunderstood that. All I have to say is this: You had an organizer in the city of Cleveland for several weeks by the name of Fox, and that man was trying to do the best he could, but what could he accomplish there? Nothing, for the simple reason that I can prove by Fellow Worker Glover here, that the men have no more confidence in the city of Cleveland in the Industrial Workers of the World.

There was an organization of cigarmakers of 85 members. They have disbanded. The cloakmakers of 90 members have disbanded. The bricklayers have disbanded, and there is still another local, I have forgotten what, which has disbanded, and there is no chance of forming another local there, for the simple reason they say, "We cannot place any confidence in the Industrial Workers of the World, for it is merely an organization to uphold the organizers, etc., the officialdom."

I don't know whether Glover is familiar with this, but among the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Jewish people there we have a number of those labor fakers, members of the Socialist party, and Jewish people at the same time, and they go around and advocate the idea that this is worse than the American Federation of Labor. We cannot induce any of those men who are oppressed by the capitalist class to join the Industrial Workers of the World.

As a matter of fact I am one of those who advanced the money, but I am not after the money so much; I may say I have been sick and I have expended the money for doctor's bills, and probably the others don't think as I do, but I think it would be a great benefit to our Industrial Workers if the reputation of the Industrial Workers of the World should not be misquoted as it was by some men who belonged to the Socialist party.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hour for adjournment has arrived, and we will adjourn until two o'clock.

At this point an adjournment was taken until 2 o'clock p.m.

FRIDAY, SEPT. 20TH, 1907. AFTERNOON SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the absence of the secretary Fellow Worker Walsh will call the roll.

The roll was then called by Delegate Walsh, who announced that the following delegates were absent: Axelson, Desmond, Kraft and Kremer.

THE CHAIRMAN: At adjournment this morning the motion before the house was to refer the whole matter to the incoming Executive Board and the amendment was that the Executive Board should pay as soon as possible the indebtedness to the men who advanced the money at Cleveland, Ohio. All in favor of this motion will say aye.

The motion was declared carried unanimously.

DEL. SCHWEND: I ask as a matter of personal privilege for the opportunity to make a correction of the stenographic report.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was decided this morning that if any delegate has a correction to make that he should give it to the committee and they will correct it. The secretary has now some communications to read.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I have a communication from the metal workers of Philadelphia asking for a charter and they have sent in the charter fee.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Move that the charter be granted.

OTHER DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded that the charter application of the Metal Workers of Philadelphia be granted and the charter forwarded.

The motion was then voted upon and declared carried by the Chairman.

Sec. Trautmann next read the following letter from the fellow workers at Vancouver, B.C.¹⁰

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is one of our active men and he sends this letter to the convention and I thought I would read it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the committee last on the floor through with its report?

DEL. HENION: We were all done with the ways and means committee at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN: There will be more resolutions referred to them tonight. The next business is the report of the committee on literature and press. Is the committee on literature and press ready to make its report?

DEL. GLOVER: Yes, I will read it. "The committee on literature and press recommend the following:

First: That the *Industrial Union Bulletin* be enlarged to twice its present size, with correspondents' column to be provided for.

2. We hold that the *Industrial Union Bulletin* should always confine its columns to the teachings of economics and industrial unionism and when articles are contributed from members or non-members dealing with politics and political expressions at the capitalist ballot box it should always be followed by comments by the editor setting forth the position of the Industrial Workers of the World.

We further recommend that all members subscribe to the *Industrial Union Bulletin*. We also recommend that the subscription price remain as it is.

3. That we give moral and financial support to papers that stand unconditionally for the industrial form of unionism as advocated by

¹⁰[The letter was omitted.—R.B.]

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the Industrial Workers of the World.”

Do you want to take action on this all together?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have to take action on it seriatim any way. That is the only way we can proceed as there are a number of points and they will be taken up in order.

DEL. GLOVER: That closes the matter with reference to *The Bulletin*, and next comes the question of literature to be selected in the form of books.

THE CHAIRMAN: If that completes the report so far as *The Bulletin* is concerned we might take that up for action seriatim. If there is no objection we will proceed on that line. What is the first recommendation?

DEL. GLOVER: That the *Industrial Union Bulletin* be enlarged to twice its present size with a correspondents' column to be provided for.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure? That stands as a motion.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I would like to hear a statement in regard to the advisability of that proposition from the editor of the *Industrial Bulletin*.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the editor of the *Industrial Bulletin* wish the floor on this question.

EDITOR EDWARDS: I can only say that it will be impossible, under the conditions prevailing in the printing industry in this city, to provide subscribers with eight pages at the rate that is suggested by the committee. That is to say, while it is desirable, if it could be done, to enlarge the paper to eight pages, it is not practicable to furnish an eight-page form at fifty cents per year.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Can I give you a few figures so that you may have an idea what we have to deal with on this business proposition in order that we shall not run ahead blindly, and so that there will be no assuming of a responsibility that we not able to meet. *The Bulletin* has 6,000 copies and we have a good stock of paper. I believe it is always desirable to use the best paper you can get because the appearance of the paper will invite some to look through the paper and read its contents. We pay at the present time \$75 a week for 6,000 copies of the paper, that is, for reading matter. We have to pay double that price for figure matter. Consequently we pay for every issue of the paper exactly as much as we charge the subscribers. The cost of the paper per year per member is accordingly 50 cents, and we charge 50 cents to subscribers. That does not include the wages of the editor of the paper, nor does it include the postage. Now, out of the increased circulation

of the paper, the more copies we print, the cheaper in proportion will the cost of the paper be, but even with the increased circulation it would require probably double the amount of the number of subscribers as for the four-page paper at the present time at 50 cents each to make the paper self-sustaining. That is, including the expenses of paying the editor, postage and other incidental expenses. I only use the term incidental expenses in this connection. If you enlarge the size of the paper, it follows that the cost of getting the paper out will proportionately increase. While I am in favor of having the paper made an eight-page paper if possible, the incoming executive board will have to reckon with the financial condition of the organization to see whether we can afford to have the paper printed at its present price. A paper like the *Appeal to Reason* can be put out at the price of 25 cents a year because they have their own plant and have that plant established where labor is cheap. As a matter of fact, they can only compete in the newspaper field with such a cheap paper because getting the labor there so cheap the paper is self-sustaining at that price; but here we have to reckon with the fact that the wages of the printers and pressmen are about double as high as the wages paid on a paper like *The Appeal to Reason*. We do not own our own printing plant, consequently we must deal with all these facts and figures in coming to a conclusion on this matter. If the convention decides to have an eight-page paper, I am satisfied that those who subscribe at the present time for the paper will even be willing to pay a dollar subscription, but I do not accept the recommendation that we should make the paper double the size of today and only charge 50 cents subscription for it. That is absolutely impossible. If this organization had \$20,000 or \$30,000 in the treasury, then we could come before the convention and recommend that we buy our own printing outfit, press and plant, make the paper ourselves, get it out ourselves, and then we could reduce the price, but at the present time we cannot do it.

DEL. _____: I think to facilitate the matter that the motion be divided as to the recommendations, there being two different subject matters.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, we will first vote on the proposition whether we shall have it enlarged and then the proposition as to the price.

DEL. LIESNER: It seems to me that the easiest and quickest way would be to leave the matter of increasing the size of the paper to those who are editing the paper and adopt the balance of the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

resolution. I make that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you are in favor of that, vote down the recommendation of the committee, and then it will remain as it is. We will vote upon the price of the paper, as to whether it shall remain at 50 cents.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Are we to fix the price first?

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well; fix the size first.

A DELEGATE: You have only so much cloth and you must cut according to your cloth.

DEL. AXELSON: Being one of the committee that proposed this change, I wish to say why we did it, which is because we thought it would give more space for education. What we had in mind was that perhaps the financial condition of the organization would not warrant it, but we brought it up so that we might find out whether the organization could carry it, and if not, all we can do is to leave the paper at its present size with its present cost and price to the men who subscribe for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the recommendation of the committee to increase the size of the paper to eight pages will say aye. Those opposed, no.

The Chairman then declared the motion lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the proposition of the committee, that the price shall remain as it is, at 50 cents, will say aye. Those opposed, no.

The chairman then declared the proposition carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary of the committee will please read the next recommendation.

DEL. GLOVER: We hold that *The Industrial Union Bulletin* should always confine its columns to the teaching of economics and industrial unionism, and when articles are contributed from members or non-members treating of politics and political expressions at the capitalist ballot box, it should always be followed by notes by the editor setting forth the position taken by the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. WILLIAMS: It seems to me that this recommendation is wholly unnecessary, for the simple reason that the editor of *The Bulletin* is bound by his official position to carry out the principles of the organization as laid down in the preamble. If he does not do so, we simply have to move against the editor. That is all there is to that. I cannot see any necessity for giving him rules and regulations when we

already have the rules and regulations in the preamble and principles of the organization. Whether the editor exactly conforms to them or not will depend upon his understanding of it, and that involved the whole question of interpretation and understanding of the preamble which we have discussed here for two days.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

DEL. DE LEON: I move as an amendment to strike out the words “capitalist ballot box.”

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

DEL. DE LEON: The phrase is superfluous, but it has a danger in it if it is accepted. It is a surreptitious attempt to squirm into the actions of this convention a sentiment that this convention has overwhelmingly three times voted down. The phrase, “capitalist ballot box” occurs to nobody who knows what the ballot box means. There is no such thing as a capitalist ballot box. The ballot box is the mark of civilized man, and all references to a “capitalist ballot box” are false, unscientific and misleading. This matter has been thoroughly thrashed out here and to adopt that resolution with that phrase in it is to adopt and support a surreptitious attempt to inject indirectly into our transactions, and through the back door, a thing that we have already decided against.

For the rest on the question of political action—what that is and what it means I think we all know—the editor of the paper, so far as I have been able to follow the paper, always had a footnote to the effect suggested and always did this successfully. If any one should promote or propose political action in favor of capitalism, I hardly think the editor of *The Bulletin* would allow it to go in—unless it happened, as I find it happens, that there is something so good that I am anxious to get a good shot at it; otherwise I hardly think that he would put in an article in favor of capitalistic action or capitalism and not answer it thoroughly. So that even is superfluous. Now, questions may arise on which we all cannot agree, and upon which we could not lay down hard and fast rules for the guidance of the editor. But with reference to political action, this, that or the other element in the nation may engage in some movement and this may turn up some how in the correspondence, and the question will be, shall we publish that, or even, shall we not originally get hold of that thing and demonstrate the absurdity of it. I tried to make it perfectly clear last time that it is folly to imagine that we can organize into a revolutionary economic movement workmen who are democrats, republicans and so forth. Such men can be united in a union of the ordinary kind where they

simply look upon one another as fellow workers, but suppose that either political party should adopt as a part of its program the colonizing theory and the extending of the water cure that has been applied to the Filipinos, would you say that the editor of *The Bulletin* should not handle that subject if he finds the opportunity? Considering the whole proposition in that way, it is superfluous and misleading and it is particularly misleading by the injection of the term “capitalist ballot box.” With that term omitted I would vote for it as the shortest way of getting through with the matter.

DEL. FOOTE: Although I take exception to some of the arguments of Delegate De Leon, I second his amendment to strike out the phrase “capitalist ballot box.” I stated my position on this fully yesterday. It is only the capitalist ballot box because it is in the control of the capitalist class.

A DELEGATE: I think this is another attempt to put on a piece of paper something that will save us. Any one who knows anything about the editor knows that he is responsible for what is done with the paper. This is an attempt to put a stick in his chair with no judgment whatever and with no latitude whatever. You would never get a man to be editor if you keep this thing up. I can see no necessity for this action at all. Therefore I move to lay the matter on the table.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now is to lay this matter on the table.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order that the delegate having previously spoken cannot make this motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. _____: I made no speech.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot speak to a motion and then move to lay it on the table.

DEL. _____: What do you call a speech?

DEL. AXELSON: I am fully in accord with the motion to strike out the phrase “capitalist ballot box” although perhaps I am guilty of writing it, but I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment that instead of capitalist ballot box, we insert after “political expression” instead of “capitalist ballot box” the words, “of the working class,” that is, “political expression of the working class.” Now the point seems to be raised—

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any second?

DEL. FOOTE: I second the amendment to the amendment.

DEL. AXELSON It is suggested by some of the fellow workers that

this is an attempt to do something on paper. You know that it cannot be that at all. What we want is to make ourselves clear so that it will be a position by which the editor knows that he is acting in accordance with the position taken by the convention so that he may know where he stands. If you allow him to have his own way about it he may insert articles pertaining to his own ideas. For that reason we say that the Industrial Workers of the World, being an economic organization, should confine its teachings to that which this economic organization is based upon, namely, economic conditions and consequently on the statements in the preamble, and to political action we must state definitely so as to give the editor to understand what we mean by that, and have our organization through our *Bulletin*, which is our official organ, teach the right kind of stuff. That is, in accordance with industrial unionism. I think that is what we want. I think the delegates will understand that this will clarify matters and there could be no confusion arise in regard to it.

DEL. _____: I move that this whole matter be laid on the table.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the recommendation of the committee be laid on the table. Those in favor will say aye. Those opposed, no. The ayes have it.

On demand of several delegates a roll call was ordered.

Secretary Trautmann announced the result of the vote as follows: Total vote cast, 121: 92¹/₂ voting yes and 26¹/₂ no.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to lay on the table is carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Glover will please read the next recommendation of the committee.

DEL. GLOVER: We recommend that all members subscribe to the *Industrial Bulletin*.

DEL. _____: That was settled this morning in connection with the report of the committee on ways and means, and I move to lay this recommendation on the table.

DEL. _____: I second the motion.

DEL. AXELSON: I believe I have the floor—is there a motion to table the recommendation?

THE CHAIRMAN: It was not seconded. The recommendation now before us is that the committee recommends that all members of the organization should subscribe to the *Industrial Bulletin*.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. FRANCIS: It is true that we thought that this matter would be settled this morning. For us to pass such a resolution in view of the fact that we have a foreign membership to a large extent would mean that you say to those men you must have this paper that you cannot read. You know what that means. I think we ought to defeat this in a hurry.

DEL. _____: Is my motion in order to lay on the table?

DEL. SPEED: It is well understood that it is the duty of every member, if possible, to subscribe for that paper, and it is ridiculous to make a motion of that kind. Every one knows that it is the duty of each member to subscribe and to pass a thing of that kind is absurd.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion to lay on the table. Those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

The chairman then declared the motion to lay on the table carried.

DEL. GLOVER: The next recommendation is that the subscription price remain as it is, but I believe that was passed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that was your recommendation and that was passed.

DEL. GLOVER: "That we give moral and financial support to papers that stand unconditionally for the industrial form of unionism as advocated by the I.W.W."

THE CHAIRMAN: That means that we give moral and financial support to the papers that stand for industrial unionism.

DEL. FOOTE: I move to lay it on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hear no second.

DEL. KEEP: Where is the financial support to come from, the general organization or the locals? The people who get these things up ought to have them self-explanatory so that we can understand them without asking questions. I have to have an interpretation upon this as to whether it means financial support from the locals or financial support from the national body. How shall it be given?

DEL. GLOVER: It ought to be understood that our papers will be given financial support, but we find large numbers of papers outside of our own that come out and support the Industrial Workers of the World. In the case of those that cannot read English, they evidently would not subscribe to the *Industrial Union Bulletin*, but there are a number of papers in other languages that they could subscribe to, owing to the fact that those papers are in accord with this organization. It is to those papers that we desire to urge those individuals to subscribe and give their support to.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would simply add, that in the city of Paterson we have a paper. Now, I understand this resolution to mean that in a general way we would support those papers. The question may arise that that is not strictly an I.W.W. paper, but it supports the I.W.W. and the paper is sold at the headquarters of the organization. This resolution, if adopted, allows that, and formerly there being no ruling upon it, we did not know whether it was proper or not.

DEL. JONES: I object to endorsing any paper, because by endorsing these different papers it ties us down eventually to endorsing the organization that publishes the paper. In the Federation convention, Petriella asked support for his paper. Now, you know what kind of a man Petriella was. Now, he might say that his paper was going to support this organization. I object to it. Our preamble prohibits us endorsing anything outside of our own organization.

DEL. AXELSON: We have already gone so far on this question that it is already settled. In the report for the year gone by, read this morning, you refer this matter over to the organization committee or the committee on literature. It is in their hands. If you pass this, the organization committee will have a way by which it can guide its action. The thing will be thrashed out now. If you don't settle it absolutely now, all you have to do is endorse his action as presented by the editor of our present journal.

THE CHAIRMAN: If this organization should increase in numbers, we may be in a position to launch our own papers, controlled by the I.W.W., to meet the question of this foreign speaking element. But we are not financially in that position yet. So we have to support papers that are within the circle of influence of this organization. There are papers like the *Le Questionne Sociale* of Paterson, which support the I.W.W., and there are other papers supporting the I.W.W., irrespective of their position in other lines. When any foreign born Worker who could not understand English asks for advice on these lines it is absolutely necessary to recommend some paper that he should read to instruct himself on the meaning and purpose of this organization. There have been attempts made by I.W.W. locals to start their own papers. As soon as they are started we will give preference to those papers. I am satisfied that at the next conference of the French textile workers we will have our own paper. I am satisfied that our Italian members will come together and they perhaps will be able to start a propaganda for an Italian paper that will that will give forth I.W.W. principles. But at the present time we must rely upon the support of these other papers. If it was not for the support we had from them

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

after the last convention we do not know that we could have started the propaganda work that we carried out during the last year. I admit that these papers are not strictly I.W.W. papers. They advocate partly our organization and partly some other organization, but that we cannot help. We have tried with some of the papers and succeeded in having them issue at certain times, for instance, a German edition in Cleveland. If we could come to an understanding with them to issue every month a clear cut I.W.W. paper, without reference to anything else, that will be a great step in the right direction. If we could get that with the Hungarian paper and with the Italian paper, it would be a commendable thing, because we could inform these people that there would be an edition of the paper dealing with the affairs of the I.W.W. exclusively, and these members who do not read English could read them. But we have not reached that position yet, and I do not think the time is ripe when the convention will come to that understanding.

DEL. FOOTE: It seems to me that this is not a question of papers; it is a question of principles. Furthermore, it is an attempt at legislation. It is an assumption that we need more legislation. Why should we urge our members to subscribe for a paper? If we urge them to subscribe for a paper, how can we consistently urge them to subscribe for certain papers which are beyond the control of our own organization? I should think that ought to be left strictly to the members. They will use that privilege; they will read those papers. I need no compulsory action on me to read all the papers I can get hold of, with the exception of ones in foreign languages that I cannot read at all. It seems to me you are trying to legislate this organization into action. You are trying to legislate revolution. You are trying to legislate everything and that legislation only compels more legislation and drives the organization away from its fundamental principles. The proposition is that we have got our official journal and that every member knows that it is the official paper of our organization. If he has the desire to read other papers he has the privilege of reading those papers, those that support the organization as well as those which do not support it. No delegate upon the floor of this convention would take the position that he would refuse to read a capitalist paper. Why, some of the best stuff that we get in learning the condition of society and studying our own condition in that society is from the capitalist press. I say that this whole thing is out of order and should be laid on the table.

DEL. DE LEON: I would suggest that the secretary of the committee read the recommendation once more.

DEL. GLOVER: "That we give moral and financial support to papers

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

that stand unconditionally for the industrial form of unionism as advocated by the Industrial Workers of the World.”

A DELEGATE: I would like to amend that report to read “Give our moral support.”

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate De Leon has the floor.

DEL. DE LEON: If a motion to lay on the table had been made I would have seconded it. I am always opposed to an organization endorsing any propaganda paper whatever that that organization does not own and control. What the editor stated was perfectly proper so far as it went. It is nothing more than decent if a man stands by me in a fight that I should extend to him my thanks for his past services, but it is not a good idea to be grateful for future services which may not be rendered. The secretary mentioned papers that had been favoring us in our hour of need; that was proper and decent, but that should not be distorted into an endorsement for the future. We never know what a paper may do tomorrow from what it has done in the past. What Jones said is a clincher. I was not aware that this fellow Petriela—I call him a fellow because I have to use parliamentary language here—I did not know that Petriela had started a paper, but I can well see how fellows of Petriela’s stamp will in increasing number start papers claiming to be I.W.W. papers, for the purpose of beating the I.W.W. We know that Petriela has done that in Jones’s case, and he will do it in other cases, and the Petrielas are legion. I am therefore against this proposition. I would not vote for the endorsement of the paper of which I am an editor. It is the struggle that we have had, a struggle that we have had to fight through, that a labor organization must own its own paper and run it to suit itself, according to its own wisdom or its own stupidity, but strictly reflecting the will of that organization, and no endorsement of its other papers is ever advisable.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now is that we support such papers as support the I.W.W., morally and financially.

A DELEGATE: I move to lay the whole matter on the table.

The motion being seconded, was put and declared carried by the chairman.

DEL. FRANCIS: I wish to go on record as voting no because I was so instructed by my local, although otherwise I agree with what has been said.

DEL. GLOVER: The next recommendation is as to the books that have been selected for recommendation by the committee. They are as

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

follows: Marx's *Capital*, Vol. 1 and 2;¹¹ *Ancient Lowly*, Vol. 1 and 2, by Ward; *Ancient Society*, by Morgan; *Economic Foundations of Society*, by Loria; *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History*, by Labriola; *Socialism and Philosophy*, by Labriola; *Landmarks of Scientific Socialism*, by Engels; *Evolution of Property*, by Lafargue; *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, by Marx; *Woman under Socialism*, by Bebel; *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, by Engels; *The Social Revolution*, by Kautsky; *Collectivism and Industrial Revolution*, by Vandervelde; *The Origin of the Family*, by Engels; *Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History*, by Kautsky; *The Civil War in France*, by Marx; *Communist Manifesto*, by Marx and Engels; *Industrial Unionism*, by Debs; *American Industrial Evolution*, by Ebert; *Positive School of Criminology*, by Perri; *The Iron Trevet, History of a Proletarian Family, the Silver Cross and the Golden Sickle*, by Sue; *Aristotle's Essays*; *Darwin's Coral Reefs*; *Ibsen's Pillars of Society*; *Plato's Republic*; *Force and Matter*, by Beuchner; *Value, Price and Profit*, by Marx; *Wage-Labor and Capital*, by Marx; The First and Second Annual Reports of the I.W.W. Convention as historical documents, and such others as may be brought out in the future; *The Industrial Union Hand-Book I.W.W.*; *Two Pages from Roman History*, by De Leon; *Industrial Evolution*, by Ebert; *Trades Unionism in the United States*, by Ebert; *Concentration of Wealth*, by Henry L. Call; *The Pinkerton Labor Spy*.

DEL. AXELSON: I wish to add one book that has just come to my memory, *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, by Karl Marx.

DEL. FRANCIS: I was brought up in the Roman Catholic Church and there they have what they call the *Index Expurgatorius*, and anybody who reads anything contained in that index gets in trouble. Now to my mind to put up an index in this organization is all wrong. We do not need an index. We are not here for study or theory or fun or to have a library. We are here to organize, to improve our condition. No index for us. We will be our own index. We will know exactly what we want and no kind of an index will ever keep us away from the books that we want. I wanted to read one of Zola's works, one of the monumental works of the human mind. The Roman Catholic Church put that in the index. I went into the library in Philadelphia and inquired for one of Zola's books. I went to the shelf and I could not find it. I then went to the catalogue and found it in the list of books but

¹¹ [The first English edition of what later became known as volume I of *Capital* was printed in two volumes, hence this reference to volumes I and II.—R.B.]

I could not find Zola's books on the shelves. Philadelphia being the City of Brotherly Love, when I found that Zola's books were all out in that kind of a sanctimonious city, I was surprised and I went to the lady at the counter and I said, "I want Zola's books," and she said, "What book do you want?" I told her, in this instance it was immaterial which it was, and she said "Pick it out," and she pulled out some books from under the counter and showed me the books. This shows that index or no index we read the books we want and for this I.W.W. we need no index at all.

DEL. HAGENSON: I am strictly in favor of the motion. The committee simply goes on record that these books are recommended by the Industrial Workers of the World, as good books to read by the working people. Now, it is quite necessary to have this list for this reason: So that the working people may know what books to read. The working people do not know what books to read now; there are a dozen books of trash for one good book for the working class to read, and these books of trash are placed before the working class much more attractively today than the sound and solid book; and for that reason, in order that we should not have to wade through so much rubbish to get hold of some good thing, I believe it is well to recommend the best books that are published. In my judgment, the Committee has picked the best list possible and it covers all parts of the subject very well.

DEL. KEEP: I am not in favor of having this list. Not alone for the reasons that have been stated, but the list itself. For instance, they have sandwiched in between Marx's *Capital* and Morgan's *Ancient Society* the *Ancient Lowly* by Ward. Now, when you ask a workman who has been looking into this question and desires correct interpretations from the things he reads without any help from outside sources or his own imagination, and ask that man to read the *Ancient Lowly* and then *Ancient Society*, the one a collection of ancient stories with facts overdrawn and wrong conclusions drawn from those facts, and in some cases facts entirely wrong, and then you couple that up with Morgan's *Ancient Society*—why, it is simply ridiculous. It seems to me that in all this there is the fundamental error that the piling on of books containing long words and abstruse sentences, all very hard for the digestion of the working-man, will make a man a competent man for the revolutionary movement. As a matter of fact, I have known men who have swallowed all of these books and digested and pre-digested and post-digested them—I have seen them when the question came up of Millerand entering the French cabinet, when they

went to discuss that subject with the workman, the workmen said, "Go chase yourself; I have no time to ask about that." Of course, Millerand is a crook, that man was an ignoramus, and did not know how to discuss anything, but he was class-conscious, but he did not need a book to tell him anything, he knew it, and his instinct was right in that instance. Again, on another occasion, when men who were in favor of contracts, who now are against them, when that man said, "Violate the contract," he was told he was not a civilized man, that he was an Indian; that when he passed his word he ought to keep it; his opponents also have all of those things, knows them all, and yet, in the argument instinct made the workman right six or seven years before the other men saw that he was right. I would rather have that understanding despite the fundamental co-ordination and all the other nations and entities. There is a working class in this country subject to the conditions which environ them today; and it is those conditions that have made this organization possible, and these conditions will make it necessary for these men to read when these men get started to understand their condition, to find the way out of those conditions. They will then pick their own reading and if they run across a book that does not tend in the line of their needs they won't take the trouble to read it even if it is in this list, and for that reason, I am opposed to this list.

DEL. CAMINITA: I want to add to the list of books the *Chicago Martyrs*, and *Parson's Life*.

DEL. AXELSON: In regard to those men in this convention who seem only to take the opposition to everything for the sake of being in opposition to the views of others—they say they don't want this index; they say it is absolutely superfluous. If any of you have ever gone through a public library for the purpose of getting a book, what were you confronted by? You find all the trash that they can put on the shelves; you can get it anytime you wish to. But you workingmen, knowing that you are a class separate from other classes—you go to a library and you don't know what book you want, nor the name of it, and I venture to say you don't get it, or, if you do get it, you have got to go through a lot of red tape. In the city of Indianapolis you have a library—one of these good public libraries. I went there for the purpose of getting this book, *Force and Matter*. I went four times and each time they told me it was "not in." The reason they told me that I don't know; it looked very suspicious to me. If I want to get a dime novel, if I want to get fiction, it is right there; but these books that are in the interests of the working classes are away off in some corner of

the library, and if you don't know they are there you do not get them. For that reason, I believe we should have a catalogue of books, for the reason that if they read them they will get some information of value to working people. We want those for a guide for those who want to read, to show that there are books worth reading, that they get good from if they do read them. Karl Marx is the only one of the books that we advocate, judging from what we have heard in this convention. There are very few of you who understand that one, let alone the rest of them. Mark that down. Why do you come up here and say, "This is useless?" If we believe in education, we must advocate the use of scientific literature. If you don't, remember this—you are driving yourself against the cornerstone on which this movement is built. The stenographic report will show where you all stand. You say it is useless. None of these men who have written these books have evolved them exclusively from their own heads. It is a mistake to say that we have a superior knowledge to what they had in the past. Today we have the knowledge and experience of the past in connection with the knowledge and experience of the present; and that is all connected together. You cannot say that an inventor has invented a whole new machine in order to find out the history of that invention; you must go back to the man who first invented the tool that we call a stick. To that you trace the invention, if you go through history you go the same way. You go to the primitive man, and then come down all along the line. So be careful what you do in this convention because it is going before the working class; not only of the United States, but of the world. Remember one thing: You will do this—as you show yourselves here today you will knock your head against the cause that you, yourself advocate, and what you do will go down in the annual proceedings of this organization. You will have this discussion to face in coming years. I do not say that it will injure you; that is for history to prove, but I know that you are making a mistake and I say, beware. For this reason I hope that this recommendation will be carried. Otherwise you show that you do not believe in education and don't believe in scientific literature. I advocate this list because I know that every solitary book that we have advocated and recommended is a scientific document, and it is for you to prove to the contrary.

DEL. LIESNER: I am opposed to this proposition for this reason: We have our own publication under our own control, and it is not necessary for us to recommend any other works whatever. We cannot be responsible for what those works bring forth. A man can take Karl Marx's book and get a thousand different meanings from them. We are

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

not advocating Karl Marx's philosophy any more than of anyone else; while we may follow along those lines we have an organ of our own, teaching the worker that which he can understand on the economic question, and that is what is interesting him most now. If he wants any other publication he can find it, and he will find it. Our recommendation will not lead him to it or from it.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Those of you who read the stenographic report of the first convention will remember the resolution that was introduced, I believe, by Fellow-worker Haggerty, who was a delegate to that convention, providing for the establishment of a literature and lecture bureau for the purpose of disseminating among other things the teachings of Marx and the other pioneers and educators of the labor movement. Now, I considered that at the time and still consider it, a practical way of carrying on the educational work of this organization. But as for the proposal of the committee that we issue a catalogue of books that shall be read, that seems to me positively ridiculous. It involves the proposition of satisfying all of the different elements in the labor movement; some of those elements may demand certain different classes of books, and they will get them; of course, by sending for them to the different publishing houses. Each element may demand a different set of books, and how are you to carry out this suggestion? The recommendation of the committee is unnecessary. We have got to carry on this educational work. We have got to make every provision that we can to reach the workers; to give them every particle of information that we can impart to them, but as to an index expurgatorius, as suggested by Fellow Worker Francis, that seems to me ridiculous.

DEL. DE LEON: I move to lay the whole matter on the table.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor to lay on the table will say aye; all those opposed, no.

The chairman declared the motion to lay on the table carried.

DEL. AXELSON: I want you to record me as voting no.

DEL. GLOVER: I want to be recorded as voting no.

DEL. FOOTE: I wish to be recorded as voting no. Not because I stand against the reading of books, but I believe the gentleman from Skedunk might accidentally happen to get hold of them and read them and cease to be chronic.

DEL. SPEED: I voted to lay on the table because all the Marxians with whom I have come in contact are the most confused bunch of

men I have ever met in my life.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next recommendation is as to the leaflets.

DEL. GLOVER: "First, the *Address to the Wage-Worker*; the leaflet for the textile industry, the food stuff industry, the metal and machinery industry; the *Story of the New Labor Union*, addressed to the wage-workers in Italian, Swedish and Croatian, German, Yiddish and Japanese. The *Industrial Union Hand-Book* is translated into Finnish and German, but cannot be printed owing to the lack of funds, and therefore we urge the printing of above as soon as the funds will admit."

DEL. COLE: I would like to add one to that. The leaflet to the transportation workmen, gotten up by J.W. Pinkerton.

DEL. FRANCIS: I wish to be informed if the leaflets in Russian are included in the report of the committee?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They are not.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that the Russian be included in the suggestion, in line with the instruction that I had from Local 59, requesting that leaflets in the Russian language be published.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The committee only brings before you the leaflets now on hand or in preparation, and wants the convention to provide for more. In the case of the hand-book being translated into two or three different languages we could get it printed, but the hardest job we have is to get good translators. It is all well enough to say translation, but you must have a good translation. For instance, I understand Polish, and those workmen will never know what this preamble means, or what it says, because the translator could not find a definition for craft unionism in that language. We have, for instance, a booklet or leaflet translated into the Italian language; I do not know whether that is a good translation.

A DELEGATE: That translation is good.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The committee brings this list of leaflets before the convention, and if you want some Russian leaflets made you want to figure the cost to see if the organization is ready to have it done.

DEL. FRANCIS: I ask that the leaflets in Russian be included.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why not make it such languages as are necessary? There are 50,000 Bohemians in this town and also New York. There is an amendment now before you that leaflets in Russian be added to the list suggested by the committee.

DEL. GLOVER: That is unnecessary. We have the provision here which I overlooked, that we make provision for I.W.W. literature in

the Russian language.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you do not insist upon your amendment any longer?

DEL. FRANCIS: I wish to speak to the motion, since that is included in the report, and state a few facts showing why it is imperative that literature in the Russian language should be printed. We know what happened in Russia. They are coming from Russia to America in bunches, and those immigrants have seen the fighting; they were right in it, and when they land here in America they feel like fighting. There are little girls of fourteen and fifteen years old who were picketing for twelve weeks every morning at six o'clock. The fakers, the east side labor fakers have a line on those fellows, and as soon as they land they give them their dope and poison. Now, if we can have some literature that we can give to them we can do something. We must provide for them and meet the dirty work of the labor fakers and their tools, those intellectuals on the east side, lawyers and doctors who are simply living on these tools. With the proper literature on hand nothing will be lost. I will add this: Take, for instance, the Jewish element: They complain that literature is gotten up in all kinds of language but so far as the Jewish language or Yiddish language is concerned, nothing is done, or very little. If you will take this into consideration, you will realize the necessity of having that literature.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I would like to add a suggestion. I would like to ask the Secretary, Have you any leaflets in the Finnish language?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We had up to a week ago.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Have you published the handbook yet in Finnish?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We have the handbook in our possession, but we did not have the money to print it. I will explain this thing. We have only one Finnish printing shop in the United States, able to do such work. It is up in Minnesota somewhere.

DEL. WILLIAMS: There is one in Pittsfield, Mass.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It is a different language altogether.

DEL. WILLIAMS: It is printing a Finnish paper.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That may be true, I did not hear of it.

DEL. WILLIAMS: We have a General Executive Board, which is supposed to look after the Finnish literature. Now, we have thousands of Finns in the lumber districts of the west, I presume also many more of them in the lumber districts of the east, and in the mining districts also. They are a good class of workers. Some of the best material we have today are the Finns, and we have got to reach them. They are ready for the I.W.W., but there is very little literature that can be

placed in their hands. If that work can be attended to it will materially add to the effectiveness of our work among those people.

DEL. FRENCH: A while ago you made reference to the fact that we were hedging around the editor of the *Bulletin* with all kinds of literature. It would look as though we merely want him to stick there and do his work there. Now, we are dictating the business of the General Executive Board for the next twelve months. (Voices of "No.") If the men upon that committee had read the stenographic report of this matter you would see that we have been threshing out this afternoon what was covered last year, and it was only the lack of means, as was well understood—it ought to be clear by this time—the lack of means and resources, and need of places to get some of it out, all that sort of thing that hindered the whole thing. The whole ground is covered. It was the duty of the General Executive Board as soon as they could get around to it. The new Executive Board, whoever they may be, will surely know. As soon as they can reach all classes of people with literature in all the various languages, it is their duty to respond, and if their resources at hand will permit it they should do it, and this discussion is unnecessary, as it is work for the General Executive Board.

I move that this matter be referred to the incoming General Executive Board to do the best they can towards getting out the literature in various languages.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: How is the General Executive Board going to know where and what literature is needed if the delegates from the different parts of the country do not express their opinion on the floor of this convention? This knowledge about literature is not obtained simply by looking over the reports. This can only be obtained by coming in contact with the delegates.

DEL. FRENCH: I should imagine that the general office was continually flooded with information of this kind.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No.

DEL. BOHM: Mr. Chairman, you spoke of the Bohemian language. It is one of the most important that we have today to deal with here in Chicago. I would like to speak in favor of having it in the Bohemian language.

DEL. JONES addressed the convention and said he was from a district largely populated with Finns in Minnesota; that the Finns were affiliated with the Western Federation of Miners; that previous to the organization of the Western Federation of Miners, and even today, the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Finns were organized; that they had a separate organization altogether, a federation of their own and their own papers. He said they had three locals in the Western Federation. He said their organization was controlled by a machine—a political machine. He said the Finns would take care of themselves.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Fellow Worker Jones, is it not a fact that the Finns want literature above all? Are they not asking for literature?

DEL. JONES: That book that you want to publish there is a good thing. (Del. Jones referred to a “scab” shop at Paterson where the label of the I.W.W. was carried and the party did not believe in industrial work.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: If I could have found another printing shop the leaflets would have been printed in another shop. I am only responsible for the crooked work done among the Finns in that part of the country.

DEL. JONES: We should go on record as repudiating that label up there.

DEL. AXELSON: In regard to literature in the Bohemian language, we took the list of the literature—we took the list of the office. He told us of the literature they had on hand. He told us they had literature in the Polish language, but it was a bad translation and they did not want to send it out. For that reason it was omitted in the list of literature.

A DELEGATE: I would like to say this: I think all of this discussion is superfluous, from the remarks made in regard to literature in foreign languages, there is one omitted from that number, and if I had not been here it would have been omitted and the thing would have gone out that this organization did not care to have that special language mentioned. That is the Portuguese language. The local at Bedford is having 40,000 printed in the Portuguese language. I think everybody is satisfied that leaflets in foreign languages are necessary and it is the duty of the Executive Board to have them printed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has there been any demand for Holland literature?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No, sir; that is one language that has not been demanded.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have quite a number of Holland workers in the City of Paterson.

(A delegate moved the previous question.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. All in favor of the previous question being now put, say aye.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

(The motion was carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that the recommendation of the committee is now before the house. All in favor of concurring in the report of the committee will say aye.

A DELEGATE: What became of the motion to refer to the incoming board?

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not understand that that was seconded. You should have stated it before I put the motion.

A DELEGATE: I suppose the Executive Board will take care of it anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir. It is an expression of sentiment to give them something to go by.

DEL. GLOVER (Reporting for the committee.): The next recommendation is that all Locals be recommended to establish libraries and to give preference to such books as are sold by the headquarters.

DEL. WILLIAMS: You will remember in the report of the Constitution Committee yesterday that this proposition came up as one of the proposed amendments to the constitution, and the action taken was that the incoming executive board consider its practical application. It seems to me that that matter was settled yesterday.

A DELEGATE: I move then that this be turned over to the General Executive Board.

A DELEGATE: There is no motion necessary in this case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the same thing adopted yesterday?

DELEGATES: Yes, sir.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, it has been adopted. The Secretary of the Committee on Constitution claims that the same amendment has been referred to the incoming executive board yesterday afternoon. In that case no action will be necessary at this time as it has already been acted upon. Have you anything else there?

DEL. GLOVER: There is one here from Hamilton Local No. 251, that all local publications published by one or more locals shall be placed under the jurisdiction of the General Executive Board, and all finances and accounts of any kind be sanctioned and audited by the General Executive Board. Also the General Executive Board shall have power to revoke all such publications as do not meet with their approval.

THE CHAIRMAN: How does the committee report upon that?

DEL. GLOVER: They recommend its adoption. That stands as a motion.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

(Calls for the question.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: It seems to me that is superfluous, for the mere reason that we have no such papers in existence today that are under the control of the Industrial Workers of the World, except the *Bulletin*, unless locals shall print separate papers, and then it is taken as a matter of course that they shall be under the control of the organization.

A DELEGATE: I represent the local that presented this resolution. I was not present at the time they passed it and it was approved, but I was instructed to come here and support it. Their object was to control any publication that might be established by locals anywhere where they got out of line, so as to have power to head them off and not have them as authority for this organization. That is the prime reason for its being presented.

DEL. DE LEON: Do I understand that they should have control over all their affairs?

THE CHAIRMAN: Over their finances.

DEL. DE LEON: The first part is superfluous—the action of the committee. Where a publication exists, and is owned and controlled by the organization, it is its paper and of course they will own it, and if we as an organization take charge we would control the contents of that paper, and take action in case that paper does not toe the chalk mark. If we are to audit it we are responsible for the debts of the concern. You cannot undertake to regulate the finances of a body. So this proposition involves this—it throws on the general organization the responsibility of the action of thousands of locals. We should control the contents of these papers, but if we undertake to act as auditors we are responsible for the finances. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the whole proposition.

(Calls for the question.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house that is the recommendation of the committee; to concur in the report of the committee. All in favor of the report say aye. Opposed, no.

(The Chairman announced the motion as lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any other recommendation there, Del. Glover?

DEL. GLOVER: A leaflet to the Transportation Workers by W.J. Pinkerton that is to be gotten out. We recommend that that be adopted and gotten out for the Transportation Workers. That is the motion before the house.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

(Calls for the question.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We are running in the *Bulletin* a series of articles by Pinkerton, one of the most instructive articles on the transportation industry, that will form altogether a book. Is it the intention of the convention that Fellow Worker Pinkerton should draw up a small leaflet for the Transportation Industrial Workers from the series of articles, and is it the intention of the organization to publish the book which is the property and will be the property of Pinkerton?

DEL. FRANCIS: Does the General Secretary understand the difference between a book and a leaflet?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: What is a leaflet?

DEL. GLOVER: This was presented under the head of leaflets. Then it will have to be an extract from the book.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Pinkerton has been asked question.

DEL. PINKERTON: I did not understand that the question was put to me direct. I would give the privilege of adopting anything from the work that I am giving to the *Bulletin* and would authorize the Secretary and Executive Board to take out at their own option anything that will constitute a leaflet that is necessary for the Industrial Workers of the World. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the motion will say aye; opposed, no.

(The motion was carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any more recommendation?

DEL. GLOVER: Local 131, Leaflet to Hotel and Restaurant Workers. We recommend that a circular be sent to the restaurant employees.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is one already written?

DEL. GLOVER: Already written.

(The motion was put an carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further recommendations.

DEL. GLOVER: The committee recommends in the form of a resolution: "Resolved, that the Convention recommends that the amendment to change the preamble of the constitution, or rather the preamble to the constitution, and the resolution to define the political clause of such document along with the stenographic report of all the discussions pertaining to this proposition on the floor of the convention, to be published in pamphlet form and catalogued in the regular order for sale.{"}"

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that this resolution be tabled. (Seconded.)

A DELEGATE: I rise to a point of personal privilege.

DEL. FRANCIS: A motion to lay on the table takes the place of any

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

other motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate will take his seat. We will proceed to vote. All in favor of the motion to lay on the table will say aye.

(The motion was put and the Chair ruled that it was carried to lay on the table.)

DEL. DE LEON: I think it is proper that we should have the resolution read again before we table it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read it once more. (It was read.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That is laid on the table.

A DELEGATE: It must be up again if it has been read.

THE CHAIRMAN: You must transact some other business. You have laid it one the table.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I make a motion right here that we reconsider our action.

DEL. DE LEON: Did we vote upon that motion to lay on the table?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Do you insist upon a roll call? The committee will proceed with its report. Have you anything more to report?

DEL. GLOVER: That completes all we have to submit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the next committee is on Rules and Regulations, and on Organization.

A DELEGATE: The Committee on Organization is not ready to report today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the committees so far reported are the Committee on Resolutions, Ways and Means, Literature and Press; Rules and Regulations and Organization I understand is not ready to report. Now, the Grievance Committee, has that any report to make at this time?

DEL. YATES: We will submit the findings of the Grievance Committee on the subjects that have been submitted to us so far.

The Secretary sent a complaint from the Local at Snowball, Arizona, the Miners' Union, saying that they had not received receipts for money sent. The committee recommended that it be referred back to the union which made the complaint.

The report of the Committee was concurred in and their recommendation adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further report?

DEL. YATES: There was handed to us by a man in this room, while in session, a two-page circular letter that most of you know the contents of in regard to Local 85, and also a written communication

from another individual. These were turned in to the Grievance Committee and we decided to lay them on the table.

A DELEGATE: I move that we concur in the report of the committee to lay them on the table.

DEL. AXELSON: Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of such action. A good many questions have been raised concerning this matter and I don't know which one is right. I have never been able to determine, and the only way I can determine is to get before us as delegates of this convention what the charges are. I don't believe that we should establish the precedent of hearing one side and not the other. If a question comes up before us it should be fully considered. What have we a convention for? Is not the convention for the purpose of finding out what is going on inside of the organization and what has taken place during the past year? I hold that is what we have a convention for—to make ourselves familiar with all the transactions of officials and affiliated unions. So I do not believe that you should at this time move to lay anything on the table before we know what we are tabling.

THE SECRETARY: Has the Local you represent received that very same letter?

DEL. AXELSON: I don't know what the letter is. We received one reply.

DEL. FRANCIS: I raise this point of order, that anything that was not referred to the convention is out of order to be considered by the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I so ruled. I was not aware that the committee had read something that did not come through this convention.

DEL. YATES: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the next reading will come under the same head.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that the only grievances referred to the committee were the matter from Bridgeport and the matter from Paterson. Are you ready to report on these? Have you anything to report on the matter referred to the committee by this convention?

DEL. YATES: In regard to the Bridgeport affair, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can proceed.

DEL. AXELSON: The motion to table is before the house, is it not, to table the communication from this—

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules the report out of order. We have ruled here that anything that goes to that committee must go through this convention.

DEL. YATES: In that case, anything that goes to the Grievance Committee must go through the convention. There are two things to

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

be considered in connection with the Bridgeport affair. Now, in the report of the Grievance Committee upon this thing, something else is injected into it. That will be ruled out of order, and I beg leave to defer the reading of the conclusions of the Grievance Committee until an opportunity has been given for the Grievance Committee to take it up and reach a conclusion.

THE SECRETARY: What is the other grievance?

DEL. DE LEON: This will be out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to understand the delegate properly as to what was said.

DEL. YATES: I understand no grievance can be considered by the Grievance Committee unless it came from the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and has been presented by a local union, you understand. We have passed a rule here that no individual can bring anything before the committee of this convention. It has to go through the Chair and the Chair is the distributor to the Committee.

DEL. YATES: This is perfectly in order then. It comes from a local union and does not go to the convention.

THE SECRETARY: The Bridgeport affair, that was referred to the Grievance Committee.

DEL. YATES: And included in that Bridgeport affair is another that covers the same matter, that did not go to the convention or come from a local.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is only part of the other grievance.

DEL. YATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you can report.

DEL. YATES: Now, this is a grievance that was submitted to the Grievance Committee, submitted by No. 205 of Wichita, Kansas. The Grievance Committee went over the letter and there is practically nothing else besides the letter. The Grievance Committee finds that it is not justified; that the three local unions in that district are voting on the proposition of a peremptory rule and they decided to dispense with it. This man protests against dispensing with it and brings this matter before the convention. The Grievance Committee justify the action of the three locals in that locality.

THE SECRETARY: The action of the three locals was endorsed by the general executive.

DEL. YATES: We approved the action of the two locals.

THE SECRETARY: Those who were against the decision of the Executive Board are those expelled from the organization.

DEL. FOOTE: There was only one expelled from the organization.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation of the committee stands as a motion. Are you ready for the question? That is the motion.

DEL. DE LEON: I make this as a motion, that when a call of the roll is demanded it shall be only when demanded by twenty votes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it be proper for me to entertain this at this time?

DEL. DE LEON: That is a proper motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

DEL. FOOTE: I wish to amend that motion by saying that we will have a roll call upon every question.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean to have a roll call upon every question?

DEL. FOOTE: If that is demanded by the delegates. It is a fact that there are not twenty men in this room to demand roll call upon every motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Twenty votes, that is practically the same thing.

DEL. DE LEON: I am willing to make it ten. It is simply to establish some rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker Foote wanted to make an amendment. In view of the fact that Del. De Leon cuts it down to ten votes, are you willing to leave your amendment go, in view of that fact?

DEL. FOOTE: I do not care to stand for ten. I will make the amendment to five delegates.

(The amendment was seconded.)

DEL. DE LEON: Five votes means five delegates. I do not recall a single roll call that was not called for by twenty delegates.

DEL. AXELSON: A point of order. We have established a rule that the delegates can occupy the floor but once. Fellow Worker De Leon on this question has been on the floor three or four times.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to make a statement before you proceed. I understood from the motion made that before a roll call can be taken that at least ten votes shall call for it. That is amended by Del. Foote that instead of ten votes it be five delegates. That is the motion before the house. The amendment to the amendment is five votes.

DEL. LEVOY: I believe we will take just as much time up in finding out how many votes we have and looking over the votes. It seems to me that those who are opposed here want the convention to see that they are lecturers and they want to put themselves before the few constituents they have in the country and show them that they spoke against this question and worked against it. They want to go down on

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

record in the stenographic report that will be read all over the world so everybody will see where they stand. That is all there is to it—they want a roll call to show us where they stand. If they want to hold a convention of their own, I would advise them to go out in the hall and hold their own meeting and we will send out their proceedings for them so we won't have to sit here for three weeks listening to them.

DEL. GLOVER: I would like to know who the delegate has reference to. I am in the minority and I would like to know if he means me?

DEL. LEVOY: If you are I mean you just the same as the rest of them.

DEL. FOOTE: Point of order.

DEL. GLOVER: Then, Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate states a point of order. What is your point of order?

DEL. FOOTE: My point of order is this, that the delegate on the floor of this convention is representing a local union. Does the delegate wish to infer that a local union has no right to representation, however small the minority, on the floor of the convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the delegate implied any such thing. I would therefore declare the point out of order not well taken and in making that ruling I would state that it is not necessary to create any ill feeling on account of all this. It is true that the minority had all the time and more time in comparison to the number of votes and locals they represent, than the majority; no one can deny that. We know that Del. Foote spoke longer than any other delegate. They were accorded the full privilege that every other delegate had. Now, it stands to reason the delegate who comes here, the majority of them represent locals just the same as those who represent the minority do. We represent locals, too, and I believe the delegates know that we must proceed a little faster than we have been proceeding, otherwise we will have to stay here two weeks, and some of the delegates haven't the money to stay here that long.

Now, after an expression of opinion has been had several times, there is no use in prolonging the discussion, although I personally do not favor the idea that everything at all times should be tabled. Now go ahead, Delegate Glover.

DEL. GLOVER: I simply want to say this, Fellow-Worker Chairman: It is all very well with the explanation the Chairman has given, providing that is the spirit that has been manifested, but that is not so. Now I can say this:

I have occupied very little time upon the floor. I have refrained from

speaking upon matters when I desired to do so because there has been so much time occupied already, and I have held myself back rather than to take the floor and add to the confusion. I have at all times, furthermore, striven to be as brief as I possibly could, and perhaps in that briefness I have failed to convey my views and ideas to the delegates present, and perhaps that is why they line up against me. Perhaps I have been in error for doing that, but I cannot help it; the thing is passed now, but I simply insist on getting fair treatment.

DEL. KEEP: I don't see any necessity for this motion. They don't seem to agree upon the amount of votes or the number of men they want to demand a roll call, and as I said in making the motion, to limit the speeches I believe first in being fair to myself, and I just want to state as a matter of personal privilege that I have taken the opposite stand to certain people, and on the second day of the convention they were defeated and on the next day they came up on two propositions since then, and they have tried to get them in in a round-about way.

Now, as a workman, I always think we should walk straight forward and to the point, and that we should speak to the point, and when the majority in this body decide against you, don't try to come back and tie that majority up in a knot, because eventually that majority will rise up and ride over them rough footed, and if a bunch of workmen—we are all workmen—if you annoy us too much, naturally, as workmen we will fight. (Applause.)

Now, then, be fair to us; we have been more than fair to you.

DEL. SCHWEND: As a delegate to this convention, I have occupied very little time on the floor of the convention. I did not come here for the purpose of seeing how many times I could get my name in the stenographic report. I came here to do the business of the convention; I came here open to conviction, and the plea has been made that this is to save time. It has been said that some of the delegates to this convention cannot afford to remain here very much longer, but I have noticed throughout all this discussion and wrangling that the very people who make that plea, many of them have been most often the ones to take up the most of the times of this convention. They are the ones in many instances that are eternally on the floor, and wanting to discuss every proposition, and sometimes, notwithstanding the fact that the Chair made a ruling that no man should speak more than once on a question as long as anybody else wanted to speak, some of these very people have not been obeying the rule of the Chair, but have been up here three or four times on one question in violation of that rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one moment, Delegate Schwend: I would

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

not like to be placed in the position that I had allowed anyone to speak more than once upon a question.

DEL. SCHWEND: I qualify that statement.

DEL. JONES: Is there a motion before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. JONES: Let us speak to that.

DEL. SCHWEND: I say let us be fair to each other. That is the spirit I came here in myself. I know I was opposed myself, when I came here, to the views entertained by the majority, but as I said, I came open to conviction, and after I had listened to the arguments on the question I was convinced and my mind was satisfied, and I was satisfied to submit. But, I do not think the majority should adopt the rules or tactics of Tom Reed¹² and ride rough shod over a minority. Such things as that won't do. They will not be tolerated by any body of men, and I do not think any faction in the convention, no matter how big their majority is, are justified in adopting such methods.

I say, let us be fair with one another, if you want to get through with the business of this convention; let us get down to business and not be eternally getting up here and shooting off our mouths and giving this convention a lot of hot air that don't amount to anything.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: I move the previous question.

(Motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. All in favor of the motion say aye. s

(The motion was carried unanimously.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We come to the amendment to the amendment that fifteen votes shall be given for roll call. All in favor of the amendment to the amendment say aye.

(A viva voce {vote} being taken the Chairman declared the amendment to the amendment lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We come next to the amendment that five delegates shall have the right to be given the roll call.

(A viva voce vote was taken on the amendment and it was declared carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the original motion—that original motion is that it requires ten votes.

DEL. KEEP: Point of order. The adoption of this amendment

¹² [Most likely a reference to Representative Thomas B. Reed of Maine who, as Speaker of the House of Representatives from 1889–1891 and 1895–1899, was often referred to as “Czar Reed.”—R.B.]

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

requiring only five members covers that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. You now vote on the motion as amended.

(The question was put and the motion as amended was carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion now before the house to concur in the report of the committee in the Wichita affair. Are you ready for that motion?

(The question was called for, and being put, the motion prevailed.)

DEL. YATES: The grievance presented was the case of Organizer French. The documents were turned over to the Grievance Committee by the Executive Board and Local 157. The committee finds from evidence submitted that French has been lax in his duties to headquarters and dilatory in his methods, and also neglectful in sending our receipts to persons and local unions who have contributed to strikes of which French has had charge.

We recommend that all organizers submit a report weekly of their work, and during strikes of which they have charge, shall submit a weekly statement of income and expenditure. Failing to do so, two weeks in succession, they be recalled from the field.

There is also another provision that Fellow Worker Fischer would like embodied in that, but it did not come in time before the Grievance Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are a number of points there and we must take them up seriatim. What is the first point you recommend, your findings? Is that a final result upon the Bridgeport case?

DEL. YATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please read that over again?

DEL. YATES: We recommend that all organizers submit a weekly report of their work. That is the first proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: What has this to do with the French case? I mean, what is your finding in the French case?

DEL. YATES: The first part of it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. YATES: The first part of it is that the committee finds from evidence submitted that French has been lax in his duty to headquarters, and dilatory in his methods, and also neglectful in sending out receipts to persons and local unions who have contributed to strikes of which French has had charge.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is before the house now. These are simply the findings of the committee; they recommend no action. Is that it?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. YATES: We did not recommend any action in regard to French personally, but we recommend that all organizers should send reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: That part comes after. What is your pleasure?

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, I move you that we hear from Organizer French, as he is here now.

THE CHAIRMAN: What have you got the committee for?

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: There is no charge against Fellow Worker French and I do not see why we should call on French to make a statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see what we have got our committee for, otherwise. Of course French has the same right to speak that anybody else has. If this convention is going to go into a committee of the whole to hear French, we must hear everything else that is to be said on the other side. Otherwise we have not got a fair representation of the case. You have heard the report of the committee. What is your pleasure?

DEL. FRANCIS: I move you that this be referred back to the committee and they give us some recommendation.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded that this be referred back to the committee and that they bring us some recommendation on that matter. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. COLE: I would like to be put clear in this matter. If we find that French has been dilatory in his reports to general headquarters and in sending back receipts for donations to the donators and contributors in any strike he has been engaged in—

DEL. DELANEY: Point of order. As long as this convention is not to hear French, they ought not to hear any statements against him until the committee reports.

DEL. COLE: I am not speaking against him; I am simply talking in regard to the report of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

DEL. COLE: I want to be clear and I want to have somebody tell me what kind of recommendation we shall bring back other than we have produced already? I don't know what to fetch back except that. We found out that the man had been slow in making his reports to the general headquarters. We find that he has been slow in sending back receipts to contributors, of strike benefits in strikes that he has been connected with, or under his charge. Now, then, finding that we have recommended. Now what else are we to recommend except what we have recommended? Put us clear on that. Maybe some of you people

can tell us what to recommend.

DEL. WILLIAMS: It seems to me, Fellow-worker Chairman, that there is an error in the Chairman's proposition to take the thing up seriatim. It seems to me that the recommendation at the close of the committee's report is included in that reference to French. They make their findings and then they make a recommendation for future action for all organizers and the two go together.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would not have anything to do with my accepting the report and the motion. If there is anything wrong it is in the motion, and that can be voted down.

So far as the recommendation is concerned, it is in the constitution now. Do you wish the floor longer? (Addressing Del. Cole.)

DEL. COLE: Yes; I desire to answer your statement. If the recommendations are in the constitution now, then we have recommended it in accordance with the constitution, have we not?

DEL. FRANCIS: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: If there is nothing against French here at all, but if experience has shown that from certain action of some delegates these weekly reports are needed, you can recommend that and this mentioning of French is not necessary. But if you go to work and bring out a report that French has been slow in his work, and dilatory, or anything of that kind, you must bring us some recommendation. For that reason I hold that this should go back and they should either strike out the charge or bring us some recommendation as to what they want us to do.

DEL. COLE: Fellow-worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: The rule is that a man can only speak once.

DEL. THOMAS: Fellow-worker Chairman: As a member of the Grievance Committee, I wish to say in regard to Fellow-worker French's case, that what we could see in the case was absolutely this, that through the circumstances prevailing at the time of this strike, the conditions were such that he could not send in his reports or his receipts immediately, on account of some important questions, and he delayed those minor things for the greater ones.

We saw that there was no criminal intent, of fraud or anything else, in the matter, and we could not see that we could bring in anything else but this recommendation, or a vote to censure him for his dilatoriness.

As for anything being done with Fellow-worker French, as of criminal intent, we could not see anything, and consequently could not bring in any other report.

DEL. JONES: I have had some experience as an organizer with the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Western Federation of Miners, and I have realized the bearing of the organization behind the organizer. We know that the truths which control industry are organized on a scientific basis, you might say; that they have great systems controlling every branch of their organization, and that requisitions from the place where the material is to be used sent by the foreman, go to the warehouse. That perfect system of organization, that card system, practically runs the organization. The present system of organization in the Industrial Workers of the World is very loose; it leaves openings for those things.

What we are here for and what the organization will bring in, is a report on this matter to help straighten these things out and make this a perfect machine. The trouble in the past has been that we have not had an organization perfected to do the work and it has been left to individualism.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: As the matter of French has been brought up and discussed in the Grievance Committee, I simply have to present the case of the Executive Board in this affair or of the entire organization. French is a good organizer, there is no question about it, and I would never accuse him of intentionally doing a wrong in this matter. But the general office has to depend upon the weekly reports from the organizer in the field who conducts the strike, and he should immediately forward receipts to the donators of contributions.

Now, in the case of Skowhegan, as well as in the case of Bridgeport, there were parties not connected with the I.W.W. who had sent contributions to the strike fund. We had sent appeals out and these parties sent in quite an amount of money. The first thing the office received was a notice after two or three weeks elapsed that they had not received an acknowledgement from the party to whom the money had been sent. It entailed so much additional work in the office explaining matters, writing to the places where the strike was conducted, and so forth, that it was simply necessary to set an example, and so the Grievance Committee recommended this rule to be enforced by the incoming Executive Board with all organizers, in case that should happen again.

In this case we had a request that the organizer be removed, but I have always believed and I believe it would be the opinion of everybody who knows what the work is, that it is very hard to remove an organizer when a strike is on. A certain element in the strike have placed their confidence in the man conducting the strike and to remove him would create suspicion and perhaps disaster would ensue.

Now, the convention must go on record and must provide for such

stringent rules that the organizer cannot be dilatory in the conduct of the affairs of the organization. I admit there were some aggravating circumstances connected with the Bridgeport case so that French could not immediately and promptly fulfill all the requirements of an organizer during the strike, but nevertheless those who are not connected with the I.W.W. and who supported the organization financially in critical hours, should receive an acknowledgement from the organization immediately of their donations and should know that the organization in all its work is conducted on the most honest basis. There should not be even a suspicion that a man is wrong in financial affairs, and that is one reason why this matter had to be brought before the Grievance Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now you have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the report be referred back to the Grievance Committee and they are to bring in a recommendation. All in favor of that motion say aye.

(The motion was lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we come to the original motion, to concur in the report of the committee.

(The question was put and the motion prevailed.)

DEL. LIESNER: I understand that tomorrow we cannot have this hall, and I wish to know if any arrangement has been made for a meeting place?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The proprietor said he would arrange a hall upstairs large enough for the delegates if you wish to meet in the afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you read the next report of the committee? We did not act upon these recommendations. Or will you report back to us with a recommendation?

DEL. COLE: No, let the convention act on them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, read the next recommendation.

DEL. COLE: We recommend that all organizers submit a report weekly of their work, and during strikes of which they have charge, shall submit a weekly statement of income and expenditure. Failing to do so two weeks in succession, they be recalled from the field.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the recommendation of the committee, what is your pleasure?

DEL. FRANCIS: I would amend that by adding that they send a copy of that report to the headquarters and to the local body.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

(The amendment was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment to the motion which is before the house is that they also be required to give a copy of the report which they send to the general office, to the local union.

DEL. HAGENSON: I would like to ask if that is not already covered in the constitution?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Not the removal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not the removal of these delegates.

DEL. GLOVER: I would like to make an amendment to the amendment that they be published in the bulletin {sic} in order to save expense. That this report from the organizer be published in the *Bulletin*.

THE CHAIRMAN: These financial reports?

DEL. GLOVER: These financial reports.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That has been the case always. Every strike we have published in the *Bulletin* had these reports with one exception.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say in that respect, that we had a number of strikes in the city of Paterson and we only published such donations and financial reports when we made an appeal to the outside. In that case it was published in the case of the Locomotive Workers.

There was collected in the city of Paterson about \$4,000 within the past nine months, of which no account in *The Bulletin* was given because the money was collected right on the spot, and we simply gave receipts to the various local unions and the individuals.

Now, the amendment to the amendment is that such financial reports be published in the *Bulletin*: Now, it may be well to make the amendment to the amendment, and the amendment one; that is to say the amendment to read that the organizers will be required to send a financial report to headquarters for publication and to their local union. That will cover that.

DEL. FRANCIS: I do not want to say simply a financial report, but that they send a report on financial matters and others as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is understood.

DEL. FRANCIS: All right, if that is understood I am satisfied.

DEL. HAGGERTY: I would like to ask a question: Would it not be better to have the local organizations handle the financial part of this rather than the organizer?

DEL. AXELSON: I will make the substitute for the whole—

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot do that. We have decided here upon the floor of the convention that there is no such thing as a substitute

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

for the whole. You can make an amendment now because there is only one amendment.

DEL. AXELSON: I understood there was an amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: That has been made into one.

DEL. AXELSON: How many can you make, three? The motion, the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am stating to you that there is only one amendment, that the last two amendments have been put into one, to read that these reports be given for publication to the general office and to the local union.

DEL. AXELSON: I make an amendment to the amendment then to the effect that the local union will carry the finance and report to the General Executive Board.

(The motion was seconded.)

DEL. COLE: I would like to make a plain, fair statement in regard to Fellow Worker Haggerty's suggestion or motion of the local handling the finances. While I would have no objection to a council handling the finances, absolutely if the local in Bridgeport had been handling the finances in this fight that French was conducting there, French would have been completely swamped through the trickery of that local or some members of it; not the local but some members of the local.

Now, I want to say this: had the local had charge of the finances in the Bridgeport strike instead of French, he would have been unable to make a report to general headquarters at all. I believe that the rest of this committee will bear me out in that and I believe Organizer French will bear me out in that statement. If there is a council I would submit to that all {that is all?} well and good; but an isolated local or two where a man is up against an organization the same as Local 113, where there isn't a man in the local whom French could talk to on account of his using a foreign tongue, I do not know what he is going to do if the finances go to the local instead of the organizer handling the strike. French or any other organizer would have been up against it in that case and you never would get a report at general headquarters. If you are working among people that speak your own language, all well and good, but when you go and conduct a strike where the tongue is foreign to you and you can only talk to them through an interpreter, then that interpreter can betray you or the organization itself, as well.

DEL. FRENCH: I want to state that I also would approve of the proposition of Fellow Worker Haggerty, and I would prefer in the case of a strike, as an organizer, to have the money handled by the local

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

organization; but there are these exceptional cases that have been referred to such as in Bridgeport. Why, that Hungarian strike committee now has over \$300 in a saloon keeper's safe and if they had handled the money received during that strike, all the money, the expenses of the Bridgeport campaign, would have been saddled to the tune of three or four hundred dollars on the I.W.W. and I would have been swamped because the money could not have been sent to me and I would not have been able to go to the expense of getting agitators to come there and create the agitation that was created there, because I would have had no funds to do it with. I couldn't get it from the Hungarian strike committee, where treacherous dealing was going on toward me, and from this other yellow streaked gang who were trying to do up the organization, because they were afraid to go to the shop they were working in. I was up against that proposition and I thought it was the wise thing to do, after consultation with some of the good men there to retain the funds and pay the expense of the campaign.

There are moneys that came in the day after the strike was over and those fellows got a move on them before the strike was over in an effort to retain all the moneys that came in in order to keep it, and had I not had control of the money that came in to me somebody would be in debt for all of the expenses and there would be \$700 in Geo. Ziegler's safe.

That taught me a lesson and changed my ideas. I had always thought it was preferable for the local organization to handle the money but in this Bridgeport case I saw it turned over to the Hungarian Committee, and I didn't even take a receipt for it, because I thought they were honest, but I saw that it was entered in the book. I think it would be best wherever possible, if there is any representative of the I.W.W. handling the strike, for him to handle the finances through the local organization. If there is any possibility of such complications arising it would be much better to have it attended to in that way and the Executive Board should instruct them to do so, in my judgment, if they think it is right.

Every organizer who is out on the road I know feels the same way, that he would prefer, if it is safe, to have a strike committee manage all the finances and take the burden off the shoulders of the organizer so that he would not be compelled to sit up half the night writing letters to people all over the country as a part of his duties, acknowledging the receipt of every dollar or 50 cents that comes in.

DEL. LEVOY: French can throw more light on this than any other man in this hall, and I am only going to speak briefly. The Hungarian

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Socialist Federation collected nearly \$1,000 for this strike, and some of the donators of this money called upon the Hungarian Federation to give an account of this money and they actually refused to do so. The only thing is this, this convention should instruct, or the committee should instruct the Executive Board of the Hungarian Federation to get that money and they will get it, and it will be turned over to the I.W.W., for the simple reason that they have that money tied up there and I don't know who is going to use it.

I think inasmuch as this matter is on the floor now that we must trace it to the end. We collected from practically everybody—from the American Federation of Labor and the priests and rabbis, and everybody we could get ahold of, and they want an accounting for this money. We told them on the subscription blanks that the donators would be published in the Hungarian Federation paper, and so far they won't give us anything, the names or the amounts, or anything. This is a serious affair, and I think it should be traced down and settled. We got that money from Germans, and Swedes, and Irishmen, and everybody else.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow-Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: You spoke on this question.

DEL. AXELSON: I made an amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did speak on it, didn't you? You know I don't want to be charged afterwards with having one delegate speaking several times.

DEL. AXELSON: Well, you will not in this case because the minutes will show that I only made the amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. The chair does not remember.

DEL. AXELSON: In listening to the argument on both sides, I am at sea as to how I shall vote, because the question devolves upon this: If an organizer is honest and makes his report, it is all well and good. Now that same thing would apply to the local organization. If the local organization is doing the same thing as an organizer, if it is interested in the welfare of the movement, it will do the same thing. On the other hand, if the organizer is a crook, he has two ways of doing the nefarious work until he can be withdrawn from the field, and the local organization stand in the same position. What I am up against is this, I want to know if there is any delegate who can evolve a plan to prevent that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anyone desire the floor upon the motion?

DEL. HAGENSON: I realize, Fellow-Worker Chairman, that at this time we are dealing with a very difficult question, but it seems to me

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

that we will have to strike a sort of middle ground. It certainly is a fact that where a strike is conducted that is of any great importance and it requires the greatest of care to carry that strike on, it will be necessary for the national head to have a man there to conduct the strike. However, there may be a point in the danger of leaving the financial affairs to the one person, and for that reason I believe that while it would be necessary to leave the executive officers in charge of the strike, they should also have, as far as the financial plans go, to give a strict account both to the local and the general organization, and I believe they also should have to work in conjunction strictly with the local organization.

DEL. YATES: During the remarks of Delegate Hagenon it seemed to me that he implied that Fellow-Worker French was dishonest.

DEL. HAGENSON: I want to correct that impression. I would state that I did not refer to any individual case. I simply referred to it generally.

DEL. YATES: This committee does not want any such idea to go abroad. We realize that French has done what is charged in this recommendation, and it is the idea and will of this committee that this should be prevented as much as possible, and we embodied in our recommendations that localities in which organizers are working should work somewhat in conjunction with him in stamping his reports, and I wish to give you to understand that no idea of dishonesty was ever imputed to French, at all.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have discussed that question sufficiently, and we now come to a vote upon the amendment to the amendment, which is Fellow-Worker Axelson's amendment: that the local organization shall conduct the financial affairs of the strike. Isn't that your amendment?

DEL. AXELSON: That is correct.

(The question was put on the amendment to the amendment, and it was lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we come to the amendment proper, which was made by Delegate Francis, which implies that the organizer conducting a strike, is required to send a copy of the financial receipts and the report also, to headquarters and to his local union.

DEL. FRANCIS: Local body.

THE CHAIRMAN: That means also for publication, of course.

(The question was put to a viva voce vote and carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, what was the motion as amended? What

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

was your proposition there?

DEL. FRANCIS: To send it to the headquarters.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion as amended will say aye.

(The motion as amended was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, is there anything else you have to report on?

DEL. YATES: No.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have now come to unfinished business, if there is any. Is there any unfinished business, Mr. Secretary?

DEL. KEEP: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Committee on Constitution was to be the first one to report and that when it concluded, it had only partially reported. Have they any report supplemental to the one they have already submitted?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will ask the secretary of that committee, Delegate Williams, have you any additional report to make on behalf of the Committee on Constitution?

DEL. WILLIAMS: We are not ready to report as yet.

A DELEGATE: Are there any others?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I asked for them and they said no. I called them as we went along. Now, we are under the head of unfinished business.

DEL. DENSON: I have a new form of application blank adopted by Local 258. I would like to know whether that comes up under unfinished business to be presented here and acted on by the convention?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Did you send it in to headquarters?

DEL. DENSON: It was adopted by Local 258.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Have you it with you?

DEL. DENSON: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Give it to the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: You hand that to the chairman and I will hand it to the committee and they will report their action upon it. Any other members present who have any recommendations will hand them to the chairman. This is the proposition of a new application blank. We will refer that to the committee. It is not necessary to read it at this time, in accordance with the previous ruling.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

NEW BUSINESS.

THE CHAIRMAN: We now come to new business. Is there any new business? The Committee on Revision of the Stenographic Report wants the floor.

EDITOR EDWARDS: For the committee on Revision of the Stenographic Report, I wish to state that when you receive the report of yesterday's proceedings which is here and ready for distribution, you will find that it is not completed, although this is an eight-page form. The report of yesterday's proceedings filled eight pages and the committee instructed the printer to take up the continuation of yesterday's report in the next number; that is in Number 5, which will be printed tomorrow, in the hope that the report for today would not exceed six or seven pages, thus leaving ample room in a form of eight pages, to contain the omitted portion of the report of yesterday's proceedings.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the committee. There is no action necessary on that? There is one thing we are not clear upon. I understand the decision of this convention to be that the only resolutions to be initiated here are those that come from a local union, or is it understood that the individual delegates themselves may bring in resolutions?

DEL. LIESNER: If I remember that ruling right it was that anything that came to this convention must be endorsed by the local union whether it came through the delegates or anybody else.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate must carry instructions for such a resolution from his union.

DEL. LIESNER: It must be endorsed.

DEL. FOOTE: That implies that this body would stand powerless to initiate any law or any motion before this body. It strikes me that this is a wrong conception of what we meant. It seems to me that we are here for the purpose of legislation. If a resolution is submitted to the committee on constitution, they, according to that, would have to accept or reject it; they could not initiate another resolution in lieu of it, if that ruling would hold good.

It seems to me that that is tying the hands of the convention. I would hold that the delegates on the floor of the convention have a right to initiate new resolutions that pertain to the ones under consideration already published, and which are the property now of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hold that in so far as it is in connection with

any resolution that may be introduced.

DEL. FRANCIS: Do you mean an amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment or where a resolution has been rejected. Something in connection with that, I hold that that can be introduced by the individual delegate; but a new proposition that has not been talked about here at all, I understand from the constitution and also the decision we have arrived at here, that such resolutions should come from local unions.

DEL. FOOTE: The only point is that it is in connection with a clause that the committee on constitution took up and which the convention endorsed of members at large.

DEL. BOESCHE: Fellow Worker Chairman, if we were to have a resolution by Duncan here again, he would be piling on resolutions here all the time. Last year somebody made a resolution that we were to have no more resolutions after a certain date, either from individuals, locals or anybody else; that they could not be admitted. I think that that action should be taken again. Otherwise, we can be putting in resolutions here which will have to go to the committee and then come back to the convention for action by the body and we would have to stay here for a month.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are under the head of New Business. You can make such a motion as that if you desire.

DEL. BOESCHE: I make a motion that no resolutions be accepted from individuals or locals after tomorrow noon. (Saturday.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that motion seconded?

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded that no recommendations be accepted from locals or individuals after tomorrow noon. Are you ready for the question.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of information: Does that mean resolutions that affect the constitution also?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: Then that is superfluous.

DEL. LEVOY: The constitution states that they have to put their resolutions in, which affect the constitution, two months before the convention.

DEL. DELANEY: I believe the constitution states that locals will have to submit their proposed amendments that much ahead, but it does not prevent this convention from taking action itself. I think it would be foolish to try to do so. If this convention is not able to initiate anything, its hands are certainly tied.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to the bringing in of resolutions which simply mean such resolutions as are amended or something we have changed in the constitution. That is what it has reference to and so the articles in the constitution would not change that language. It does not mean something altogether new but something we have acted upon here.

DEL. BENSON: I wish to state that on account of the notice in *The Bulletin* that the resolution must be at headquarters two months previous to the convening of the convention, that that is the reason there is no resolution brought from my local. That is the way we understood it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the way they understood it in my local, too.

DEL. BENSON: For that reason we did not bring any, and that is the reason why I held this application blank and thought it was not admissible, but I see repeatedly that there have been resolutions brought in here and that is the reason I brought it in now.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair holds that when there is something upon which we have acted as in the matter of amending, that in that matter the delegates have a right to make amendments and bring in resolutions.

Now, the motion before the house is whether tomorrow noon shall be the limit within which to bring in resolutions.

DEL. LIESNER: Point of information: I would like to ask if this resolution now on the table pertains to any amendment to the constitution?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean the one that is in the hands of the committee?

DEL. LIESNER: The one you just received.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I believe that would go to the committee on resolutions.

DEL. LIESNER: All right.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If any one wants the previous question they will have to get the floor and make a motion on the previous question in order to be recognized.

DEL. FRANCIS: I make that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot make the motion because somebody else now has the floor.

DEL. HAGENSON: I do not see the necessity of this motion. I do not believe there is any great amount of resolutions; neither do I

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

believe that there is any danger of any great pile of resolutions coming in. There may be something come in that may be of benefit to the organization, but I do not believe there is anything much coming up that will take up any great length of time. For that reason I believe that motion is unnecessary at this time.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move you the previous question.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the previous question now be put. All in favor of the motion say aye.

(The motion carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion that tomorrow noon should be the limit to bring in any resolution, say aye.

(The motion prevailed.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further new business? We are under the head of new business.

DEL. BOHM: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del{egate} Bohm.

DEL. BOHM: Article I, Section 2 of our Constitution reads: "The Industrial Workers of the World shall be composed of actual wage workers brought together in an organization," etc. Now, for that purpose, supposing my foreman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make a motion?

DEL. BOEHM: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you have got to make a motion so that we have something before the house. If you want to bring up anything of that sort you have got to bring it up under the head of "Good and Welfare." Unless you have a motion to make or a resolution, you cannot speak. Is there any new business? It has been provided by the committee on rules, under the head of rules and order of business; it has also provided for good and welfare of the organization, and we are now under that head.

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

DEL. FOOTE: The constitution committee has considered another clause here, and I guess we are all ready to report on it without any further deliberation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the Constitution Committee ready?

DEL. FOOTE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. FOOTE: I am agreed upon it if all the rest are agreed.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed upon it?

DELEGATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

DEL. WILLIAMS: (On behalf of the Constitution Committee): It is a proposed amendment to the Constitution from the Constitution Committee; an amendment to Section 10 of Article VI. If you have the constitutions in your hands you will notice the change that is proposed to be made. The amendment that we propose reads as follows:

“All National Industrial Departments and National Industrial Unions of the Industrial Workers of the World shall pay a tax to the general organization of 8 1-3 cents per month per member, reported in good standing.”

Then Section 11: “All departments and other subordinate organizations of the Industrial Workers of the World shall use the official I.W.W. stamps in membership books.”

In addition to that: “All stamps shall be paid for at 15 cents each and no book shall be considered in good standing except stamped ‘up to date.’”

Now I will state briefly the purpose of that proposed change in the constitution. It is to eliminate the difficulties that attend the use of the transfer system, the card system that we have today, where the secretary of a local to which a member is transferred collects dues, and remits one-half of the dues to the local from which the member transfers, and also to avoid the per capita system of reporting to headquarters the per capita every month, and replacing that with a simple system of buying the stamps and paying for them in advance; that is the proposition, in brief, as I understand it.

DEL. LEVOY: Is that the recommendation?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is the recommendation. Now, the question is, Have you taken into consideration the amendment made by the Silk Workers’ Union of Paterson?

DEL. WILLIAMS: I have not that here.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been printed in *The Bulletin*, and I presumed it was to be handed by the secretary to the committee.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I don’t think we have considered that. I have not the document with me. I left my documents at headquarters.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be well. I thought it would come in together with this.

DEL. LEVOY: I want to ask a question. Do I understand by this amendment that if I paid up for August and go over to September, I am not in good standing?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the secretary explain that?

DEL. KEEP: I do not wish to take up time, but I would like to have the secretary read these sections as amended by this amendment, if adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did read that as amended, didn't you?

DEL. WILLIAMS: That is exactly what I have done, read the sections as amended. I did not know that this matter was to be brought up here tonight. I supposed that the committee would meet and get this matter in a little bit better shape.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be done if you are in the committee room and we do that and adjourn until tomorrow morning.

DEL. KERN: I move that the committee have the amendment—

DEL. HAGENSON: I move that the amendment—

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute. It has been moved that this be referred back to the committee.

(Motion seconded and carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is now twenty-five minutes past five.

DEL. GLOVER: I move you we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

(Motion seconded and carried.)

Adjourned to 9 p.m. {a.m.??} Saturday, Sept. 21, 1907.

SIXTH DAY—SATURDAY, SEPT. 21, 1907.
MORNING SESSION.

Chairman Katz called the convention to order about 9 o'clock.

The secretary called the roll, which showed the following absentees: Bohm, Huber, and Pinkerton.

THE CHAIRMAN: Reports of committees, standing and special.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. FRANCIS, of Committee on Resolutions: Mr. Chairman, the committee on resolutions has two resolutions which would be appropriate to adopt at the opening of the session. One resolution is on the Moyer, Pettibone affair, and the other on the Preston and Smith case. The committee submits the following resolution on the Moyer, Pettibone case:

“Whereas, Charles H. Moyer and George A. Pettibone are still in the clutches of the servile tools of the Mine Owners’ Association, the first under heavy bonds, the others {sic} languishing in jail at Boise{,} Idaho, and both accused of the murder of an ex-Governor of Idaho.

“Whereas, we realize that the parasite class will try every means, criminal or otherwise, to disrupt the fighting labor organizations to assure it domination over the working class;

“Whereas, the persecution of Charles H. Moyer and George A. Pettibone is the direct result of the advanced stand taken by them in the labor movement; therefore be it

“Resolved, that we, the delegates to the third annual convention of the I.W.W. assembled this the 21st of September, in Chicago, Ill., affirm our unflinching solidarity with our persecuted brothers and pledge ourselves to continue as in the past to use every effort to achieve their liberation.”

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the reading of the resolution. What is your pleasure?

DEL. WILLIAMS: I move the adoption of this resolution.

(The motion was seconded from all parts of the hall, and being put, was unanimously carried.)

DEL. FRANCIS: In the case of Preston and Smith we submit the following resolution:

“Whereas, Fellow Worker Preston, of Goldfield, Nevada, in the discharge of his duty as picket, being attacked by the owner of a struck restaurant with drawn revolver, shot and killed him; and

“Whereas, though it was a clear case of self defense, Fellow Worker Preston was arrested on the charge of murder, and Fellow Worker

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Smith{,} the secretary of the union, was arrested on the charge of being an accessory before the fact, and both sent to prison by a packed jury; and

“Whereas, eight other members of the I.W.W. and W.F.M. are being held for trial on a charge of conspiracy in connection with this case; and

“Whereas, the Citizens’ Alliance and Mine Owners’ Association have been backed up by scab herder Grant Hamilton and his A.F. of L. scabs; therefore be it

“Resolved, that we, the delegates to the third annual convention of the I.W.W.{,} demand that Preston and Smith be given a new and fair trial and the freedom to which they are entitled; and further be it

“Resolved, that the others be speedily tried and released; and further be it

“Resolved, that we consider said Grant Hamilton and his organized scabs traitors who would sell the lives of their fellow slaves for the master’s smile; and be it further

“Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be published in *The Bulletin* and sent to the labor press.”

DEL. SPEED: I move the adoption of the resolution. (Seconded.)

DEL. DE LEON: I agree with the committee’s resolution except where they say “Whereas, eight other members.” That is so indefinite. I move an amendment that instead of saying “eight others,” we say “Vincent St. John and seven others.”

DEL. FRANCIS: We accept that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee accept that?

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes.

DEL. DELANEY: I was one of the committee and I will state that the only name I knew was Vincent St. John, the only one I remembered, and I think it is an insult to the others to make any distinction. I think if we mention one that we should mention all of them. That was considered, and in writing the resolution I put it in that way and left the names out because I did not know the others. I believe it would be an insult to all the others to mention any one.

DEL. AXELSON: There was one clause in this that I did not understand correctly. Perhaps I misunderstood the committee’s report, and it may be cleared. It is said that these men referred to in the resolution have been sent to jail by a packed jury. Is it the fact that the jury sent them to jail, or was it some police court or some other institution of the mine owners that sent them to jail and that the jury has not yet acted? That is what I want to be clear upon.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Preston and Smith were tried before a jury and sentenced to 10 and 25 years. The jury, by the way, in order to explain some matters, thought that if they gave a recommendation to the judge to use leniency in regard to these men, that perhaps they would have been given only one or two years in prison. Three of the jurors were members of the Western Federation of Miners. I talked to Vincent St. John about it, and one of the jurors was an *Appeal to Reason* reader, and these men are responsible for the jury agreeing on that verdict. I state that because St. John made that statement to several persons, and made it in our headquarters. But the case is now pending and an appeal has been taken, and perhaps in this month, if the higher court shall decide it, we may have another trial for the two.

DEL. AXELSON: I think that covers the ground. I have read about it, but I do not remember all the facts.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Would the committee accept a correction? It is said that Preston and Smith were both organizers of the union. Neither one of them was. Smith has been secretary, and if I am correct, was secretary of No. 77 when it amalgamated with the Western Federation of Miners.

A DELEGATE: Yes, they were organizers.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They were both organizers, but Smith had been secretary of Local 77 of the I.W.W. prior to the merging of the two unions. The correction ought to be made. They were not secretaries; they were organizers.

DEL. FRANCIS: It states explicitly; we simply mention that one was secretary.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Neither one was secretary.

DEL. DE LEON: A point was raised against me yesterday because I was rising to speak three or four times. I wish to ask whether I have the floor now to speak on my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: Now, if my amendment would be construed as an insult to the others, one of whom I have met and know personally, I would then ask leave to withdraw my motion. But I do not so construe it, and the way the motion reads it looks to me like a slur which Preston himself would be the first one to resent. That strike was conducted, in point of fact, by Vincent St. John, together with the others connected to him. Every one who was there and every one who even followed the papers upon the subject would know that. To say Preston and Smith and seven others, puts the seven others into a category where they do not belong. Now, the imprisonment of Smith

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

and Preston was simply intended to be a dragnet to catch St. John, and upon the same principle that when Haywood was wanted they took Moyer and Pettibone along to conceal their real purpose, these others were taken along also. I think it is an incorrect presentation of the case to say "Preston and Smith and eight others." If, however, it should be thought that it was an insult to these other men, then I would ask leave, in case my motion is defeated, to present another one to the effect that this resolution be referred back to the committee with instructions that they ascertain, as they can readily, the names of all the seven and insert them; because if anybody thought it was an insult, then I should certainly say it is an insult to those seven to mention them in a lump like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion and the amendment to the motion. What is your pleasure? (Question called for.) The amendment is that—will you repeat your amendment, please, delegate?

DEL. DE LEON: My amendment was that the passage which reads "and eight others" be amended to read "St. John and seven others." That is my amendment. But in view of the objection that has been raised, I will ask leave to withdraw that, and my motion will then be, as I stated, that this resolution be referred back to the committee with instructions to ascertain the names of all the others and insert them.

(Secoded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the withdrawal of that amendment?

DEL. FRANCIS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If not we will consider it withdrawn.

DEL. LEVOY: The way I understood, some are already put in. Is that right?

DEL. FRANCIS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection to the withdrawal of that amendment, the question will be on the motion of Delegate De Leon to refer this back to the committee to ascertain the names of all the eight members and insert them. Is that right?

DEL. DE LEON: Yes.

The motion to refer was put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything else to report, Delegate Francis?

DEL. FRANCIS: That is all for the present.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

REPORT OF CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will take up the next committee. Has the committee on constitution anything to report?

DEL. WILLIAMS: We have for consideration a proposition from Paterson, N.J. I will read the proposition and the recommendation of the committee:

“The district council of Paterson, N.J., through Secretary William Glanz, writes to headquarters regarding the difficulties experienced in the textile industry owing to the position in that industry of women and girls who are employed as winders, quillers and cloth pickers. These women and girls are paid from \$2 to \$4 per week, and cannot be expected to pay more than 15 cents a month as dues. They are not organized, but being a powerful factor because of their numbers and the nature of their work, it is imperatively necessary that they be organized in the I.W.W. The district council therefore proposes the following plan to meet this situation:

“First. That the G.E.B. permit the district council to organize an auxiliary or branch.

“Second. All silk and textile workers, { . . . }¹³ quill winders, hard and soft silk winders, cloth pickers, and folders, shall be admitted to membership in the auxiliary; all members of the auxiliary shall have a voice but no vote in the affairs of the general organization—the I.W.W.

“Third. Members of the auxiliary shall pay 15 cents per month dues. Of this sum 7½ cents shall go to the general office, the other seven and one-half cents to remain in the treasury of the local or district council.

“Fourth. When a sufficient number have become members of the auxiliary and the time is favorable they shall make a demand for an increase in wages. When a sufficient number has received an increase in wages they shall withdraw from the auxiliary and become members of a branch or local of the Industrial Workers of the World.”

Here is the recommendation of the committee:

“The committee is averse to any constitutional change, and therefore recommends the following resolution to be referred to the committee on organization for their recommendation to the convention:

“Resolved, that district councils and national industrial unions shall have power, with the consent of the G.E.B., to organize industrial branches, at such lower rates of initiation fees and dues as the

¹³ [One word missing from newspaper original.—R.B.]

smallness of the wages of the workers affected may render necessary; provided, that such act be taken only where found necessary in cases of women and children who could not otherwise be organized to raise their wages; and provided also, that the moment the wages of such elements are raised the dues and other contributions demanded from them shall accord with the constitutional regulation.”

DEL. DE LEON: In regard to the recommendation of the committee, the committee on constitution has no power to recommend changes and alterations. An alteration for the benefit of Paterson is very proper and very desirable, but it is not in the nature of an amendment; it is more in the nature of a dispensation that shall come regularly through the committee on organization. For that reason we framed it in that way, having heard the argument on the part of Paterson, for the committee on organization to consider. While the committee will have some other matters of the same nature, it will be well for the committee to consider this so that there will be no conflict in the recommendations. It is not in our province to refer to the committee on organization, and therefore I move to concur. (Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this be referred to the committee on organization—

DEL. DE LEON: No, that the resolution which the committee on organization {constitution?} has drafted, be referred to the committee on organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is what I meant, the report that has been read by the Secretary. All in favor—

DEL. JONES: Does that include the resolution of Paterson too, pertaining to this matter under discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation is referred to the committee.

(The motion to refer was put and carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything else to report?

DEL. WILLIAMS: On behalf of the committee on constitution: Here is a recommendation from the General Secretary-Treasurer:

“All efforts should be made to abbreviate the time consumed in conventions. Two important committees should be prepared to give a report immediately after the calling of the convention for the transaction of business. I would therefore suggest that each union when electing delegates should make nominations for auditors, and that out of the nominees three be elected by referendum vote and have the books of the general office audited three days prior to the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

convening of the convention. Such auditing committee should also act as first committee on credentials and report on delegates whose seats are not contested.”

The recommendation of the committee is that this proposition be rejected on the ground that the medicine is worse than the disease.

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands as a motion before the house, the recommendation of the committee.

DEL. AXELSON: I believe that is a pretty good proposition, but I would like to see that one clause stricken out of there in regard to this committee being the committee on credentials. I don't believe that we want to go on record in that way. That can easily be done on the floor of the convention. We won't abbreviate any time by following that suggestion. But as to auditing the books three days before three convention convenes, I think that is a good proposition, if this committee is elected will serve, that is if all the nominees on the committee from the union will act. In that way a good deal of time will be saved. With the eliminating of that part as to giving them the right to act as a committee on credentials I would be in favor of it. I think that should be stricken out. I think that will be consented to by the mover of the suggestion. I would like to hear from him. I wish to know if the mover of this suggestion would be willing to strike that from his recommendation, that this committee on auditing the books should be a standing committee on credentials.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order. My point of order is that the suggestion of the national secretary {sic} is not in order because the matter has passed out of his hands and the only motion before the convention is the recommendation of the committee on constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken. Are you ready for the question? (The question was called for and the motion carried.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: We have one other proposition, and we ask that this be deferred until after the report of the committee on organization has been given, in order that we may be clear in bringing it out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you have nothing to report at this time?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Nothing further.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next committee is the committee on ways and means.

DEL. LEVOY: Nothing to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the committee on literature and press anything to report?

DEL. GLOVER: I will say for that committee that we have nothing as yet to report.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you receive the suggestion from the report of the General Secretary?

DEL. GLOVER: What suggestion do you refer to?

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the General Secretary was divided and given to the various committees. Your committee has not received its share, has it?

DEL. GLOVER: It has never met, and I can assure it has not taken up that matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will give you that before you leave the floor at noon.

DEL. GLOVER: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee on organization.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

DEL. FISCHER, on behalf of the committee: Fellow Chairman {Fellow Worker Chairman?} and convention: The first thing we took up in the committee on organization was the reports of organizers which were sent to us. Before we go into this I would like to ask if the convention wishes us to read these reports. Some are quite lengthy, so if you are satisfied with our bringing before you the recommendations of these organizers we will do so.

DEL. KEEP: I think there would be no objection to the committee simply stating the recommendations of the organizers.

DEL. FOOTE: It strikes me that it would be to the advantage of this organization and this convention to hear the reports in full of these organizers. We have taken up valuable time with other things; why not take up time with things that really are of great value to the work of the organization? It strikes me that the experience of these organizers in the year past is one thing that we should above all else consider for the next year. I would suggest that the organizers' reports be read in full, that the report of the organization committee be received and considered, and then the organizers be given an allotted time to be heard. (Seconded.)

DEL. JONES: Would the delegate believe in having the organizers' reports go in the stenographic report? It would fill two pages of the paper.

DEL. FOOTE: I have not considered that, but I hardly think it necessary inasmuch as it is the province of this convention to hear the reports and then the organization as a whole hears the report of the convention on the matter. But the organizers' reports are the business

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

of the convention, and the convention acts and the executive board and the officers act after the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, Delegate Foote, there has been no motion made. So far as the chair is concerned I would take the stand that we had the organization committee for the purpose of reading all these reports and recommendations, digesting them and presenting them to us in a manner so that we do not have to waste two days of our time in hearing all these things that may be said. That is what we have the committee for, and I would so rule. You can appeal against my decision.

DEL. FOOTE: I do not care to appeal.

DEL. AXELSON: I feel inclined to, It is absolutely necessary for us to know about this. We want to know all the transactions and in what way the work is carried on.

DEL. FRANCIS: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you raise a point of order?

DEL. AXELSON: I do not wish to speak, but I would like to make a motion, and if I am not allowed to make a motion I appeal from the decision of the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the motion you want to make?

DEL. AXELSON: The motion is to the effect that the reports be read on the floor of the convention of the various national organizers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I declare that motion out of order.

DEL. AXELSON: Then I appeal from the decision of the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: I simply repeat what I said before, that it is my opinion that the committees are here for the purpose of hearing all this mass of argument that comes before them and digesting it and bringing it before this convention in that form so that we do not have to waste too much time. I do not know if my position is strictly in accordance with parliamentary law or not, but it seems to me to be common sense, and that is why I have taken that stand. Now, the appellant can state his side of the case.

DEL. SCHWEND: The decision of the chair—

DEL. KEEP: I rise to a point of order, that there can be no debate except between the appellant and the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. SCHWEND: I want to make this point of order, that the decision of the chair has been appealed from, and it now becomes the duty of the chair to put the question: "Shall the decision of the chair be upheld?"

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate is mistaken. You must first hear the

argument, and then we come to the motion. Del. Axelson can state his side of the case, and then nobody else can speak upon it.

DEL. AXELSON: I think I practically covered the case before when I made the remark that I think it is essential for all of us who are here to hear the experience of these organizers, because I believe myself that the experience of the organizer who has been out among the working class, who has learned the actual conditions of the working class in the different industries in the different localities, can give every one of us valuable information by which we can guide ourselves in the future in certain rules and regulations pertaining to the organization. This is the reason why I want this decision taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the appellant and the statement of the chair. All those in favor of sustaining the chair will please say aye. Opposed no. The chair thinks that he is sustained, but if there are three or five delegates they can have a roll call. Do you demand a roll call?

(A delegate called for a show of hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of a roll call can show their hands. Are there five that want a roll call? If not—(counting) one, two. Proceed.

DEL. LEVOY: A question of information. Are those reports of the organizers to be published in *The Bulletin*?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you mean all these reports?

DEL. LEVOY: I understood {it} that way from the secretary. The secretary probably could answer; if not, the editor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the editor of the *Industrial Union Bulletin* prepared to say whether all the reports of the organizers as they came before this organization committee will be published in the *Industrial Union Bulletin*?

ED. EDWARDS: We will act in conformity with the instructions of this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: The answer of the secretary {editor?} is that they will act in conformity with the instructions of this convention. Now, there being nothing before the house, the committee on organization will report.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of information. Wouldn't that shut off any supplementary report or any statement from the organizers on any controversy involved in the reports of the organization committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think not. I would not object to hearing, so far as I am concerned, from any one who has any additional light to throw upon the subject as it is brought in by the organization committee. I

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

want again to state that the only thing that prompts me is that it simply saves time. To publish them would take a big book without gaining anything thereby. The committee on organization has the floor.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

DEL. FISCHER (of committee on organization): The first report is on the recommendation of William R. Fox. His recommendations are contained in the following passage: "What is best to do? Stick to our principles and propagate them. Change not an iota of the preamble." We considered that self-evident, and therefore did not take any action.

The second report is the report of Mrs. Forberg.

DEL. DE LEON: A question of information. The committee has not presented a motion or acted upon that?

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be well to read the whole business, and then you may take it up seriatim, unless you want to act on everything as it comes up.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that we act on everything as it comes up. (Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded that we take the report as it comes and act upon the various recommendations as they are read. Now, we will take up this one; that will stand as the motion of the committee.

DEL. LIESNER: I think that will lead to confusion. We may conclude to act on a proposition now, and later on have something that will require a change there because we don't know what is in the whole mass or what the recommendation will be. So I think it is best to go over them first and then act on them seriatim. In that way I think we can act more intelligently.

DEL. FRANCIS: In my estimation, I think the committee know how to act, and they are not going to submit one proposition that is in contradiction to another. I don't believe we should read the whole and then go over it again. I hope this motion will prevail.

DEL. AXELSON: In order to do away with this, I do not think any lengthy discussion is necessary, but should this report be read until the organization committee has completed its work? Wouldn't it be well to have this organization committee keep in contact with what the convention approves of, and then get together and see that it harmonizes, and they can make a short report on the whole afterwards.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any one else desire the floor upon this question?

The motion is that we act upon the recommendations of the committee as the secretary of that committee reads them, without reading the whole report first.

The motion was put and carried.

DEL. FISCHER: The recommendation of Organizer Fox is “stick to our principles and propagate them. Change not an iota of the preamble.” The organization committee consider this self-evident and does not recommend anything in this matter.

DEL. KEEP: I think the convention also thinks that.

DEL. WALTERS: As a member of this committee I will say that I did not understand this this way at all. This committee agreed to concur, and practically we have concurred in the recommendation of this organizer by our action on the preamble that we took previously. Consequently it has been acted on.

(The question on concurring in the action of the committee was put and the action concurred in.)

DEL. FISCHER: Mrs. Forberg, organizer, recommends: “First, that we center our efforts on the smaller cities, where the A.F. of L. is weak.” The committee recommends that we do not concur in this recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands before the convention as a motion. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. FOOTE: Not living in a large industrial center for some years, I cannot speak, of course, with any degree of definite knowledge as to the conditions. But it seems to me to have been the experience of the organization since its formation that where the constructive, solid work of the organization has been carried on has not been in your large industrial centers, like Chicago. While we know that the field in a place like Chicago is open to good work, still we see there a great majority of the working men that are unorganized today have been organized or been victimized in some shape or form by the organizations of the past. It strikes me that it would be harder to build up an organization starting from the plain basis of nothing but the determination which you say we did start from since the last convention—it strikes me that it would be hard if we should confine all our efforts or the bulk of our efforts to the industrial centers without going into the smaller towns in these outlying districts where locals can be formed and where the exploitation is not so fierce, and where

the masters are not watching so close over their slaves. Now, I have just one instance to cite of my own knowledge; that is the case of a man in my particular industry. I believe it would be impossible to organize much of an organization of bakery workers in this town. Why? Because the International is in here; this is its headquarters; its paper is published here. The large shops of this town carry the International label, and why do they carry it? Because of the contract they make, the deal with the bosses, and I as a man who has rebelled against that organization am blacklisted and prevented from working in a place like Chicago.

On the other hand, take a certain district out in the west. The International Bakery and Confectionary Workers' Union has an organization in Kansas City, No. 218, in which I have held cards twice. It continues to exist. By virtue of the union men there? No; by virtue of invoking a deal with the boss bakers and the labor faker unions. I cannot work in Kansas City without I work in a scab shop; consequently I do not work there at all. But our little local in Kansas, in Wichita, rebelled and withdrew from the International. The field is open south of us, and a branch of our local has been formed, as you know, in Ada. Another has been formed in Oklahoma City. On the south we can go to Houston, Fort Worth and Dallas, where the International, I understand, is not organized, without there is one in Dallas, and I think not. But they did have a local in Galveston. We can organize then and we can take in the towns in Texas and then force that Galveston local to come across. You can all talk about men coming in the organization on the pure proposition of principle. That is all well and good, but I want to say that men cannot stay in the organization without that principle is backed up and they can defend themselves. Take that principle all through; suppose we organize the bakery workers in Kansas, Oklahoma, Indian Territory, Arkansas and part of Missouri and Texas, and go south into Nebraska, and what would be the result? That we would establish a barrier over which the International man would have to cross to go from the east to the west. What have we got in Butte? There is a bakery local there which perhaps is not directly affiliated, but can be affiliated with our organization. I certainly believe the bakery workers would organize with the other fellows. And the same I believe as to Rhyolite, and I am satisfied, knowing the men in the west and in my state as I do and down on the coast, that the bakery workers can be lined up, and if that is followed by a definite program then we can get the bakery workers in the cities. They have the control of a whole lot of food production

and can dictate to the capitalists in many instances. They can dictate as to whether or not the miners on strike shall be fed. They can dictate as to who shall be fed, as to whether the strike breakers or soldiers shall be fed. It means a whole lot, to me especially. I believe that the report of the organizer is well taken on the point he makes, and I believe that whether or not you adhere to it, that the outlying industrial centers should not be neglected at least.

DEL. KEEP: It seems to me that a recommendation such as this denies the fundamental end of our organization. As an industrial union, an industrial organization, we must seek our membership where the industrial line of production is the thing. In the smaller towns it seems to me, especially where I have worked, and I have worked in a good many towns, I have noticed that the smaller towns are not the citadel, but the outpost, and if we intend organizing along industrial lines it seems to me that we should not run away from where the industry is organized. It is a self-evident fact that the industrial centers are in the large cities, the industrial forms of production, and such being the case, why should we center our efforts around the places where that is not the main thing, to go off into the smaller towns and try to organize fully along trade lines. It seems to me a negation of the principles upon which we stand. As to the other point, simply because the A.F. of L. is weak there, that is not to say that we are not to make any fight there. Why are we going to run away from the other fellow? Another thing, in a town such as Chicago or New York and the other large centers of population there are thousands; in those other towns there are hundreds of men. Will we leave these thousands to themselves, let them go and attend to the hundreds? I cannot understand this idea at all. I agree perfectly with the committee. Another thing I want to point out in all such discussions as this: The convention is a legislative body, but the proposition is to turn it into an administrative body. The general executive board has charge of the organizers. They know the field and know what can be done. Then why are we to say to them that they are to administer our acts? They are to act as the administration, to execute what we here decide upon. We cannot vote on all the details for them; just the same as I made the point about the editor and the other officials; we were to decide on a certain line of policy and leave the points to them. After having decided upon them, the general executive board, it seems to me, is the one to administer that policy. If they find that in certain localities and organizer is needed, then in their wisdom they will send him there. If they find he is needed in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

another he can have work there and they will send him there. I do not see why we should get mixed up in these things that concern the administration and not us as a legislative body. Therefore, for those reasons I am in favor of the adoption of the report of the committee.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman, I agree in part with Fellow Worker Keep, but not altogether. I hold that this convention as a legislative body has got to outline as nearly as we can do it the line of action or the line of organization that we expect to pursue in the next year, and not leave everything to the judgment of the G.E.B. We have got to get a consensus of opinion of the industrial situation in different parts of the country and find out where the work is most needed. Now it seems to me that the proposition of Organizer Forberg is in the first place a little indefinite, and in the next place it would be a bad line of action for this organization to pursue. Take the illustration of Fellow Worker Foote, for example, regarding the bakery workers. His suggestion that we take the smaller towns is in line with Organizer Forberg's suggestion where the A.F. of L. is weak. Now, a chain of bakery workers locals organized as in Wichita, Kansas, Omaha, Neb., Houston, Tex., San Jose, Cal., such a chain would be a chain of broken links and parts, and therefore would be an ineffectual form of organization. Now, in my opinion we have certain dominant industries, very well centralized. For example, the mining industry, the lumber industry—

THE CHAIRMAN: The textile.

DEL. WILLIAMS: The textile industry and a number of others that will form the backbone of the organization that we are trying to build up, and without that backbone a chain with locals scattered here and there in the smaller towns throughout the country will be a chain with broken links, and they will disappear in the course of evolution as we go along. You know that is not a promising form at the present time, not the solid substance of the Industrial Workers of the World. Let us go after those dominant industries. Even though we may not get results immediately, the money that has been spent upon any of those that I have mentioned and others that may be mentioned will bear fruits in solid work in the very near future. I am in favor of the recommendation of the committee.

DEL. JONES: With reference to the smaller cities, I as one of the committee on organization hold that it is not a question of cities at all; it is a question of industries, and therefore we practically brought in the resolution the way we did. I understand that this organization, this convention here, comes together to build up the backbone, the

skeleton which the workers will come together on. The skeleton is the backbone of the organization, and we are here to make something to which the workers can attach themselves, no to go out and organize a few locals here and there; we want to centralize, to bring them together, and the action of the committee in regard to this resolution practically recommends the principle underlying that, and that is why we brought in the motion that way.

DEL. AXELSON: I have listened very attentively to the remarks made on this proposition. It was stated that it would be a bad move for us to make in accordance with this report of Organizer Forberg. For myself I am not willing yet to say that it will be, because the reason for this motion has not yet been stated. I take it for granted that when any person, organizer or member or delegate to this convention, makes a motion to this effect, that he should give the reason for making it. Therefore, I think it is proper, even at this time, in order to fully understand the bearing of the two propositions taken that Organizer Forberg take the floor of this convention and explain why she takes this position. If it would be in order I make a motion that Organizer Forberg be given time to explain why she sends in this report.

(Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You did not state the time. I presume that would be the same as any other delegate, ten minutes. It is moved that the organizer be given the floor upon this question. You have heard the motion; are you ready for the question?

DEL. WALTERS: I wish to speak on the motion of Fellow Worker Axelson now. I am opposed to the motion. Fellow Worker Williams has taken the words practically out of my mouth that I wished to say on this proposition for the recommendation of the organization committee. Now the Industrial Workers of the World wants to organize the workingclass, but their fundamental principle is to organize the industries, to organize the future structure of society; bear that in mind. Now, we have had in the past—

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Walters, do you want to speak on the motion?

DEL. WALTERS: I am speaking in opposition to the motion of the fellow worker here. I am speaking to show the reason we should not grant the floor to Fellow Worker Forberg, if you will allow me. It is for the reason stated that the organization committee has brought in the recommendation that it has. We want to concentrate our efforts along lines which will bring a fundamental structure, to build this structure

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

for the future commonwealth. Now, we do not oppose organizing any food stuff industry, but we do oppose putting our organizers in the field as we have in the past year and have them hopping around the country like a hen on a hot griddle and getting no results; practically speaking. And for that reason I hold that it is not necessary at the present time to give any one the floor to state why we should organize and concentrate our efforts in a few small towns or in a few chains of towns, as Fellow Worker Foote has put it. We want to organize something that we can build upon, not wildcat locals.

(The motion to permit Organizer Forberg to have the floor was put and declared carried unless a roll call should be demanded. A roll call was demanded and taken.)

DEL. YATES: Am I to understand that all acts of the Convention up to now become law?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. YATES: In that respect, then, Delegate French is no longer a delegate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why?

DEL. YATES: Because that rule we passed in regard to delegates representing Local Unions would apply to him.

THE CHAIRMAN: What of it? The law that has been passed here would mean that the organizer would be the man who has to be a member at large. That is what you mean.

DEL. YATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Consequently he would not be a member of the Local Union that selected him. Delegate French is not a member of that Local Union anyway, as it is.

DEL. FRENCH: Does that apply to the seats? Is that the point you are making?

DEL. YATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It could not apply to the delegates who are seated at this convention. You could not make it operative backwards.

DEL. YATES: That is what I want to know.

(Secretary Trautmann then announced the result of the ballot as follows: Total number of votes cast, 125; 65 voting aye; 60 voting no.)

ORG. FORBERG: Fellow chairman {Fellow Worker Chairman?} and fellow workers: I would like to say that if I had realized that my whole report would not have been read or printed, on the floor of the convention, I certainly should not have made my report. I was given to understand that the report I prepared for the convention would be printed in last week's *Bulletin*, and would thereby become the property

of every member of the body, so that you could understand it, and the misunderstanding that has been deliberately foisted upon this convention of my recommendations would not have occurred. I was given to understand in a letter received from General-Secretary Trautmann in May, to this effect: that every organizer of the I.W.W. should be here in Chicago during the days of the convention, not as a delegate, but with a voice at the convention, in the affairs concerning organizing and propaganda work.

Now, to take this one particular recommendation of mine, that we should center our efforts of organization in the smaller sized cities, where the A.F. of L. is not strong, and to only quote a part of that recommendation, and leave the rest out, to say nothing of the other recommendations, puts me in a very unfair light. That is proven by the fact that delegates have gotten up here and attempted to prove that I was in favor of the old organization of the last convention that sent organizers from one place to other {another?}. Now, if they had seen my report they would have known that was not correct.

The first recommendation, or at least the first point covered in my report was that our efforts as an organization should be to build up a machine of organization that should and would control the efforts and work of the working class in propaganda and organization.

I recommended that the country at large should be divided or organized first into district organizations, not scattered from place to place, but that all of the local unions in any one district should form a district organization, and under this district organization should be placed the national organizers. That these national organizers center their efforts upon whatever workers there were in that district, in whatever industry there was in that district, for the purpose of building up the organization on the right lines, with an industrial basis.

Now, not only do I recommend that, but that these organizers in giving their weekly reports, should give duplicate report to the council of the particular district in which they were working, a duplicate of the one that went to general headquarters, making misrepresentation impossible on the part of the organizer of the work he was doing in any district, because the locals in that district would have control over his work while he was there.

Then further, in that recommendation, the recommendation that I gave here and is under discussion at this time, was the suggestion that the moment you go into an industrial center like Chicago you find two different well defined propositions to work against. In the first place,

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

you find a strong central organization of the American Federation of Labor, whose chief purpose is to keep any class organization out of the town.

The American Federation of Labor—whatever may be the sentiments of its members,—and I want to say that I never did or never will call members of the American Federation of Labor fakers, or dishonest, because they are working men the same as we are, but they are held in bondage by an organization that is the direct auxiliary of the capitalist class that stands in with the employers and the Civic Federation and for that purpose is used in Chicago and New York City and all the other great industrial centers, just to keep an industrial organization out.

If you take that vast herd of working men that has been spoken of here, that vast aggregation of working men in industrial centers, and attempt to organize them, where do you find them? You find them shut up in slave pens like the Chicago Steel Works, you find them herded into a great factory, a great industry, with a steel fence all around them where no organizer can get at them, and it is practically impossible to work with these men in these large cities for the reason that you cannot go to their homes. The moment they are out of the shop they are scattered from one end of the city to the other, and you are handicapped on every hand in attempting to organize a large industrial center.

When you go into the smaller cities, does that mean that you of necessity retard the work of industrial organization? Not at all, but it does mean that you take the industries that are predominant in these small cities where the A.F.L. is weak, and you can get into the factories and shops in all of these western cities mentioned by me, you can get into the packing houses and you can line up those workers into an organization on the industrial plan.

These workers pay their dues into this organization and give the necessary funds to keep that work of propaganda going on in the larger cities like New York City and Chicago.

That was the statement that was made in that recommendation, that the reason for using these smaller cities while we could use them, was to give us the backbone, the money, the necessary funds to carry on the work of education in the larger cities. That is the reason why I suggested this.

Some one has said that I did not suggest a particular industry. Now, we were supposed to make recommendation according to the district in which we worked. It would be impossible for me to recommend

anything in the eastern part of the country or on the Pacific Coast, because I was not there. I took the district in which I have worked, and recommended the two industries that I thought in that district could best be worked in; that was the mining industry and the food stuffs industry.

Why did I select those two particular industries? For this reason: in the mining industry throughout Kansas, Oklahoma and Indian Territory you find thousands of men working in the coal and oil industry who have never been organized. They are absolutely unorganized, and you can go right to those men and get them into the organization. It gives you a nucleus in the mining department, around which the coal miners as they come over from the American Federation of Labor can unite with that part of the mining department already organized.

Not only that, but in southwestern Missouri and in eastern Kansas you have the zinc and lead mines, you have the smelters where this ore that is taken from the zinc and lead mines is smelted, and those smelters are all unorganized, the men who work in them know nothing of organization, they have never been members of any organization, but they are ready to organize, and they are ready to organize, why? Because a few of those men who have been members of the Industrial Workers of the World from the first have spread the propaganda, they have done the work of education, they have interested these men until they are ready to come into the organization and to stand with them for the emancipation of their class, and not because they want to get into any craft union.

As to the food stuffs industry the statement that was made in my recommendation was that there were thousands of workers in the food stuffs industry in the southwest, in the packing houses, but not only that, but in the state of Minnesota where I did work for a few weeks just before being recalled, you have thousands upon thousands of flour mill workers in the mills, all unorganized, or practically so.

There was one city in the state of Minnesota where there are twenty-four mills lined up against the river bank, the biggest flouring mills in the world, and those mills are all unorganized, or practically so. In one of the largest mills they have a little bit of an organization that went out on a strike four years ago and was practically destroyed save only a few officers and just a few men to support those officers left in that organization. You have all these men unorganized, and they can be organized into a food stuff industry, these flour mill workers and bakery workers, together with them.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

And, if you go a little further {sic} west into eastern Colorado you have the great sugar beet industries that can be lined up because they are unorganized. It is not a question of organizing on craft lines with me. It is a question of building up an industrial organization as a basis for the co-operative commonwealth that is to come in the future.

Another reason why I recommended the mining industry and the food stuffs industry is because I consider those two industries the most important. While I believe that the Industrial Workers of the World should organize on the basis of the new society, while I believe that the workers should be drilled in this organization of ours to handle our own administrative affairs, I know that in that regard I disagree with a great number of men in this convention, men whom I have heard over and over again say if a revolution ever was to be brought about it would be brought about by concentrating our work on one particular industry, and that industry of such vast importance that when a crisis should arise you could by control of that industry precipitate a revolution.

Now there is no industry in the country of which that would be true or was true in so great a sense as that of the mining industry, because the miners who today are organized in the United Mine Workers of America, if they saw fit and were drilled to act together, could precipitate a revolution any day they choose, but the fact of the matter is that their organization while strong in numbers is weak in discipline. Their organization while strong in numbers is dominated by a few particular officials.

The one thing I would hate to see more than anything else is that the work of the Industrial Workers of the World should be concentrated in a few petty officials and that we should allow them to dominate our organization in the same way that the officers of the American Federation of Labor, and especially of the United Mine Workers of America, dominate those organizations.

Unless the rank and file keep the local unions throughout this country in their districts, in control of the organization, unless they can make their organization of such a character that they can act and act for the working class at all times, then we might just as well quit organizing altogether.

I want the Industrial Workers of the World to be an organization of the working class founded on industries, with power to act in those industries. Now, understand when I recommended the smaller cities I did not mean it to be inferred that I wanted the work cut off in the large industrial centers. What I did want is that special efforts should

be made toward doing work in places where immediately the organization could be built up, for the purpose of supporting work in the larger cities. I thank you.

DEL. JONES: I would like to ask a question: These recommendations that came up, on the fourth page they are summed up in certain recommendations which are as follows. The first is that we “center our efforts on the smaller cities, where the A.F.L. is weak.”

You say (referring to Delegate Forberg), “to sum up my recommendations they are as follows.” Now, we have acted on those recommendations that you have summed up, seriatim. We have taken them up here, but the convention would not allow us to read the whole of them as we came down through them.

DEL. FRANCIS: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: Before I proceed to argue on the proposition I want to make this statement: Fellow Worker Forberg said that there are some men here who believe simply to organize one industry will enable us to have a revolution. Then she goes on to say that if the mining industry was organized, that they are strong enough to bring about a revolution at once. You can judge as to that for yourselves.

Now, as to the proposition itself, I hold that any limitation, any specific limitation in the form of a resolution for this convention to adopt, is in my estimation tommy-rot, if you will allow me to use a slang phrase.

If you had a resolution that the organizers should be confined to work in smaller cities, and then you get a telegram, after the Telegraphers’ strike is over, and it won’t last forever—if you get a telegram asking you to send an organizer at once, what are you going to do? Now, according to this resolution, if it is adopted, the organizers should confine their efforts to the smaller cities. Now, I want to say that we have been doing the best we could last year and the year before, and I don’t believe in any specific limitations.

If one trade wants to bring up its troubles or necessities, why that would mean that if we had a bakery workers’ convention, then I would propose a tailor’s convention, and so on.

Now, while I realize that there are particular necessities in the various trades, I do not think that they should be brought up here for the delegates to waste their time on. I think that that does not amount to anything. Therefore, I believe that on this proposition the recommendation of the committee should be concurred in, and that it should be left to those who would be put in charge of carrying out the mandate of this convention to do the best they can under the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

circumstances.

I know there is a great deal to be said about the necessity of organizing large cities. Those who have lived in large cities know why it is needed, and I want to go on record as saying that I am opposed to confining the organizers to the small cities and running the meetings in Salvation Army style. I believe in the organizers being used to the best advantage, and in concurring with the recommendation of the committee I think that good judgment will be used in the future, and that these matters will be properly taken care of.

DEL. LEVOY: Fellow Worker Chairman: I partly agreed with Fellow Worker Forberg, and I disagree partly with Fellow Worker Francis. The reason is this: We experimented last year in organizing 1,000 men here and 100 men here and 60 over there, and so on, and just as soon as the men were organized they declared a strike. They went on strike, and the result was we had nothing behind that organization, not much with which to help them, because in these particular industries we had say 60, or 80, or 200, or possibly 1,000 men, so when they lost the strike the result was that they dropped out of the organization.

We came to the conclusion in Schenectady that if we had concentrated our efforts in one industry, and I do not speak of mining, but whatever it is, whatever industry is the easiest to organize, and had sent our organizers, and concentrated our efforts in that industry for a year or two, then we would have gotten not a nucleus but a foothold in that industry. The result of that would have been if you had gone to some other industry, if you had gone to a man who worked in that industry, the first question he would put to you would be, if for instance it was their own organizer, a A.F.L. man, he would say, how many members have you got, and you would tell him, say 30,000 or 50,000. Then he would ask you "How many machinists have you got in this organization, how many bakers," or whatever trade they are in. What would you tell him? Three or four hundred. Well, supposing you could tell them that you had 5,000 or 50,000 or 100,000 miners or railroad men in that industry. You could then point out to them the advantage of an organization like that and they would realize it and I believe this convention should decide in regard to this matter, that we should concentrate the organizers next year in one industry and if that is done, I am certain we will see better results than we realized last year.

DEL. SPEED: I think the body should just consider this one particular thing which this Committee has brought up, and that is the organizing in smaller localities. That is the only phase we are dealing

with at present.

It is a fact that in many cases where the people are scattered all over you can go in and organize a little local and get out a charter of 15 or 20 or 30, and then you go away and what becomes of that local? It goes up in smoke. That is what happens.

Now, it is folly to organize in that manner. It cannot be done. It gives the other fellows an opportunity to say, "Oh you have a local. Where is it? It is gone up." We have got to use every means at our hands, and that does not confine us to making our efforts in smaller cities. We do not say that you shall not organize in the smaller cities, but work must be done in the large centers of industry, and out of those large centers of industry, comes the thought, comes the expression, because it rouses the comment of the men, and it permeates all over. It opens the way by which in the near future you can reach those men and organize them. But, if we confine ourselves to every little 2 by 4 locality, we might just as well disband as to think we can accomplish anything that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker Trainor, will you take the Chair?
(Delegate Trainor here assumed the chair.)

DEL. KATZ: I want to say a few words on this question. It seems to me ridiculous to spend so much time on this one thing for the simple reason that some industries it is possible to get at much easier in large cities and some industries it is much easier to get at in smaller cities. That is all there is to it, and no general recommendation can be adopted here, if we have any kind of common sense.

Take, for instance, the cigar making industry. A man who is not a member of the organization which Mr. Gompers springs from, and the worst labor fakers of the country, such as Brown of New York and all those other fellows, the Cigar Makers International Union, of which I have been a member for about ten or twelve years, you cannot work if you are not a member of that organization, in a small town at all, and you come into a small town and you could not any more organize the cigar makers at the present time than you could fly, because they are a part and parcel there, you might say, of the capitalist system. You can only organize them in such cities as New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore and maybe some other larger cities that I know of, or some of the smaller towns in Pennsylvania.

So, to spend any more time upon this proposition would be a waste of time, I think.

(Del. Katz here resumed the chair.)

DEL. FRENCH: Fellow Worker Chairman, what I wish to say is that

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

it ought to be plain to the delegates that the logical proposition for us, owing to the position we take that is that we center our efforts on the dominant industries. The unfortunate wording of that clause is that we center our efforts on the small towns, and that makes it a waste of time to discuss it.

(At this point the previous question was moved and seconded, and the question being put, the motion prevailed.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the motion that we concur in the report of the committee will say aye.

(The motion was carried.)

DEL. FISCHER: Recommendation number 2 of Mrs. Forberg:

“That Local Industrial Councils of all unions in a given district be organized, and that organizers work under the direction of these councils.”

Constitutionally it is provided for the first half of this recommendation, and the advice of the General Executive Board to the organizers contains the second part. Therefore, we cannot concur in the recommendation. It is superfluous.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion to concur in the recommendation of the committee, say aye.

(The motion was carried.)

DEL. FISCHER: Recommendation No. 3:

“That special efforts be given to the mining and food stuff industry.”

We concur in the recommendation concerning the mining industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

DEL. FRANCIS: Point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of information?

DEL. FRANCIS: If I remember right, the committee on resolutions have a resolution where it says that an organizer in food stuff shall be provided for. Does not that settle it?

DEL. FISCHER: That comes up later on.

THE CHAIRMAN: That comes up later on.

DEL. AXELSON: As I am a delegate from that city in which the greatest flouring industry and the greatest flour mill industry of the country is located, namely, the city of Minneapolis, I can state that I would like to say that it is absolutely necessary to do something in that city.

As Organizer Forberg clearly stated it, they have a small organization there, and they had, as Organizer Forberg also stated, a strike about four years ago, in which these men in their struggle went

upon the floor under the leadership of their president, who stated to them that they had a fair fight, and they had not been out of the factory three hours until he says, "The fight is won because the chief of police is with us." It seems that the chief of the police was an old member of the stone cutters' union, or some other union, I forget which one, but it turned out afterwards that one of the strike-breakers was shoved into a coach and carried up onto the platform at the mill, and then it was discovered that this great chief of the police of Minneapolis had ceased to be a member of the union. He had a star and the policeman's club was the only brotherhood, if that is brotherhood, that they got. (Laughter.)

Now, there is a small number who supported this organization; it is not a union, because in order to get the membership up there, they hauled up three or four barrels of beer, and it is not a union, but a beer drinking contest. That is all there is to it, to the flour workers' union and the bakers' union in Minneapolis.

If the proper steps could be taken and you had the necessary means behind you, I think you could organize that industry. If you could organize that industry in Minneapolis you could go to other places and organize them, and then you would have one industry organized, and that would make a basis for a great industrial union. That would be true because of the point raised by Delegate Foote, that the food stuff workers in a strike can render to the striking members of the Industrial Workers of the World the best aid that any body of men can render it.

Supposing in all localities where they import strike-breakers the union men belonging to the food stuff industry and the bakers' organization would refuse to give them the necessary food stuffs? How long would they live on air? Not very long. Consequently that is one of the essential points, and I think it should not be omitted.

It is recommended here that we concur in the report regarding the mining industry, and I say take the rest of it in, too, because the two are essential and we cannot ever go to work and chop off one and say "This is more important than the other." They are all important and the food stuff is equally as important as the mining industry.

DEL. KEEP: I would like to say that in the city of Columbus, where I come from, I might ask this convention to make a special effort to organize the men who make mining machinery. There is one of the largest mining machinery producing plants there in the country. For some year and a half I have been working as a tailor and I have to go by that plant every day to my work. Such being the case, at noon time I

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

see a crowd of men standing around there and I have stopped and talked to them for half an hour. I don't say because I have done it, but out of that has come the nucleus of an organization in that plant, which is the largest plant in that town.

Now, it seems to me that in Minneapolis, just the same as in Columbus, so far as the mills are concerned, if they want them organized, let them do their share of the work. Do not expect everybody to come up there and help them. It seems to me a call for help should not be sent out for just one particular line.

I could point out the fact that if we controlled the mining machinery industry, that we could stop the miners from working, because they would not have any machines to work with, and I could show you if you organized the plants of that character, then we would have that organization which could accomplish a revolution overnight tied up in a knot, and I could say that that is the more important work.

As I said before, it is administrative work which belongs to the General Executive Board and should be turned over to them and not to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary has the floor.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Mr. Chairman, the experience in the past with organizations of labor that have been in existence, the Knights of Labor as well as the American Federation of Labor, proves conclusively that all employees of the food stuff industry were organized after the important industries became part and parcel of a given organization, by the propaganda or union made food stuffs; that the employees in the food stuffs industry were, with no exception, partly from the pressure coming from employers and partly by getting the support of others in demanding so-called union made goods, forced or had an easy road to travel in organizing the existing organizations.

Now, the present Bakery Workers' International Union, I am perhaps better acquainted with than either one of the speakers on the floor of this convention, with the history of that organization, and of the five industries connected with the food stuffs industry, including the cigarmakers, which is considered to be a part of the food stuffs industry according to the statistics of the United States.

Those organizations were organized after the other important organizations came into existence. In the early days, the furniture workers, the mine workers, the metal and machinery workers were organized first, and they practically forced the others to fall in line. The organizations of the food stuff industry today in the old

organizations are only held together by the support of the other organizations.

If the United Mine Workers of America today would cease, for instance, to patronize the blue label on their cigars, the entire Cigarmakers' International Union would collapse immediately. If the Mine Workers, and the Metal and Machinery Workers, and all other workers in the most important industries would cease to patronize the label of the International Bakery Workers' Union, that organization would collapse tomorrow.

They have never trained their members to be fighters. They only came into organization by the support of other organizations, men and women, and they never virtually made a fight themselves to elevate their own conditions, and their conditions will not change, even if they be organized into the Industrial Workers of the World.

The most important thing to do is to undermine the power of the capitalist institutions, such as the United Mine Workers of America, such as the Machinists' International Union, such as, for instance, the old Brotherhood of Railway Employees and such as the Longshore and Maritime Workers. We must undermine the power of those organizations and build up our organization from the disgruntled and discouraged members of those organizations, and those minor organizations, such as the food stuff industrial workers, and the others, will fall in line just as soon as they see the others are lining up.

I know that to be a fact because I have been engaged in the food stuff industry myself. I know that they are the least important industry in the entire array of industries in any country in the world.

For my part, and for those who have gone over the field, I believe, I hold, that the agricultural workers, the mine workers and the transportation workers and the textile workers are more important to go after than it is to go after these small industries.

For instance, in the mining industry of the United States of America, and I exclude Canada in my argument, the Mine Workers of America in the different branches of the mining industry constitute 876,000 employes according to the last statistics. I include in this number the metalliferous miners, the oil miners and all the subsidiaries of these industries.

The metal and machinery industry of America today embraces over 2,100,000 employes. The transportation industry, according to the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission, embraces 1,450,000 employes. Pinkerton is more able to give the exact number.

A DELEGATE: He is not here.

SEC. TRAUTMANN (continuing): Now, the textile industry, including the garment workers, the silk workers and all the different branches of that industry, today, altogether embrace about 650,000 employes. Now, this branch of workers when organized will bring power and pressure to bear to bring the food stuff industry workers into line. The food stuff industry probably does not employ more than 350,000 workers throughout the United States.

Now, I know, in view of these figures, if we concentrate our efforts upon the industrial centers and those places where the workers hold a strategical position, that all the workers in all the other industries will fall in line.

I am satisfied, for instance, that in Portland, if our men will continue to organize the sawmill men and the lumber jacks, that once organized they will by their co-operative force and power force these small shops into line, or I should not use that term "force," but they will fall in line by the pressure brought to bear on them by seeing the great work done by the organization.

Now, you talk about the big mills in Minneapolis. The entire milling industry, the flouring mills, employs in the United States not more than 35,000 employes. The bulk of them may be in Minneapolis. It cannot be denied that the organization made every effort to organize the men and women in that industry. They were formerly organized into the American Federation of Labor. Today we find in the small mills, as for instance Murphysboro—take Cincinnati, they have organized small unions and the fight against the Minneapolis trust mills is used to boost up the trade of these independent mills. They had a fight on and they lost the fight in the American Federation of Labor. They are discouraged, and we may perhaps find a few who will be ready to study industrial unionism. They may form a nucleus of an organization, but the question is, Is the Industrial Workers of the World prepared, without having the backing of other industries, to force a fight against the combine in Minneapolis?

You may rest assured, as soon as you start to organize a given industry that is not so important, that the capitalists will first single out that industry to crush your organization and blacklist the man who would try to organize under the Industrial Workers of the World, and you would not be able to give them any support. It does not require any skill today in the most modern plants of the food stuffs industry. They can break in a man in 24 hours in the Stock Yards District, they can take a man in from the street and put him to work. It does not require in the most improved shops—and I challenge contradiction—it

does not require any amount of skill in the great sanitary shops of the bakery trust, or whatever the name of that trust is. Their places can be filled as soon as they go out on a strike.

The Brewery Workers do not require any skill. They have five academies in the United States where they train their scabs and when a strike goes on as in New Orleans, within 24 hours the places of the skilled, highly paid brewery worker is filled. And then, they are organized in the American Federation of Labor, and we have a fight that we are not able to handle as an organization, because we are numerically too weak to take up these food stuffs industries.

That is one of the reasons why I would discourage this, although seeing the necessity of organizing all the workers.

For us, the only consideration that should prompt us in our action is this: We must have some results and we must have some practical center, so that by the force of the power we organize we may get the others into the industrial ranks of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. FOOTE: I wish to say that if the committee's report is concurred in, the action of the last convention in considering a resolution from food stuffs industry and turning it over with recommendations to the Executive Board, has been made void. I wish to state further that if this report is concurred in, and the position adhered to, that my local union will have been victimized by the organization.

I wish to state further that we have victimized not only in our local sense but in the sense that we have attempted to spread out the organization in the other towns that I have mentioned, and with the hope that this convention would take some action to render us assistance in that way. Not to devote its time to that, but to render us assistance along that line. That is all we ask.

I wish to ask Secretary-Treasurer Trautmann if the Bakery Workers Local Union 224 ever asked anything from this organization?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No, I would not say they have any more than anybody else.

DEL. FOOTE: Have they asked anything from this organization?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: When?

DEL. FOOTE: In their local situation.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You asked that organizers should be sent into that district.

DEL. FOOTE: Did the Bakery Workers ask for it?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: All the unions combined.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. FOOTE: They thanked you for sending an organizer down there.

Another statement which Sec. Trautmann makes which I wish to deny is, that men can be placed in the bakery shop industry of this country without any training. That is all nonsense, such a statement as that.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I qualified that by saying the bake shops of the trust, and I will prove that, too.

DEL. FOOTE: I deny it. I know something about it myself, having been for fifteen years in the business, and consequently I know something about the work and I know something about the expense of it and I know that he is slandering the spirit of as great a set of men as are in any union of the working class when he says that the men in the food industry, and especially in my industry, have been mere tools, that have been forced and jobbed around. I know that they have been jobbed and dealt with, but they have always rebelled against that, and that is the reason, because of that experience, why they have not had anything along the line of an international craft union.

I want to say that this statement of Fellow Worker Trautmann is misleading and to say the least an injustice to the men I represent. If you take this position on the floor of this convention, I feel that I may go back to my local union and report thus to them: that if you feel you can carry on the fight longer, if you feel that in your local conditions you can go out to these other men and protect yourselves against the A.F.L. well and good, but if you do not, why you will simply have to hit the road.

DEL. JONES: The position of the Committee, as I understand it, on that is this: that we believe if we have the organization, the workers will attach themselves to it. The sentiment in the mining districts has been to join the organization, and they have sent delegates here demanding that they be affiliated with us.

In the food stuff industry we only have the opinion from one small district in the United States on that matter, but in the mining industry we have practically a universal feeling to join this organization.

The Committee on Organization holds that the food stuff industry is ready for propaganda. That when they get ready for organization that they will tell us that. Then we can go to them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker Trainor will please take the chair. (Delegate Trainor here took the chair.)

DEL. KATZ: I do not care to speak upon every question, but I would like to speak upon this question because we have certain instruction

from Paterson, and that is to request this convention that special efforts be made to bring about an organization in the locomotive building industry. We have not brought that up, due to the fact that we recognize when the General Executive Board gets down to work, they will do that anyway, and I am surprised to hear from quarters that claim to be the most advanced and progressive, such recommendation{s} come up that seem to me to be reactionary.

To say that we shall devote our efforts to a special industry and especially to an industry that is not centralized, as the food stuff industry in general, seems to me a reactionary measure. What are these small bakeries?

Why, in half of these United States, the man who owns the bakery also works down stairs with his men, and we will be confronted with the situation of being asked to give the label of the Industrial Workers of the World to be placed upon loaves of bread that are made partly by a member of the Industrial Workers of the World and partly by his boss.

Now then, no one here will have any objection to the organization doing all in its power to organize the bakers everybody else {sic} but why not take in every other industry? Why just the food stuff industry? What about the silk workers whom Fellow Worker Caminita and I represent?

DEL. AXELSON: Point of order. We are speaking to the motion before the house which referred only to two industries, and consequently we have not covered the rest.

DEL. KATZ: This is germane to the question. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hold this, that we could, with the same amount of right, claim why the silk workers in Paterson come before this convention and ask that there be special efforts made to organize them. They went to work and organized themselves, that is all there is to it. Now, the others should do likewise. There is plenty of chance to organize.

It seems to me childish to come together here and argue and argue and spend a lot of time about who we are going to organize first, just as though we would have nothing to do but go out and organize an industry after we have decided upon it. We organize those who desire to join our organization, no matter where they are to be found.

(Delegate Katz here resumed the chair.)

DEL. KERN: Fellow Worker Chairman: Anybody who would give this question serious consideration would come to the same conclusion as Fellow Worker Trautmann has stated on the floor this morning. It appears to me from some of the remarks that have been made here,

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

that they really do not know what industrial unionism is, or what the Industrial Workers of the World are organized for.

I, in the Building Industry, could come here and argue that you ought to have an organizer for the building industry, and possibly I could give you some good points. Another delegate would speak for the food stuff industry and claim and show points where his industry should be organized, and another one speaking for the metal and machinery department could make good points by stating that by not making any machinery, that they could not make any food stuffs for those people to eat, and so could the transportation department come out here and make a good argument to the effect that they would not handle these goods, and so could the miners come out here and make good points, and claim they would not mine coal to furnish steam for the locomotives to transport this stuff. For that reason, I believe we should concur in the report of the Committee.

(The question was called for.)

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Worker Chairman: We have all been attempting to cut the time down so as to get out of here, but it does not appear that we do that when we are in action. It is only talk. We have been talking all morning here on a matter that has been referred to the General Executive Board by the last convention, as I understand it, and which should really belong there today if we have any confidence in our General Executive Board. Why should we waste this time? That General Executive Board can act according to conditions and cut this work short.

We have had a great amount of chin music here this morning, and while it is good in its place it has been entirely out of place, and as a consequence we have wasted not less than two hours on practically nothing. When we get through, the chances are ten to one that the whole matter will rest where it should rest and where it does rest now without any argument.

DEL. KEEP: I move the previous question.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. All in favor of the previous question will say aye.

(The motion prevailed.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion that we concur in the report of the committee will signify so by saying aye.

DEL. LEVOY: I want to understand this question. This motion is that we centralize our efforts in the coal mining industry, isn't it?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have the recommendation read.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. FISCHER: The recommendation of Mrs. Forberg reads as follows:

“That special effort be given to the mining and food stuff industry.” We recommend that at this time it should be given to the mining instead of the food stuff industry.

(The question was again called for, and being put, the motion prevailed.)

DEL. FISCHER: Recommendation No. 4.

DEL. HAGENSON: I call for a division.

THE CHAIRMAN: A roll call, you mean?

DEL. HAGENSON: A roll call, that is what I mean.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I do not see any five hands up; only one. Go ahead, Delegate Fischer.

DEL. FISCHER: Recommendation No. 4: “That 50 per cent of the income of the general organization be {de}voted to the payment of organizers and printing of literature.”

We refer this to the ways and means committee.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of that motion that it be referred to the ways and means committee, say aye.

(The motion was carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The ways and means committee had better take that right down.

DEL. FISCHER: Report of Organizer Ettore. Recommendation No. 1, with regard to strikes: “I approve of the clause in the constitution relative to strikes, and would make it even stronger by inserting, ‘that in case the G.E.B. does not endorse the strike, no local should have the authority to issue appeals for funds in the name of the I.W.W.’ ”

We concur in the recommendation.

(The question was called for.)

DEL. FRANCIS: Point of information. I wish to be informed if that implies that the local would be prevented from issuing a local appeal.

DEL. FISCHER: If the strike is not endorsed either by the G.E.B. or the local body, the local body has no right whatsoever to appeal to other locals for assistance. If the strike is not endorsed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to ask the secretary a question. I did not understand that. Does that mean if a shop goes out on strike and has not the endorsement of its local union, or General Executive Board, that that in that case they have no right to appeal in the name of the I.W.W.?

DEL. FISCHER: That is the understanding.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. WILLIAMS: If I understand that recommendation, it means an addition to the constitution and it appears to me that the constitution is explicit enough to cover that ground without that addition. I refer to Section 4 of Article VII: "A local union shall be entitled to assistance from the general organization in cases of strike only when the general organization has allowed or endorsed the said strike."

Now, that appears to me to cover the ground completely, and the proposed addition to the constitution is unnecessary and superfluous.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Worker Delegates: In regard to this additional clause or recommendation pertaining to strikes, it seems to me ridiculous to think of it. Here is a local union, and the members of this local union must have voted to go on strike. Now, if they go on strike, they certainly cannot go into the local body and do the work in the local body and not sanction their own work. That seems ridiculous, to strike in a shop and then decide against the strike in their local union. Consequently I move that it remain as it now is stated in the constitution.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move you that the recommendation of the committee be tabled.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the recommendation of the committee be tabled.

(The motion was carried.)

DEL. FISCHER: Recommendation No. 2: "I would recommend that under no conditions should anyone not belonging to the organization be allowed to speak officially for the I.W.W., on the ground that if he is not eligible to be a member of the I.W.W., he is not eligible to speak for the I.W.W."

The committee concurs in this recommendation.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment; I will just state the motion. That is now the motion before the house.

(The motion was seconded.)

DEL. AXELSON: If an individual is not eligible to the organization, the organization has no lock which it can put upon its mouth. You have no such a lock yet, and you never can get one. If an individual desires to speak, of course he can speak. You believe in free speech—

DEL. CAMINITA: The committee says to speak officially for the I.W.W. That he cannot talk officially if he is not eligible to be a member of the I.W.W.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. AXELSON: Even so, if an individual takes it upon himself and says he is an official, all you can do is show him up to the crowd.

DEL. JONES: The question here is, as I understand it, that in Portland, Ore., the local there hired this man to speak during a strike, and he was a member of the S.P. and not a member of the I.W.W. He would only go on the platform if he got a chance to boost his organization, the Socialist party, and we held that no outsider can represent the I.W.W., no man who does not belong to it can represent it.

(The question was called for, and being put, the motion prevailed.)

DEL. FISCHER: Recommendation No. 3:

“I would recommend that if a hall is to be maintained by any I.W.W. local, it should always be apart from any political party’s headquarters.”

The committee concurs in this recommendation.

(The question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That means that the I.W.W. headquarters should not be at the same time the headquarters of any political party.

DEL. AXELSON: Should not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Should not, yes, sir.

DEL. SPETTEL: It seems to me a pretty tough proposition. While I am not in favor of the I.W.W. being in the same room or hall or building with any political party, I want to ask how you are going to prevent it? Supposing the I.W.W. has headquarters up here and the Socialist Labor party, or the Socialist party, or some other reform party, I would say (Laughter), wants to come up here and keep rooms next to the I.W.W., you would have to have some influence with the proprietor of the place to prevent that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not apply to that. It only applies where the I.W.W. has its own hall, that it should not rent it or hold it in conjunction as headquarters with a political party. I would understand by that that if the I.W.W. had a hall in any town and it would hire out that hall to any organization, it would certainly not bar out any political organization, but it certainly should not be understood that it should go in partnership with any political party in maintaining headquarters. Isn’t that the idea?

DEL. FISCHER: That is right.

DEL. FRANCIS: We have been here for the last few days insisting on shortening these recommendations and our time. Now, I cannot see for the life of me how you can enforce all the regulations. If the men in your locality deem it necessary to do such a thing, how are you

going to enforce this resolution? Are you going to elect a standing sergeant-at-arms to see that they live up to these resolutions?

Why are these matters brought up here? It is simply because something happens somewhere that they are brought forward. This movement is practically in a transitory stage. We are getting there and there will be no fight afterwards, but because little things happen they want iron-clad rules.

Now, I for one think that if in a certain locality they deem it proper to meet with a reform party, or at least to have a joint proposition, if they think that to be for the good of the locality, no recommendation will force them to do otherwise, and I am opposed, therefore, to this recommendation.

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: If we adopt that proposition we will have to send a dictionary along with it to interpret it.

Another thing is that we will have to have an organized militia to go out and enforce it. If we cannot trust our members to take care of that proposition locally, what are we going to do about it? That is the question now. We would have to alter our constitution in order to provide means for disfranchising that local or recalling its charter, or something to that effect, if we wanted to enforce it, and without that we cannot enforce it. All we can do is to leave it to the judgment of the members of these local bodies.

Besides, we claim that members can come in here without regard to their politics, and suppose they have taken that for granted and have come in here? This particular locality may be of the Socialist party persuasion. They naturally feel that there is no harm in using the same room, and perhaps they may be, by virtue of circumstances, compelled to us the same room, and in other localities the reverse might be the case.

Now, how are you going to draw a political line on that proposition as your constitution stands at present?

DEL. JONES: It is the wording of this resolution. If you will allow me, I will read it. It says: "It should always be apart from any political party."

Now, there is no difference of opinion in my mind as to what the word "should" means, but if the word "shall" were in there, we would be compelled to change our constitution. But by this resolution all we say is that we "should" be apart. It is just a resolution in that spirit.

DEL. SPEED: I know of an instance where a local of the I.W.W. was offered by the S.P. to furnish them with twenty members if they would

meet in their hall. (Laughter.) They would bring in twenty members if they would meet in their hall.

Now, I believe that we should endeavor to instruct the membership of the respective locals all over the country that wherever possible we separate the I.W.W. from any political party, because where they are closely connected, as a rule, one or the other will commence to dicker for this or that, and there will be more or less friction within the organization. For that reason we are endeavoring to try to separate the I.W.W. absolutely from any close connection with any political party.

That is the object of this recommendation, because we find different localities where they were closely connected together, there is always more or less friction arising, and we want to avoid that as much as possible.

DEL. KERN: I move to table the question.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that we table the recommendations.

A DELEGATE: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

THE DELEGATE: That the committee have the last word.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee can speak if they wish to.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion to table this recommendation will say aye. Those opposed, no. I declare the motion carried. I hope there will be no call for a roll call.

DEL. SCHWEND: Before we proceed any further with the recommendation of the committee in regard to Organizer Ettore's report, I think it would be more than justice to give Organizer Ettore the floor for a few minutes to explain the recommendation, the same as we did Organizer Forberg. I make a motion that he be granted the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire—I want to call your attention to the fact that we have the following resolution:

“Whereas, The expenses of the day's stenographic report has grown to a great extent, and whereas the treasury of this organization is not in shape to meet this heavy drain, which is about \$70 per day; therefore be it resolved, that the delegates and others occupying the floor be assessed the sum of four-fifteenths of a cent per word delivered, which sum will cover the expense of the publication of this report.”

(Laughter.)

DEL. SCHWEND: That resolution is all right.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

A DELEGATE: I move that that be made a privileged question.
(Motion seconded.)

DEL. FRANCIS: Does the organizer insist upon having the floor?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair can only ask Organizer Ettor if he has anything to present.

DEL. ETTOR: I wanted to speak on a question just passed. But I notice it is the work of parliamentary assassins to take and table things when it is important.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would not do Organizer Ettor any good to speak upon a thing after it is tabled. He ought to speak before it is tabled. We can state in two minutes the same proposition we had in Paterson; now the membership there had sense enough not to make the headquarters of the I.W.W. the headquarters of any party.

DEL. WALTERS: A point of order; this matter has been disposed of and we should go on.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right. The next recommendation.

DEL. FISCHER: I would also suggest in this connection that it should be a constitutional provision, "that in case any local should either disband or fall in arrears, the books, documents, money and charter should be returned to the general office by the local near by." We recommend it be referred to the constitution committee.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion, that this be referred of the committee on constitution say aye; all in favor of that motion—

DEL. HAGENSON: It has been covered by the constitution already, if I remember right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's refer it to the constitution committee and they can act on it.

(Motion put and carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Further reports.

FURTHER REPORTS.

DEL. FISCHER: I fail to see the utility of a big mixed local, except it be organized into a general laborer's {laborers'??} union, and I would recommend that something be done in the matter of getting mixed locals to insist that whenever there are enough of a given industry, a local industrial union should be immediately formed.

This same matter will come up in the report of Trautmann, and therefore we will recommend something later on, and we will take up the matter of—

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute. I would request the secretary of the committee to read only such recommendations that the committee wants the convention to act upon.

DEL. FISCHER: I wish to also bring to your attention the fact of organizing lodging houses, restaurants and things of that nature in connection with I.W.W. locals. I consider them a nuisance and detrimental to the movement, since they bring the organization into disrepute and make the organization look like the salvation army. We concur in the recommendation that they shall not have any of these things in connection with it.

(Cries of question.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the question say aye; opposed, no; carried.

DEL. FISCHER: I also wish to recommend that the election of an education and press committee by locals be made mandatory; the duties of such a committee being that they attend to all the work of education, and report the progress of the I.W.W. in their respective localities for *The Bulletin*. The members of the committee concur.

(Cries of question.)

A DELEGATE: We don't need any question on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you have anything to refer to any other committee, all you have to do is to hand it over here and we shall do it. Report only upon such things as you wish the committee {convention?} to act upon.

DEL. FISCHER: Report of Organizer Thompson; he gives a description of the condition{s} in the mining industry and the textile industries, and we could only find one recommendation, and this recommendation is, he believes that before any proper organization work should be covered with literature; that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: How is that?

DEL. FISCHER: Before any proper organization work can be done or should be done, the field should be covered with literature. We concur in that recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the question before the house, and before any organizing is done in any locality, literature should be distributed.

A DELEGATE: What is the recommendation?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the recommendation.

A DELEGATE: I move the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion to concur in the report will say aye; opposed no; carried. I am waiting for the secretary.

DEL. FISCHER: Organizer Cox recommends that a systematic

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

invasion of the coal field{s} shall be started as soon as the financial conditions of headquarters allow it. We concur in that recommendation.

(Cries of question.)

A DELEGATE: That has already been covered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly. According to the ruling, it is covered already, because I said we should only act upon such things as it is necessary for the convention to act on; we just adopted a resolution to that effect; there is no use to move that twice or three times or half a dozen times, that would not organize the miners.

DEL. FISCHER: We have received here a number of letters calling for organizers and so on; we refer them to the incoming G.E.B.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say you received a number of letters?

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was a letter from the silk workers of Lancaster; was that also referred?

DEL. FISCHER: Yes, we have that letter; Lancaster Silk Workers, referred to the incoming G.E.B.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure?

(Cries of question.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion that all these demands for organizers be referred to the incoming Executive Board, say aye; opposed, no; carried.

RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. FISCHER: Then comes the resolutions. The letter of the Educational Club of Butte, Montana; we recommend that this letter be published in *The Bulletin*.

(Cries of question.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Motion put and carried.

DEL. FISCHER: Resolved that the convention instruct all organizers to discourage strikes and stop strike talk and { . . . }¹⁴ cannot read that.

THE CHAIRMAN: What does the committee recommend?

DEL. KERN: I move that be sent back.

DEL. FISCHER: All right.—Resolution from Local 59 of the

¹⁴ [One or two words missing from copy. See "Official Report No. 6," page 6, bottom of fifth column. Possibly "—I"—R.B.]

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Clothing Workers of New York City: “Resolved that provisions be made for a Jewish Organizer for New York City.” Referred to the incoming G.E.B.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? (Cries of question.)

Question put and carried.

DEL. FISCHER: This is from Wichita, Kansas; it is suggested that organizers be selected from the ranks of a given industry who are conversant with the conditions and needs, to organize their own industry. We concur in the recommendation.

DEL. FOOTE: We have considered it this way; suppose that a plant in this town would want to be organized and you selected a wage worker who was conversant with our proposition and put him to work there at a salary, not as a salary from the organization, but put him to work there as a wage worker amongst the rest of the men, have him do a certain thing; but for an organization to keep this man on their list, and whenever they need protection, give them that protection, not to have them as paid salary organizers, but to simply use them—

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

DEL. FOOTE:—as a part of the standing army, if you wish to call it, and add to the force of the organization.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Do I understand that suggestion to mean the organizers shall be selected from their own industry?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will have to ask the committee what the interpretation of that is; will you read that again?

DEL. FISCHER: It is suggested that organizers be selected from the ranks of a given industry who are conversant with the conditions and needs, to organize their own industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that that does not mean that the man who is employed to organize the locomotive workers must be a locomotive worker.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Oh, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: What he suggests is that a man be employed to work in a place and to agitate when they are at work, and when they are victimized, the organization takes them up.

(Cries of question.)

Motion put and carried.

DEL. FISCHER: “Resolved that the convention instruct all our organizers to discourage strikes and strike talk, and to impress upon those whom they are organizing the necessity of realizing that a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

congress of the workers to have the power to retain the full power of the laborer and member will take place in all the smaller remunerations of our recommendation.” We recommend and concur in this.

DEL. SCHWEND: The language of that resolution I do not consider to be just right, that we discourage strikes. I move to insert the words, “that we discourage the inauguration of strikes.” We do not want to discourage strikes after they are called, but we should discourage the inauguration of strikes.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would like to say that we should make that kind of a thing a physical impossibility. When there is a strike and the organizer goes down, he is not going to say, don’t stop the strike. I consider those things superfluous, and we should leave it to the men representing the organization. If that individual does not know the need of organization, you can make a recommendation thirty miles or thirty feet long and it will not be lived up to. I am surprised that the gentlemen do not know better than to bring that recommendation up.

DEL. KEEP: This is in line with certain talk I have read in *The Bulletin* and listened to here. Just as Francis said a little while ago, I am opposed to that for this reason, that I am a Revolutionist; I want the revolution just as bad as anybody can want it; I want to be free just the same as any other man does; I am working in the shop and I am getting for my work a certain price, and the boss comes along and says “you have to take 25 cents less.” What in the name of God is the use of telling me I should not strike if I see the chance to win, and if the other men can see a chance to win? Are we to get this idea in our head that we shall not be an organization that can strike and not talk strikes, or is it a breach of the principles of the I.W.W. that a strike is only a temporary weapon, but that we want to better our conditions now, or what we want to do is to overthrow the capitalist system of production, then why do we want this if we are not teaching that day by day? Are we not doing it? Then this simply has the force of discouraging a strike at all; we cannot make it so plain, so explicit that we won’t even need an interpretation for some people, and the organization has now stated, as we understand them, we conduct strikes, we go to the organization, the men, so that they can strike on a more perfect basis than they had before, and why start out and say we are going to discourage {the} idea of a strike or strikes? They are inevitable, as I stated the other day, they are things that will happen; what is the use of putting us in a glass cage, and if anybody gets discouraged because it goes down, because it does not win in a week, don’t tie our hands;

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

we are willing and expect to fight. We expect discouragements, but don't try to throttle and choke off the natural impulse of a working man to throw it off, and don't try to get it into his head.

DEL. DELANEY: I move to table the motion.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been made to table the motion.

A DELEGATE: Everything on the floor that comes up he wants to table.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot do that way; the committee has a right to speak even if the motion is made; it has been decided here by a previous voting that the Committee has a right to speak upon this point if they wish.

DEL. WALTERS: I wish to say a few words. The sense of this resolution is this, and it has sense in it, and I am surprised that Fellow Worker Francis, after going through what he has gone through in New York in the last year, would get up and make the remarks he has made. What this resolution means is this, in New York City particularly we have an element over there that is merely forming organizations, with the idea that they can better their condition at the present time, under the conditions as they now exist. These men in these organizations who go out to these men corral them and they say this, come in here and join this organization, we are an industrial organization, we have headquarters, we are all over the world; all you have to do is to come in here, get chesty and go up to the Boss and tell him you want more money and if you do not get it, we will give it to you. That is what we have in New York all the time. We have these little wild cat strikes, and we have a call for funds of the revolutionary strikes, and we have to dig down in our pockets to keep up the strike; none of them have ever been won and they cannot be won under these conditions. This sort of thing is destructive to our organization.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we come to the question. All in favor of the motion that we table the recommendation of the committee say aye; all in favor of that motion to table it say aye; opposed, no; the chair is in doubt.

Roll call asked for.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to state it is five minutes to twelve; we will adjourn after the roll call has been had.

DEL. WALTERS: I do not think the roll call has been called for. I move that we vote by show of hands.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute, we cannot vote by show of hands; we will have to have a roll call.

DEL. DE LEON: It would only take a few minutes to have a roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the roll call, raise the hand. We will have a roll call. I want the delegates to remain so that we can take their vote.

A DELEGATE: What are we voting on?

THE CHAIRMAN: You are voting whether you table that proposition.

THE DELEGATE: If I vote no, that means not to table it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not to table it. Delegates will keep their seats until the vote is announced. I would like to see the Committee on Press and Literature after the meeting adjourns.

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, we are ready to report.

The secretary announced the result of the roll call as follows: Total number of votes cast, 124; 70, no, and 54, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, then, the motion is still before the House and we will now adjourn until two o'clock.

The meeting here adjourned to two o'clock P.M., Saturday, September 21st, 1907.

SATURDAY, SEPT. 21, 1907.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Chairman called the convention to order at 2 o'clock, and the roll call showed the following absentees: Huber, Pinkerton, Rotkowitz, Young.

THE CHAIRMAN: When we adjourned this noon the motion to lay on the table the recommendation of the committee on organization was voted down by roll call. We are still considering the recommendation of the committee, and the motion before the house is to concur in the report of the committee.

At the request of Delegate Walters the pending recommendation was read, being the resolution in regard to instructing delegates {organizers?} to discourage strikes, and impress upon members the necessity of realizing the aim of the workers to secure the full product of their labor.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I want to make an amendment to the motion,

and I will state my reasons.

DEL. AXELSON: I understood that there was an amendment to the motion by Fellow Worker Schwend to the effect that instead of discouraging strikes they would not encourage strikes. Wasn't that correct?

DEL. LEVOY: That is the same thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Schwend spoke as to why that should be done, but you did not make an amendment, did you, Delegate Schwend?

DEL. SCHWEND: I believe I offered an amendment.

DEL. AXELSON: I seconded the amendment.

DEL. SCHWEND: The amendment was that the two words "the inauguration" be inserted, so as to read "we discourage the inauguration of strikes."

THE CHAIRMAN: We accepted that as an amendment before you spoke about it.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I offer an amendment to the amendment then: That this matter be referred back to the committee on organization, to be presented in a digested form. The reason for this is this: The recommendation of I believe Organizer Fox, is it, or Cox?

DEL. FISCHER: This comes from New York.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is the recommendation of the committee.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Well, wherever it came from, the recommendation proceeds, I think, from some experiences that we have had in different parts of the country with different organizers of the I.W.W. For example, in the district where I came from an ex-organizer who is now not connected with the organization in any way was in the habit of telling the men that if they came into the organization and were to go on strike they were to receive a certain sum per week from the Western Federation of Miners in the form of donations. Now, I do not think that we can legislate against this thing. I do not believe we can stop those practices entirely, but if the committee can bring in a resolution or a suggestion which can be adopted as the opinion of the convention I may be in favor of it, and that is the reason I make the amendment to the amendment. (Seconded.)

DEL. HAGENSON: I believe this legislation that we are making here now is something that is hardly needed, or in other words, it cannot be applied. We cannot use it though we have it. It would simply tend to mislead this organization. If organizers go out among the workers trying to persuade them to come into the organization, using

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

misrepresentation to bring them in, that certainly is wrong and certainly is something that works detrimental to those that do it and also to the organization. But at the same time I believe we have a sufficient law upon that already, so that any more of it would hardly do any good or cover the ground any better. I believe this should be voted down.

DEL. LIESNER: I did not understand that any unauthorized organizer was to take upon himself the right to organize for this industrial union. Therefore I think all that is necessary for our organizers, is to warn these working men against any such false promises. There is nobody who is authorized to represent this organization who has a right to make such a promise, and if they are warned they will not be misled. Consequently I cannot see the necessity of any kind of legislation. All we need is to instruct our organizers to warn the workers against any such tricks.

DEL. AXELSON: In listening to the discussion I come to the conclusion that the proposition set before the convention by Delegate Walters is absolutely right, and we must take a stand showing what the ultimate principle and aim of the organization is, namely, not the increase of wages, but to organize the working men to take and hold the product of their own hands for themselves. This is only a way so that when these working men or some of these organizers who are trying for an increase of wages, telling the working men to go in because then we will organize a strike, they will know and he can show that they do not represent industrial unionism, and this is a guide that is going to safeguard against anything that Walters in his remarks upon the question set forth.

DEL. JONES: Mr. Chairman, the preamble, I believe, covers the situation. I think it is the object of any legislation on the part of this body to show up the different meaning or to elaborate the meaning of that preamble. Another resolution which we had this morning practically says the same thing, in regard to Organizer Ettor's report. We have had resolutions galore since the starting of this convention on this preamble and we have voted them all down. I cannot consistently vote to endorse this resolution at all. The preamble says: "between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together." When they do, we will have emancipation; we know that. We should not go and tell the workers how they will vote in the future. Our preamble tells them that already. Now, it is unnecessary, this resolution in this form, just as unnecessary as the resolutions we have had on previous days. That is why I am opposed to this resolution.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. YATES: I realize the necessity of something being placed in the constitution, or being adopted as a resolution, so we in New York did that with these two propositions. When Sherman came down to New York at the time the Cleveland stogie workers' strike was on, he was asked how the Cleveland strikers were to be supported, and he gave it out that they were being supported by the married men getting \$7 a week and the single men \$5. Now, that created an impression amongst the people that the organization was prepared at all times to pour money into a local where a strike was in progress. Now, I feel that if Organizer Thompson's report had been read a lot of this matter would have been cleared up, and if a recommendation of the secretary had been inaugurated, I feel it would not have been necessary for this resolution to be introduced here today.

DEL. KOETTEL: I can state that this resolution has been discussed at length at home locally, and they have never come to any sort of agreement there, but the sentiment of the men is in favor of discouraging all strikes that we possibly can, and I would like to have Sec. Trautmann elaborate upon this.

THE CHAIRMAN: He has spoken once before.

DEL. KOETTEL: Not upon these strike conditions. I feel now like voting against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The motion is that we concur in the report of the committee and adopt the resolution. An amendment is made by Delegate Schwend that we insert the words—

DEL. FISCHER: "Resolved, that the convention instruct all organizers to discourage strikes."

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Schwend moves to amend by inserting the two words ("inauguration of"). An amendment is made to refer back. All in favor of the motion to refer this to the committee to bring in something more definite will say aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it, unless you want a roll call. Any further recommendations?

DEL. FISCHER: (Continuing report of committee on organization): We have two resolutions from a New York local relative to the payment of organizers: "Resolved, that no organizer of the I.W.W. be paid for more than a six-day week."

Another one: "To ask the convention to instruct the General Secretary that no organizer shall under any conditions receive payment for meals and board, and no organizer who is sent to any district with the knowledge that he will remain there for seven days or

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

more shall receive any hotel expenses.” We recommend that to the convention.

Also: “Resolved, that no organizer be paid for more than a six-day week, and be it further resolved, that all expense{s} incurred by organizers must be approved of by the Industrial Council or by the local union under whose jurisdiction they are working.”

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands as the motion before the house. What is your pleasure?

DEL. AXELSON: I really do not understand the reason of the six-day week. As I understand, this body is not a body who believe they have got to worship one day in the week. I believe if an organizer has a field in which to work and can do successful and useful work on the seventh day of the week, that day’s work is as valuable to the organization as the remaining six. Therefore I move an amendment that whenever an organizer works on Sunday or the seventh day, which would be proper in this connection when the six days are referred to, he receive the same pay for the seventh day.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the use of making an amendment? Vote down the motion.

DEL. WALTERS: In the first place, this is the same as two motions, and I would move that we segregate the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: No motion is required. We can segregate it any way. We will take up the six-day week question first.

DEL. WALTERS: I wish to speak on that. The reason the committee brought in this report on this motion was this: We know that organizers laugh when you try to cut off expenses. I don’t blame them. The fact is this: We all know the financial straits of the organization. We know it is hard to keep organizers in the field. That is one point. We hold that if we send a man out to organize and we pay him \$3 a day, which we are paying him now, I understand, for a six-day week, or \$18 a week, there should be revolutionary spirit enough in that man to do what the other members of this organization are doing night and day, taking up all their time for nothing. In other words, we hold that it is the duty of the organizers, as they are revolutionists, to give at least one day of the week to the organization when the rest of the organization is giving that day and every night in the week too. For that reason we hold that this resolution should go through.

DEL. KEEP: A question of information. How are the organizers paid now?

DEL. WALTERS: Three dollars a day.

THE CHAIRMAN: The organizers are paid by the day, for seven

days in a week, I presume.

DEL. LIESNER: Are they employed by the day, just for a number of days, or are they kept continually in the field from one end of the year to the other or from one month to the other? That makes a difference.

DEL. TRAINOR: I would like to raise the same question. As I understand it, organizers are employed by the week.

A DELEGATE: By the day.

DEL. TRAINOR: Is that the way they are employed?

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will have to answer that. So far as I know it is by the week and at such and such a sum per day. That is, they are paid according to the number of days that they work in a week.

DEL. TRAINOR: If we go out tomorrow morning in search of a job and we secure that job, we are supposed to work six days at that job, and we are supposed to get so much a day. If we work Sunday we are supposed to get extra for it. Now, if a man on a Sunday, even though he does go to church, if he is working for an organization of this kind, his interest is in this organization on Sunday, and if he sees a chance to organize a local union or branch of a local union I not see why there would be any necessity—because it don't take all Sunday to organize a local, it only takes a few minutes if you have the ground prepared—I don't see why it would be necessary for the organizer to sit down and figure out the minutes and seconds that it takes him to do every piece of organizing work, so I don't see where it is necessary for that organizer to be paid a full day's pay for doing that.

DEL. SPETTEL: Or a half day's pay.

DEL. HAGENSON: I cannot see any reason for this motion at all or for this regulation. In the first place it has been stated that an organizer who is employed by the organization should always be willing to work for it, even on Sunday, as the balance of the organization does, and as the balance of the organization work for it even every night in the weeks besides. I believe if you have an active organizer in the field, a man that has the good of the organization at heart, you will find him at work as early in the morning as the balance of the wage slaves, and I believe you will find him at work all day and you will find him at work much later than or just as late in the evening as any of the others, and also as hard at work Sundays as any other day, and for that reason I do not see why we should make any special day that he should need to be paid for. If the organizer is getting \$20 a week, let it be \$20 a week; if it should be \$18 a week, let it be so; if \$25, let it be so. But I do not see why we should recognize any

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

fossilized superstitious day and put ourselves on record in that line.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The recommendation of the committee should be segregated in two parts.

DEL. FISCHER: We have done that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The part that we are now discussing is the question of the seventh day.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The General Executive Board has only two cases where the matter of demanding pay for seven days a week has been abused. That is my recollection; I cannot state the cases distinctly. But the local executive board passed over all the bills. Not {Note?} when any one of the organizers submitted a bill for a week's expenses there were occasionally bills for Sunday work, but that was only a bill when he was directly engaged in conducting strikes or conducting affairs where Sunday work was absolutely necessary. As a matter of fact I know that most of the voluntary organizers used their Sundays very largely. In the last year I myself had only two Sundays off, and I went every Sunday organizing or speaking before a body of workers. Many of the organizers did likewise. Many of them, however, have to travel a certain distance, and it is a real expense, and all depends on what part of the country they live in. If they live, for instance, in Montana, or do organizing work in Montana, the expenses are higher, and with the \$3 a day rate they cannot live very well. They have higher expenses than organizers in other cities where living expenses are cheaper. All depends on circumstances. Now, if you pass the recommendation of the committee on constitution {organization?} you simply prohibit the organizers from doing work on Sunday or any other day only six days in the week. There may be circumstances where the organizer has to work seven days, but that matter should be left to the general executive board to judge. You have all seen the bills printed in the *Industrial Bulletin*. If there had been an abuse of the privilege of the organizer in his bill of expenses and his day's pay, any member of the organization had a chance to kick about it. I certainly agree that we should limit the time to six days, if possible, but not make it so stringent that when necessity demands an organizer should not be permitted to work seven days a week when he is in such a locality and has such expenses during the week.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the secretary that that is not the proposition. The proposition is to work seven days but only get paid for six.

DEL. FISCHER: To only get paid for six.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is a different proposition altogether.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: That is his wages, but he gets all his expenses.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I don't understand it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read it again.

DEL. FISCHER (Reading): "Resolved, that no organizer be paid more than a six-day week."

A DELEGATE: That means \$18 a week?

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

DEL. SCHWEND: I move as an amendment that this resolution be amended so as to read that the pay of organizers shall be \$18 a week. And if I am in order and will be permitted by the Chair, I would like to explain my reasons.

(Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

DEL. SCHWEND: Now, if the co-operative commonwealth or industrial commonwealth that we all look forward to is worthy of our efforts, in my opinion there is no day that is too good for us, no day that should be excepted, but we should be willing to use our best efforts on Sunday as well as any other day for the accomplishment of our ideals. Now, I say that if we adopt this resolutions as it stands we are simply, as it were, catering—although it may not be intentional—we are catering to a kind of old superstition, or that could be the interpretation put upon it. But if we make it \$18 a week, then our organizers have the privilege of getting out and working on Sunday just the same as any other day, and no doubt they will do it. I believe they would do it anyhow, but I do not see the necessity for saying that they shall only be paid for six days in a week, when we can accomplish the same object by establishing a certain weekly wage.

Delegate Francis moved the previous question. Seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we will come to a vote upon this question.

DEL. WALTERS: Are we voting now on the amendment before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are voting on the amendment before the house.

DEL. WALTERS: And the committee has no right to speak now?

THE CHAIRMAN: According to the ruling established here, the committee is to have the floor before the question is put to a vote. Now, if the committee desires to be heard they can now have the floor.

DEL. WALTERS: There has been altogether a misinterpretation put on this resolution. I assure you that your committee does not desire to

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

stop any man from working if he wants to work 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, to establish the co-operative commonwealth. You can work yourself to death if you want to, and we are with you to help you. The proposition is this: Now, we know that the organizers do not have such a hard row as they try to tell us, we know that we are lenient with them. When I go into a shop to work I work six days a week and get six days' pay, and my boss don't pay my hotel expenses and meal bills. I pay those out of my six days' pay. If I work seven days I have seven days' pay to pay my expenses with. What we want to do is this: We want to establish a rule. Trautmann has said that only one or two organizers have abused this thing. That is a fact. I am not here to cite specific cases. I am not here as a knocker or to knock any organizer or any one else, but I want the abuse stopped. Now, if an organizer is sent on the road he is sent out to a certain district. It does not make any difference where he goes, he is working six days a week under pay, and he gets his hotel expenses and his meal bill, and car fare, and everything else paid, and his \$18 is practically clear money.

He has no expenses, figuratively speaking. It is a fine proposition. Now, we want to pay the same pay for the seventh day. We want to pay him \$3 and expenses. What the committee wants to do is this: We don't want to fix the salary at \$18 a week, because there may be cases where we will have to pay more and there may be cases where we can pay less. We have national organizers working in New York in the Jewish quarters for \$10 a week, and they don't get any expenses except their car fare. We have an organizer working there for the local organization, Local 95, that gets \$18 a week and only gets car fare in running from place to place. This organizer, living in Newark, several miles away from the city, when he comes in he pays his car fare and when he goes home he pays his car fare, and only has his fare paid in going about as an organizer. Katz is in the same position. Katz is organizer in Paterson. I understand he gets no car fare and gets the magnificent sum of \$15 a week and pays for the meals for himself and his wife and children, and he has more than one.

A DELEGATE: More than one what? (Laughter.)

DEL. WALTERS: These things have to be taken into consideration. While I hold that the organizers will be very well paid, I hold that a man can give that one day to the organization, as I said before, when you take into consideration the work that is done by the rank and file and the Sundays that they give up. I myself have had no Sunday for the last two years or more in this organization. Nearly every night in the week my work is demanded in the labor movement. I get nothing for

it. I never got a cent in my life for it. I don't want it. I hope the resolution will carry. I hope the amendment is not carried, but I hope the resolution is, that we do not pay organizers for more than a six-day week, even if they work ten days in the week.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the amendment that the organizers get \$18 per week will say aye. Opposed, no. The motion is lost. Now, the motion will be the original motion.

DEL. FISCHER: "Resolved, that no organizer be paid for more than a six-day week."

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of that will say aye; opposed, no. Carried. What is the next point?

DEL. FISCHER (Reading): "Resolved, that all expenses incurred by organizers must be approved by the Industrial Council or local union under whose jurisdiction they are working."

DEL. LEVOY: I move as an amendment that organizers shall be paid the prevailing wages in the district they are in. If somebody will second the amendment I will explain myself.

A DELEGATE: That is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is not seconded anyway.

DEL. LIESNER: I want to ask a question. That states that the expenses of organizers must be approved by the locals under whose jurisdiction they are working. Suppose the organizer gets into a district where there are no locals, then what?

THE CHAIRMAN: They must be under some jurisdiction; the nearest town.

DEL. FRANCIS: The recommendation, I understand, is that the expenses must be approved.

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move to amend that he simply give a copy of the expense, one to be sent to headquarters and one copy to the local body.

DEL. KEEP: I think you are going to get into a good deal of confusion on this matter. An organizer may strike a town and incur certain expenses before he meets the local union or committee, and when he presents them to the organization they will not approve them because they have not authorized him to incur those expenses. You will find in some cases that some of these locals are so particular about expenses and the handling of funds that it would cause internal friction. I do not care whether that is adopted or not. I am simply pointing this out. This is another attempt, it seems to me, to make a negation by putting up a rule. A man can rob in six days as much as in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

seven if he is not honest as an organizer. He can run up a big expense account if he wants to do it. If he is honest he will not do it, and if he is dishonest he will stuff his expense account. I am not saying anything derogatory to any organizer. I am not in favor of this.

DEL. YATES: A point of order. I believe the resolution brought in by the Grievance Committee covers all this.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was something brought in and adopted, but I do not recollect the exact wording; have you that?

DEL. YATES: I have not the exact wording.

DEL. FISCHER: That only has reference to reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand this resolution to mean that if an organizer comes into a town and renders a bill for expenses, a copy of his financial report is to be sent to the local organization under whose jurisdiction he is working.

DEL. WILLIAMS: That was not seconded.

DEL. FRANCIS: I wish to withdraw my amendment.

DEL. KEEP: Let us have the original resolution.

(Del. Levoy took the floor.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Levoy, you spoke upon this question.

DEL. LEVOY: I did not speak upon it. I was going to make an amendment, and you ruled it out of order; but I want to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have not ruled you out of order. There was no second to your amendment. Well, go ahead.

DEL. LEVOY: I believe we fixed the matter or expense a day or so ago. Now, if we would give them a salary, for instance, counting the prevailing rate—

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. The question of salary has already been settled.

DEL. LEVOY: I want to speak of expense.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question was segregated into two parts.

DEL. LEVOY: The question of salary was not settled.

A DELEGATE: Sure!

DEL. LEVOY: That was the amendment. The amendment was three dollars. The only thing that was settled was that he should work six days a week. That was settled?

DEL. YATES: No.

DEL. LEVOY: It was not. The amendment was lost, but it said \$3 per day, and I believe if we would fix that salary so that he shall incur his own expense without stating the hotel bills and meal tickets, and all that, we would not have had the squabble all around. We have in every local where I went—the organizer sending in a bill for expenses

so and so, incidentals and everything else. I believe they should be paid a salary and pay their own expenses, and we should pay their railroad fare and car fare.

DEL. AXELSON: There seems to be a good deal of confusion on this, but it is clear to me that it is only a safeguard, and a good one. It does not mean that the local organization, if I understand correctly, is going to pay the expense, but it only wants to set clear that the local organization in that community in which the organizer is employed shall approve the expense, the expense to be paid by the National headquarters. That is the way I understand it. Consequently, you don't have to take only the word of the organizer, but you have the word of the local organization in the community where the organizer is working. That seems to be clear to any one here. If there is any confusion or anything that would tend to confuse anybody, but it has a tendency to clear it up.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I don't agree with Axelson on that proposition. I had a time in getting the officials to approve the expenses of the organizer. If I understand the proposition correctly the national organizers' bills are compelled to be submitted to the G.E.B.; to make weekly itemized reports of their expenses, and if those expenses are excessive the G.E.B. or the Local Advisory Board will as readily find that out as the local will, and it seems to me that you are going to complicate matters a whole lot by putting this into the hands of the local. I hold that the national organizer should be free from the jurisdiction of the local when he is working in a community where that local is. I hold that the national organizer is a check upon that local. Now, there was a proposition in the instructions that Local 173 of San Francisco wanted to fasten upon me and which I refused, by which the national organizer should come under the jurisdiction of the local, and his reports to the headquarters should be verified by the local and signed and sealed by the local officials before they were sent in. I supposed {opposed?} it. I insisted that we were taking the check off of the local in order to place a stronger check upon the national organizer. Those reports that come in from the national organizer are valuable when they come in on an independent basis, but when they are subject to the jurisdiction of the local the G.E.B. is unable to find out the situation. The proposition comes up with regard to this expense account. No organizer can put in an expense account that is excessive and have it pass muster in the local executive board. It will know enough about the conditions in the country to know that \$5 a day for meals and all that is excessive, while perhaps a dollar and a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

quarter a day in some parts of the country would not be excessive. Therefore I object to this proposition.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Mr. Chairman and Fellow-Workers: I can assure you that at this time it is not my desire to speak, not feeling very well after traveling so long, but I cannot keep quiet any longer because my position might be misunderstood. I should have spoken on the other motion in regard to the six-day week. One delegate here has referred to men who had a seven-day week. I have worked seven days a week while I have been organizing, and I deny that I have abused the position of organizer. I wish to refute any statement of that kind, by any delegate, that I have ever abused the office of organizer on the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World. However, that motion has been passed and I am not going to refer to it further except to say that I have nothing in my pocket. If I have ever had I simply paid it back into the organization. I have been organizing for a good many years, and I have been working in taking in locals of the Industrial Workers of the World, and I have been working for General Secretary-Treasurer Trautmann and the Assistant Secretary, and my bills have been very few. I have been working among Sherman locals in Montana, and I had wanted to abuse the office I could get John McMullen in the City of Butte to verify an account of \$5,000. The only work in those Sherman locals is to tear them down. There are hundreds of locals that were loyal to Sherman a few months ago which we have succeeded in turning against Sherman, stopping the payment of per capita tax to him. There were dozens in existence that were more loyal to him than to us, and if I had wished to have an account verified I had nothing to do but send it to some local organization. You are building up a lot of false legislation. You are trying to make a man dishonest. If he is dishonest he can steal. If you catch anyone stealing money, discharge the man. This is only trying to make a thief out of a man by setting up false legislation here that I believe will do no good to the Industrial Workers of the World. It will do no good to make a man show how many hours and how many days a week he works. If he is dishonest he can get around it. I don't want to go to church. One man may want to go to church, though I say that if any organizer wants to go to church, if I was the president of this organization or on the General Executive Board, I would fire him for wanting to go to church. (Applause.) Before I sit down I want to say that you will get along with the business of the convention more expeditiously than wrangling about men turning in an account to the Industrial Local, because he has greater and better work to do. He has worked in

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

tearing down the work of the fakirs. In the city of Butte, in the State of Montana, in the Sherman locals, I could turn any account into a Sherman Local or to John McMullon, president of the Trades' Assembly, and have my account verified. There is a lot of work to do. I don't want to do it. It is the most thankless job a man ever had, organizing the working class. I will never be a traitor to the working class. I have always put in my time, and the result shows for itself, though only getting \$3 a day. I hope you will not build up any false legislation that is useless to the working class or the Industrial Workers of the World. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. What is your pleasure? (Question called for.) All in favor of the recommendation will say aye. Read it.

(The recommendation was read by Del. Fischer.)

The motion was put and lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ways and Means Committee.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

DEL. HENION: "That the income of the general organization be devoted to the payment of organizers and printing of literature."

Now, the report of the Committee is that we do not concur.

Calls for Question.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing before the House. Was that resolution brought in by a Local?

DEL. HENION: By Organizer Forberg.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure? All in favor of the recommendation of the Committee will say aye.

The recommendation was put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything else?

DEL. HENION: Nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Committee on Press and Literature.

COMMITTEE ON PRESS AND LITERATURE.

DEL. GLOVER: Mr. Chairman, there was a report presented by the editor of the *Bulletin* and was turned over to the Press Committee. We find we can do nothing with it as the Convention has already acted upon it, so consequently, we simply consider the matter settled.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman, in regard to what we have on our hands now, it was been {has been?} passed upon and recommended yesterday, and the Convention here acted upon it after a discussion, and voted to table it; so the Committee on that certainly cannot recommend it any longer, because they made a laughing stock of us yesterday in introducing it. Therefore, I move we leave it as it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't quite understand you. Was that a report?

DEL. AXELSON: It is a statement as to the reason why we do not want to take up this report and read it.

A DELEGATE: Regular order of business, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next committee. Is the Committee on Constitution ready to report?

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Fellow Worker Chairman, we have had turned over to us several recommendations of Organizer Walsh. I will read the recommendation and then the proposed amendment to the Constitution that the Committee submits. The propositions of Walsh are as follows:

(1) The abolition of the per capita tax, and in its place the advanced payment of per capita stamps.

(2) Withdrawal cards to be issued only when a worker ceases to be a member of the working class.

(3) Transfer cards to be abolished; that a worker's card be deposited under a new jurisdiction be a transfer, and that the secretary where the said card is deposited should notify the Local of which the applicant was formerly a member. This to be done, that should there be any charges against him it soon would be known. The secretary with whom the card is deposited collect all back dues and assessments of the worker and keep same in their treasury.

(4) That no member cease to pay dues or assessment as long as he is a member of the working class.

(5) That in the event of his absence from the jurisdiction of his local union he shall on depositing his card pay up all back dues and assessment levied by the National office. The same will be a reinstatement fee.

DEL. WILLIAMS: This was proposed by Organizer Walsh and it has been embodied in our proposed amendment, and I will now read the recommendation of the Committee. The amendment is to strike out Section 10 of Article 6 and substitute the following:

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

“The National Industrial departments and National Industrial unions of the Industrial Workers of the World shall pay a tax to the General Organization of eight and one-third cents per month per member reported in good standing.”

Then Section 11 is amended as follows:

“All departments and other subordinate organizations on the Industrial Workers of the World shall use the official I.W.W. stamps in membership books. All stamps shall be paid for at fifteen cents each and no books shall be considered in good standing except stamped up to date.”

The recommendation of the Committee is that these proposed amendments be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the recommendation of the Committee. You understand that is the motion. There are two sections.

DEL. WILLIAMS: There is another recommendation here in connection with that and it is that Organizer Walsh be allowed to make a statement regarding this proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that?

DELEGATES: “No, no.”

DEL. WALSH: Fellow Worker Chairman, I don't know that it is necessary to make a statement if you understood the concrete formation of the organization and the work of the local union. In attempting to audit the books of unions in the field, I find it is impossible to audit the books kept by many workers in the western states. It may be done in the east. You have today under the present Constitution a per capita tax and a per capita stamp. By having a per capita tax and a per capita stamp it gets confused. A local member becomes a member in January. He pays January dues and is a member in good standing for January, February and March. In sixty days his good standing has lapsed. When he goes over to another Union, and a few more months go by, the other union then under the present rules collects from him the number of months he owes in dues, including February and March, and pays back to the former Union half that has been collected. You have a conflict between a per capita tax and a per capita stamp. As a result the headquarters is loser all the time.

The next is the transfer card. In the west it is absolutely ridiculous. On the steamer *Ohio*, for instance, on which I went to Alaska, there were a number of Industrial Workers of the World. Now, they had not taken any transfer card, but they had taken a job upon that boat. When we got to Nome, as the result of a ship striking an iceberg, we were laid

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

up for over a month in that community. Now, there is no way to get mail back to get a transfer card. My contention is, that by the abolition of the per capita tax it will protect the headquarters.

DEL. JONES: I see the Organization Committee has a report to make which will do away with all this system of transfer and make everything complete. I would ask the Constitution Committee to withhold this until after the Organization Committee makes its final report.

DEL. FRANCIS: I realize now that this is a complete proposition in itself. While I did second the amendment I think the Chairman should have known enough not to entertain the amendment. I wish to say this, that this is a very good proposition and I move that this proposition carry. Now, therefore, I would urge the chairman to declare the amendment out of order and proceed to vote on the recommendation.

DEL. JONES: I did not speak upon the question at all. All that I ask the Committee on Constitution to do is to defer their report. The fact is, that you are acting upon matters here that are going to conflict with the report of the Organization Committee and it is useless debate at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that this be deferred until the Organization Committee has reported. Are you ready for the question?

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the Constitution Committee anything else to report?

DEL. GLOVER: That is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other committee ready to report?

DEL. FRANCIS: The Committee on Resolutions.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

DEL. FRANCIS: I will read first the matter that was referred back to the Committee:

“Whereas, Fellow Worker Preston of Goldfield, Nev., in the discharge of his duty as picket, being attacked by the owner of a restaurant with drawn revolver, shot and killed him;

Whereas, Though it was a clear case of self-defense, Fellow Worker Preston was arrested on the charge of murder and Fellow Worker Smith, another organizer, was arrested on the charge of being an accessory before the fact and both sent to prison by a packed jury;

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Whereas, Vincent St. John, Walter Campbell, Ben Donnelly, L.D. Jardine, A.E. Johnson, Harry Rodgers, Jerry Sexton, and R. Elmer Vice, are being held for trial on a charge of conspiracy in connection with this case, and,

Whereas, the Citizen Alliance and Mine Owners' Association have been backed up by scab herder, Grant Hamilton, and his A.F. of L. scabs, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the Third Annual Convention of the I.W.W. assembled this, the 21st day of September, demand that Preston and Smith be given a new and fair trial and the freedom to which they are entitled; and be it further

Resolved, That the others be speedily tried and released, and further be it

Resolved, That we condemn said Grant Hamilton and his organized scabs as traitors who would sell the lives of their fellow slaves for their master's smile, and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be published in the *Industrial Union Bulletin*, and sent to the labor press."

We recommend the adoption.

The motion was seconded, put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other recommendation from the Committee?

DEL. FRANCIS: We have another.

Reading as follows:

"MEXICAN REVOLUTIONS.

Whereas, It has become known to us that Antonio Villarial, Ricardo Flores, Magon and Zebrado Riviera, after being persecuted on false charges have been rearrested on the charge of having committed murder in Jimenez, Mexico, and are being held pending extradition.

Whereas, We believe the only crime these men have committed and for which they are being persecuted, is that of organizing their fellow workers to resist the oppression of the master class.

Whereas, We believe there exists a conspiracy on the part of the Mexican government and American capitalist interests in the Mexican Mining Industry to railroad these men to the gallows or prison, and,

Whereas, We know a fair trial on the charge under existing conditions is impossible in Mexico, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the delegates of the Third Annual Convention of the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Industrial Workers of the World assembled this 21st day of September, 1907, that we protest against the extradition of these men, and be it further

Resolved, That we will use every means to so arouse the working class, that the aforesaid men do not become victims of capitalist brutality, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the president of the United States, the clerk of the court in which extradition proceedings are pending, to the labor press and be published in the *Industrial Union Bulletin*."

DEL. HAGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask for information. Does this committee know that they are correct in the statement of the charges? I understood that these men were not wanted under a charge of murder, but they were wanted under a charge that they were political prisoners who had skipped from Mexico.

DEL. DELANEY: I will state in looking that matter up that I found a clipping of the Chicago *Daily Socialist*—perhaps it is not good authority (A delegate: No good. Can't depend on it.) I found there the statement that they had been released; that they had been held under charges of criminal libel and they had been released and immediately rearrested on a charge of murdering and unidentified man at Jimez, Mexico. That is a charge they are held on now.

DEL. HAGENSEN: It don't appear to be good evidence there. I am quite familiar with the case. I do not believe it should go out that they were charged with murder. I do not believe that is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the House is to adopt the resolution.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Are you acquainted with the Mexican Labor League of St. Louis?

DEL. HAGENSEN: Yes, somewhat.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: With the parties connected with it?

DEL. HAGENSEN: I am acquainted with one of the brothers of one of the prisoners, and two of his sisters, and his father. They do not talk very good English; they are Spanish. From what I could understand from them the charges are that they are political prisoners that had skipped and not murderers.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: If they are political prisoners the Mexican government can only get their release by making charges of murder.

DEL. HAGENSEN: I believe I would like to make myself clear.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have spoken a number of times.

DEL. HAGENSEN: For a point of correction. It looks to me that if

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

we pass a resolution that throws a false light on these imprisoned men it makes it harder against them than if we leave out that they are murderers, and we should put it in that they are political prisoners.

DEL. DELANEY: It was copied from the papers—a news dispatch. It stated that these men were released and had been immediately arrested on the charge of murder in Mexico—the murder of an unidentified man. The resolution simply says, They are charged with murder.

DEL. JONES: As there are doubts upon the facts in the resolution I move that this be referred to the incoming general executive board.

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the committee any further resolutions?

DEL. FRANCIS: We have the following:

RESOLUTION ON ANTI-ASIATIC PERSECUTION.

Whereas, In the past year several riots have occurred on the Pacific Coast directed against Asiatics on the ground that they are cheap labor.

Whereas, These Asiatics have, whenever an attempt has been made, shown their ability to organize, better their conditions and to stand true to their class

Whereas, The interests of the working class are the same no matter what their race, creed and color and are diametrically opposed to the interests of the capitalist class, and

Whereas, These outbreaks but serve to further divide the workers where they should be united, and therefore serve the interest of the master class, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we condemn this persecution of our fellow workers from Asia, as well as all other anti-foreign agitation, as being against the interest of the whole working class; and further, be it

Resolved, That the action of these rioters is really an endorsement of the persecution that each race of immigrants has met in their turn, which has helped the master class to keep us in slavery, and further be it

Resolved, That we condemn the A.F. of L. as well as other so-called labor organizations who have in this respect aided the masters, and further, be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the labor press and published in the *Industrial Worker Bulletin* {sic}.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

(In the discussion which followed the word “allegation” was substituted for the word “ground” in the first “Whereas” of the above resolution.)

Del. Williams moved that the second “Whereas” be stricken out.

DEL. WILLIAMS: The allegations of facts in there are open to question. The fact of the matter is that the Asiatics are cheap labor. I don't think anyone can question that. They would not be there on the Pacific Coast if they were not cheap labor, and there would be no feeling against them. We have no organizations of Asiatics at the present time. The pure and simples did not want to organize them, and don't want to organize them, and the I.W.W. has been unable to organize them, and it seems to me that the clause, in view of that fact is open to question and ought to be stricken out. It is superfluous anyway to the rest.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is that the second whereas in the resolution be stricken out. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. AXELSON: I am strictly opposed to striking out anything in that resolution because if we do strike it out and go on record as saying that these men are cheap labor, we must take into consideration the country from which they have come and their environment which they have been brought up under and the general conditions, before we say they are cheap labor. We must remember that they are not always conversant with the conditions of this country and they don't learn it the first year either.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not talking to the question. The question is not to insert into the resolution that they are cheap labor. The question is whether or not that should be stricken out. You must confine yourself to the question.

DEL. AXELSON: I am speaking strictly to the question. In order for me to show my position I must show why I stand the way I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: I stated that you must confine yourself to the discussion of the question before the house. You didn't do that. Now, you can continue if you want to discuss the question.

DEL. AXELSON: I hold that this is an international movement. We must not and cannot draw any barriers on any race, creed or color. We are holding—

THE CHAIRMAN: You will take your seat.

DEL. AXELSON: I appeal from the decision of the chair.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: State the appeal.

DEL. AXELSON: I hold that I am speaking strictly to the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to give every delegate an opportunity to express his opinion if he speaks upon the question. There is a resolution brought in by the committee which it is not necessary for me to state, and which I could not state as you have it there, and there is an amendment made to strike out a reference which is an allegation of fact, and that is that the Asiatics are willing to organize. Now the delegate rises to speak as though the amendment were to insert in that resolution that they were cheap labor, as though we wanted to insert into that resolution that we are opposed to them, and for that reason I think we should not waste time on that and that it should not be allowed. The question before the house is whether the chair be sustained or not.

(Yea and nay vote taken.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair is sustained.

DEL. SCHWEND: I believe it would be well to have the committee read the resolution as it stands with this section eliminated.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read the resolution and recommendation with this clause eliminated.

(Paper read as directed.)

DEL. DE LEON: I believe I misunderstood how Delegate Williams made his amendment. There is an objection to striking out the second whereas, and I could hardly vote for the proposed amendment because I think it goes farther *{sic}* than I believe he means to go. Can I have the clause read?

(Paper read as directed.)

DEL. DE LEON: There is another clause in which the cheap labor is mentioned. Kindly read that clause.

(Clause read as directed.)

DEL. DE LEON: If you will allow me, my amendment is to strike out the words "On the ground that" and insert "On the allegation that."

DEL. FRANCIS: The committee will agree to that.

DEL. DE LEON: I think that eliminates Williams' objection. I don't like the words "on the ground that," when you say "on the ground" it means that you accept the reason, and when you say "allegation" it means that it is doubtful. I know the ground of the objection to them is the allegation that they are cheap labor, but is that true? We know that the labor bureau of the State of California has explicitly stated that the Japanese are merciless towards the employer and the labor bureau is hardly run in the interest of the laboring people. Now, if we use the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

word "allegation," I think that meets the objection of Mr. Williams. If we retain the words "on the ground that" I will have to vote for the amendment of Williams. If my amendment is adopted, and we use the word "allegation," which means doubt, or that it is questionable whether the statement is true or not, then I will vote against the amendment.

DEL. FRANCIS: The committee will accept the amendment.

DEL. HIGGINS: From the reports that we have gained from the Asiatic working people, and their organizing in this country wherever they can, I don't hardly believe that the statement of cheap labor can be backed up with the facts and I also believe that they have proven that they are really organized to stand together as a class. I believe that is proper. I believe that some of our organizers that are here at the present time will affirm that these people have shown that they are ready to organize and ready to stand by an organization when they are organized.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question is moved.

On vote the motion lost.

DEL. SPEED: Fellow Workers and Chairman, I have been in California for the last twenty-eight years, up and down the coast and will say that at the time of the Chinese agitation and the present uprising of the Japanese agitation is the result of the little two by four, the small orchardists and fruit growers of California who are making the howl, simply on the question that the Japanese have come into California and the little two by four is being placed on the road to pack the blanket. Necessarily he squeals and the Anti-Japanese League of California is squealing through editorials published in the San Francisco *Chronicle* in the interest of the fruit growers of California and the small orchardists. The Japanese in their work, like all other people come to this country and necessarily hang together like one man, as a solid body, and the same thing is true of the Greeks; in San Francisco they are solid and hang together like one man and if one gets fired, the whole bunch quits. The California fruit growers and small orchardists used to hire a class of men who were unorganized and who would work at a place a couple of days and if he didn't like it would quit and they could not depend upon that class of men and they have induced the Japanese to come there and they came and they have been working in large bodies and these orchardists after having eliminated the white class who were not reliable and could not be depended upon. After the Japanese accomplished their purpose, that

of eliminating this element, they demanded better conditions and in some instances were getting better pay than the whites in other districts, and that is what is causing this agitation. Here is the statement of a San Francisco man, he made a statement of this kind, "When the Japanese are working and they hear the whistle blow at noon, they quit immediately, and that was a crime." The second proposition is this, that when this class of workers go on a strike, it is no strike because there is nobody to take their places. Now, I say the whole fight against the Japanese is the fight of the middle class of California, in which they employ the labor faker to back it up. That is really the position of the fight there against the Japs and while I know that condition, it is practically useless for the present time and under present conditions for the Industrial Workers of the World to take any steps there to organize these men under the present conditions. We have enough to do under the present state of things and prejudices that array our organizers, without going outside and if we organize the men who are already in California into the I.W.W. we will do well for the present and I think it would retard our own development and the facts of the matter are that the whole fight against them is the fight of the small orchardists and fruit grower, who is finding that the Japanese is going to take his place.

DEL. KEEP: I understand that in the beet sugar industry in Lower California the Mexicans and Japanese went out on a strike against a plant. The A.F. of L. was willing to organize the Mexicans, but not the Japs and the Mexicans were men enough to say if you won't take these people, we won't have anything to do with you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is to concur in the report of the committee, or the amendment to strike out the second whereas. What is your pleasure?

DEL. AIAZZONE: I wish to make an explanation why I seconded the amendment, it was to bring this matter up because I knew if the amendment was not seconded, this discussion could not have taken place.

DEL. FRANCIS: First of all, I don't understand why we should always take up something else. We don't propose to organize the Japanese.

DEL. SPEED: I simply make the statement for the purpose of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

DEL. FRANCIS: As far as my knowledge goes of the facts, I know of a case where there was a strike on the Frazier river, a fishing industry,

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

where the Japanese did organize, and the white men helped the employers to break up their organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will now come to a vote. All in favor of the amendment signify by saying I {sic}, all opposed no. The amendment is lost.

Now we will vote on the motion. All in favor say aye, all opposed no.

The motion carried.

DEL. FRANCIS: The committee on resolutions received the following communication signed C.H. Axelson:

“Whereas, the I.W.W. allows editors of political papers as delegates to its conventions and denies the right of its own editor to such a position, and

Whereas, Editors occupy a tactical position in the labor movement superior to any other wage earner, therefore be it

Resolved, That all editors who are members or wish to become members of the I.W.W. should become members at large. Signed C.H. Axelson.”}

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman will declare the resolution out of order.

DEL. AXELSON: What is the reason please, why this resolution is out of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will give you the ruling if you desire. If a member of this organization, or if a man is eligible to be a member of this organization, he has some rights and some duties, and the same rights and same duties as any other man or member, and you cannot make any special legislation here for any member of the organization because of any calling he may have. That is all embodied in the constitution and if a man is a member of this organization we can't say that this man can't hold this office because he is following that trade and a man can't be a member of this body because he is following another trade. We can say what our officials can hold.

DEL. FOOTE: Under that ruling, to hold the constitution as it now stands, if a man like A.M. Simmons {sic}, becomes connected with the I.W.W. he could become a delegate and come to the convention and others like him; then they could pack the convention with men who have the power, and are outside of the interests of the working class. I am asking for information.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will answer the delegate. There was a resolution introduced before the house by one of the delegates that no man could be a delegate to this organization who is the editor of a

political newspaper.

DEL. CAMINITA: I wish to make an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not before the house. It is out of order. The delegate has asked a question for information, as to whether or not a man like A.M. Simmons {sic} could come into this convention. Now, if A.M. Simmons {sic} or any other man who is a member, should he be eligible, he could come, no matter what local he would belong to. Delegate Caminita is the editor of a paper, and a political paper and he is a member of local fifty-two, and another man may be a member of the newspaper writers' union or whatever their local may be called, and they have the same rights as any other member.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move we proceed with the regular order of business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have the committee on resolutions any further report?

DEL. FRANCIS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other committee {with} anything ready to report; if not, we will go into the report of the officers and would be glad to hear from Delegate Heslewood.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I have a long report to make, or I might say two reports, and they are both in writing. Between the times when I was coming over on the Hamburg American Line I wrote out my report. I have some suggestions that I would like to appear before the convention adjourns, and my other report is a sort of general report. I don't want to take up too much time here this afternoon, and I would be willing to go into either of these reports, the one of the general work of the year and the recommendations I have to offer for the work in the West for the ensuing year, which is a lengthy report of some thirty-two pages hand written, and the other report that will probably interest you.

DEL. LEVOY: I move that the recommendations come before the committee where the other recommendations come from.

DEL. FRANCIS: This was passed upon in a ruling yesterday that anything that was not published in the *Bulletin* and is not reported to the editor, it was ruled that it should not be handled in that manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will vote on the proposition.

(The motion was lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion being lost, the delegate will read the report.

The report of Delegate Heslewood was received with hearty

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

applause, and will be published in full in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, if it is in order, I would like to make a motion that this report be received and ordered published in the *Bulletin*.

The motion was seconded by Del. Aiazzino and others.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded that this report be received and published in the *Industrial Bulletin*. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. BOHM: I desire to amend the motion to the effect that it should be published in pamphlets and sold in pamphlet form.

(The amendment failed of a second.)

DEL. WALTERS: I move an amendment that this report be received and turned over to the Committee on Organization.

(The amendment was not seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That goes without saying.

DEL. WALTERS: This matter or reporting afterwards will come up later on.

THE CHAIRMAN: It goes without saying that this report will go into the hands of the proper committee. The question now is whether this report should be published in the *Industrial Bulletin*.

EL. KEEP: I would like to ask the editor of the *Bulletin* whether inasmuch as the other things that have been done and said here have been printed, this report will not also be printed in the regular course.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

(The question was called for.)

DEL. DE LEON: Before that motion is carried, this is the place to make an amendment, and my amendment is that before this report is published, the editor of the *Bulletin* shall read it over carefully. There is one word occurs there in the report, I do not care to mention it, although I think it occurs twice, which may expose the editor and Heslewood and perhaps the organization, to a libel suit. I know the term is perfectly correct, but you should not invite such things. I will not mention it, as I do not think it is necessary.

I would therefore move to amend that the editor of the *Bulletin* be instructed to eliminate any such word that would be the handle to a libel suit.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I will accept that in my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will accept that in your motion?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. YATES: I seconded the motion in the first place that that be turned over to the same committee that the other organizers' reports were turned over to. It was not because I did not want to hear the report of Delegate Heslewood, but in all fairness to the other organizers, I feel that their reports should be treated in the same manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is not a report of the organizer; this is a report of a member of the General Executive Board. The fellow worker does not report as an organizer; he reports as a member of the General Executive Board.

DEL. YATES: I believe he commenced his report by those very words, "General organizer."

THE CHAIRMAN: No, he did not; he spoke of the organizers.

Now, you have heard the motion and Fellow Worker Williams accepts the suggestion made by De Leon in his motion. Are you ready for the question?

(The question was called for an, being put, the motion prevailed unanimously.)

DEL. LEVOY: Point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: We now come to the question of referring it to the various committees and we have decided upon that, that all these reports go to the various committees.

DEL. LEVOY: Point of information: Will this be published in the proceedings? If it is going to be published in the proceedings those words should be eliminated before it is published.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be published in the *Industrial Bulletin*.

DEL. LEVOY: In the proceedings, too?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course; in the stenographic report. We have a committee here, you know, of Edwards, Walsh and Caminita; they will attend to that.

Now, we will proceed with further business. The next report will be the report of Delegate Heslewood from the International Congress.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I may say, fellow workers, as a prelude before I start to read, that this is not a lengthy report. It merely takes up the matter of the trades union question in the congress. I did not consider that the other questions that came up before the congress were of vital interest to the members of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Owing to the fact that most all of the work at the congress was

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

translated into English by an Englishman who knew as much about the revolutionary movement as a hog knows about New York, and all I know about French would not make a very large book, or German, or Italian, and furthermore I might say that owing to the fact that all I know is the Canadian language, I am not very well versed in the kind of revolution that this little Englishman had to give us in the congress. Being a member of the commission from America on the discussion of trades unions and political affairs, I might say that I considered that the most vital point anyway of our organization, and the one on which I am best posted.

The other matters I intend in the future to take up in the *Bulletin*, the resolutions of the other commissions, and also to have some articles on my observations in my travels, in regard to the working class. But this report merely deals with the trades union question.

(Delegate Heslewood then submitted his report, which will appear in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.)

(The applause which greeted the reading of the report having subsided, Delegate Williams was recognized by the Chair.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I move that that report take the same course as the preceding one.

(The motion was seconded by Delegate Walters and others.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is made and seconded that this report take the same course as the preceding one. Are you ready for the question?

(The motion being called for, the motion was put and carried unanimously.)

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Worker Chairman: The reading of that communication reminds me of a resolution passed by this convention. I want to ask if the copy of that resolution will in any way come in contact with the members of that congress? I refer to the resolution that we passed here pertaining to the Stuttgart Congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not aware that we have passed any resolution as to the Stuttgart Congress.

DEL. LIESNER: Then that is a mistake. That has not been brought up yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now then, have we any other committee to hear from? If not, there are some important things to be decided under the head of new business, and one of them is whether we will meet tomorrow or not.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

NO SUNDAY SESSION.

DEL. GLOVER: In order to bring that matter before this convention, I move you that we hold a session tomorrow.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been made and seconded that we meet tomorrow. Are you ready for the question?

Delegate Williams has the floor.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, if I thought we could finish the sessions of the Convention by tomorrow night I would be in favor of meeting tomorrow; but it seems that there is more work than can be done in one day, and as we have had a pretty hard week of it, I think we ought to be entitled to one day of rest. I am therefore opposed to the motion that was made; not because it is Sunday but because we need the rest.

DEL. HAGENSON: I for myself would like to see that we do not have a session tomorrow. It would satisfy me much better personally, but as the plea has been made, and no doubt there is a good foundation for it, that a number of delegates are very anxious to get through, and because of this fact we have hurried things in my judgment, much more than they should have been hurried, for that reason, in order that we may have a little more time, which I believe is probably needed, I will be in favor of the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Caminita has the floor.

DEL. CAMINITA: I yield the floor to Delegate Aiazzone.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I would make an amendment that we meet Monday Morning at nine o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will vote on the motion and then there will be no amendment needed of that kind.

DEL. SPETTEL: Fellow Worker Chairman and delegates: If I thought by holding a morning session tomorrow we could wind up our business Monday night, I would be very much in favor of coming here tomorrow. It would be a poor policy for us not to do anything tomorrow and then come here again Monday and find that we could not get through until Tuesday. If there is any way of ascertaining whether that will occur, I should like to have a session tomorrow morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Foote has the floor.

DEL. FOOTE: Inasmuch as the report of Delegate Heslewood has put in some more matter for the committee to work on, would it not be well to let the committee finish up that work tomorrow and then meet again Monday morning at nine o'clock?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Jones has asked for the floor, and then Bohm and Francis.

DEL. JONES: I believe the most important work before this convention is the work of the Committee on Organization. We only had two and a half hours' sleep last night and got up at five o'clock this morning and we are still working on it, but we need some rest. We are not going to work all night tonight, and we have more work to do before our report is finished. It has got to be put in shape so that we can place it before the convention in the smallest detail, and we want tomorrow to do that in. We will be doing that tomorrow if you are loafing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bohm has the floor.

DEL. BOHM: Fellow Worker Chairman and delegates: I think everybody is of the opinion that if we could finish up by Monday night that we should not have a session tomorrow, but if we could not finish up Monday night, we might not be able to finish Tuesday, and for that reason I would be in favor of holding a session tomorrow.

DEL. FRANCIS: I want to go on record as being in favor or a whole day's session tomorrow. All this talk about the committee amounts to nothing. If the committee is not able at this stage of the game to bring in some kind of a report inside of six days, we might have to wait another six days. I am simply stating how I feel about it. I think every one of us is anxious to go home. While I do not believe we should rush things through in order to go home, still I think that inasmuch as there is a whole day before us tomorrow, we should hold our sessions, and if that committee is not ready to report, there will be others who are. I hope the delegates will vote that way. I am from New York and I would be glad if I could go home tonight, but inasmuch as I cannot, I want to see this convention hold its sessions tomorrow in order that we may get through.

DEL. _____: Fellow Workers, Chairman and Delegates: I am in just as big a hurry to get home as anybody else; but the majority of the delegates assembled here are strangers in this town, and since we came to this town, none of them have been able to get further {sic} than Bush Temple, and around the corner to get their chuck, and I think the least they might do is to have this one day. We would feel like blazes if a capitalistic master asked us to go to work on Sunday, not because it is Sunday, but because it is one day we do not work, and for that reason I am opposed to holding a session tomorrow.

DEL. YATES: I believe a session is necessary tomorrow, because it will be the means of getting us away one day earlier at least. I do not

see any earthly reason why we should not have a session tomorrow. We work Sundays just the same.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will say, gentlemen, there will be nothing to do tomorrow; it would not be right to hold a session. You have heard the announcement of the Committee on Organization. It will give them time, and I believe that the delegates who are present here will not only go to see Chicago, but they will see whether they could not do something for the organization here. As far as I am personally concerned, I will then have an opportunity tomorrow for what I intended doing, going to a certain part of the city, that is, among the Bohemians, and making arrangements for an I.W.W. meeting. There is a polish meeting tomorrow.

DEL. {sic} TRAUTMANN: Not tomorrow; tomorrow afternoon at Powjesky's Hall.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would amend that, that we hold a forenoon session.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not seconded.

(Cries of question.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion that we hold no session tomorrow will say Aye; opposed, No. The ayes have it.

(Roll call is called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of roll call raise their hands. The roll will be called.

DEL. FRANCIS: What is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: We are voting by roll call as to whether we shall have a session tomorrow or not. The motion is not to have a session. That was the motion, not to have a session.

DEL. GLOVER: The motion was to have a session.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor answer yes, if you are in favor of a meeting tomorrow, and no, if you are in favor of not meeting. That is plain.

DEL. KEEP: Mr. Chairman: I don't know whether it is necessary to be excused, but just to get it in the record I will state that I will not be at any more sessions of the Convention. I have got to go to work on Monday morning. I do not suppose I have to be excused, do I?

THE CHAIRMAN: If you cannot stay I don't see how we can hold you. I want to make a statement—while they are counting the votes; I have been requested by Organizer Walsh to state that he wishes to make a short statement of an important matter.

ORGANIZER WALSH: Fellow Worker Chairman and fellow workers: When I was in Nome, Alaska, organizing, the miners started

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

a paper known as the Nome *Industrial Worker*. I edited it for a few weeks. They are short an editor. It is all organized in the I.W.W. They want an editor. It will take an editor about four days to get to Seattle, and it will take about nine days to go from Seattle to Nome. He must be in Seattle not later than the 4th of October. I am not able to find a man to fill the job. If there are any men who know anything about it that can help them to get an editor, one who understands the labor question—they want the real thing up there. If he has not got the money I will telegraph to Nome to have a ticket advanced from Chicago to Seattle, and from Seattle to Nome.

Total number of votes cast, 119; 33 voting yes and 86 voting no.

ORG. WALSH: I wish to say relative to the wages as editor, they are \$7 per day. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment, the convention will not stand adjourned as yet.

A DELEGATE: I would like to ask the organizer how much the cost of living is up there.

ANOTHER DELEGATE: Eight dollars a day.

DEL. WALSH: That depends upon whether you live like I did up there; the miners furnished me a cabin free of charge; the meals range anywhere at the restaurant from two bits to \$2.50. The paper sells for twenty-five cents. The subscription price is \$5 a year. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, fellow workers, the Committee on Rules and Regulations has provided, under the order of business for good and welfare; we are under that head now. The convention has nothing under the head of good and welfare. Of course, it is unnecessary to enlarge the stenographic report, but I am about to bring that up.

A DELEGATE: I move we adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made to adjourn.

Motion seconded, put and carried.

Adjourned to Monday, Sept. 23, 1907, 9:00 A.M.

SEVENTH DAY—MONDAY, SEPT. 23, 1907.
MORNING SESSION.

The convention was called to order by Chairman Katz at 9 o'clock a.m. The roll call showed the following absentees: Dressler, Herrmann, Levoy, Lindner, Rotkovitz, Young, Haggerty.

COMMUNICATIONS.

The secretary read the following communications:

“Goldfield, Nev., Sept. 16, 1907.

“To the Third Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, Brand’s Hall, Chicago, Ill.

Fellow Workers: Goldfield Miners’ Union No. 220 sends greetings. Keep the banner of revolutionary unionism afloat and free from grafters and fakers.

“WM. JURGENS,

“M.J. SULLIVAN,

“VINCENT ST. JOHN.”

“Blue Island, Sept. 21, 1907.

“Wm. E. Trautmann and Delegates:

“Dear Sir and Fellow Workers: It is with regret that I am forced to absent myself from the convention. Its deliberations in all its phases were educational to me. I may have an opportunity to spend a few hours with you before you finish, and for that reason I will not request my name to be stricken from the rolls. I hope that when the delegates have ceased their deliberations they will have left a mark behind them, a beacon light of hope, shedding its rays of truth from pole to pole, from antipode to antipode, casting its light on a charter of liberty in its adopted principles, which when expounded to the proletariat shall show to him the path of salvation and the death knell of capitalism. Hoping that the disciples of industrial union, traveling in the path of the sun, keeping company with the hours and minutes, and that their agitation will know no rest until the achievement of industrial freedom is accomplished in the interests of the workers of the world.

“Yours for industrial unionism,

“WM. J. PINKERTON.”

“Detroit, Mich., Sept. 19, 1907.

“To Geo. N. Young, Delegate, Chicago:

“Fellow Worker: Some time ago I wrote to General Secretary

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Trautmann asking for a speaker to come before the musicians here October 4th, and gave him the idea that it was to be a national convention of musicians, and since then I learn it is only a local affair. The matter will be brought before the convention probably by Trautmann. Please make the correction.

“Yours for industrial freedom,
“F.N. HITCHCOCK,
“Secretary Local 159.”

Referred to the committee on organization.

“Patton, Pa., 1907.

“W.E. Trautmann:

“Dear Sir and Fellow Worker: After the I.W.W. was organized here we, the members of the I.W.W., elected a clock weighman and placed him on one of the tipples, and the United Mine Workers of America refused to pay him because he did not belong to that union. It was the custom for the company to collect the check weighman’s wages and the union dues through their office, and turn the whole thing over to the U.W.W. of A. and they paid the check weighman, but they refused to acknowledge the choice of the people of this mine because he was not nor would not be a member of the United Mine Workers. Now, a part of the people that worked in his mine belonged to the United Mine Workers and a part to the I.W.W., and they all contributed to the check weighman’s salary, regardless of their respective organizations. After three months they elected another check weighman, and there remained a surplus of \$45. The deposed check weighman accepted a position as mine foreman and turned the surplus over to the local; that is, the I.W.W. agreed to stand sponsors for the money in order to get it off his hands. He offered their share of it to the U.M.W. of A., but they refused to accept it. Now, there arose an argument among the members as to whether we should report this to headquarters, so I thought I would write you and find out. Hoping to hear from you in the near future on this matter, I am

“Yours for industrial freedom.
“PATRICK COX.”

Referred to committee on ways and means.

Also an application for charter from Italian mixed local, Chicago. Referred to committee on organization.

Also telegram received by mail from Goldfield, Nev., as follows:

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

“Goldfield, Nev., Sept. 20, 1907.

“Delegates I.W.W. Convention,

“310 Bush Temple, Chicago:

“Greetings. Wishes for progress and repudiation of all political parties.

“GLADWIN BLAND,

“PHIL S. HALEY,

“A. FISTER.”

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the reading of the communications. What is your pleasure? If there is no objection they will take the usual course and be received and referred to the committee on ways and means. If there is no objection it will be so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: Reports of committees, standing and special. I believe the organization committee is the one to report now, and the secretary of the committee has the floor.

DEL. FISCHER: On behalf of {the} committee on organization: Fellow Worker Chairman and Delegates: We have first a resolution from Locals 91, 130, 15, 95 and 179 of New York, presented by Delegate Walters and referred back to the convention. The resolution is as follows:

“Resolved, That the convention instruct all our organizers to discourage strikes and strike talk, and to impress upon those whom they are organizing the necessity of realizing that the conquest by the workers of the power to retain and enjoy the full product of their labor should take precedence in their minds of all smaller ameliorations of our conditions.”

We recommend the following: “Owing to the fact that the pent-up discontent of the workers is bound to break forth in revolt, it is impossible to at all times avoid strikes; therefore, we are unable to recommend any general rule as to the conduct of organizers in the matter of strikes.”

On motion the recommendation of the committee was concurred in.

DEL. FISCHER (continuing report): Another resolution presented by the same delegate:

“Resolved, That the Local Advisory Board be abolished and the work of administration be centered in the hands of the G.E.B.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

members, each member having full authority in his district in all matters pertaining to administration and organizing work subordinate to and under the control of this G.E.B. and the referendum vote of the membership.”

We recommend that the Advisory Board be abolished. The position of the committee is this: We hold that as the Local Advisory Board acts on the recommendation of the national officers and the G.E.B. has general supervision and is fully responsible, it is not necessary to have the local Advisory Board as part of the general administration.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the Advisory Board be abolished. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. AXELSON: The committee has made a statement in a general way, but I would like to have a more definite understanding on it, and if there is any one here that can give it I would be glad to hear from them.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The creation of the Advisory Board was done at the last convention at practically my own suggestion. The membership of the I.W.W. has demanded publicity of all affairs with the organization. The medium of giving publicity to all transactions within the organization was either in a publication or through the medium of the Advisory Board. Now, if such a motion should prevail to abolish the Advisory Board, we should provide certain rules that transactions within the office be also published, or that all matters sent to the General Executive Board, all important matters, be published in *The Industrial Bulletin*. That was done because the old Executive Board of the I.W.W. was assembling in star chamber sessions and to abolish these star chamber sessions the Advisory Board had been created. That Advisory Board has been selected by the General Executive Board. Its duties were outlined by the same General Executive Board. Either you have to make rules for the Local Advisory Board that will not conflict with the rules of government laid down for the members of the General Executive Board, or you have to abolish it and then leave everything in the hands of the General Executive Board, with the proviso that their transactions be published in *The Industrial Union Bulletin*.

DEL. HAGENSON: Mr. Chairman: There was one part there referring to the power that the executive officer has over his district.

DEL. FISCHER: That is not recommended.

THE CHAIRMAN: That has not been recommended by the committee. The committee simply recommends that the Advisory Board be abolished.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. HAGENSON: Then it is all right.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I believe the matter that Sec. Trautmann has suggested is fully covered by the ruling of the last convention, that the action taken at every meeting should be stenographically reported.

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

DEL. AIAZZONE: That they should have that stenographic report and that is published in *The Industrial Union Bulletin*.

DEL. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman: From what I can learn from the past as to the administration of the general office, it seems to me the Advisory Board has fulfilled its function in good shape. It strikes me that a board of such a character which is instructed by the G.E.B. is of beneficial influence. There are a number of propositions that are coming up through the year which the general secretary-treasurer would undoubtedly need some advice upon and some instruction upon. To put all those propositions directly before the General Executive Board would simply be to withhold action on a proposition that perhaps would need immediate action. So long as the Advisory Board is under the direct control of the General Executive Board and working in conjunction with the secretary-treasurer, and so long as it is not any great expense to the organization, it strikes me that it is an institution that we should not do away with. I believe the experience of the past year fully demonstrates that, and I would dislike very much to see the Advisory Board done away with, because its work is taken up weekly and published in *The Bulletin* and we know fully the action of the organization.

¹⁵{ . . . } the objection of Fellow Worker Foote holds good regarding affairs that need immediate attention. If you will have followed the minutes of the Local Board you will have noticed that very frequently on matters requiring immediate attention the secretary has simply reported his action that has already taken place and the Board has approved of that action. Now, that is the function of an executive officer like the General Secretary. Anything requiring immediate attention cannot even be brought before the Local Board; it must be handled immediately by the secretary, subject to the approval of the Board, to be referred to the Board later on. Now, as to important matters in which the secretary does not or cannot possibly take the responsibility upon himself, the G.E.B. may be consulted and a consensus of opinion may be obtained from them. The Local Board is

¹⁵ [An indeterminate amount of matter, including the identity of the speaker, missing at this point in Report No. 8, pg. 2, col. 4—R.B.]

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

not even as conversant with conditions outside of its locality as the General Secretary is. The Local Board, being established in Chicago, the members of that Board are not familiar with the outside conditions as a rule, and they are just as liable to take wrong action—more so, I think, than the Secretary would be. Now I cannot see any other function, any other excuse for the Local Board than to audit the accounts, and inasmuch as the constitution provides for publicity of the affairs of the organization, those accounts will have to be made out and published in the *Bulletin* by the secretary any way. Consequently it looks to me as though this Local Board proposition is rather complicating matters and is the entering wedge for the disruption of the organization. The Executive Board members are scattered in different parts of the country, and here is a Local Board usurping the functions of the G.E.B., subject, you say, to the approval or control of the G.E.B.; nevertheless they have the power to act and do things before the G.E.B. can use its power against them, and it is a dangerous thing and a complicated piece of machinery that I think should be done away with.

DEL. DELANEY: It seems to me this matter ought to be referred to the constitution committee to consider it in connection with the recommendation made in the report of Fellow Worker Heslewood as to the creation of the office of General Organizer or General President. The constitution committee may have something to recommend on that head, and I think we will all agree that it is necessary to have a local executive with limited powers at least, right here in Chicago to act in case of emergency, and I think if we refer this matter to the constitution committee it may be able to report so that we can act with some intelligence on it. We cannot do away with a local executive power; you have got to have a center, and I think it can be better centered in the hands of the general officers as a local executive board than in the hands of one individual of the organization. I move that it be referred to the constitution committee. (Seconded.)

SEC. TRAUTMANN: With instructions from the convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, there is no motion except to refer. I do not think that is debatable, a motion to refer, is it?

DEL. FRANCIS: A motion to refer is always in order and debatable. I do not think the committee simply reported that because they {would} like to have a change. I think there is something else besides, on account of the experience in the past year, and if things had run smooth in the general office last year perhaps there would be no such recommendation necessary as to this Local Advisory Board. Of course

the things have not been brought out, but we may as well be plain about it. This recommendation is simply based on the bad experience of the last year, as far as I know, and therefore they want to do away with the Local Advisory Board. I want to be understood that under certain circumstances I would not oppose it, but the way the land lies here, in the large city of Chicago, although some believe it would complicate matters to do away with it, I think there is no necessity for the Local Advisory Board, and therefore will vote in favor of the recommendation of the committee.

The question was put on the motion to refer to the constitution committee, and the motion was lost.

The original motion of the committee, that the Advisory Board be abolished, was then carried.

DEL. FISCHER (Continuing report of committee): Recommendation of the G.E.B.: "That a new membership card system be established as soon as financial conditions permit, and that all membership books must be made out at general headquarters so that a record can be kept of applicants and a more uniform control over the affairs in the organization can be maintained."

We recommend, first, that a new form of membership book be issued; second, that a registration card system be installed, whereby it is possible to keep the record of every member of the I.W.W. at general headquarters, as well as in all subordinate bodies.

DEL. WALTERS: I think this should not have come up in the way it has; I mean it should not have been read the way it has been read, together. There are two different and distinct things. First we recommend a new form of due books, a new kind of due books. The other is a different matter altogether. For that reason I move that we take up the first matter first and dispose of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not require a motion. I simply asked the secretary to read it to see what follows, whether it is something that has a bearing upon this. We are acting first upon the first recommendation. The motion before the house would be the recommendation of the committee that we have a membership book.

DEL. FRANCIS: As far as I myself am concerned, the experience of the last year has shown that those books are in a form to answer if you could make them more substantial or perhaps have better printing and better material, but as far as changing them, that is a different proposition and I am opposed to it. Are we merely an experimental concern? Are we to have every year another change? I would like the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

delegates to realize that we do not need any of those changes. And while the second recommendation has been mentioned, I will tell you right here that if this recommendation is approved you do not know how much the cost of the general office will be. It is now something in the hundreds, but it will be in the thousands. I believe each local should do its own work in issuing membership cards, and I also know that no matter what kind of a system you establish in the general headquarters, the local industrial union will do as it pleases any way, though without intending mischief. They will do the best they can, no matter what system you establish. Therefore I would like to have some one move that we table this so that double work will not be required.

DEL. JONES: Just one question. The resolution there deals with the membership book. Now, this systematic numbering of members of the organization is an unnecessary affair.

DEL. TRAINOR: A point of order—

DEL. JONES: It is a question whether we will have a new style of book or take the old one. I think the old style of book is of too flimsy a character for an organization of this kind, and it just gives the incoming Executive Board power, in issuing new cards, to issue cards of a more substantial nature.

DEL. YATES: While the present book may not be substantial, we want to remember why the old form was dropped. At the time of the last convention when the new book was to be issued, it contained the name of Sherman as President. There were some 300 of them on hand on our local union, and there were those who thought it better to keep them until they ran out. Some of the members who were revolutionary did not agree with the idea of keeping that book at all; they wanted to purchase another so as to get rid of the objectionable form. If this convention alters that book we will have to buy a new set of books for the old members, and I certainly concur with them.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I offer an amendment, that the matter be left in the hands of the Executive Board, and if they see fit to make a change they will have the power to do it. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. AXELSON: In reference to the subject under discussion now, the membership book, I do not see really at the present time any absolute necessity of going on record as to changing things again. As Fellow Worker Yates has pointed out, the change last time was an absolute necessity, because as we had abolished the President we could not have a card that had a President's name on; that would not have been consistent. But at the present time no such necessity exists. As I understand, one application blank is left with the local union and

duplicate of the same is sent to headquarters, which enables the headquarters to know the name and address of any man who is affiliated with the union. That is all that this new proposition is, as I understand. Now, we have already that means of letting the headquarters know, and there is no necessity for a regulation requiring every local union to make out a duplicate for every member. I hold that that is good enough until we have some department where it is absolutely impossible to ignore it. I think it is best to use what we have as long as it is practicable to use it.

DEL. GLOVER: I remember quite well in the local that is making out the books it was a difficult thing to make the proper entry of the names, and I think we are agreed about the sheer necessity of adopting a book on a cheap order, anything that could be got out immediately. The book was simply for an emergency. That is all it was intended for. Now, the original book that we had was certainly one of the best books that could possibly be given to members of any organization. It was durable, substantial, of a convenient size, and at the same time it was not a cumbersome thing or too large to carry around. I feel that while we do not want to take on any burden of expense to the organization by making a change now, because we have got a lot of those on hand, I would favor the amendment with this proviso, that when the General Executive Board finds they can make this change, they adopt something on the style of the original book when the old book is about run out. I certainly would not be in favor of keeping up this form of book. It is difficult for the secretaries to make it out, because they find it is very hard to make them so they can be understood, particularly when men transfer. I have had books come to me that I could not understand without getting additional information from the men, owing to the fact that the book was not thoroughly adapted to our work.

DEL. WALTERS: Fellow Worker Glover has covered the point pretty well, but there is one portion that I do not agree with. This is a fine specimen of card to put before somebody as the card of a revolutionary organization. We are working men, but surely we are not as cheap as all this. I do not believe in a book like this going into the hands of any man who works, whether in the mine or machine shop or any where else. We should instruct the headquarters to start in tomorrow or after this convention adjourns and get out dues book of a new form. If they have not got the money, we want to leave it to their judgment, the judgment of the General Executive Board, as to when they are able to do this. Another thing the committee considered was

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

that we should not fix a hard and fast rule about a certain kind of book. We leave that to them to adopt the best book for the money. I think it is logical that we should have something stronger than this, something that would not wear out in a day or two. This book ought to last two years. For that reason I hope the recommendation of the committee will be concurred in.

DEL. HAGENSON: I realized from the form of the book that we have had for the past year that a change was necessary. We certainly need, as has been stated, a more substantial book. However, I would be in favor of having the new book, whenever it is made, made in such a way that it would not be necessary to change any faster than organizations are formed in new localities, and that where locals did not desire or care to change it till this book ran out, a new book could be adopted and yet it would not be necessary to enforce its use only according as the new book was needed. In this way the getting of a more substantial book would not incur any particular expense, only the expense if a more substantial book.

DEL. KERN: I would like to amend the amendment of Fellow Worker Williams, that that be left to the incoming Executive Board for their recommendation.

DEL. WILLIAMS: That is the same thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: That amendment implies that it be favorably recommended to the General Executive Board.

DEL. KERN: Yes.

The motion to refer was put and carried.

DEL. FISCHER (continuing report): We recommend "that a registration card system be installed, wherever it is possible, to keep the record of every member of the I.W.W. in the general headquarters as well as in the subordinate bodies."

THE CHAIRMAN: Let it be understood that that means that all the members are recorded at headquarters and also in the subordinate bodies.

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that the recommendation be tabled. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded that the recommendation of the committee be tabled.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of information. Is it not already stated in the application blanks that this rule shall be followed?

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. FOOTE: Then I do not see any necessity for any additional clause.

DEL. HAGENSON: I would like to know what they are tabling before it is tabled.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read it again.

(Delegate Francis read the committee's recommendation a second time.)

DEL. BENSON: I would like to ask, as there is nothing on record, only the member's name, on these application blanks, what is the use of sending the copy?

DEL. WALTERS: A point of order. I think this motion to table will cut off the debate, though no one may know what the proposition of your committee was. Yet a motion to table is always in order and is not debatable, although it cuts off any information that the delegates here may want.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know, but the member has a right to ask for a point of information.

DEL. WALTERS: On a motion to table?

THE CHAIRMAN: So as to know what he is laying on the table.

DEL. WALTERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Otherwise he does not know what he is voting to lay on the table. All in favor of the motion to lay on the table will say aye; oppose, no. The motion is lost.

DEL. FISCHER: Will you let me explain this?

THE CHAIRMAN: All right; Delegate Fischer will explain the situation.

DEL. FISCHER: Cards shall be issued by the general headquarters similar to our application blanks, with space for inserting the numbers of the other subordinate bodies, and even the general number which every member receives by applying for membership in this organization. These cards shall be distributed by the general headquarters to all subordinate bodies, and they work as follows: As soon as a person applies in an industrial union for membership and he receives his card the financial secretary shall make out two cards, one to keep in the files of his own organization, and the other will be forwarded to the next higher body. The next higher body will deposit the card and give it the number of his office or of his department and file the same card. He again will forward the card to the office of the industrial union, the next higher body, and so on until this card shall be received at the general headquarters, where it will be deposited. By having this system we will always know how many members apply for

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

admission, at the general headquarters. We will also be ready to find out where a man was formerly, and where a man is now, because every man will be numbered. In this way we will have control over all members. That is the reason we recommend this system.

DEL. OHMAN: I am not quite clear as to the intent, although it seems that if a man applies, for instance, in a branch of, and that branch sends the application to its higher body which is a branch, and so on, it will take probably a month or two before it would reach headquarters, would it not?

DEL. FISCHER: No.

DEL. OHMAN: Wouldn't it be sent from one branch to another until finally it was received at headquarters?

DEL. FISCHER: I don't believe it will take months, for the simple reason that at this stage of the game we only have industrial unions directly connected with headquarters. It simply means the forwarding of this card to one higher body.

DEL. OHMAN: Another point. When the applicant applies for membership he would then have to make out a card for him, that is, one for the applicant, one for the local union and one that is going to be received by the final headquarters.

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

DEL. OHMAN: That is what I want to be clear on.

DEL. FISCHER: That is right.

DEL. OHMAN: And three cards would have to be issued for each member.

DEL. FISCHER: It all depends on how many subordinate bodies we have.

DEL. OHMAN: I do not think I favor at this time that sort of proposition. I think the way we have it at present, where all the applications that come in, the names are sent to the headquarters and the card issued from the local, is all sufficient.

DEL. JONES: The fact is that this card system will do away with this complicated proposition. When the local secretary makes out the card it will be made out on a standard form of card, practically the same as the card that is issued to him, and when he goes to an industrial union the local industrial union, it will be placed on file. There will be no copying into a large book, but the card itself will be filed and the copy will be mailed to the next higher body, who will file it again. The next higher body will take the card and a copy will be filed at headquarters. That will do away with bookkeeping, do away with the bookkeepers altogether.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That will depend on to what extent you intend to establish military discipline in the I.W.W. If you adopt a system such as prevails, for instance, in the International Iron Molders' Union, where they have that registration card system, you will have to have in the unions an additional secretary to look up the cards and you would have to have additional bookkeepers at the office with a membership of approximately four or five thousand men. The card system has been recommended by the General Executive Board. The reasons for recommending this card system were these: We are absolutely sure, I might say, of a certain membership. We have more than 1,200 members in New York City. We believe we can get a membership of 3,000 there. Nevertheless, the general office has to provide for approximately 1,000 or 1,200 members because in our big industrial centers we have not as yet got the more concentrated form of organization as outlined in the constitution, or rather in the explanation of the constitution contained in the hand book. This plan will work in the large industrial centers, but it will never work in the industries where they have a floating element. It cannot work in the mining industry, in the lumber industry, in the agricultural industry; it cannot work where men work today in this place and tomorrow float to another place. If we could establish a system that each and every organizer must send to headquarters a duplicate application, that would be sufficient to ascertain approximately how many members have been taken into an organization. But that cannot be enforced during times of strikes. Now you all know, those who have been in the field, that as soon as a strike is inaugurated by twenty or thirty men they pull with them the entire factory out on strike. It is natural that when they see the action of the courageous men the others will follow suit, and in those strike epochs one or two hundred and up to 600 will go out, as was the case at Portland. It may be necessary to send some one from general headquarters at a time when it is absolutely impossible to go. I certainly agree that the system as we have it now is not perfect. It is too loose; it does not give the general organization exact control over the affairs of the organization. One union may pay for six months on a membership of three or four or five. All at once it may jump up and start to pay on 100 members, especially when it is approaching convention time. Then you will see some of the unions who were doing little for six months pay up their dues in order to have a delegate or representation at the convention. I believe the system recommended by the committee on organization would be good for the purpose of establishing a certain rule, a certain system within the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

organization, but if we are going to follow the registration card system it would imply that if a member moves from one place to another we would have to take out from the registration box a member here and put him in the other place. Anybody who has gone through that system—and I have gone through it—knows what additional help would be required. But I believe the time will come when we will have to have a more centralized system by which we will have better control over members. If we could have this thing established, though I believe we cannot at the present time—then we could always supply the various members of the organization having their addresses at general headquarters, with all needed literature and we could keep them posted on things within the organization. In that way we could notify members throughout the jurisdiction of the Industrial Workers of the World of any impending conflict. At the present time the system is loose. We need a system by which we can concentrate the efforts of our members all over the country. That is one of the reasons why the system as recommended by the committee is recommended, but we are not as yet in a position to invoke it or enforce it within the organization of the I.W.W. I only want to bring out these points so that we may instruct our delegates or those who come here, that we should enforce a more strict discipline within the organization so that the general headquarters will know the exact standing of the organization. But we should not bring it down to a military discipline that, if enforced, will in itself simply cause a weakness in the entire organization.

DEL. THOMAS: I wish to state that the general secretary has expressed my sentiments. I do not see at this time that we would be benefited by the establishment of this system. As each and every person knows, the members in the different trades, and particularly the mining industry, are largely of a floating character. A man is here one day and away another day. It is impossible to keep a check on them. In view of this fact I will move that the whole matter be referred to the incoming Executive Board until a condition arises whereby such a system would be a benefit to us, and not until then. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been made that this be referred to the General Executive Board.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I believe it would be better to have the application and the duplicate together, so that you can tear it off and one remain in the office of the local union and the other be sent to the general headquarters. I would make that as an amendment to the amendment. (Amendment seconded.)

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. KERN: I move the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we have a motion and two amendments. The original motion is the recommendation of the committee on the card system. The amendment is to refer it to the incoming General Executive Board, and the amendment to the amendment is that the application blank have a stub that can be torn off and sent to the general headquarters. All in favor of the amendment to the amendment will say aye. Opposed, no. It is lost. All in favor of the amendment, that it be referred, will say aye. Opposed, no. Carried.

DEL. FISCHER (Continuing report): Recommendation of the G.E.B.: "That all efforts of the organization be centered on important industries of which the workers are ready to organize under the rules and forms of the Industrial Workers of the World, and where by organizing of the industries economic might be acquired so that the work in less important industries would thereby be facilitated." We concur in this resolution.

DEL. AXELSON: As I understood the discussion the other day—I believe it was Saturday—we had this very proposition up, but we could not come to any definite understanding. We decided then that we should do the work wherever it was best, no matter what the industry. Now we come with a definite proposition to concentrate our work on important industries. I do not see why you could not have done that before. I have nothing against it, but if that is the case and if that is the sense of the convention I do not see why the discussion was had on last Saturday.

DEL. KERN: I move to refer that to the incoming Executive Board. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made that that be referred to the incoming Executive Board.

DEL. FISCHER: That is understood.

DEL. FRANCIS: I move the previous question.

The previous question was seconded and carried.

The motion to refer to the Executive Board was then put and carried.

DEL. FISCHER (continuing report): Recommendation of Executive Board Member Heslewood: First. He recommends that the office of chief officer or president be re-established. We do not concur, but recommend that district organizers be appointed by the G.E.B. as soon as possible.

DEL. OHMAN: A point of information. I do not quite understand

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the phrase, but that is how it reads—

DEL. FISCHER: I will read the recommendation again.

(The recommendation was again read.)

DEL. OHMAN: I would amend that first part, where he says “chief officer”—

DEL. FISCHER: He means chief organizer.

DEL. OHMAN: I would amend that by making it “general organizer.”

DEL. FRANCIS: I ask that we divide it and take up the first part first.

DEL. OHMAN: The reason I do this is that the general organizer, as I understand, would have supervision of the entire organizing force. Hence he would in reality become as the superintendent of the organizers. That is what the name would imply, in reality, and therefore I make that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your amendment is that instead of “chief officer”—

DEL. OHMAN: Instead of “chief officer” or “president,” that the name shall be “general organizer.”

THE CHAIRMAN: General organizer or organizer general.

DEL. OHMAN: To have supervision of the organizing force.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to ask the committee on constitution whether they did not act upon this identical thing.

DEL. FISCHER: No, that just came up yesterday.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to rise to a point of order. The matter which this committee has reported on does not come under its province in any way, but belongs to the committee on constitution, but as long as I saw the spirit was to vote this thing down any way or refer it to the G.E.B. I did not care to raise a point of order. Now comes a proposition that is much more sensible and which would affect very materially the whole constitution. I rise to a point of order, and that point of order is this, that the committee has trespassed on the function of the committee on constitution. A thing of that sort should be referred to the committee on constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: I asked when the recommendation of Delegate Heslewood was made, that Delegate De Leon, or the chairman of the committee, would take out such matters as belonged to their committee, but they did not point them out, so I turned over the recommendation of Delegate Heslewood to the committee on constitution. Therefore I would declare the point of order well taken, and this matter goes to the committee on constitution.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. DE LEON: How comes a report on that subject by the committee on organization?

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate does not understand me. I took the report of Delegate Heslewood and gave it to the committee on organization, themselves to pick out such points as belonged to them.

DEL. DE LEON: Oh, I understand.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: In view of the fact that we have a couple of resolutions bearing on the subject, we can simplify matters by referring this resolution to the resolution committee. I move that the matter be referred until these resolutions that they are working on be reported on. I believe the two matters can be fixed up by the constitution committee, and we can save a whole lot of time of discussion. For that reason I move that the matter be referred until these resolutions are reported by the constitution committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will rule that it is now in the hands of the constitution committee.

DEL. FRANCIS: I want to speak on the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been declared out of order. It is in the hands of the constitution committee.

DEL. FISCHER (report continued): The committee on resolutions recommends that charts similar to those hanging on the wall be issued by the General Executive Board for organizers and locals.

DEL. KERN: I wish the organization committee to explain that chart and tell what they mean by it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The organization committee has the floor to explain the charts.

DEL. FISCHER: According to the constitution you know the organization starts with the industrial union. That is, the industrial union is the first part or the first organization chartered directly by general headquarters. As soon as several industrial unions in various localities of the same kind are established, these industrial unions will form a national industrial union. Say, for instance, you have a building trades local in New York and a building trades local in Chicago and a building trades local in San Francisco, numbering about 5,000. Then these three industrial unions and all other industrial unions of the same kind will form a national industrial union of building trades workers. As soon as you have one or two, two at least, or more national industrial unions of kindred industries organized they again will consolidate and form a national industrial department. For instance, you have organized the national industrial union of metalliferous miners; you have organized a national industrial union of coal miners;

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

you have a national industrial union of salt or sulphur miners; then it becomes the duty of the General Executive Board to call these three or four different national industrial unions together and organize them in the form of a national industrial department. Several of these departments will, after organizing, consolidate again and will be called the Industrial Workers of America, of the World, or of the American Continent. This chart will show you, furthermore, the relations between these different organizations. It will show you how the moneys, the so-called per capita tax, will be distributed amongst the other bodies. The industrial union will take in the man and will give the individual his stamp and will receive 15 cents, which shall go to the general headquarters. At this stage the money we are paying goes directly to headquarters, but when we have established national industrial unions, national industrial departments, this 15 cents or per capita tax is distributed to different organizations, and every one of these organizations is to receive a part of that per capita tax, because we hold that only 15 cents can go out of the treasury of the local to keep up the general offices, and as we have national officers and national industrial union officers and national industrial departmental officers in the future, and general officers, it is only logical that these 15 cents should be divided. The question came up day before yesterday that the national industrial department should pay 8 1-3 cents out of this 15 cents to the general headquarters. I at that time made a motion to amend this proposition so as to allow national industrial unions to keep five cents in their treasury, and the national departmental organization five cents, and five cents for the headquarters after that is established. At this time it will keep only four cents in the administration, that will give the smallest union the largest part of the money, and the next larger one somewhat smaller, and the general headquarters the smallest part of that initiation fee. That is all eliminated when we come to the point where we organize these organizations.

One point I left out is as to how industrial unions shall be connected with the branches. Now, we believe that only one charter in a given industry should be issued; meaning that all workers in a given locality who are helping to perform or helping to erect or carry on a certain work, shall be members of one organization. Now, in the large industrial centers or in the large cities it is impossible to have all men who are helping to perform a certain work formed into one organization. First, we find that we cannot get a hall which is large enough to hold five or six or ten thousand men. Secondly, the men in

those organizations speak five or six different languages, and you cannot get men who are speaking so many languages to work together unless you have an interpreter, and that would cost quite a sum of money. When those conditions exist it is necessary, when an industrial union gets a sufficient number of men speaking different languages or performing a particular part of a certain work, that they be allowed to organize themselves into branches, as we have done. Say we have in one industrial union of the building trades a hundred men, and fifty of these men can speak English and fifty can speak Italian, what are we going to do? We form out of that industry two branches. One branch will be called the Italian branch, the other the English branch. Now, the question comes up, how are you going to run these two bodies? It is very simple. These branches elect their delegates, and those delegates from the various branches form a general committee of that industry, the industrial union. That is the body who will hold the charter. That is the body which will represent the industrial union; dealing with the bosses' organization. It is in fact the organization. Now, as soon as you have the branch established it becomes necessary that certain funds be allowed these branches to pay for meetings and running expenses. There are two ways of giving these branches money or of having the moneys of the branches and industrial union divided. The moneys received from members of the I.W.W. comes in the form of dues or in the form of initiation fees. Now, the best plan is to give the funds to the industrial union as well as to the branches, by sending all the moneys received by the branches for initiation fees to the industrial union, and that all moneys collected in dues excepting 15 cents, which goes to general headquarters, shall stay in the branches. This system will give the branch as well as the industrial union a working fund.

DEL. WALTERS: I want to ask a point of information which may save a lot of discussion. I do not wish to speak of this matter until all the other delegates have spoken. If the chair will allow me I will explain this matter by speaking to the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may choose whether you wish to speak now or later, as a representative of the committee. Who is the chairman of the committee?

DEL. WALTERS: I am chairman of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you better wait until the others have spoken.

DEL. WALTERS: The point I wish to raise is that I am familiar with this matter and an explanation might eliminate a lot of discussion;

that is all.

DEL. FOOTE: A point of information. I would like to put a question. Looking at the chart on the wall there as I do, the dual question is brought to my mind as to whether or not the recruiting or mixed local is a pendulum or whether it is the base. Is it the whole superstructure or simply a part?

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you explain that, Delegate Walters?

DEL. WALTERS: The recruiting local will come into the department in its own logical place. It is not a pendulum. I wish to go on record. Now, the matter with the committee is this: You start with the local union. Before you organize the building trades you organize a mixed local of the building trades, but not a recruiting local as you term it. When you have, say, a mixed local of the building trades with twenty men in one line of the building industry, we would take those men and form a local industrial union of the building trades.

DEL. FRENCH: I wish to raise a point of order, in order to avoid confusion, that the term "mixed local" in the building trades is not a correct term, and if Fellow Worker Walters continues to use it he will confuse the minds of the delegates.

DEL. WALTERS: We form a building trades local, and then when we become larger we would form branches of the local industrial union, that we would call branch No. 1 and branch No. 2, for instance. Then you will elect an Executive Board, as we term it in New York, a general committee to carry on the functions of the local industrial union, and all general matters are referred to this committee, and the initiation fees of the local industrial union will go into the local industrial union instead of into the branches. The local industrial union is the unit of organization. Now, we have the branches of this local industrial union. An applicant applies to his branch and puts his application card in his branch. His application card is referred to the local industrial union. The local industrial union makes out his card and receives his initiation fee. The initiation fee held by the local industrial union is to carry on the propaganda of that organization; it is to carry on all the work of the organization. The local industrial union being the unit of organization, is the body that carries on all the work. The branches of this local industrial union elect delegates. These delegates meet and carry on the work of the organization. Suppose this local industry has ten branches; the branches of masons, plumbers, hod-carriers, plasterers, bricklayers and so on down the line. They meet and carry on the work of the organization. If a grievance arises it is thrashed out there. In case of strikes they do not call out simply a

branch, they call out the whole organization, and for that reason the work of the organization is centered here. The initiation fee should stay in the treasury of the industrial union. Now, the other portion of the question—

DEL. FISCHER: In relation to recruiting locals and their relations to general headquarters.

DEL. FOOTE: I would like to ask a question. In a place where there is no industrial local union, where would you place the recruiting local? Where would you suspend it: from the general organization?

DEL. WALTERS: A recruiting local is a local taking in the men where there is no industry in a given locality.

DEL. FOOTE: The point is, where is the means of transit between the recruiting local of the industrial union and the general organization?

DEL. WALTERS: The recruiting local touches directly with general headquarters.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to refer the delegate to page 5 of the constitution. The constitution provides for industrial councils. Now, I would like to know where the industrial council comes in in that chart. I do not ask how the industrial council is arranged: I ask where the industrial council comes in there on the general map.

DEL. WALTERS: We can put the industrial council there (indicating on chart). The local industrial unions, understand, elect their delegates, and they in turn form the industrial council.

DEL. DE LEON: The first map has the full scheme of the councils, as I may term it. We have two stars in our planetary system. One is the industrial council. Now I would like to know where in that kind of a system the industrial council comes in. That is my question.

DEL. WALTERS: The local industrial council comes in there (indicating on the chart).

DEL. DE LEON: Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish the floor to say a few words. I always favor a chart. I know that if you reflect a picture on a person's mind he is able to understand a thing. Therefore just in the measure as the chart is correct is it an aid, and in the measure that the chart is incorrect it is harmful. I consider that chart harmful in the fact that it is a false picture. Look at the first ball, the general administration. From that general administration or towards the general administration run two lines to national industrial departments. Now, we know that that line can mean nothing but a general action between the general administration and the national industrial department. We know that the industrial department is not

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

absorbed in the general administration. We know that that line means that out of the national industrial department certain individuals are chosen and are delegated and they constitute the general administration. That I think you will accept as correct. Now, I invite your attention to the two lower set{s} of balls, the yellow balls and the light green balls. Upon the principle of the picture conveyed to our minds in the line from the National industrial department to the general administration we would be justified to conclude that the lines connecting the light green balls with the yellow or buff balls indicate that out of the light green balls individuals are to be chosen who are to represent that organization. Now, the fact is that that is not so. The fact is that the industrial union, the industrial yellow ball, consists wholly of segregations of light green balls. It does not consist of representatives of the green balls. The industrial union itself, the industrial central committee, consists of all the green balls that go to make up that industrial union. Take the industrial union of the building trades that Walters mentioned. That industrial union, that yellow ball, is made up of subdivisions, one subdivision of the players {planers?}, another of plumbers, another of electricians, another of painters, and as many as you like. These light green balls consequently do not constitute the yellow ball in the shape of delegates. They are part of the yellow ball. If I were making a chart I would rather divide the yellow balls into their various component parts. On the other hand, if we start from below up and keep looking at that chart with the knowledge that the line that connects the light green balls with the buff balls above does not indicate representation but individuals out of the green balls; if we start with the knowledge that those lines simply indicate a constituent membership of that yellow ball; if we start with that picture on our minds we have a jumbled idea when we get to the top of the picture. Thus the line that connects the general administration with the national department would indicate that the general administration was made up wholly of the whole national industrial department. I hope I make that point plain. That chart, therefore, conveys a false picture to the mind. The lines do not mean the same thing. They might mean one thing in one part of it and another thing in another. I hold that this is not a subject to take up the time of the convention. This matter should have been elaborated and presented before the G.E.B. and presented by them to the organization. But in the shape in which it is in here it is not plain and conveys a false idea to the convention.

DEL. AXELSON: What do you suggest? Do you move any motion?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. DE LEON: No, I simply wish to show that the chart is misleading. I have made the suggestion, but since the question has been asked I will suggest that this matter be referred to the G.E.B. to thrash out and present to the organization.

DEL. FRANCIS: The thing is not ready. Let them cook it first.

DEL. AXELSON: I have no right to refer to the discussion that has taken place on the chart?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can speak upon whether it should be referred or not.

DEL. AXELSON: I am not in a position to say very much, either way; but one thing that has been brought in upon my mind is this, referring to the recruiting unions. I do not know whether this is the rule or not, whether in the various communities, or in the various cities, or in the various villages,—the first organization I think as a rule is that recruiting union. Now, according to that chart, I think it conveys a different impression.

DEL. JONES: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. JONES: He is not speaking to the motion. We are not on the relation of the recruiting union to the Industrial Union, but we are on the motion to refer to the incoming Executive Board, for their action.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate will please confine himself to whether this should be referred or not.

DEL. AXELSON: I have already stated that I cannot say one way or the other. The only idea is to get clear on that proposition, and that is what I am trying to do now. If I cannot talk on that I will sit down.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house now is the motion to refer, whether we are prepared to talk about it here an hour, and then refer it. The question is, are we going to refer it or not. That is the motion before the house.

(The question was called for.)

DEL. AXELSON: That can only be settled by vote. Proceed to take the vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. All in favor of the motion that this be referred to the incoming Executive Board will say aye; opposed, no.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Carried unanimously. We will continue with the report.

DEL. FISCHER (Continuing the report of the Committee): We recommend that all matters concerning the sending out of organizers be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. FRANCIS: I move you the previous question.

Motion seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been made and seconded that this matter be referred. What is that?

DEL. FISCHER: That matters concerning the sending out of organizers be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of this motion will say aye; opposed, no.

(Motion carried.)

DEL. FISCHER: That closes the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: This closes the report. Now, is the Committee on Constitution ready to make a report?

DEL. DE LEON: This matter was not referred to us at that time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sir?

DEL. DE LEON: No, we are not ready. We are through. All that was before us we have reported upon. I learned here this morning that there are some other matters that have been referred to us which have been handled by the committee on organization, and of course we will leave that until the body adjourns. And I understand that they have a recommendation.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: It is through no fault of mine, Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers, that I have arrived at this convention late, to submit this proposition. I believe that it is the most important proposition which can come before this convention. Probably there are many features of it that I could not speak on, but for all that, my experience in the past years has taught me that it is necessary to have this constitutional amendment brought before this body for its deliberation.

Now, the constitutional committee says they are through with their work; and the only point I wish to make is that it is through no fault of mine that I was not here sooner to submit what little recommendations and constitutional amendments I might wish to. This is the main one, and the only important one. This "Ball" business (referring to chart), and all this thing about organization, in my opinion is premature, and "Rubifoam." This is something important. This is where we are going to save thousands of dollars; and I hope this thing will be discussed fully and at length, if necessary, and I only wish that when we get through with it we will have somebody to handle this organization and look after it, some man that is a true revolutionist, and who will carry prestige in this organization, to

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

represent us properly.

I wish to have this submitted to the constitutional committee.

DEL. DELANEY: I move that we adjourn until 2 o'clock, to give the constitutional committee time to act.

THE CHAIRMAN: The constitutional committee, if necessary, can withdraw, even while we are in session, and report afterward. They have enough time between twelve and one o'clock. There might be other committees which wish to report now. This will be referred to the constitutional committee, and the constitutional committee will report no doubt this afternoon upon this matter. Isn't that so, Delegate De Leon?

DEL. DE LEON: Yes, unless, I would inquire, to expedite matters, what committees are ready to report now?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what I am going to find out, now.

DEL. DE LEON: It would depend upon the nature of the work that is before the convention, as to whether I would be inclined to withdraw with my committee or not. There may be most {more?} important matters before us.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this matter can be handled in a very few minutes by the constitutional committee, and that we be allowed to wait until this afternoon's session, for our report. We will have it ready by that time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we may find something to do in the meantime.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes.

The Chairman called upon the Committee on Literature and Press, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Grievances, as to whether they had anything to report. Representatives of each of the committees answered in the negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter of Bridgeport has been referred to the committee on grievances. No, that was the matter of the building trades of New York.

DEL. YATES: Mr. Chairman: I might say that the committee has not yet considered the matter. It won't take but a few minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, what did you do yesterday? We gave you a whole day.

DEL. FRANCIS: This matter has not been referred to the grievance committee, but has been sent back to the local.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate from New York is mistaken. The matter has been referred to the grievance committee by a vote of this convention.

DEL. WALTERS: I would like some information on this matter. I would like to know what the chairman of this committee means by saying it was referred back to the local of New York?

DEL. FRANCIS: It was, as a matter of making of making all kinds of wild-cat charges; and this the convention decided; Fellow Worker De Leon and several others spoke on it; and it was sought to teach the locals to bring specific charges by sending it back.

THE CHAIRMAN: Never mind. That is out of order. The chair has informed the delegate from New York that this has been referred to the committee on grievances; and I believe that Delegate Thomas has received that. Didn't you, Fellow Worker Thomas?

DEL. THOMAS: Immediately after our morning session yesterday, that is, adjourning from the session, I tried to ascertain what the proposition was, and of course went to Delegate Walters there, and he said the matter had been referred to the constitutional committee, I believe, but, anyhow, he obtained a copy, and this particular resolution that they desired was laid before this convention for a ruling; and that was in reference to the branches in the building trades, I understand, in New York city, retaining, I believe, the initiation fee, or, rather, retaining as much money as would benefit the local union, provided it had the moneys. And they desired a ruling upon this matter; and, of course, obtaining the resolution I copied it down and gave it to the secretary, and I said that we should have something done on this, and it was understood that we could do nothing else but affirm and agree with the local union, building trades, that the branches had a right to allow this initiation fee to go into the local union, building trades.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is that the report of the committee?

DEL. THOMAS: I presume that is the consensus of opinion. I believe it is, anyhow.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that the report of the committee?

DEL. YATES: I might say that what Delegate Thomas has said is practically the decision of the committee, that we believe that all initiation fees should go to the industrial union. I do not believe that the committee needs to discuss that question at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the concrete decision of the committee, is it?

DEL. THOMAS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the committee so reports?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. THOMAS: In so far as we regard the local union as the unit of organization; consequently, we think the fees of initiation should go to the local unions, and not be retained in the branches.

THE CHAIRMAN: That now stands before the convention as a motion. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. FRANCIS: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: This proposition has been here before this house some days ago, and this is only another way of satisfying Local 95, because they are not able to control the component parts of the organization. This idea might look very nice, of all the initiation fees going to the local unions, as long as you are initiating anybody; but suppose you got slack—only for the benefit of those people, because they ought to know better, and not bother us here with that kind of a proposition—suppose it is slack in the trade, in the industry, and you did not initiate a member for six months?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Francis, that is not the question before the house. The committee on grievances simply render a decision here interpreting a clause of the constitution. It doesn't make any difference whether anybody is admitted or not.

DEL. FRANCIS: I am disputing the merits of that recommendation, and I have reason to state the facts, and I simply want to show, for the benefit of the delegate from New York and his constituency—say that all the thing they will get an income from is from the initiation fee; but suppose the branches do not initiate anybody for six months, and at the same time they keep all the revenues from the dues, then that general committee from the local will be the first ones to howl, and say, "Help us out; we don't get anything from the initiations."

I say this will never go with all of the organizations. You cannot compel the members to do what they do not want to do. Before the industrial union is formed there are branches, and when the branches are organized, and they organize the industrial union, they decide what they want.

There is no use of repeating the arguments of previous days, but it is a fact that no such recommendation will ever carry. When the industrial union is formed, they represent the branches, and they immediately decide what they are going to do. I will give you an illustration, a practical illustration, from Local 59. We have an arrangement in our by-laws that for each man who is initiated there is 50 cents paid in, and for each initiation of a woman 25 cents. We do not care if the branches charge the limit charge, but they must give us that much, in order to get the membership book.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Now, I asked the delegate personally if he could give me the positive information, if the local itself—the industrial union, issued the books; and that information he could not give me. If there is a local that has a certain arrangement, those arrangements will be lived up to. But I again want this convention to go on record, with this interpretation of the constitution. This organization is not built from above. This organization is built from below, and according to the decision, according to the by-laws made of the particular branches that finally organize the industrial unions, that way it will be. No amount of interpretation will in any way change matters.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I would like to ask a question. Does the general committee of the Clothing Workers Union of New York provide for a tax on all the branches, to sustain the general committee and the organizers?

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes, sir.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is the point I want.

DEL. FRANCIS: The local, 59, allows each branch 20 cents, for inducement. We do not believe in paying this assessment for this and that. We get our dues through stamps, and we do not care what anybody says. Pay it. If he cannot show the book, we say “Get out of here”—we do not say “Get out of here,” but we tell him “Pay up,” and then talk. We charge the branches 20 cents, for inducement. As soon as we get them we send to headquarters, because so far we could not buy, to give you the information, we could not buy the stamps for cash. We had to contract a loan from headquarters. But as soon as we got any amount, from \$5 to \$10 or \$15, we sent the money down to headquarters. But the branches have to pay 15 cents, for inducement; so it leaves in the local 5 cents. Out of the 5 cents we pay to the industrial organization for stamps, as many as we get, and the local keeps three cents. And the we get the charter from the new membership committee, as I told you. Is that satisfactory?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes, that is correct.

DEL. WALTERS: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: On this matter I want to get into it, to show just exactly what it means. Before the last convention, after the inception, or at least after the first convention of the Industrial Workers of the World, we know we had Shurtleff in New York, and Shurtleff was organizing anything, in any way, shape or form that he could do it, in order to get a charter, and to get prestige or himself. He organized a lot of wildcat locals in New York, and among them were several Jewish locals, in the building trades. These locals each had separate charters.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

After the last convention this form of organization was established,—an industrial form of organization. When the delegates came back and reported this, we started in New York to form industrial unions. These people had that craft-unionism instilled into them; and it is a hard thing to get it out. They had charters. We had to issue branch charters to them in order to hold them, and we formed industrial unions. Now, these branches have that idea, and you can't get it out of their heads, that they are locals of their own. You cannot get them to work in unison. You cannot get them to carry out the ideas of this organization. That must be borne in mind.

This organization was one of them. As I dwelt on this the other day I do not wish to take up your time with that. Now, this organization is acting independently. I have here an agreement, which I showed to Secretary Trautmann, where they went so far as to grade their men in that organization, to fix the scale of wages for men in that organization. They divided them in classes. It is an agreement drawn up between the Industrial Workers of the World, Building Trades Local Union No. 95, Branch No. 7, Tinworkers, Sheet and Metal Cornice Workers, of Brooklyn. They fixed a scale like this: To employes of the first class—mind, this is a contract with the bosses—all employes of the first class to receive \$4.00 a day; second class, \$2.75; and the third class, or helpers, to receive \$1.50 a day. Do we stand for that here?

DEL. AXELSON: No.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, we have gone to that branch several times. The organization there has enacted by-laws. They won't live up to it. They take this money in their treasury. They raise their initiation fee. Remember, this branch has the majority of votes. Remember that. And in the general committee they can carry anything they want to, practically speaking. This branch has raised the initiation fee to two dollars, for that local union, through the fact of their having a majority of votes. Now, this branch retains their money in the treasury. They cut everything out. It keeps the organization, at least, from carrying on a proper agitation. It keeps them from carrying on their work.

We told this organization, two or three weeks ago, that if they did not comply with the mandates of the constitution, we would kick them out of the organization.

DEL. FRANCIS: Then why don't you do it?

DEL. WALTERS: Have I the floor?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, this organization came back with this, that

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

“We do not interpret the constitution the way you do; but if you get a ruling at the convention we will abide by that ruling, and there will be harmony.”

Now, that is all we want. We do not wish you to change the constitution. We do not wish to expel this branch, if we can help it. If we can get an interpretation of this clause in the constitution, and go on record here, when I go home everything will be plain sailing; we can carry out the mandates of the organization; we can carry out the proper form of organization, without disbanding these men. That is all I want. That is all that this local union has asked me to get here; and I hope I get it.

DEL. DE LEON: I desire a little information.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is it?

DEL. DE LEON: Do I understand that that central committee consists of representatives from those branches?

DEL. WALTERS: From several branches, yes, according to the membership.

DEL. DE LEON: Exactly. Do I understand that that central committee decided to appoint that walking delegate?

DEL. WALTERS: Yes.

DEL. DE LEON: Do I understand that that central committee fixed the salary at \$18?

DEL. WALTERS: Yes, sir.

DEL. DE LEON: Do I understand that the delegates of that recalcitrant branch voted along with that?

DEL. WALTERS: Yes, if I understand it right. One moment, I wish to get that information correctly. I wish to state here—

DEL. DE LEON: Do you know?

DEL. WALTERS: I could not say positively; but I want to say here that I am not a member of this local union. I am only representing it. I cannot go into the minute details of matters in that union.

DEL. DE LEON: Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman's answers must be correct. We cannot deny that. Now, I propose to say a word upon that.

We cannot imagine that a central committee can be made up of anything but representatives. And we can imagine that a vote would be a farce without at least a majority of those representatives. Now, from what Fellow Worker Walters says, it would seem that even the representatives of that branch which objects to this walking delegate, even they have voted for it.

DEL. FRANCIS: As I understand it.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. DE LEON: Now, in view of this fact, I move you that, since this matter is exclusively a matter of grievance, or of enforcement of the constitution, that it be referred to the incoming General Executive Board, to enforce the constitution.

DEL. WALTERS: I am satisfied.

(Del. De Leon's motion was duly seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made that this matter be referred to the incoming General Executive Board, to enforce the constitution.

DEL. FRANCIS: For the enforcement.

THE CHAIRMAN: For enforcement. All right. Are you ready for the question?

(Question called for.)

DEL. HAGENSON: It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, and fellow workers, that this has come before this body, to decide where the initiation fee should go, whether into the branch or into the industrial union. Now, I believe that is a matter which should be settled right here. And to me it looks altogether out of place to have the initiation fee go anywhere except where the member is initiated, where he is taken in, which no doubt would be in the branch local. Any revenue required of any of the central bodies should be specified revenue.

DEL. OHMAN: Fellow Worker Chairman, a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. OHMAN: The point of order is that the speaker is not speaking to the question. As I understand it, the motion is to refer that to the General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to refer. You should come to a debate now, as to whether it should be referred or not, for enforcement.

DEL. HAGENSON: What I am speaking on is that it should be settled right here now, and not referred to the General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are opposed to the motion?

DEL. HAGENSON: I am.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. HAGENSON: And my reason, as I have already stated, is that we should have a specified revenue coming from these branches into these central bodies, and not initiation fees, simply because the initiation fee may be nothing, and it may be a good deal. It is altogether a matter that is settled by the membership in that locality, and not by the Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? All in favor of

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the motion to refer this, for enforcement, to the General Executive Board—

DEL. DE LEON: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I would insist on having the motion put the way I put it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was rather long. I couldn't remember it. I will write it down.

DEL. DE LEON: It is, Whereas this is simply a matter of the enforcement of discipline, therefore be it resolved that this question be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. All in favor of this motion will say aye; opposed, no.

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other committee that has anything to report?

DEL. AIAZZONE: The auditing committee will be ready to report tomorrow morning, unless there is something you want to take up this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. You can take your work. You can be excused from the convention, perhaps, or you can stay up a little later tonight.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I am satisfied, if all the other members are.

DEL. DELANEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it would be in order, at this time, but I think we made a mistake yesterday in regard to those resolutions about the three Mexican revolutionists. I think they should be acted upon at this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: What resolutions?

DEL. DELANEY: That were referred to the General Executive Board, about those three Mexicans. I think that our information is specific enough. I think they should be acted upon by this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: You should have to make a motion to reconsider. That is the only way you could do it.

DEL. DELANEY: Then I move to reconsider.

DEL. HAGENSON: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you vote with the majority.

DEL. DELANEY: I would not be able to say no whether I did or not. I do not know whether I voted or not.

DEL. HAGENSON: I will make that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know that Delegate Delaney was opposed to that going to the Executive Board, and I hardly think that he voted in the affirmative; and a motion to reconsider must come from someone who voted with the majority.

DEL. HAGENSON: I will move to reconsider, and I know that I

voted with the majority.

(The motion was duly seconded.)

DEL. DE LEON: I desire information from Delegate Delaney. Is he ready now with positive information upon the subject?

DEL. DELANEY: I have nothing further, except clippings, which I did not have the other day.

DEL. DE LEON: You have no further information than you had Saturday?

DEL. DELANEY: Except what I got since then.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I did not hear that. Delegate Delaney, I did not hear your answer. Have you any additional information?

DEL. DELANEY: I have simply got the clippings, which I did not have with me then.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

DEL. DELANEY: And I would like to read them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment. You can do that afterward. The motion has been made and seconded. Who was the one that seconded that motion?

DEL. AXELSON: I seconded it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is now before the house.

DEL. HAGENSON: The reason I am in favor of taking this matter up now is because I have got some additional information, satisfactory on this matter. I have learned that these men were discharged, as was reported here, and rearrested on new charges. The charges were murder, correctly, according as our resolution stated, and it is clear that the whole thing was a manufactured affair. I have been entirely convinced of that, and I believe that we should take action here, and show our objection to such procedure.

DEL. DE LEON: I move to second the motion, in order to give an opportunity for the facts to come out. I shall be against voting to reconsider, upon the ground that the delegate who has the matter in hand, and who is the one most likely to have positive information, states that he has no additional information. What he has with him are the clippings, from which he gathered the information he gave us yesterday. Now, I consider that a resolution of this sort should not run any risk whatever of being grounded or based upon false or defective information. It is a serious matter, and we do not want to make ourselves the laughing stock of anybody. My private opinion is that the facts are just as given there, because the chances are that way. That is a way this government has had. It is not Mexico alone. Russia has done that, and on one occasion this very country did that.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

But because it is likely simply, we are not justified in saying that it is so. We should not adopt a resolution except upon facts that we can rely upon as being incontrovertible. Now, there are no new facts before us. Delegate Delaney himself says that what he has are the clippings from which he gathered the information he gave us the other day. For this reason I shall be against the resolution, and prefer that the matter should stand as it is, that the General Executive Board shall look into this affair, ascertain the facts, and if it finds the facts to be as stated in that clipping, then by all means that resolution, under instruction of the convention.

DEL. KERN: I move the previous question.

DEL. FRANCIS: I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no objection, and no one wants to speak, anyway. So we will go to the previous question. A motion to reconsider requires a two thirds majority. All in favor of the motion, to reconsider the question of the resolutions relative to the affair in Mexico, will say aye; opposed, no.

(The motion was lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost. And we are now under the head of unfinished business. Is there any, Mr. Secretary?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Fellow Worker Chairman, the report of the General Secretary-Treasurer is, or a part of the report, is in the hands of the committee. If the convention will permit to correct an error in that report, which is absolutely necessary. While the communication from the Roumanian Syndicate, or Weinstein. I perhaps was misinformed—

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order. We do not want to waste time on this. The Secretary will be here. Corrections of figures must come to the eye, and not to the ear, and, since he says the report is in the hands of the Committee on Ways and Means, it is to that committee that that should be referred. Then it will appear in their report, and we can see that it is all right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Ways and Means. I gave you that matter, didn't I (To Delegate Henion)?

DEL. HENION: I haven't that report. We haven't acted on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: What did you do yesterday?

DEL. HENION: Well, I wanted to stay here and do business but everything was adjourned. I couldn't hunt up everyone else. I couldn't find them in this city. I am not posted on where they live here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, I do not mean you personally.

DEL. HENION: I don't know what they did. I cannot answer for

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

anyone on that committee. I looked around and tried to find somebody and couldn't.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who {You?} are the chairman?

DEL. HENION: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who are the members of that committee?

DEL. HENION: Haggerty {Haggerty?}, Spettel, Schwend, Conover and Henion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, the delegates on that committee, with the additional light that the secretary wishes to throw upon it, will please be here this noon and be ready to report this afternoon. Any new business? I want to announce, under the head of new business, that the proprietor of the hall informed Secretary Trautmann that this convention will have to go upstairs again. Is there any other new business before the house?

DEL. DELANEY: I move that we adjourn until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The motion to adjourn was duly seconded and carried and the convention took a recess to 2 o'clock P.M.

MONDAY, SEPT. 23, 1907.

2 O'CLOCK P.M. {AFTERNOON SESSION.}

The convention was called to order by the chairman at 2 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed with the business session, there is a fellow worker here—I think he is not a delegate, but he is a member of the I.W.W.—I don't know where he comes from—

A DELEGATE: He is a Chicago man.

THE CHAIRMAN: This gentleman offers to take a picture of the convention; he has his camera here, and he offers to take group {picture} of the delegates, and requested me to bring it before the convention. I don't know whether you desire to take that matter up.

A DELEGATE: There is not time enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure about it?

DEL. HENION: How long will it take?

THE PHOTOGRAPHER: It will take about twenty minutes.

A DELEGATE: Let us go on with the business.

DEL. FOOTE: So far as I am concerned, I don't care to be pictured.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: The same way here.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any motion?

DEL. AXELSON: As I understand, this is a voluntary offer and the idea is, as I am informed, the headquarters would have the pictures in their possession to dispose of to the delegates in any way they might see fit, and that being the case, with no expense to us, if headquarters can make a dollar or two I would be willing to stand for the operation.

A DELEGATE: I suggest that we do it after we adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: It could not be done after adjournment.

A DELEGATE: Let's proceed with the business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well; we will proceed with the roll call of the delegates.

The secretary then called the roll of delegates, at the conclusion of which {he} announced the following delegates as absent{:} Bohm, Covert, Francis, Keep, Lindner, Thomas.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business is reports of committees. The committee on constitution is ready to report.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I want the close attention of all the delegates. We have some proposed amendments to the constitution submitted by different members beginning with the proposition from Executive Board Member Heslewood. I will read the propositions together, and then read the recommendations of the committee regarding them. If you will pay close attention there will be no need to ask any questions about the matter after I have finished.

These amendments are to Article II of the constitution, and I will not number the sections because if adopted they will have to be rearranged later.

(Reading): "The officers of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be a General Executive Board composed of a president and one member from each industrial department and a general secretary-treasurer. The president of the General Executive Board shall also be the general organizer of the I.W.W., and he shall supervise the work of all national organizers, to be appointed and recalled by him, subject to the approval of the General Executive Board. He shall as much as possible devote his time and labor towards the organizing of the workers in the important industries, to carry on a propaganda of organization and education. When not on the road he shall assist the general secretary-treasurer in the performance of his duties. For his services he shall receive the fixed amount of \$125 a month, and while on the road in the interest of the organization his expenses shall not exceed \$3.00 a day besides mileage. The general president, the general

secretary-treasurer and the editor shall constitute a local Executive Board which shall have full executive power in emergency cases, and they shall be subject as officials and as an Executive Board to the G.E.B., and when no emergency exists their executive acts must be approved by the G.E.B. before being enforced.

“Whereas, there is not at present any department in existence, we recommend that the General Executive Board for the coming year shall consist of the president, five additional members elected at large by this convention from various parts of the country, besides the general secretary-treasurer, the latter to have a voice but no vote in the deliberations of the G.E.B.”

Now, here is the recommendation or report of the committee:

The committee reports that whereas the subject matter of these three propositions centers around the proposition of Heslewood restoring the presidential office, and the matter comes up at a late hour of the convention session; and whereas, upon that subject the committee’s function to digest is inoperative, and the essence of the proposition will have to be digested ultimately by the convention itself; and whereas, the three propositions are coherent enough to be accepted or rejected by the convention; therefore, be it resolved, that this committee recommends that the convention itself consider the matter in the first instance.

DEL. DE LEON: In view of the nature of the recommendations, I move you that the committee’s recommendation be acted upon in this matter, and that it be considered and passed upon by the convention itself.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

DEL. DE LEON: The committee on constitution is not trying to shirk its work or its duties. Had a proposition of this nature been introduced at the beginning of our session we certainly would have handled the matter, digested it ourselves and brought in a distinct recommendation. Had this recommendation come at this late hour from any other person than Heslewood we would have refused consideration thereof, because it is very much in the nature of a motion to reconsider the previous action of this convention. But this recommendation comes from Heslewood, that is, from a member of this convention who could not be here before because he was on an errand on which this organization had sent him by a general vote. In view of that we have felt obliged to consider the matter.

Now, then, this is a late hour in our deliberations. As we understand

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

it, no other committee has anything more to report. The committee on auditing is not yet ready to report. In view of that were we to consider this matter further we would have to ask the convention to adjourn to give us time. We then would have had to make our recommendation and tomorrow would have had to go over the whole field again. Our recommendation is therefore intended to save time, in view of all these facts to save time. In view of all these facts, without having to go into committee of the whole I think the convention itself can handle the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

(The motion was declared carried by the Chairman.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter is now before the house.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I will have to speak upon this for a minute or two. I am sorry that anything has been brought up that will delay the convention, but I realize that this is a very important matter. If I did not think it was for the best interests of the I.W.W. at this time and of great importance I would not have brought the subject before the convention. I realize that we have got along without a president in the past year, without anyone being called president. The real fact of the matter, however, is, that we have had a president and, from no fault of his, he has been jumbling up that office with other jobs that are not attached to his office, and has not been able to do all of his work properly on account of having too much work. I am not finding fault with anyone, but we have got to go back a little to find out how we came to abolish this office. All we abolished really was the man called president here a year ago. We have only got rid of the name. I fail to see why because someone abused the office of president, because they dragged the name of president in the dust, because they have wronged us, as the constitution allowed them to do, giving them so much power,—I cannot see for the life of me why you should be opposed at this time to this proposition, nor why this office should not be created again.

It is necessary to have someone at the head of the organization to supervise the organizers, to look after that alone, direct the national organizers in the field, which is not the duty of the general secretary-treasurer. It is the duty of a president, and I can see nothing wrong with that word. We have had a president in past years, and I can see nothing wrong with the word president. We must have someone to preside over the organization. Some members look at this differently. They seem to think we are putting up a czar or autocrat.

Now, this amendment to the constitution that is submitted here,

has done away with any clause in the constitution that would give the president the right to take upon himself any kind of power. It has limited his powers to the minimum that is absolutely necessary. Now, the reason for bringing this subject up is that I believe that we should have a president to establish our prestige in the West. It has been generally felt in the West that we should never have abolished the office of president. That we should have thrown Sherman through the window and not abolish the office. I believe in the West at this time we are in a predicament that some of you do not understand. I am not speaking for the East, but I am satisfied that the electing of a president in the West will carry considerable prestige; we all know that when Sherman was president of the organization that he could get the biggest meetings of any man in the country. He could get larger meetings, even than Debs, with all his national reputation as an orator. I remember going to hear Sherman in the city of Denver, and there was not standing room in the largest hall in the city. St. John and I spoke in that city last year, and the people were more acquainted with {the} I.W.W. then, but we did not get a very large meeting. This, I claim, would establish prestige in the West with the miners and lumberjacks of the State of Montana, who look to the head of the organization and wish to have a president. Out there they believe we never did the right thing in abolishing the office. I believe it is a wise strategical movement, on account of men claiming that we should have a president. Moreover, this fake convention that is threatened October 1st will not be pulled off in this city. I believe from what I heard yesterday that Sherman is about down and out. But I will not go into that. I believe we should re-establish the office of president, limit his power, put it at the minimum, and send the president on the road as much as possible, and as much as the finances will permit. I have to hear yet some sound argument against the word president. You cannot connect it in my mind with any czar of Russia or king of England, or anything of that kind. I simply want a man to preside over the organizing work of this organization, with definite powers, and I cannot see any objection to the word president. You have to have someone to handle the organizers. I know we have had failures during the past year because our secretary was too busy to watch them all closely. He could not watch the movements everywhere. We want a man specially to watch these things. I know one man in particular who never made a speech, who never went before a local union, but who drew \$40 or \$50 a week regularly, where it took months to get onto him.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

A DELEGATE: What is the name?

DEL. HESLEWOOD: His name is Barton; and other men have given very poor satisfaction. I admit that in many places I have given very unsatisfactory results, but I did the best I could, and the result was due to my lack of ability, but other men did not try to do a thing. For all these reasons, which count up very strongly, I am in favor of this change, and you will have to give me some strong reasons why the office of president should not be re-established, with the power limited to the minimum. There should be a local executive board and there will always be two men to vote against him, and they will have to submit their propositions before the General Executive Board unless in the case of an emergency, such as kidnapping a man from one State to another, or some emergency where action must be taken immediately. This office will not cost us any more than it does now. This proposition is not a revolutionary movement, but it is a tactical movement, the re-establishment of the office of president.

A DELEGATE: So that we may have the matter properly before us, it is necessary that the meaning of the recommendation should be made clear. Does it read that it shall be the president of the General Executive Board?

THE CHAIRMAN: It means the office of general president. A motion will be in order.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: To get this matter before you so that we can discuss it, I move that my proposition be accepted here, which is to establish the office of president and abolish the office of assistant secretary-treasurer.

DEL. ROKOVITZ: I would like to ask for information, whether this motion is in order, since we have the constitution which says that the officers shall consist of general secretary-treasurer and secretary-treasurer—I wish to know whether this motion is in order at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was decided that this matter should be taken up by this convention. Which article is that?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Article 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion means that the officers of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be a general president, general secretary-treasurer, and general executive board, composed of the five members. That will be the proper motion, to strike out the words “assistant general secretary-treasurer” and before the words “general secretary-treasurer” there should be the words “general president.” Is that your motion?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

A DELEGATE: Would it not be better for the secretary to read the motion?

DEL. WILLIAMS (Reading): "The officers of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be a General Executive Board composed of the president with one member from each industrial department, and general secretary-treasurer." That is the amendment that is proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the amendment before the house.

DEL. FRANCIS: As a matter of personal privilege, I ask to be recorded as opposed to a president.

DEL. ROSKOVITZ: I wish to say against this amendment that we have been having all kinds of difficulties and struggles, not necessary to mention, on account of the president. Now, it is stated by Heslewood that it is not the fault of the office, but that it is the fault of the man, and that we should do away with the man and not with the office. He advises us to have a president in order to have prestige with the men in the west. That alone is sufficient reason why we should not have a man in that position, for the simple reason that the prestige alone makes a man in that office assume powers not given to him. That is why I am against this amendment.

DEL. GLOVER: A point of information: In case the office of president should be re-established, what duties would he assume? Would he assume the duty of general organizer, with supervision of the organizers? If so, I would not be opposed to the proposition of re-establishing the office of president. But, as I understand it, in the previous case it was found that he had no particular duties to perform, that he was merely a figurehead. This organization would not care, in my opinion, to tie itself to a figurehead. But if this president is to be the supervisor of the organizers, then it seems to me he would have specified duties to perform, in mapping out the general work of the organizers in the different fields and departments and territories where they would be most effective, and the best places for the accomplishment of the work of organizers. If that is true, I would be in favor of re-establishing it. On the other hand, if he is not to assume that duty then I am not in favor of it and I cannot see why we should tie ourselves to an official who is simply to remain a figurehead. If I am given that information—

THE CHAIRMAN: The best way to answer that will be to have Delegate Williams, secretary of the committee, read the proposition.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I can answer that by reading the clause relating to the duties of the president: "The president of the General Executive Board shall also be the general organizer of the I.W.W., and he shall

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

supervise the work of all national organizers, to be appointed and recalled by him subject to the approval of the General Executive Board. He shall as much as possible devote his time and labor towards organizing the workers in important industries, to carry on the propaganda of organization and education. When not on the road he shall assist the general secretary-treasurer in the performance of his duties.”

DEL. DELANEY: I think we have had enough experience in the past two or three years to put up men who will merely be figureheads. I think that we have men who have been tried and proved true, not only in this convention, but other places. I believe this convention has the intelligence to pick out such men who will not be figureheads, and I am in favor of this amendment. I believe this organization cannot afford to have all of its executive power spread all over the country. We have got to have an executive head in Chicago, who can act in a crisis at once, not through a correspondence course, but at once. I believe that this local executive board should, of course, be held so that they cannot do anything they please, but they should have power in a case of emergency. I hope the motion will carry, and I think this convention can trust itself to elect proper officers to carry out its will.

DEL. FRANCIS: They come here and propose a president, the thing that we got rid of last year, on the ground that the other fellow was a figurehead. Now, as I remember it, he was anything but a figurehead. Sherman was everything. He did everything that he pleased. They give us the plausible argument that this officer is going to supervise the organizers. If you imagine that he can really supervise the work of the organizers you are mistaken. The only way in which he can supervise the work of an organizer is by being present at the place where that organizer is working; if he is not present he cannot supervise anything. Now, you will understand that he cannot be present in more than one place at one time, so this proposition presents a physical impossibility. It is stated as an argument that a fellow who never did any organizing still drew a considerable salary. If the rank and file know what this organization means, then the rank and file will put the kibosh on such a fellow. They will stop him exploiting this organization, but to believe that a president three thousand miles away can send a message to a fellow worker as to what he is to do and know what he is doing is nonsense. He may send his messages, but if there is not a membership in that locality the fellow will do just as he pleases, until his resources are cut off. That argument does not hold water.

They say also that in the West they want a president, and that when

Sherman went to Denver he filled a large hall, but that can be understood when he came to Denver he had practically he undivided support of the Western Federation of Miners, and some of the fellows whom we have since realized are fakers proceeded to pack the hall for him; but you can elect your best man president and send him there, and there might be a riot in the hall, but you will not have a packed audience, because the opposition know what they are after—they are after the money—they know what we are after, and that is to put them out of business. So don't believe that prestige of a president will be the whole show. We should congratulate ourselves that we got rid of the president. We must rely upon our membership to send the necessary information to headquarters. Leave the thing as it is. I know the resources of the organization are not such that the General Executive Board could be so located that the organizers would be in easy reach of the general office and be consulted. In the last analysis the knowledge of the organizers will depend upon reports from the different cities that get them, to the general office. If you have a fellow who is called president, or general secretary-treasurer, or assistant general secretary, they have just as much judgment, the one as the other will have, and you will have to depend upon the reports that will come in, and they will act accordingly, and even if a fellow is called a president he cannot do otherwise than to receive the information and act upon it. I think if it is properly understood in the West, they won't want a president. The proposition here is just like what the committee said a couple of days ago, the medicine is worse than the disease. No president for me. We should be very glad that we got rid of him.

DEL. LIESNER: The fellow workers in my locality thought it was a grand move when we abolished the president's office and established our present method. I believe that they will hold the same belief even after we have taken whatever action we take here now. I think the best thing we can do is to leave matters as they are, and establish, if you will, a general organizer to superintend and take care of the organizing work subject to the approval of the General Executive Board. Then you have the thing you want, and as to the word "president," and its prestige, we can get along without it. If that is all we need to establish this organization we would be in a bad row of stumps, with poor prospects of getting organized. I think we can exist without that term president, and I think the present method is the right one.

DEL. WILLIAMS: There is one point I want to add to the remarks of Fellow Worker Francis, and that is in regard to the president being able to supervise the work of the organizers. You will remember that

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

we had a president at one time in the I.W.W.; leave out of your consideration who he was, and the question of his ability and anything else, but remember we had that president, and the same proposition comes up here; he was on the road the greater part of the time, traveling from one part of the country to another, in the supposed work of supervising the organizers, and the work of organizing generally. Now, if there are any organizers here who worked in the first year of that administration—I am one of them—they will bear me out that the actual work of supervision was not in the hands of the president, but was in the hands of the secretary-treasurer of the organization. Why? Simply because the president was on the road. He didn't even have a chance to receive his mail, and when the locals wrote for organizers they wrote to the secretary-treasurer, and when they wrote regarding matters that needed the attention of the executive board they wrote to the secretary-treasurer, and the secretary-treasurer acted. Now, that will be borne out by the facts. That president, I will not say that he was a figurehead of anything of that sort, I will not say that he may not have done good work, but I will say that he did not and could not supervise the work of organization. If you create this office of president in order to enable him to supervise the work of organization, he will have to remain in the office of headquarters in Chicago continuously and do his supervision almost entirely by mail, with an emergency call here and there once in awhile. Now, I understand the change that was made last year in establishing the office of assistant secretary-treasurer, that was the underlying object. It was understood that the secretary-treasurer alone could not attend to all the duties of that office and perform them properly; there was too much work for one man; financial affairs and the direction of the organizers, and all those things, were mixed up together, and it is remarkable that the present secretary-treasurer has been able to do the really remarkable work that he has done in the past year under these circumstances, and with his assistant absent most of the time.

A DELEGATE: All of the time.

DEL. WILLIAMS: If the assistant is in the office with the secretary and the work is divided then the work of supervision may be carried on jointly by the two secretaries, and an emergency call may be answered by either one of them, whenever it may be necessary.

I hold that to re-establish the office of president will not justify the expense that is involved, in the first place, owing to the necessity of the president traveling from one end of the country to the other, and I

hold that as to supervising the organizers the argument is not well maintained.

Now, as to this question of prestige. I am willing, as a member of the I.W.W., and one who has been in the field in different parts of the country, especially the West, for quite a long time—I am willing to support any legitimate move that will increase the membership of the organization, but the trend of my education and my thought on this question leads me away from the idea that we must have a man, an individual who can be brought prominently before the workers and then because of that individual's influence alone, those workers will be brought into the organization. If they are brought in on that basis I say they are no good. If we cannot build this organization from the bottom we have built no organization at all. It must come from a clear understanding by the membership, and that clear understanding is not maintained by setting up a man. These individuals are not so numerous as you think; you might get a figurehead one time, and a real man another time. If this prestige is to be maintained by setting up a man and pushing him before the workers and persuading them to join the organization because he is there, I say let us be careful about moving along that line. I do not see the particular advantage of the move at the present time.

Now, if this movement proceeds from any desire to influence any body of workers who are on the fence, or anywhere near the I.W.W. position, then I am opposed to it. If there is any organization that is on the fence or is about ready, or which may be induced in the near future to come into this organization, they will not be brought in by the prestige of an individual. They will be brought in by the understanding that they have here an industrial unionism, and if they are not brought in by that understanding they will soon go out again—they may go out again. So I am opposed to this proposition. I believe that the advantages of the present method are greater, and that we shall have better results for the organization than we shall have by re-establishing the presidency.

I am not opposed to the office of president because of the word "president," or anything of that kind, but because of the reasons I have just given.

DEL. CAMINITA: I cannot understand why, after one year, we should re-establish the office of president. Someone says that without a president we cannot control the organizers, but I think that the secretary-treasurer, if he wants to, can control the organizers. We don't need any president. I want to ask you a question: During the past

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

year we have been without a president. Has the I.W.W. suffered by that? Is not the I.W.W. stronger today than it was one year ago? Then is it not proved that the president does not give any life to the organization? If we want to re-establish the office of president, we introduce the thing that we got rid of. We want to go along without any chief, without any czar. If we go to Russia we ask the Russian people why they don't abolish the czar, and they answer you that it is impossible, because without a czar Russia is dead. If we go to Germany the people say the same thing. If we ask the American people why they don't abolish the office of president, they say you are crazy. It is said if we want to educate the people we must educate the people with pamphlets or books or papers and by facts, and the most important fact is to show that the I.W.W. can live without any president. I think that we are better without a president, because you remember one year ago, when Mr. Sherman was president of the I.W.W. he tried to spoil the I.W.W. But you say it is not the fault of the office, it is the fault of the man. But you know the man is the exponent of the cause. You take a man and put the man in office, he must represent the cause; if you take a man and put him under water he must drown. It is not his fault, it is your fault. If you take a man and put him in a fire he must burn up; you cannot say it is his fault. It is our fault. If we put a man in the office of president, if we give the man power, in one year or two years—I cannot say how long—he will be corrupt. He will think that if he is president it is because he must understand something better than the other men; that he has the right to be chief; that he has the right to consider himself better, something like a god, and then he tries to spoil our organization. We must show by this organization that people can govern themselves; we must show the ignorant people that without any president that we can live and grow just the same. We have an organization in Paterson; we have not any president, and we make good progress in our locality, and if we can make good progress without a president, why cannot the I.W.W. everywhere? I believe in two or three years the I.W.W. will be stronger than the present American Federation of Labor. Now, how much will the president cost a year? I think it would cost \$1,300. Can we not save this money for some other thing? Do you want to spend this \$1,300 a year? You must remember when a workman goes to work in the factory he gets \$1.50 or \$2.50 a day, but you give a man \$125 a month to preside over this organization. If he is honest he can do nothing at all. If he is dishonest he can spoil the I.W.W. I hope the I.W.W. will not vote for this motion.

Without any president we can progress; with a president we are in danger.

DEL. OHMAN: While Fellow Worker Williams has covered what I was going to say in regard to prestige, there is one matter that occurs to me. Delegates going home will have this put to them. Do the Industrial Workers know what they want? One year they abolish a thing, the next year they put the same thing back again. Of course, we know why that was done, but the majority of the workers don't know why it was done, and it will cause considerable trouble, I am satisfied of that. For that reason I am certainly opposed to re-establishing the office of president. As to the other objections, they have them covered and I will not take the time to repeat them.

DEL. THOMAS: I wish to say in this matter of re-establishing the office of president, that what our fellow worker on this side has said will convey the meaning that the reason you abolished the presidency was simply because you wanted to get rid of Sherman. I have been under the domination of one man power for quite a time, and that is the domination of Mr. John Mitchell, of the United Mine Workers. For the reason that I understand thoroughly that one man power is not a democratic institution or a democratic organization, I wish to say that I am opposed, absolutely opposed to re-establishing one man power in the I.W.W. This is a question—whether Fellow Worker Heslewood understands it or not—it is a question of hero worship, because he says that if we wish to have prestige for this organization, for the benefit of the organization, we must have a president. All students of development and evolution of our race understand well that the ecclesiastical powers were at one time in control, and from those ecclesiastical powers came the dictum to appoint a certain individual—of course, they had what they call geographical lines and divisions and decided who should be king of one locality and who should be queen of another locality. But coming down the line we see that from the abolishment of ecclesiastical powers in dictating who shall be king there was progress, and we find that in 1776 the colonists of America said we do not believe in kingship, and we can have a government of the people, by the people and for the people, without a king, and consequently kingship should be abolished. Coming down the line further, they established a presidency in lieu of a king. But that is only another reflex of the desire to have a hero to worship. I would therefore say, beware of having a kingship in the I.W.W., whether in the form of a president or anything else, and I wish you to understand further that I for one don't want to have a big stick in this

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

organization; I want a democratic organization here, a democratic government here, and in so far as that is concerned I say keep the organization as it is and do not re-establish the presidency, because not only am I opposed to it, but my constituency that has been reared under the domination of ecclesiastical and kingly power is utterly opposed to it. I am particularly opposed, myself, because I realize that hero worship is a delusion and a detriment to the working class of America.

A DELEGATE: As a point of information I would like for the information of the delegates, to ask the secretary to read what the duties of the general president would be, because we seem to be getting away from that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think everybody knows what the proposition is before the house.

DEL. HAGENSON: I feel quite satisfied with the position that the delegates seem to take in this matter. When it seemed there was a possibility of re-establishing a president in this organization, it seemed to me that it was one thing that I hated above all things; it has been said that because of the condition the presidency was in at that time, and because of the kind of man who was president, therefore, the office of president was done away with. But in my case that was not so. In the locality where I belong it was the unanimous instruction to the delegates at the last convention that the office of president should be abolished, not because Sherman was president, but because they were strictly opposed to the office. I know in that locality the situation has not changed at all, but to leave that part of it and come down to where I stand myself, according to my own convictions, I believe we would commit a crime if we were to re-establish the office of president. While it may be used as a sort of diplomatic move, owing to the fact that in certain localities the announcement that the president of the Industrial Workers of the World was there, would be a big attraction—it is said by taking away the powers and not giving him practically any control, only giving him the title, there would be no danger. That may be true, but I would rather have one man in the organization that did not want a president than five hundred who want a president. And that is not because under the rules of the organization you are in danger particularly, but more on account of the condition of the membership in the organization. If we have a majority of the membership in the organization that is in favor of a dangerous position, then indeed we are in danger. On the other hand, if we have a membership who see the danger of the position and the

membership is ready to rebel against that dangerous condition, it will not make much difference what kind of rules we have. We must understand that it is the rank and file of the organization that make the organization, and that it is the rank and file who have got to fight the battle for the working class.

DEL. KERN: I don't think Fellow Worker Heslewood meant what Fellow Worker Thomas seems to think. His idea was to get the best results with the least possible exertion. So far as Fellow Worker Williams stated I agree with him, that a general organizer on the road cannot do much good to the organization; he should be in the office to lay out plans, and dictate where the organizers should go, and what work shall be done. There is no question that this man Barton has acted dirty towards us, and I believe from what I have learned in Chicago in three months that I have been studying the situation, that he came well recommended before being put on the road. Now, Fellow Worker Williams says that Secretary Trautmann has done remarkably well so far as laying out the work of these organizers is concerned, and from what I have seen I will say that he has done remarkable work, and emphasize the remarkable, and the only thing that was needed was that he should have had some assistance in the office, and then we should not have had the trouble with this man Burton that we have had.

DEL. FOOTE: The question of power has been brought into consideration. So long as this organization stands for the centralization of power and the power exists where it is centralized, whether it be king, or president, or pope, or secretary-treasurer, the power exists there, and it stands on the proposition of using the power along the line of the best interests of the organization. Now, I am not superstitious about names. The name of king does not represent to me everything relating to a kingdom. The czar does not represent to me everything relating to the Russian dynasty. It represents to me a figurehead. I look below that for the power that is being used. Whether you call it president, general organizer, or what not, the fact remains, and the power exists there. It is placed there for a definite purpose, and if that purpose is not accomplished, then the power should not exist. The power already exists in your centralized form of organization, and you have to take into consideration the manner of administering the force. Now, the convention here—I have to laugh, because it was the only suggestion of mine that was considered at all favorably by the convention, and it was passed unanimously, of which I am very proud, because it is one of the pet theories of my local

union—it was decided that men should be taken, selected in the industries in which they work, and given the task of organizing those industries. Now, perhaps it has not been plain just what we meant by that. We simply meant that we should take men who were known to the organization and have them go into certain industries that they were familiar with, and work there as wage workers with the aim and object of constructing in that plant or industry a nucleus for the Industrial Workers of the World, to build from the inside. The provision was made that these men should receive no salary from the organization, but should be protected and used by the organization for that definite purpose, My local union submits that that is local organization work. You remove that logical method of organization work, if you please, and it seems to me that it is not good to be controlled in such a manner as would not bring results.

Now, to embody the power of the organization in your general secretary-treasurer is to commit the same crime that you are all afraid of committing. Of course, you do not state that the general secretary-treasurer has committed a crime. You do not state that the office of president would necessitate a crime. Some say it is a figurehead. That is according to how we speak from the standpoint of the organization, but the point of this: the power has been centralized, and it has been centralized to such an extent that it has not been controlled along lines conducive to the organization; and I hold that the secretary-treasurer is enabled,—and not knowing a great deal about the office I speak from the standpoint of a lay-member, so to speak,—I hold that the secretary-treasurer would have more than he could do to look out for this systematic plan of organization work as I have suggested.

Now, another thing to be taken into consideration is the fact that there is always great danger to the organization from without as well as within, from a strategical standpoint. Take the proposition of the United Mine Workers. Suppose we devote our time to that industry, the coal mining industry, and suppose that we accomplish good results in that industry. Then there is a danger, and it is a danger that is always present, simply because the men who are behind that danger are always scheming some coup upon us, and the danger continues to exist when we take in a portion of the United Mine Workers, that the men such as Mitchell will so conspire to bring about a general revolt in the coal mining industry and among the members of the coal mining industry, a general strike, for instance, or something of that sort, as to smash up your organization.

Now, not one will doubt but what that is a danger, and how best to

control that danger, how best to be aware of all the methods of these men would, I believe, come within the province of a man who had control of the work of organization, and it represents nothing to me whether you call him president or not; he is president because he would be the chairman of the executive board, and I believe—

DEL. CAMINITA: You make a mistake.

DEL. FOOTE: All right; I have made many of them, but I believe it is not the creation of an office that is unnecessary, but I believe it is the absolutely necessary culmination of the forces of organization work that are centralized here and that are compelling action.

Now, as to whether the man would travel over the country all the time or not, we should not judge ourselves by Sherman. I, at least, do not, and I am satisfied that some of the rest do not, most of the rest or perhaps all of the rest do not. But Sherman was not out to organize the working class; he was out to control the working class by machinery which he attempted to do and fell down, thanks to our efforts. I do not see that we should bring Sherman into this comparison at all.

I was in the committee on constitution last year and the reason I voted to do away with the office of president was the same reason I voted to make higher the number necessary to constitute a department. We had to get rid of these department fakers; we had to get rid of Sherman. They hollered that we were abolishing departments. What for? Abolishing fake departments.

And, the same reason held with the Committee on Constitution with regard to Sherman, and of course construing the position of a president in the light you construe Sherman's position, none of us would have anything to do with it. But, there are methods of work, concrete methods of work and concrete lines of work for a man such as we propose, and that power is centralized and has got to be used some way for the organization and its own benefit every day.

Talk about at this stage of the game that everything must come from the bottom. Surely it must come from the bottom, but then, at the same time it must go to the top, and what will we do with it here after it goes to the top? Allow it to go on out or control it? Is it a method of evaporation? Certainly not. We mean to keep that power in our organization and to so use it and direct it as is deemed most advisable along proper lines.

Now, coming from the West, or Middle West, I do understand Heslewood's position. I do know that the office of president, with a good man in it, would have some interest. However, I have not allowed that knowledge to influence me in my position. I wish to take a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

position right from the facts, and I stand for the election of a president.

DEL. AIAZZONE: As I came in late—I had to do committee work—I would like to have the motion read.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY:¹⁶ The secretary will kindly read the pending motion.

DEL. WILLIAMS: The question that is being discussed is as to whether we should recommend the office of president of the organization. I will read you the two clauses so you can understand what you are discussing.

“The officers of the Industrial Workers of the World shall be a General Executive Board composed of a president and one member from each industrial department, and a general secretary-treasurer,” and the duties of the president are outlined: “The president of the General Executive Board shall also be the general organizer of the I.W.W., and he shall supervise the work of all national organizers to be appointed and recalled by him, subject to the approval of the General Executive Board. He shall as much as possible devote his time and labor towards organizing the workers in the important industries, and carry on the propaganda of organization and education. When not on the road he shall assist the general secretary-treasurer in the performance of his duties.”¹⁷

DEL. AIAZZONE: I am glad to know that. When we organized Local 120, or rather previous to organizing it, those with whom I came in contact in an effort to get their signatures in order that they might become members, all asked me very particularly about the organization and especially in regard to the president. They have a prejudice against having a president. Of course, so far as that is concerned, it is not as it was last year, but you want to look out that you don't give them any opportunity to create any suspicion whatsoever, and therefore you should not give the office any power whatsoever except to supervise, something like that.

DEL. KATZ: Fellow Worker Chairman—

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Of course, it is necessary for everyone to arise to their feet when they desire the recognition of the chair. You will come next if I am in the chair, or you can take the chair now if you desire.

DEL. KATZ: No.

¹⁶ [No indication of Katz having relinquished the chair appears in the text—*R.B.*]

¹⁷ [Compare to previous readings for minor differences in presentation.—*R.B.*]

DEL. AXELSON: I have listened with interest to the discussion pro and con on the question before the house. It seems to me that the argument of some individuals in this discussion has run to an extreme.

Supposing that you establish a president, and we give that president unlimited power, in proportion as they try to make it out. Try to give him the power of the czar of Russia or any other autocratic individual who is supposed to be vested with supernatural power. In this case that is not so with me; I do not look at it in that respect. I know that the work of the secretary-treasurer, the work that he is doing now, is practically the work we are talking of hiring the president to do.

Now, we have today in the Industrial Workers of the World a secretary-treasurer and an assistant secretary-treasurer. The assistant secretary-treasurer to my knowledge, as far as I know, has never yet been in the office and participated in that work. The work has been absolutely in the secretary-treasurer's hands. Now, what assurance have we that the secretary-treasurer, if he should take the notion, could not have done some wrong?

The question with us now is that in accordance with the supervision spoken of in this recommendation on the part of Heslewood, we would eliminate all danger, because the organizer, or the president, if you please, his action is subject to the local advice of the board comprised of the secretary-treasurer and the editor, and himself. He has always and at all times two individuals against him. That is the first proposition; he has got to work in accordance with that or otherwise he is up against it.

Then comes the other executive board, and if they do not sanction his action then he is up against another proposition. Now, if you elected the right local advisory board, the right executive board, how much field or space is there where the president is going to be able to betray you? There is none.

Now then, in the west, as I know, and as has been stated by Heslewood himself, this idea of president is one that takes well. In the west we find the best field and the most revolutionary element that is to be found; what I refer to now is the Western Federation of Miners. I take the stand now then that if you elect the proper man, a man who will have some prestige, although I do not believe in the superstition idea of idealism, but I know men are given to that idea and they are seeking for that in certain men.

Now, if we accomplish some good to this organization through that means it is our duty to do so, because we are already safeguarded, as I have pointed out to you, in that there is no loophole where this

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

president can in any way run you in any way, shape or manner, because as I have told you, he has got the local advisory board and the executive board to work in harmony with, and if he does not work in harmony with them, that cuts his career short in his official capacity.

So you see also as I have stated, that the assistant general secretary has not taken any part in the general secretary's work. Now, if the general secretary-treasurer has done that work alone in the last year, by establishing this president he will have an aid {aide?} anyhow. The president will not confine himself to the office because when he is called for to in any way propagate or advance industrial unionism by any body of working men, he is occupying then the same position as a national organizer. He is getting the same compensation, no different, and then at that moment he is nothing more than an organizer.

In the office he fills only that function that the assistant secretary-treasurer should have filled, if it would have been absolutely necessary to have him.

So we see we are always safeguarded and with the field in the west as the fellow workers from the west have assured me, if we establish a presidency and elect the right man, a certain good influence will be brought to bear on the revolutionary element in the west and especially in the Western Federation of Miners. If that is a fact, then I am willing to establish a president if some good can be arrived at, and as they assure me to that effect, I am for the election of a president.

DEL. TRAINOR: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: As I have listened to the different arguments here of the different delegates it has come to dawn upon my mind that the only object in abolishing the office of the president at the last convention was for the mere purpose of getting rid of Sherman. Now, when this proposition was brought along after that seat was abolished, and was brought to where that belonged, and some delegates, as I gather from what they say, have been led to understand that the reason why the seat was abolished was because they thought it was an imposition on the organization and a seat that was utterly useless. Therefore, this organization should travel along its lines and could travel along its lines and get along very nicely without a statue sitting up at the head of it as a general president.

Now, you hear again that the Western Federation of Miners might be influenced to come into this organization simply because we would re-establish the position of general president. It seems to me very funny that if the Western Federation of Miners is such a revolutionary set of men and their principles are industrial unionism, that it would take a general president to bring them into this organization.

(Applause.) Anybody who tries to tell me that, I do not believe him.

If a general president sat at the head of this organization and I was a revolutionary industrial worker, it wouldn't make any difference to me whether he sat there or not. The mere fact of him sitting there would not bring me into this organization if I did not think this was the proper organization.

Therefore, I do not see why we should cater to the Western Federation of Miners or to the United Mine Workers of the World {sic} or to anybody else. As long as their principles are not industrial unionism, the general president cannot make them industrial unionists.

Therefore, I wish to go on record as being utterly opposed to a president.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Fellow Worker Katz is recognized.

DEL. KATZ: Mr. Chairman and fellow workers: I take the stand that Delegate Trainor does. I was at a show the other night in Bush Temple. They call it "All-of-a-Sudden Peggy," and these things come all of a sudden, too much so.

When we were before the workers in Paterson and elsewhere, this question was brought before us. They said, "Why all this struggle in Chicago?" We told them frankly, enumerated everything to them. We said first that we reduced the dues. Is that anything wrong? No. We abolished the presidency; that was all right. And formerly all the locals in that city had a local president and now they have abolished the office of president and have a chairman.

Now, I recognize one thing, that there is nothing to that talk about a czar or a king as a president, because if you haven't a czar you have a president, and if you haven't a president you have a secretary. What is the difference? It is only a difference in name.

The main question is, What are we going to gain?—whether it is a wise strategical move on our part. I say it is not. Where we may gain in one part of the country we may lose in another. I doubt very much if we should gain anything through it even in the west.

There is Delegate Williams who has had a great deal of experience out west; he has traveled all through there, and I know in the east that all the progressive organizations have abolished the presidency. I believe that this matter will not gain any new converts for the Industrial Workers of the World.

There should be a man, however, I believe who should relieve the secretary-treasurer from looking after the organizers. There should be a general organizer whose duty it would be to supervise the work of

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

the organizers in the field and that can be done without establishing again the office of general president.

(Several delegates here endeavored to gain recognition from the chair.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Fellow Worker Levoy has the floor.

DEL. LEVOY: Fellow Worker Chairman and delegates: the whole question, the way I understand it, hinges on prestige and that means that according to some we should have a president.

My understanding of this prestige is different. You can call a man president or by whatever name you want to call him and that would not establish prestige in an organization like this. I was surprised at the minority who call themselves revolutionists, who have always been talking about Marx, that they should come out for a president at the present time. (Laughter.)

I know that the prestige we establish in every town where I see the working class is studying industrial unionism, is by the work we do in their behalf. They are like the man from Missouri, they will tell you "You have got to show us," and if you cannot show them you can have the president and secretary and everybody else and they won't listen to you. That is all there is to it.

In Paterson we did show them. We showed them in Paterson that they could raise their wages and they struck and they won their strike, and that was prestige for this organization, and that would be prestige for this organization in every other locality and town.

In Schenectady, no matter how the organization may run down, the prestige is there to this day even. When we went there and told them that we wanted 25 cents or 50 cents a day more, we got it. That was prestige enough. We showed them that we could get it where the American Federation of Labor could not get it and they came in in herds. Local after local, every month.

The president was there, I don't care whether it was Sherman or anybody else—he was there three times, and he held lectures in the hall and the hall was filled up, but who by? Ladies and old women who wanted to see the president. (Laughter.) They were the ones who came there for that purpose and not the working men. And, just as soon as the president left, we did not hear any more about the president, but when we went to the shop and when they saw what I have mentioned before, that the I.W.W. could raise their wages, the prestige was there. As I say, they came in in bunches, they came in in herds. The prestige is still there. None of them went back to the A.F.L. I don't say they were Marxes or revolutionists; they came there to better themselves

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

and they are there today, and I am willing to bet that inside of a year that prestige will still be with them.

We had to show them that the I.W.W. helped conditions and that was the only prestige and they know today just as soon as they go out of the I.W.W. their wages will be cut and nobody could enforce them. They are there because they want to get more wages. That prestige is there and by reason of that prestige they know that the I.W.W. is the correct organization, and the only organization to better their condition, and that is the only prestige that we should have in this organization. No president or any other man can give prestige to this organization. This organization must gain its prestige by the work which it does for the emancipation of the working class, and the man who thinks he can go in and gain prestige by telling a nice story and by being president, is not fit for this organization because he will get out just as soon as he sees he will not get any benefit out of it. Therefore I say that the only prestige we can have is the prestige we gain by showing what we can do.

DEL. LIESNER: I move to amend the motion, that we have a general organizer, who shall also be an assistant secretary.

(The motion was seconded by Del. Aiazzone.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: It has been regularly moved and seconded that we have a general organizer who is to act also in the capacity of assistant secretary. Am I right?

DEL. LIESNER: That is right.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Do you wish to discuss this motion or will it now be put to a vote?

(The question was called for.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: The delegate here has the floor. (Referring to Delegate Walters.)

DEL. WALTERS: Fellow-worker Chairman and Fellow-delegates: I think the constitution pretty well provides for this amendment. We have now a general secretary-treasurer, and an assistant, according to our constitution. Now if we turn this office over to the general secretary-treasurer's assistant, this office of organizer and assistant general secretary, it does not make any difference; it is merely mixing things up a little bit. If we have an assistant general secretary-treasurer, then that assistant can be sent out on the road whenever it is deemed necessary and there is a chance to let him go in the office. That is, when the work is not so hard there and there is not so much of it but what he may be absent. I think that ground is well covered in the constitution.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Now, I am utterly opposed to a president in this organization. I am opposed to setting up a tin god to bow down to and worship, under any consideration at all. Now, what I am going to say I know the delegates from the West do not like to hear, and I know in a great many instances it does not occur either, although it has in the past, but the fact is this: human nature is human nature and there is a whole lot in a name. A name gives prestige whether the office that is called by that name is a figurehead or not. The word prestige conveys an idea, it conveys the idea of the head of an organization. Now, you can put a man in to do the same work that this figurehead that we are talking about would do and call him assistant secretary or the organization, and it conveys altogether a different meaning; it does not convey the same meaning that the word president does. That must be taken into consideration, of course.

Now, we talk about this prestige and I want to take this from a different side from what the other speakers have taken it. As I said before, human nature is human nature, and you cannot get away from it. There are cases where this does not apply. I believe and know there are men in the world that you could not touch them under any consideration, but I also know and believe that there have been good men, the best of men who have been put in high positions and they were not there very long before they lost their heads. And why did they lose their heads? Simply because they had this thing you call prestige. They go out and they have prestige in organizations or certain sections of the country and the working class in that section of the country simply follow them like a lot of cattle. They have the prestige and they can manipulate those men in any way, shape or form they want to, no matter what kind of men you have at the head of the organization. They can build up a machine under that name. It has been proven in the past; it will be proven in the future.

Therefore, I hope this convention will not set up a tin god for any man to worship whether he be from the west or the east, from the north or the south. I am opposed to this proposition in all its inceptions.

DEL. SPEED: Point of information. I would like to ask the last speaker in regard to that, as far as the machine being built up, whether that cannot be done under the secretary-treasurer or anybody else?

DEL. WALTERS: Certainly.

DEL. SPEED: Then what is the difference?

DEL. WILLIAMS: An amendment, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: I recognize Delegate Williams.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I would like to make an amendment that we leave

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

the constitution as it is.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: There is already one amendment. Is this amendment an amendment to the amendment?

DEL. WILLIAMS: It is.

(The amendment to the amendment was seconded.)

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to a point of order.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: You may state your point of order.

DEL. DE LEON: My point of order is that no motion can be entertained as an amendment which is superfluous in case the motions before the house are defeated. Supposing the amendment is defeated and the motion is defeated, why then that amendment to the amendment becomes utterly superfluous. An amendment must amend something; it must be something new.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I will withdraw that amendment under those circumstances.

DEL. DE LEON: If that is accepted, I rise to make an amendment to the amendment.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Very well.

DEL. DE LEON: I move you that the constitution be amended to the extent that this convention create the office of a general organizer with headquarters in Chicago, who shall be a member of the G.E.B. and who shall receive a fixed salary of \$125 a month, with no more than three dollars a day for expenses when actually on the road.

If that amendment to the amendment is seconded, I would like to speak of it.

(The amendment to the amendment was seconded.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: It has been regularly amended {sic} and seconded that the office of general organizer be established with a certain rate of wages and expense attached to said office, with headquarters at Chicago. Does that contain the sense of your amendment?

DEL. DE LEON: I will read it again.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Will you kindly read it again, Fellow Worker De Leon?

(Del. De Leon again read his amendment.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: I take it that the body will accept the reading of that as a statement by the chair. Now you all understand it and it is properly before the house.

DEL. DE LEON: I stated that if my motion was seconded I would like to have the floor.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: It has been seconded.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. DE LEON: Have I the floor?

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: You have the floor.

DEL. DE LEON: Now, Mr. Chairman, if I understand the amendment correctly it proposes indirectly to abolish the office of the assistant secretary. My amendment to the amendment does not do that. I consider defective a move which should bring about what the amendment would perform.

The office of the secretary is a very important one in more duties than our man can attend to, and the assistant secretary would be a necessity in that office. To compel the national or general organizer to also attend to the duties of the assistant secretary would disable him from attending to the duties of either office. The assistant secretary should be the one by all means who shall always be in town, exceptional cases excepted.

On the other hand, the creation by this convention of the special office of general headquarters, with headquarters in Chicago, would have in my mind this advantage: It is absolutely true what so many have said pro, as well as against the proposition to create a presidency; but what we are really up against, if I can use that term,—I do not mean that we are confronted with a dilemma, is this: the issue that we have really been debating is this, power must reside somewhere. It is a compulsory thing upon us. It is an inevitable result of co-operative labor. He who says co-operative labor, says organization; he who says organization, must say headship, whether he wants to or not. Friend Caminita is a president or Pope, or any title he may choose to give himself, as editor of his paper.

DEL. CAMINITA: No, sir.

DEL. DE LEON: I know you are because I am an editor myself of a very democratically organized paper. You cannot make me believe that you accept all correspondence that comes to your hands; I know too much about that. You are the head of that fountain and the danger always lies in this: that since that headship somewhere is a necessity, demagogues play upon the sentiments of the czar, pope and the like, and then become the real tyrants behind the mask of democracy. A general organizer implies a headship in the matter of the organizing work. The G.E.B. does not meet with sufficient regularity or frequency and the work of organizing under present circumstances must be systematized.

System requires that someone should have his hand at the rudder. The work of organizing has not been conducted in that systematic manner it should be. Now Caminita and others say, and I agree with

them, that the I.W.W. has grown. But Caminita will not imagine that without his meaning to he has been uttering a remark that the capitalists use when they try to oppose us; that is to say, look how magnificently this country has grown, and imply that it has grown because of the tyrannical conduct of the capitalist class. Now, this country has grown despite of capital; it has not grown because of capital. We have grown not because of the method in which our organizing was conducted; we have grown despite that. Some children grow although their parents have a habit of giving them a whaling every day. They do not grow on account of the whaling; they grow despite the whaling, because growth is in them, and they develop.

Now, I desire to see some system in this matter of organizing. The national secretary cannot do it because he has other things to attend to and if we have not got a general organizer and an office created for that function, you may beat around the bush as you may like, but that function will have to be organized by some one and it has been here sufficiently indicated that in point of fact we have had a president.

Of course the idea is absurd, to say that if you have a president he must be a Sherman. We can limit his powers. However, that is outside of my amendment.

The national secretary by so much as he may have and has had to keep an eye on the work of organizing, has been drawn away from the work of his office. The G.E.B. cannot meet with that regularity required, and a body of that nature cannot conduct a systematic work of this character.

Now, then, I hold that with regard to these headships, what I held in the first convention, what I held in the last convention, and what I have I think sufficiently expressed now: That in the moment of action the common sense of people will lead them to take a chief, a head man, a commander. Give them any name you like, chairman, president, general, or marshal, without that man men cannot move as one. For that reason I strove in the first convention to limit as much as possible the number of members on the Executive Board. I succeeded in that much.

The question that confronted us last year was another question. With regard to the office of president and of headships generally, I will say this, that I would not go across the street to abolish a president, if there is one, nor would I go across the street to establish one if there is {not} one, except at moments where action is needed. Action is needed now. We are confronted with a state of things by which the organization must be limited because it cannot conduct its business in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

its dislocated shape. The organizers appointed by the G.E.B. acting very much upon their own responsibilities, their actions not centralized, with the present lay of the land this is harmful. The present lay of the land does not demand a person with prestige necessarily, although if that could be obtained, it would do us no harm. The present lay of the land demands that the fighting element of the I.W.W. be mobilized, and in order to mobilize it we must have a chief of the organizing department.

I am not catering to the Western Federation of Miners or anybody else; just the reverse. Because I am not catering to anybody but because I believe that war is necessary, therefore am I doing just the opposite of catering, and I hold that the creation by this convention of a general organizer is demanded by the situation that confronts us.

We are surrounded by men who are intriguing. We are surrounded by pure and simple politicians. We are surrounded by pure and simple craft unionists, and we are surrounded by the hostility of the capitalist class that promotes the one and the other. At this critical moment where our growth can be gradually hurried up at the expense of those people whom some imagine some are trying to propitiate or to cater to, at this moment we want a person who is clothed with the dignity of the power of a special appointment by this convention; a person who can be chief of its organizers; who can systematize the work and carry the war into Africa where it belongs, and there are several Africas in America ready to have their Carthage destroyed.

DEL. AIAZZONE: May I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Yes.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I would like to ask Fellow Worker De Leon if we should have a general secretary-treasurer and an assistant secretary-treasurer and a general organizer? Would your amendment imply that?

DEL. DE LEON: No, my amendment implies that the office of the general secretary-treasurer remains, that the office of the assistant secretary-treasurer remains, that the number of general executive board members remain, but that one of them be clothed with the function of a general organizer.

DEL. FRANCIS: I make a motion that this whole proposition be tabled.

(Motion seconded.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: The proper way is to dispose of the motions before the house by making a disposition of all of them. Is this motion debatable?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. DE LEON: No.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Anything this body does not want it is at perfect liberty to vote down. The motion has been made and seconded that this be placed on the table.

(The motion was defeated.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: I recognize Fellow Worker Jones.

DEL. JONES: In this motion of Del. {sic} De Leon's, there is one clause that I am not in favor of. By a previous action of this convention we limited the powers of the secretary-treasurer by giving him a voice and no vote on the executive board. Here the secretary-treasurer is working under the executive board, and this organizer if he is appointed will be working under that board, and I consider that if he has the power to ratify his own actions, that would be wrong according to the rule that we have laid down previously on this other matter.

I would therefore move that we amend this in that instead of making him a member, to give him a voice but no vote, in all matters that concern the ratification of his work.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: The total number of amendments have been exhausted unless this body desires to grant a further amendment. Fellow Worker Speed has the floor.

DEL. SPEED: Fellow Worker Chairman: I feel that I would have been compelled to vote against the office of president as it was first introduced. I know the sentiment of that section of California which I come from, and we have abolished presidencies there within all our locals. That is sufficient for me to indicate that they do not desire a presidency over this organization generally.

Therefore, I would have to vote against that, but I am more in accord with the amendment introduced by Delegate De Leon, because I do also realize the necessity of having a knowledge of what is going on in the various localities of the country. I know that men are chased without this knowledge from place to place and when they get there they find absolutely nothing there.

It was only a short time ago that I myself was directed to go into a section of the country, and had I acted upon the impulse on the instruction, I would have gone there and after getting there would have found nothing to act upon and that would have been an expense without any result. Now, if you can frame up a proposition that will give us a knowledge of these things, I hold that it will save the organization the difference in the cost of administration. These wild goose chases that we have been in the habit of running up against without any results from them have added a great amount of expense

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

to this organization, and that is one of the reasons why I think we ought to have some official who is in touch with every section of the country and can get the true pulse of that section.

At the present time the general office relies upon the men who are in the various localities and who are simply enthusiasts sometimes who, when they see two or three men going on a strike think that a revolution is at hand, and they want some man to come there and accomplish a revolution. I have had a half dozen ask me to go to various places and I know that those who went there, when they got there, found nothing.

Now, this ought to be guarded against. This is one of the sources of expense to the organization which brings in no results, and looking at it from that viewpoint, I think if we had a general supervisor over these things, who can keep in touch with the organizers in the various localities of the country, that that would aid us largely and cut down the expenses in that manner sufficient probably to pay the expense of this new office. Looking at it in that light I am in favor of the amendment.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: I move the previous question.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Fellow Worker Liesner has the floor.

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Worker Chairman and delegates: My reasons for making the original amendment were to avoid the very faults that Fellow Worker Speed has just mentioned. My idea of the general organizer is this: That he should remain in the office as much as possible so that the whole country can be in touch with him and only leave the office on special emergency cases, and while he is in the office, he shall act as assistant secretary, and thereby avoid the extra expense, which I understand is at least \$125 a month. By acting as assistant secretary and remaining in the office, he takes the burden off the secretary-treasurer, who should at all times remain in the office in order to properly attend to his duties, thereby I think facilitating the work on both sides.

That is my reason for making the amendment. That is my reason also for insisting upon supporting the original amendment.

DEL. KERN: Mr. Chairman, if you will give this movement of last year a little consideration, the delegates will see that just what they are doing now is what they did last year, allow the general executive board to place the secretary-treasurer in charge of sending out organizers with the exception that they are going to pay this man at this time for doing the work, where they didn't pay the secretary-treasurer for doing it. In other words, they simply recognize the hardship and hard

work that our secretary-treasurer was doing, and they want to take some of it off his back. That is the way I look at it.

If they were to study it in that manner, they would see it in that way, and if they just had an opportunity to sit down in that office there for three months, as I did, and see the hardships and everything the secretary-treasurer had to put up with, they would be anxious to get another organizer to take care of that part of the work.

DEL. KATZ: Mr. Chairman and fellow workers: I spoke on the motion, not on the amendment. There were various delegates spoke on the motion and amendment.

I want to say this relative to the organizer: I believe that is a good proposition for this reason. I want to bring some concrete cases before this convention to prove that it is absolutely necessary to do something in that respect.

Take the silk working industry which is concentrated around New York, Paterson and a certain part of Pennsylvania. We made a request upon the general secretary-treasurer shortly after the last convention, when I came to Paterson, to send an organizer as soon as he was able into the district of silk workers in Pennsylvania, which is not very far from the anthracite coal region, so that he could cover both at the same time.

Now we cannot expect with the pile of work that the secretary had to do that he could attend to that; in the first place he did not have the organizer or the funds to pay him, but I am sure that if there would be a man there who would understand and make a special study of these conditions, that he would have had our request granted and today it would not have been possible for the American Federation of Labor to accomplish what they did accomplish in that part of the state.

Ten thousand children went out on strike in Scranton and in the vicinity of Scranton. The Paterson Local sent me there. I could do absolutely nothing because I came there late. I saw these children driven by the class conscious instinct out of the mills to go out on strike and strike for the eight-hour day, and they were practically driven back by the fakers of the American Federation of Labor assisted by the coal miners' fakers in that part of the country, and they were forced to sign a contract there that would be a check off system and that out of the small wages—mind you \$2 some of the girls make a week—they are going to deduct all dues, assessments and fines that those fakers are going to impose upon those girls—children, practically.

Now, Mr. Chairman and fellow worker delegates, I hold that if we

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

had a man in the office who would relieve the secretary-treasurer of all this work, he would look out for this work especially and it would be his business to do this and nothing else, that such things would not occur because he would have been aware of the condition there. There are three industries in that part of the country which were left alone and that is the cigar making, the silk working and the coal mining industries; all concentrated in or around Scranton, and all due to the fact that the organizers were elsewhere and did not accomplish much, I am sure.

I know that French was in Skowhegan, away up in Maine, in a little town where a hundred silk workers were on strike, where thousands of silk workers were left without an organizer. I do not blame the secretary for it; he did the best he could, because you have piled up all the work upon one man. But, let us not do it in the future, but let us have a competent man whom we can elect upon the floor of this convention and who will take the work in hand, and to whom the organizers will have to report not only once a month or whenever they feel like it, but every week, and they have to do it or be called off the road.

DEL. WALTERS: I would like to have some information from Delegate De Leon through the Chair. In this clause as I understand it, it places the organizer on the executive board with a vote.

DEL. DE LEON: As a member of the G.E.B.

DEL. WALTERS: With a vote?

DEL. DE LEON: Oh, yes; clothed with a vote.

DEL. WALTERS: I would ask if Fellow Worker De Leon would be willing to strike that portion out of his amendment, and have it with voice and no vote?

DEL. DE LEON: No.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard and I agree with it, that when the men of a committee are not all equal they cannot function properly. We have a man here as organizer and as a member of the executive board going around the country and carrying on the organization work of the organization. This man is incurring expenses; this man is directing work. Now, this man comes back into Chicago and sits on the executive board and passes on his own work. Now that I am opposed to.

I see the necessity of this motion; I see the necessity of an organizer and a directing force, and I am for that, but I cannot vote for this amendment unless this clause is stricken out.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. DE LEON: I would like to ask the delegate a question through the Chair.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Delegate De Leon desires to ask you a question.

DEL. DE LEON: Of the delegate through the Chair. Is it true or is it not true that members of the G.E.B. now go about as organizers and then come back to Chicago and vote as the delegate says, upon their own action? Is that so or not?

DEL. WALTERS: It has been but should not be.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: This delegate has the floor. (Indicating Delegate Hagenson.)

DEL. HAGENSON: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Delegates: I certainly am opposed to this amendment as it now stands. I am opposed to it for this reason: that as I opposed the president, this is one and the same thing as another president only with another name. It elects a man that has charge and direction of the organizing work, and at the same time sets {sic} him on the executive board with a voice there and a vote equal to any other member of that board. I am opposed to that.

However, I realize the necessity of finding some way of aiding in directing the organization work, and I believe the original motion was that the assistant secretary-treasurer would have that work in charge. I myself believe this: that the general secretary-treasurer, the assistant secretary-treasurer, and the editor are all the officers that we need to elect on that line of regularly paid officers; and I am also willing to see that one of these two secretaries be put in charge of the organizing work or the organizers. But, I am opposed to putting either on of those on the executive board, and if you have a general organizer, I am certainly opposed to putting him on the executive board.

DEL. LIESNER: I move the previous question.

(The motion was not seconded.)

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: Delegate Delaney has the floor.

DEL. DELANEY: It seems to me that this thing is not thoroughly understood. To my idea Fellow Worker De Leon's amendment is that these three officers, the general secretary-treasurer, assistant secretary-treasurer, and the general organizer will be a local executive board with power to act in cases of emergency only; and so their voting on their own propositions, I think the men doing the work are the ones best fitted to have supervision of it and to act, if they have a general executive board to oversee their acts. Then I say it is well and good. There are five members not accounted for there, and this idea of not

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

being able to trust three is ridiculous. If we cannot trust three we cannot trust a dozen. It is a matter of keeping an executive board here in Chicago which can act in case of emergency and I hope that amendment will prevail.

CHAIRMAN HAGGERTY: The secretary desires to make a statement to the convention.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: It is rather in the shape of a few remarks on the whole proposition. No matter whether you have one, two, three, four or five secretaries in the office, neither of them will be able to supervise the work of the organizers, and I will simply cite some instances to show you that in case of emergencies we had to call upon one or the other organizers to send them into the field in order to supervise strikes or to supervise the work of other organizers.

I will take as an illustration, in answer to the remarks made by Fellow Worker Katz, that it was the intention of the general executive board to send an organizer into that district. We sent an organizer to Patten, Pennsylvania; we sent him among the coal miners with instructions as soon as he would be ready there, to proceed further {sic} and start the organizing work among the silk workers. This report sent to general headquarters from that organizer led us to believe that the greatest kind of work was being done; that more than 5,000 coal miners in that vicinity were ready to fall in line. That a general convention of coal miners, according to his description, was already called, and in order to complete the work of organization, he wanted another assistant. He sent for the general secretary-treasurer.

Now, for my part, it was simply impossible to leave the office, and the local executive board, acting upon the information from that one organizer and in response to it, had to recall an organizer from the coal fields of Illinois who was doing the best kind of work in the vicinity of LaSalle, organizing practically every week a new coal miners' union, and send to Patten, Pennsylvania, to find out whether this organizer was really reporting the truth. And what did he find out? He only had to report. He couldn't act even at that time. He had no power to act or to remove the organizer. He had to return to Chicago and report to the local executive board that that organizer, and I will mention his name, Mr. Markley, was simply seeing visions and ghosts.

There was no convention. There was no organizing work done; there were no preparations made; there was no chance of getting the coal miners organized; no chance of ever getting the silk workers organized, but it was necessary that the general executive board send another organizer to supervise the work of the other organizer, and

then this other organizer had to come back to Chicago and report the false notions and the false reports of that first organizer.

If we had had a man to supervise the work with the power to recall that one organizer, it would not have been necessary to have had that other organizer return again to Chicago or to send him back to the east later on after we had money enough to follow the work that necessarily had to be done in other localities.

I believe Organizer Thompson is here and he can bear me out in that statement. The expense of the general organizer for this experimental trip of Markley was approximately \$850.

We take another instance. These are experiments that neither the general executive board or the local executive board with the best of endeavors and intentions were aware of. They had to take the report of an organizer and they took it in good faith and found that they were simply swindled. We take the case of all our strikes. Here comes a telegram to general headquarters from Portland, saying, "We must have organizers. We have a strike of 3,000 mill men." A fellow by the name of Yarrow, or whatever his name is, simply spreads the news that the general office of the I.W.W. has hundreds of thousands of dollars in its treasury and is ready to pay strike benefits regularly to the men who are called out on strike, and so we had to send dispatches to Heslewood to proceed immediately to Portland and take charge of the strike.

In this case one man was assigned with the duty of getting as many as possible into the field in Portland to take the best advantage of that strike situation. We entrusted one man there with the supervisions of the strike and he called the best and most available men into that district. Fellow Worker Williams went there. Ettor was called there from San Francisco, and other organizers, but there was one who was supposed to be the general organizer to supervise the work at the strike.

The same experiment happened in Bridgeport. They had about 1,500 men on strike. French is on the ground. He wires for the right to have supervision over that strike. Certainly we could not deny him that right because he had the best knowledge of affairs. We had to give him that right. We had to give him the power to send for more organizers and he used that power in order to supervise the strike, in order to conduct the strike on the best lines possible under the circumstances. The experiment was also very expensive as you will see by the records.

I do not accuse anybody; I do not claim any money was wasted in that strike, but just as well as French in that locality, and just as well as

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Heslewood in his locality, it could have been done from the general office by a general organizer who could have been dispatched to the scene of trouble and the whole work could have been supervised by one man, who would have had the right and who would have had the power to remove any objectionable organizer.

If Fellow Worker Heslewood in Portland had had the right to remove any objectionable man during that strike, I am satisfied that two or three of those skylarkers in that fight would have been removed immediately.

Now, I hold in such cases of emergency it is absolutely necessary for one organizer to be dispatched to the scene of trouble to supervise that work. No matter what you may call him, no matter what powers you may give him, in these times there is a necessity for such an office and for such a position and we do not need to go to the experiment as we did last year, an experiment that cost the general organizer {organization?} approximately, if I had the time to bring you the figures, over \$2,500.

Now, this is the only argument I have to make. I believe that the office of general organizer could be created. I believe that he should have supervision over the work of the national organizers, and if his work and functions shall not be satisfactory to the general executive board, he can be removed, just as well as the secretary-treasurer. I voted for removal of the power to vote. I believe that if he be a general organizer vested with the right to remove another organizer, that he should submit his actions and his work to the general executive board as a supreme body over his work, while the convention is not in session.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would like to ask a question of the general secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. FRANCIS: I would ask this question of Secretary Trautmann: Would you need then an assistant secretary, if this work of organizing was removed out of your hands?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That all depends on the growth of the organization.

DEL. FRANCIS: But I mean, starting now with the fiscal year, as it comes, would you insist on having one, or in other words, would you have to pay \$375 a month? Would you have money to pay that? That is my question.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Not at the present time, but in two or three months I believe we would.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. FISCHER: Fellow Worker Chairman, and Delegates: last week we decided that the officers of the organization should not have a vote on the general executive board, and now we want to create another office and give that officer a vote on the general executive board. I believe we would do wrong. You would do wrong to these other officers, and he will certainly do wrong, with himself, for the following reasons: We took the vote away from the other secretaries, for the reason that they should not vote upon their own work. Now, if that general organizer has a vote on the G.E.B., he certainly will have the right to vote on his own proposition, and this will work wrong.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. FISCHER: I am for the establishment of the office of a general organizer, but I certainly cannot vote for the proposition, as long as he has a vote on the G.E.B.

DEL. YATES: If I understand the motion aright, it means that we shall still have the general secretary-treasurer, and the assistant general secretary-treasurer, and the general organizer. Is that what it is?

DEL. DE LEON: The one on the G.E.B. is the general organizer.

DEL. FRANCIS: Three paid officers.

DEL. YATES: That we shall have three men, with \$125 a month?

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes.

DEL. YATES: Is that the way I understand the amendment?

DEL. DE LEON: I do not know about the three—

DEL. YATES: Well, in a matter of response, of transferring a general organizer from one place to another, it seems to me that what Secretary Trautmann has brought out will not be abolished; that if this general organizer is on the Pacific Coast, superintending operations there, and disaffection breaks out in Massachusetts or New England, and his services are immediately required there, I consider that it will be a big jump, and I consider that on the expense account nothing will be saved. Now, I believe that one of the organizers in the report specifically stated or outlined a plan of campaign whereby organization work could be carried on and centralized in what we may call districts. I believe that that is a better proposition than having a general organizer, to flit from one end of the country to the other, all around the country. I believe, myself, that that is a better proposition than this, and I think it ought to be considered.

DEL. CAMINITA: I am sorry that I must speak again. As I am opposed to the motion, as I am opposed to the amendment, I am opposed to the amendment to the amendment, and I will tell you why.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

The general organizer, I think, is like the president. You change his name, but you do not change his character. In fact he has power over the organizers. Why? What can he do? Can he control the organizers? I guess not. If the organizer is honest he can do his work just the same, without any chief. If the organizer is dishonest he can fool the chief, as well as I fool the capitalist law every day. Then I am against the chief, because I think that the past teaches me that the chief is dangerous, in every society, and because the past teaches me that we can make progress just the same without any chief.

But Delegate De Leon said, "I do not want any chief, and I am chief myself, in my paper." Oh, I do not say that, because if I go among my men and I tell them that I am chief, they would kick me out of doors. All the power that I have is to write every day, and when I do not feel like writing, I must write, because I get my wage every week, and the only power in my paper—I say mine, but I must say in our paper—is just that I must correct all the articles that the comrades send to me.

I do not know, Delegate De Leon, if you are chief or not in the political party to which you belong, but I can tell you, sure, that I am not chief in my party. I am just one of them. That is all.

And I do not think that the general secretary is a chief. I think that the general secretary is just like a telephone. Do you think that the telephone is chief? When I need to speak to a person who lives in New York, I go to a telephone; I pay, and I telephone to that person. But when I need to write to San Francisco, or to know something about what is going on in San Francisco I write to the general secretary and he gives me the answer. That is the secretary. For me the secretary is a telephone, and not a chief.

But Delegate De Leon said that we need the secretary, then we need the general organizer. I want to ask you why we need today the general organizer. What can that general organizer do? He cannot divide himself into several parts, and go in every state, to see and to control the work of all the organizers. Then he can stay here, or he can go some other place. He is just one, just a person, and he can do the work of a person. That is all.

Somebody, I do not remember who said it, but somebody said that the children need a person to control them. I know my children need their mother, and my children need my counsel. But do you think that I am a child? Are you children? I do not think so. I see that you are men, and you can control yourselves. Then when you say children need control, we must not say that men need control, too.

I know that the capitalist system needs chiefs today, but we do not

want to exploit anybody. So we do not need any chief. The capitalist people today need the general, need the army, because the army is exploited.

I want to ask Fellow Worker Katz, do you need any general organizer? Do you need any chief? I see that you every day do a good work. I see that you work from the morning at seven o'clock until midnight.

DEL. KATZ: You are mistaken. I do not.

DEL. CAMINITA: How?

DEL. KATZ: I do not do any such thing.

DEL. CAMINITA: But you do not need any general organizer. You do not need any chief, and I think if you do not need any chief, no organizers need any chief. If they are honest they will do their work. If they are not honest, if they are dishonest, they will fool the chief.

But, if you give us the general organizer, which is wanted, you would have to spend \$125 per month. And I think that you can save this money in your pocket. You can save this money, and do not need to create another officer that costs you money. You remember that you must work hard to make your \$125 per month. You must work from the morning until the night. And if you spend so much money for nothing, I think it is foolish. I think that the general organizer should not be created. Thank you.

DEL. FRANCIS: I put a question to the general secretary previously, but it seems to me that he doesn't want to tread on any one's corns.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Are you afraid?

DEL. FRANCIS: It seems to me that we are beating around the bush. I will go on record right now that we cannot afford to have three paid officers in the general office, at \$125 a month. And I speak for a local which you will find, if you go to the financial record, is the fifth on the list in the amount contributed, and also for a local which, even when we had a strike, knowing the condition of the headquarters—I for one always advocating a general committee, always going around amongst the rest of the workers, and always trying to smooth things over, the workers always carried away with the idea that we must use money—and I think the secretary will bear me out, that we never ask any direct support, because we know the condition we are in.

And therefore I dislike this kind of an arrangement because I know we cannot pay this \$375 a month, for fellows sitting around the office, no matter how much work they do.

Now, I hold this, that when we just stick to the constitution as we have it, and have an assistant secretary—how many miles do you live

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

from Chicago, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: About seventeen hundred miles.

DEL. FRANCIS: And if you just have him within seventeen minutes of 310 Bush Temple, if you can get that in working operation, we do not need any general organizer. This assistant secretary and this general secretary will attend to that. If one of them is needed to go to a certain locality, if Trautmann is needed to go to a certain locality where German is spoken, it will be a mighty good thing to send Trautmann there. And if we need anybody else to go to an American locality, we know what we want, and we will elect such a man, and he will go there. I cannot understand, for the life of me, why we should always discuss something that we cannot put into effect. And, again, this general organizer, to put him on the general executive board, and give him a vote, yes, I guess not. I guess not. (Laughter.)

Now, if the general secretary and the assistant secretary should have no vote on the general executive board, why should the other one have a vote, then?

But on the whole, this is simply so much wasted time. And I also want to state that, as close as I can figure, this convention costs us about \$30 an hour. So just so many hours as you waste, so many dollars you waste. And so I hope that you will stick to the constitution and not wish to make this arrangement. I never attended such a convention, a convention where such wildcat propositions were entertained, such wild kinds of propositions, as in this kind of procedure; and I also want to object to these so-called debaters who will start a debating club, on the merits of having or not having a president, and come here and spend their time debating on it. I thank you.

DEL. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that in so far as I took my position against the motion, that I am likewise in opposition to the amendment.

To my mind this question is nothing else but a compromise, a compromise. It is not a question of putting an organizer on the executive board to supervise organizing work, but it is just to put an organizer upon the board with the functions of a president. (Applause.) That is the long and short of it.

A DELEGATE: That is correct.

DEL. THOMAS: And I, for one, assuming, of course, that you have three upon the board, that is, the general secretary-treasurer, and assistant, and likewise the general organizer, assuming that they have their vote upon this—

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

A DELEGATE: They do not.

DEL. THOMAS: Never mind. Assuming, I say, that they have their vote. And the general organizer, in his functions of designing and outlining the plan of an organization, would come into a position where, with only three upon the board, and him given a vote, and likewise the others, he would particularly cast his approval upon his own actions, and in so far as that is concerned then I say that I shall vote against the amendment.

I do not approve of the matter at all, for this reason, and there have been instances on both sides of the house today, on this amendment,—that you cannot facilitate the organizing work better than has been done; if your general organizer is in San Francisco, and a communication from Maine comes, where is he, in order to facilitate the question of organization in reference to, as Katz says, Scranton, Pennsylvania.

I cannot for the life of me see that this proposition would work to our advantage. I think it would militate against us. Therefore I am against the motion, or against the amendment. (Applause.)

(Question was called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I desire to ask the convention if they have discussed this question as much as they wish to discuss it. Now, you ask for the question, you have a motion, you have an amendment to the motion, and you also have an amendment to the amendment. If you are now ready the secretary will proceed and you can vote intelligently upon the question.

DEL. WALTERS: I call for a roll call vote upon this proposition.

(Several delegates asked for a statement of the question.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. You will all hear it. Who among you desire a roll call vote? Raise your hands.

(A number of delegates raised their hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have the roll call. Give strict attention to the secretary and the secretary will read.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Let us have the amendment to the amendment.

A DELEGATE: Can we also be recorded as voting against this, if we lose out on this?

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read all the questions before the house and make it perfectly clear, so that every delegate may intelligently vote.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Fellow Worker Chairman, will the mover of the amendment to the amendment kindly state the amendment again, as the stenographers have just changed and we haven't the record in

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

our possession.¹⁸

DEL. DE LEON: The motion is that the constitution be amended only to the extent of creating the office of general organizer, with headquarters in Chicago, who shall be a member of the G.E.B., and who shall receive a fixed salary of \$125 a month, with no more than \$3 a day for expenses when actually on the road.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, fellow delegates, that is to establish an office known as general organizer, to be located in the city of Chicago, to have charge of the organizers, to receive \$125 per month and \$3 a day for expenses when traveling, with car fare, and is also a member of the general executive board. Now, there is the question before you. Those who desire to establish that office will vote yes. Those who are opposed to it will vote no. The secretary will call the roll.

(The roll was called; afterwards Secretary Trautmann announced the result of the vote as follows: Total number of votes cast, 116; voting yes, 40; voting no, 76.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment to the amendment is defeated. The question now comes up of the amendment to the motion. Will the secretary please read it.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Will the mover of the amendment please state his amendment?

DEL. LIESNER: The amendment is that we establish the general organizer, who is to remain in Chicago, in the office, the general office, and perform the office of assistant secretary, as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question comes up on the amendment to the motion, the purpose and intent of which is that the general secretary-treasurer be a general organizer.

DEL. LIESNER: Not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: You combine the office, do you?

DEL. LIESNER: Establish the office of general organizer, who shall perform the office of assistant secretary as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment to the motion. Are you ready for the question?

(Question called for.)

DEL. DELANEY: Roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have a roll call, of course. Those of you who are in favor of the amendment to the motion will vote yes. Those of you who are opposed will vote no. The secretary will call the roll.

DEL. HAGENSON: Can I have a point of information, before I vote?

¹⁸ [This may help to explain certain inconsistencies in the original text.—R.B.]

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: You may.

DEL. HAGENSON: The point is, will this assistant secretary have a seat on the executive board, or not?

SEVERAL DELEGATES: No.

DEL. HAGENSON: He will not have it, if he is elected?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Nor a vote? That is all right.

DEL. HAGENSON: Nor a vote. That is all right.

(A roll call was taken, after which Sec. Trautmann announced the result as follows: Total number of votes cast, 113; voting yes, 78; voting no, 45.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried. The original question will now be read.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The mover of the original motion, who is he? Heslewood? Well, that is lost.

DEL. WALTERS: This kills the original motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The affirmative of one is the negative of the other?

DEL. WALTERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is so recorded. What is your next order of business, gentlemen?

DEL. AIAZZONE: The auditing committee is ready to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The auditing committee may now report.

(Chairman Katz here resumed the chair.)¹⁹

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee on Constitution through with its report?

DEL. DE LEON: No.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Do I understand that that motion that was carried disposed of the rest of the proposition of Del. Heslewood?

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. HESELWOOD: Yes, that is all I wanted.

DEL. WILLIAMS: We have here the amendment that was deferred for action the other day until the report of the organization committee was handed in or acted upon.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order. The secretary, when we got the report of the committee on constitution, read three resolutions. We have acted on but one.

DEL. WILLIAMS: That is what I asked about.

DEL. DE LEON: No, you asked about Heslewood. That is disposed of. But there was one from Delaney, of a local executive board, and one

¹⁹ [Text provides no indication of when Katz passed the gavel.—R.B.]

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

from somebody else.

DEL. WILLIAMS: This one from Delaney refers to the creating of a local executive board. The way it reads here is that the general president, which we have not decided upon of course, and the general secretary-treasurer, and the editor shall constitute the local executive board which shall have full executive power in emergency cases. Now, you will have to change this, according to the amendment, I suppose, to read that the general secretary-treasurer and the organizer and the editor shall constitute a local executive board which shall have full executive power in emergency cases, and they shall be subject both as officials and as an executive board to the G.E.B. and where no emergency exists their executive acts must be approved by the G.E.B. before being enforced.

A DELEGATE: What is the recommendation?

DEL. FRANCIS: A motion, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your motion?

DEL. FRANCIS: I move that this resolution be tabled.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion will say aye, to table the resolution. Opposed, no.

(A vote being taken the motion was lost.)

DEL. HAGENSON: Now, I would like to make a motion, that this resolution be adopted, with the corrections that the Secretary stated.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded that this motion be adopted with the corrections as stated by the secretary.

DEL. AIAZZONE: When we voted to elect the editor of the *Industrial Union Bulletin*, I rose to ask the question whether he would be made a general officer, and I was told he would not be; and now we make him a general officer; and I am against it.

DEL. FRENCH: Only in emergency.

THE CHAIRMAN: In emergency cases.

DEL. FRANCIS: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman of the committee has the floor, to explain this.

DEL. FRANCIS: A point of order is always in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: A point of order?

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is it?

DE. FRANCIS: My point of order is that we have passed upon it, that the local executive board was abolished, and therefore that

motion is out of order, that motion has been carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say that the motion passed here was to abolish the advisory board. This is to establish a local executive board.

DEL. FRANCIS: What is the difference?

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not well taken; that I my decision. You will have to appeal from my decision.

(Question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Williams has the floor.

DEL. WILLIAMS: If I understand the purpose of this proposed amendment, it is largely to supervise, through a committee, the work of the general secretary-treasurer and his assistant, who is to be the organizer; and the proposition is to admit, as a third member of this committee, the editor of the *Bulletin*. Now, I do not approve of it. It is another way of trying to get around the—

DEL. AIAZZONE: —bush.

DEL. WILLIAMS:—proposition which we settled by abolishing the local executive board.

DEL. HAGENSON: The local advisory board?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Local advisory board; and I hold that we do not need this local executive board for emergency cases, or to audit the accounts of the secretaries, or anything of that sort. These secretaries act in emergencies, and as you know they refer that action afterwards for approval or disapproval. Let them act. Let them present a digested form of their actions to the general executive board, including their financial accounts, to be referred, or rather to be brought back and published in the *Bulletin*, according to the principle of publicity that we have adopted.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is correct.

DEL. WILLIAMS: No more than that is necessary, but as for introducing the editor of the *Bulletin* onto an executive board with a general secretary and his assistant, it seems to me that we are performing a pretty queer act to say the least. I do not think that he belongs there is the administrative affairs of the organization. In the first place he has his hand full in his position of editor, and he cannot assume the functions of directing the affairs of the organization. It is a dangerous position to put an editor in, in the first place, and I am opposed to that proposition. We do not need that executive board. The general executive board can control the affairs of the secretaries themselves, in the way that I described, and therefore our action of the other day, of abolishing the local advisory board, should stand, without any further amendment to the constitution.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

(Previous question called for.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. SPETTEL: What is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is the adoption of this. Hagenson made the motion. Didn't you?

DEL. HAGENSON: I made the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: And his motion is to adopt, with the corrections as made by the secretary. All in favor of the motion, that is, that these officers should act as a local executive board, will say aye; opposed, no.

(The vote being taken, the motion was lost.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: Here is the third proposition in the form of a resolution, that whereas there is not any department in existence, we recommend that the general executive board for the coming year shall consist of a president and three additional members, elected at large by this convention from various parts of the country, besides the general secretary-treasurer, the latter to have a voice, but no vote in the deliberations of the G.E.B.

DEL. FRENCH: That is out of order.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I would like to ask you a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is it?

DEL. HESELWOOD: I move that we strike out the word "President" and substitute in its place this other grand high officer,— "Organizer."

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the motion? Please read that again, so that we know where to insert that.

DEL. WILLIAMS: "Whereas there is not any department in existence, we recommend that the general executive board for the coming year shall consist of a president and five additional members, elected at large by this convention from various parts of the country, besides the general secretary-treasurer, the latter to have a voice but no vote in the deliberations of the G.E.B." Understand that the committee does not recommend this, but it was the proposition of the man who made it, and this was to be brought before the convention to act upon directly.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion must be made, then?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes.

DEL. LEVOY: I move that we elect a general executive board of five from this convention, and a general organizer and a general secretary-treasurer, that is acting, without having a vote, but only with voice in the executive board meetings.

DEL. FRANCIS: I second that.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Your motion is, then, that we elect an executive board consisting of five?

DEL. LEVOY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that the general secretary-treasurer and general organizer be members of this executive board, with voice and no vote?

DEL. LEVOY: That is my motion.

(Motion carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Has the constitutional committee anything else to report?

DEL. WILLIAMS: We have this proposition, of amending the constitution, regarding the per capita tax, and the payment of it. I will read to you the proposed amendment. Get your constitutions and listen to this.

DEL. FRENCH; Page 17, Article 5.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Section 10.

DEL. FRENCH: It is Article 6.

DEL. WILLIAMS: Here is the proposed amendment. Notice it carefully:

“All national industrial departments and national industrial unions of the Industrial Workers of the World shall pay a tax to the general organization of eight and one-third cents per month per member reported in good standing.”

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the recommendation, is it, Delegate Williams?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands as a motion. Are you ready for the question?

(Motion put.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair is in doubt. You have got to vote again. All in favor of this motion will raise your hands. The motion is to concur in the recommendation of the committee.²⁰

DEL. WILLIAMS: The committee have the following report to make: Section 10: All National Industrial Trial Departments and National Unions not affiliated with the National Industrial Departments of the Industrial Workers of the World shall pay a tax to the General Organization of 8 1-3 cents per month per member reported in good standing.

Sec. 11. All departments and other subordinate organizations of the

²⁰[The outcome of the vote is not recorded—R.B.]

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Industrial Workers of the World shall use the official Industrial Workers of the World stamps in membership books. All stamps shall be paid for at 15 cents each and no book shall be considered in good standing except stamped up to date.

DEL. DE LEON: I move that the recommendations of the committee be accepted and adopted.

DEL. {ORG.}? WALSH: As I drafted that, I will explain. I don't believe that reads clear to the convention and that is because we haven't read the following section which abolishes per capita tax. There is the confliction upon the proposition.

DEL. JONES: It says there I believe that the industrial departments and the industrial unions will pay 8 1-3 cents for dues stamps for each member in good standing. Now a National Industrial Union is a part of the department and it would have to pay the money twice.

DEL. FRANCIS: I will move to amend to read this way, The National Industrial Department shall buy due stamps at 8 1-3 cents from the General Headquarters.

DEL. FISH: I move that the National Industrial Union pay 9 cents to General Headquarters and the National Department 4 cents to headquarters.

DEL. FRANCIS: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You made a motion.

DEL. FRANCIS: My motion was not entertained.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be for the National Industrial Union to pay 9 cents and the department 4 cents to General Headquarters.

DEL. KERR: Point of information. Does that not conflict with the National Industrial Union and the National Industrial Department, as Fellow Worker Jones just stated, or is it the sense that in case there is no National Industrial department? If that is the sense, then they should buy stamps the same as the others.

As I understand it, he buys the same as the others from general headquarters at 15 cents.

DEL. FISH: At 15 cents?

DEL. KERR: Yes, buys stamps from the general headquarters for 15 cents. If the words "National Industrial Union" were stricken out entirely it would be all right.

DEL. FRENCH: I think it is all very clear and I don't see how anyone can have any confusion. There are two sections here and everybody seems confused. In section two and article five, "National Industrial Departments shall pay as general dues into the treasury of the Industrial Workers of the World the rate of 8 1-3 cents per month."

It goes on that the "Local Unions shall pay 15 cents per member per month together with such assessments as may be levied as provided for in section four, article two. "And that implies that the Local Industrial Union pays 15 cents for the dues stamps. Of course it was understood that the 8 1-3 cents was to be paid for stamps by the Industrial Department to headquarters. In this case there is no National Industrial Union, but in section 10 it says that the "National Industrial departments, National Industrial Unions, Local Unions and individual members of the Industrial Workers of the World that are in arrears for dues and assessments for sixty days," etc., and then it goes on to tell the way these organizations, or individuals who are in arrears, what time their remittances shall be due and when they shall not be considered in good standing, etc. This is all that section ten applies to. The only real clarification that is needed here at the present time is to insert after the words "National Industrial Union," the words, "Not yet affiliated with the Industrial Department." That clarifies the whole situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that in section ten?

DEL. FRENCH: That is it, that will provide for this contingency. Suppose that the silk workers in the next two months or at any time before the next convention get strong enough to get locals enough to consider forming a National Industrial Union of Silk Workers, and they have to wait a few months or a year before the clothing workers or cotton workers are strong enough to organize a department, they can organize and can have an executive board and secretary and its secretary would purchase stamps directly from the general headquarters and get them for 8 1-3 cents, the other 6 2-3 cents remains with the National Industrial Union and whatever other arrangement they can make with the locals. Later on suppose they arrive at the stage where a National Department of the Textile Workers is arrived at, then it would be time enough to make them divvy up the 15 cents between the three bodies. That is not likely to happen this year, but the whole thing is cleared up by putting after the words "Industrial Unions" in section ten, article six, "Not yet affiliated."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make that as an amendment?

DEL. FRENCH: I move those words be inserted.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Wouldn't it be better to have it read, "Where it is not yet organized as a department?"

DEL. FRENCH: Yes, that is more clear. I will accept that.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Do you mean to infer that the silk industry is

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

to form a National Union?

DEL. FRENCH: Yes, sir, a National Industrial Union.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I beg to differ with you.

DEL. FRENCH: As designated from the cloth workers.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: As a part of the textile workers.

DEL. FRENCH: As I understand it, then, there would be no need of any subdivision of the department of the textile industries at all?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You would have the cloth workers, members of the general headquarters and another subdivision of the textile workers in a National Union?

DEL. FRENCH: An Industrial Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing that now.

DEL. FRENCH: The thing is getting all mixed up in the minds of the people who discussed this thing last night.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing that now.

ORG. WALSH: This is the thing that has to be cleared up. Article one provides and describes what a National Industrial Union shall be, as I wrote it myself last year.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is that?

ORG. WALSH: Article one, page four. The National Industrial Union shall be made up of National Industrial unions, and an industrial department shall be made up {of} National Industrial Unions of closely kindred organizations appropriate for representation in the departmental administration and assigned thereto by the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World.

DEL. JONES: I believe that Organizer Walsh does not mean what has been brought out on this discussion at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a question of how to get the local unions to buy stamps in bulk, from the general headquarters.

DEL. JONES: That seems, I believe his proposition, and I would move giving him the floor to explain the matter, and then let it be referred to the committee so they can adjust whatever differences there are.

THE CHAIRMAN: If we are going to refer anything any longer we won't get out of here this year.

ORG. WALSH: I will stay at this just as long as I can to get even. I realize that with the Industrial Union proposition, there are conflicting opinions. There is one thing that we want to abolish in the front part of this constitution. It should never have been put in there at all because, if they are members of a department, they could not be members of a National Industrial Union, and the fact remains that if they are still

members of a National Industrial Union, and not a department, they must be subject to the rules of that department, or rather Union, and when that department is organized, he must be subject to the rules of that department. Now if the secretary will just read the committee's recommendations.

(Sec. 11, as recommended by the committee, read.)

ORG. WALSH: Now, if we simply abolish section ten, and that must be abolished if we get what we want of section eleven, and you will find the proposition is to protect the National Headquarters in getting all that is justly due to them, which was brought out this morning in the New York local where they have something like two thousand members and pay dues on something like one thousand. Now, it is to overcome that same thing, not only in New York, but every place we know of, and if we do that we have got to abolish that section, and add this, "All departments and other subordinate organizations of the Industrial Workers of the World shall use the official I.W.W. stamps in membership books. All stamps shall be paid for at fifteen cents each and no book shall be considered in good standing except stamped to date."

Now, for instance, I join a local say on January first and I pay up for January and I am in good standing for January, February and March, and if the secretary keeps the books as he should he must report me in good standing for February and March and he must pay the per capita tax, which he don't do. That is where the General Headquarters get skinned. When I go to another local in May and I present my credentials from local number one; suppose I have paid up January dues and neglected to pay the February and March dues and he has to collect them, then he must send half of it back, that is the amount on the books. He has paid for me for the months of February and March, for which I am in good standing upon that section. He must upon the books report to headquarters a part of it, and upon the collection of my dues, he must count me in good standing for four months, therefore I have a double membership. Again, suppose I join a local and pay in advance for a year, say starting in January, now in January or February or whatever it may be; he has already put the stamp in my book for twelve months, and he must necessarily have paid for these stamps and he has got to record me as in good standing for twelve months upon his book of record. In February I transfer to local number two and number two puts me on its books in good standing for ten months, and a new secretary comes in and he finds me in good standing for ten months and he must write to headquarters, and if I

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

am in good standing when I leave number one, he reports me for the year and the secretary from number two reports me for ten months, there is where I have got a double membership. Under section eleven we can straighten the bookkeeping out, but it is necessary to abolish the present system. The reason this comes upon me so forcibly is that in a number of locals in the mining camps and a man leaves, it is impossible to straighten up those books, that is to undertake to carry out the per capita tax and the stamp proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion, are you ready for the question?

DEL. FRANCIS: Was there not an amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: There was an amendment made by French.

DEL. WILLIAMS: It was not seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the original motion come before the convention. Read the two sections, please.

(Sections 10 and 11 read by Del. Williams.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now vote on the proposition.

Yea and nay vote taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carried.

DEL. FRANCIS: I voted no because I can make no head or tail out of it.

DEL. JONES: I voted no on the proposition because that says that the National Industrial Department and the National Industrial Union must both pay this month to Headquarters.

THE CHAIRMAN: It stands to reason that when the National Industrial Department is organized, there is no National Industrial Union. As I understand it, the National Industrial Union is a body that exists only up to the time that the National Industrial Department is organized. We could not form a National Industrial Union of silk workers if we formed a National Union of Textile workers.

DEL. JONES: On that reasoning the local union is abolished and all the branches are abolished because it is a part of the industrial Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, the constitution takes care of that. The general organization is composed of local unions and these local unions can be organized into Industrial Unions. You can organize the textile workers into a National Union, but according to the interpretation of the constitution the way it has been interpreted, you could not organize the silk workers into a National Industrial Union, but it must be all the textile workers. If the silk workers of Paterson

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

have today a sufficient number of locals and have a large enough membership they can form an Industrial Union, but according to the secretary of the last convention and the one preceding that, he holds that we could not organize the silk workers into a National Department, they would be compelled to take in the other textile workers.

DEL. WALTERS: I would like to ask for information. Take the silk workers. Say we have a local industrial union of the silk workers in Paterson, now the branches are separated over the country, say one in San Francisco, one in Washington, another in Nebraska and one in Northern Pennsylvania, how are we going to get those branches of this organization to meet in a general committee and form a united organization?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Walters don't seem to understand what,—

DEL. WALTERS: You mean that you don't understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is all there is to it then if I don't understand. What do you ask me for?

DEL. JONES: It is not right to let this thing go in like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing before the house.

DEL. WILLIAMS: We have one other matter to report on in the morning, but we are not ready to report it yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to announce, that I have been requested by a number of delegates that don't seem to care to do so themselves, that we have a night session. They want to hold a night session.

DEL. YATES: I would like to ask if it will be possible to complete the work tonight?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, and before we vote on that we will hear from the Auditing Committee.

DEL. BENSON: Fellow Delegates: The auditing committee have the following report to make:

Chicago, Ill., Sept. 23, 1907.

To the Delegates of the Third Annual Convention of the I.W.W.

We, your committee elected to audit the books of the organization for the year beginning October 1st, 1906, and ending August 31st, 1907, hereby submit the following as a correct statement of receipts and expenditures.

	Receipts.	Expenses.
For October	\$1,075.60	\$327.15
(Emergency fund handled by St. John.) For October 1st to		

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Oct. 31st	2,140.30	2,162.42
For November	2,156.08	2,573.51
For December	1,923.15	2,259.45
For Jan., 1907	2,442.34	2,013.40
For Feb., 1907	1,836.95	2,278.08
For Mar., 1907	3,297.94	3,073.51
For Apr., 1907	3,214.68	3,370.28
For May, 1907	2,796.93	2,979.60
For June, 1907	4,166.95	4,420.96
For July, 1907	2,444.54	2,508.63
For Aug. 1907	3,056.30	3,611.77
	\$30,550.75	\$31,378.76

Leaves liabilities of organization, \$1,028.00.

Our attention has been called to an omission by the printer of the financial statement regarding Local No. 33 of Cleveland, Ohio. Said Local has paid from Oct. 23, 1906, to Mar. 1, 1907, \$20.45, and from March 1st to Sept. 1st, \$83.40, making a total of \$103.85. This local's account was found blank in the report.

By a careful audit of the books, we find the receipts and expenditures to be correct, and corresponding with the above figures.

Respectfully submitted,
N.R. BENSON,
ERNEST AIAZZONE,
WM. HERRMANN,
Auditing Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the reading of the report of the auditing committee, what is your pleasure?

DEL. DELANEY: I move that the report be accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report of the committee be accepted.

DEL. DELANEY: I think they should be voted a vote of thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let that vote be included.

DEL. AIAZZONE: There is one thing which we overlooked on account of our hurrying here to the hall to hear what was going on. That is, that hereafter a financial statement be published each month. I think that will save a lot of expense. There is another thing and that would also be corrected by the method suggested, that is Local 33, this local's account was found blank in the report, but that was an omission by the printer.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment to the motion. The motion is that we receive the report of the committee accepted, and that the secretary-treasurer publish a financial statement every month in the *Industrial Bulletin*.

Yea and nay vote taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other committees ready to report?

DEL. HENION: The Ways and Means Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear the report of the Ways and Means Committee.

DEL. HENION: Now, Fellow Workers and Fellow Chairman, this is a pretty lengthy report and I don't suppose that it is necessary to read it now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any recommendations that we want before the house?

DEL. HENION: The committee wishes the report accepted and referred to the incoming general executive board.

DEL. AXELSON: What is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we accept the report and refer it to the incoming executive board.

DEL. AXELSON: Which report?

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the secretary-treasurer, referred to by the Ways and Means Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the report of the secretary-treasurer relative to Ways and Means be referred to the incoming general executive board. All in favor of this motion will say aye. Opposed, no. The motion is carried.

DEL. HENION: As to that part in this report in International Relations, I do not suppose it is necessary to read that, either. But after some correspondence between the I.W.W. of America and the G.E.B. of our syndicalists who have established fraternal affiliations, the membership cards will be mutually recognized and an information bureau will be established to convey the necessary information to our fellow-workers who are contemplating immigration to America. The I.W.W. will prepare a special leaflet to be distributed in this country. Our Fellow-Worker J. Wagner was instrumental in bringing us together in the establishment of the interchange of cards. Approved by the Ways and Means Committee.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I want to make an explanation in regard to this matter. I have got reliable information in reference to Fellow-

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Worker Weinstein, who is connected with the institution of the movement in Roumania. We received last week the official organ of the Roumanian syndicalists. In the paper it is stated that it was Fellow Worker Weinstein who started the correspondence; I want to give due credit to the one who is practically behind the syndicalist, or rather, the general office of the syndicalists. For that reason, the extract from that paper was submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means. This Roumanian syndicalist organization recognized the card of the I.W.W., and is going to carry on the propaganda consistently.

It was moved and seconded to concur in the report. (Carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Has any other committee anything to report?

DEL. KERN: A point of information. Wasn't the nomination and election of officers to be made a special order for tomorrow?

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be the last order of business.

DEL. WALTERS: A point of information. I understand there was something to turn over to the Organization Committee this morning that the committee has not received.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary received some communications which went to the stenographer, and they will be turned over to the committee.

DEL. THOMAS: There was something in reference to the election of a check weighman, from Patton, Pa., where the money was retained by the United Mine Workers.

THE CHAIRMAN: That went to the Organization Committee.

DEL. YATES: In view of the fact that there is not very much work for the convention to do now, and also that several of the delegates want to go home, I move that we have a night session and that we adjourn from now till 7 o'clock. (Seconded.)

A DELEGATE: Make it 8 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we vote on that motion, I want to ask Fellow-Worker Trautmann, do you think we can have the hall?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will see in five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else to come before the body?

DE. LIESNER: A point of information: I was instructed by my local to get definite information as to the membership of the I.W.W., and I want to ask if that will be compiled in any manner by the secretary, or in what form I can get it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would say that you can ask the secretary. The information is in the financial statement that has been published in the *Industrial Bulletin* several times. I want to say for the

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

representation, for instance, from Paterson, that we are entitled, I believe, to 28 votes; that would imply that we would have only a comparatively small membership, but the fact is that there are only represented here members who were paid up to the last day, whereas we have many members on the books who are two months in arrears and who are considered good standing members by the organization, so that in fact the number of members is twice as large as represented here.

DEL. LIESNER: The way I understand it, they asked for some definite report.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would give them the answer that I would give all officers; tell them to go ahead and organize and never mind counting noses. (Applause.)

DEL. KERN: I move that we take up the election of officers tomorrow the first thing at 9 o'clock or 10 o'clock. (Secunded.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: I think the motion is out of order as the reports of committees are not all in yet. You can not do it until they are.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be improper to do that now.

DEL. BENSON: Do I understand that by the previous action of the convention all the organizers' reports are dispensed with?

THE CHAIRMAN: The organizers' reports have been referred to the various committees and these committees acted upon them and brought in their recommendations on the matters contained in the reports, and that is all.

DEL. BENSON: Then the only method for us to get the organizers' reports in any other way before the membership would be to reconsider that action?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly, that would be the only way.

DEL. BENSON: Then I move that that matter be reconsidered. My reason for moving that is that I believe—

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair cannot entertain any motion until we have decided this matter of a night session.

SEC. TRAUTMANN (returning to the convention hall): That is all right. We can have the hall.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. BOHN: A question of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you want to be informed upon?

DEL. BOHN: I want to be informed whether I am a wage slave—

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we will now take up the question of having a night session. The secretary reports that we can have the hall.

DEL. KERN: A point of information: Would it not facilitate matters

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

by meeting here earlier tomorrow?

DEL. TRAINOR: We cannot get through tonight.

DEL. KERN: I move to table the motion to have a meeting tonight.
(Seconded.)

(The motion to table the motion to have a night session was put and the result was in doubt. A roll call was demanded. The chairman again put the motion and declared the motion to lay on the table lost.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other committee that has a report to make?

DEL. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet before you spoke.

{NEW BUSINESS.}

THE CHAIRMAN: We are under the head of new business. You can make a motion now.

DEL. BENSON: My motion is this: In view of the fact of the very valuable suggestions that will come out in the organizers' reports, and that this convention has not had the opportunity to listen to or read, I move that the question of dispensing with them be reconsidered.
(Seconded.)

DEL. JONES: I move as an amendment that the organizers' reports be referred to anybody that wants to read them. I have read fifteen hours on them.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is a good one. Is that seconded? (Amendment seconded.) There is a motion and an amendment before the house. The motion is that we reconsider our action in having referred the reports of organizers to the various committees; that means that we shall have them read again. An amendment is made to the motion to reconsider—

DEL. BENSON: You misconstrued my motion. I did not say to have them read.

THE CHAIRMAN: What did you say?

DEL. BENSON: The reason why I move this is not that I want them read during the convention; I think the time of the convention has been consumed already too far; but I want the general membership to become cognizant of all that the organizers have reported. I believe it is necessary that a membership of the locals who are organizing and working should know what the organizers think and what they say about these localities.

DEL. SPEED: If I were not on that committee I should not want to have them read. Being on the committee I am not anxious to burden

this body with reading each part, because I want to tell you this, that there is a whole lot that is contained in them that consists simply of lectures on Marx, and so forth, and have no information of any import, because I hold that a report got up by an organizer should really be a prospectus simply of the conditions of the section of the country in which he or she has been doing his or her work. That is what the organizers' reports should consist of, and the recommendations that are given by the organizers towards building up the organizations in their respective localities. Instead of that some of the reports are taken up with lectures, and I assure you that this body does not want any lectures.

THE CHAIRMAN: According to *Roberts' Rules of Order* a motion to reconsider cannot be amended. The motion before the house is to reconsider the action taken on the reports.

DEL. KERN: I moved to table the motion to reconsider.

(The motion to table was seconded and carried.)

DEL. CAMINITA: I move that we meet tomorrow at 8 o'clock instead of nine, because I, for one, can not stay here another week.

DEL. WILLIAMS: I want to say on behalf of the Constitution Committee that I was mistaken in my statement when I said that we had one matter to report upon in the morning. We are now through and would like to be discharged.

DEL. FRANCIS: I made a motion to that effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Constitution Committee reports that they have concluded their work and they ask to be discharged. What is your pleasure?

DEL. THOMAS: I understand the fellow worker to say that as the work of the committee is concluded, it desires an honorable discharge. Some time ago when the Auditing Committee made its report I made an amendment that it be discharged, but as there was one portion of the work continued the Committee desires to know, as that work is done, whether it can be discharged.

THE CHAIRMAN: When there is no work to do.

DEL. THOMAS: I believe it is correct that so far as each and every committee has completed its work it is discharged, because you cannot keep them here twelve months.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not going to keep them here; if there is no objection the Constitution Committee is discharged.

DEL. BENSON: I beg leave to say that the Grievance Committee have finished their work.

THE CHAIRMAN: All committees that have finished their work are

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

discharged, and it does not require any action.

DEL. KERN: I did not see in the proceedings of this convention printed in the paper any report where we ever had a Constitution Committee or Resolution Committee.

DEL. AIAZZONE: Then you did not read it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did not see it in the printed report? That is not my fault, is it? It was there.

DEL. ISAACH: I move that we adjourn.

DEL. TRAINOR: Was the motion carried to have a night session?

DEL. ISAACH: No, it was laid on the table.

{GOOD AND WELFARE.}

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now under the head of good and welfare. That is important business. I want to be understood, and I do not want to go home and have an important matter misunderstood. That is the point made by Delegates Trautmann and Walters relative to national industrial unions. Now, I will simply say that in making the statement that I did I repeated what the national secretary stated, because I thought that he understood the matter since he was a delegate to the first convention and to the second convention. Now, the question that I would bring before the convention is to interpret this clause of the constitution. It may be that in the very near future we will have a number of silk-workers' organizations throughout the country. Now, have we, according to the Constitution, the right to organize a National Industrial Silk Workers' Union?

DEL. JONES: No; it says distinctly that the National Industrial departments shall be organized first and be subdivided into Industrial Unions, in Article I, Section 3: "The Industrial departments shall be subdivided in industrial unions." The Industrial departments shall be organized first and subdivided.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will read that: "The industrial departments shall consist of not less than ten local unions, aggregating a membership of not less than 10,000 members. The industrial departments shall be subdivided in industrial unions of closely kindred industries." That is correct.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That is my interpretation.

DEL. AXELSON: What are we under now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Good and Welfare.

DEL. AXELSON: I would like to make a motion or suggestion. I move, inasmuch as we are under the head of Good and Welfare, that

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

we give Organizer Thompson the floor to tell us something about what has created so much confusion in this convention, namely, Karl Marx's Economics. (Seconded.)

DELEGATES: No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded that we give Organizer Thompson the floor. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. FRANCIS: When a similar question was up some days ago it was said that if we gave one fellow the floor we would have to give the next fellow the floor. I, for one, do not believe in any privileges, and inasmuch as this convention has lasted into the second week and a night session is not to be held, I don't want some one to give us a lecture about Marx. We don't care anything about Marx now. We are not bothering about Marx here. We are bothering about how to push this organization, and no amount of lecturing will help us do that. We want work, and the man that will produce results in the organization is the man. I hope you will vote this proposition down.

DEL. BENSON: I have heard several sneering remarks about Marx in this convention, and I, for one, emphatically protest against it.

DEL. FRANCIS: I have not sneered at Marx.

DEL. BENSON: I think, in view of the fact that those who sneer most at Marx understand him the least, it is only right that the men should be given the floor to explain themselves.

DEL. SPEED: As this subject has been mentioned on several occasions I would like the convention to understand that I have no objection whatever to Marx, not a particle. Those who desire to study Marx, let them study him. I am in the Industrial Workers of the World for one purpose, and that is to do my best to organize the working class. Now, look here, here is the proposition: We have got to treat the working class as the working class is. We have got to talk to the working class as the working class talks, in their own language. Now, understand it, there would be as many different brands of Marx as there are of Heinz's pickles, 57 brands. I have no objection to Marx, and not a soul in this body has, to my knowledge. The thing is to find out how we are going to make the working class revolutionary. We have got to organize the working class. That is what we have got to do, and my idea is this, that we have got to drill and discipline the working class; to bring our organization down to a solid basis; to keep in touch with all the events transpiring in the present society; to take advantage of the opportunities and the circumstances as they arise, and by doing these all these other things will find their natural place in the order of

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

events. There is no need of our floating in the air of chasing clouds at all. It is well that the working class has a knowledge of Marx. It is right that they should have a knowledge of Marx. Nobody has any objection to that. If it is the idea that any delegate sneers at Marx, I deny it absolutely. The idea is that we do not want, when we are here for the purpose of doing practical work towards building up our organization, we do not want to be treated to discourses on Marx.

DEL. FRANCIS: A matter of privilege: I want to go on record that I am not opposed to Marx, but against any one being set up as an expert authority on Marx, when other people are sick and tired.

DEL. CAMINITA: If there is to be any lecturing I want to give a lecture on Bakounin.

DEL. LIESNER: I am not opposed to this discussion at all. I believe it would be enlightening to all of us. But in view of the fact that we are attempting to cut short the sessions of this convention and the time is short now until the hour of adjournment, I do not think it is policy to listen to any talk of the kind, because if we permit one man to have the floor on this there would be others entitled to it, and we do not know where the end would be.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn, and the convention then at five minutes of six o'clock adjourned until Tuesday, September 24th, 1907, at 9 o'clock a.m.

EIGHTH DAY—TUESDAY, SEPT. 24, 1907.
MORNING SESSION.

Chairman Katz called the convention to order at 9 o'clock.

The roll of delegates was called by the secretary, and showed the following absentees: Linder and Young.

TELEGRAPHERS' STRIKE.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first order of business is reports of committees, standing and special. I want to call the attention of delegates to one thing that has been omitted, that we have not heard from the committee that was appointed to see the telegraphers. The committee has not rendered any report up to this time, and I would call upon the chairman of that committee to make his report.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will say for that committee that we went over and delivered the check for \$50 to the striking telegraphers, and were invited immediately to address a mass meeting in the Revere House, and immediately complied with the request. The audience received the committee with cheers, to say the least, and the committee then stated that they would at some future day again invite speakers of the I.W.W. to address the strikers on the subject of industrial unionism.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the report of the committee: what is your pleasure?

DEL. LIESNER: I move that it be received and approved and the committee discharged.

(Motion seconded and carried.)

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other committee to report this morning?

DEL. FISCHER (of the committee on organization): With reference to the Patton matter which was read before this body yesterday, we recommend that the secretary be instructed to notify the Patton local that it shall keep the money which was left over from the check weighman fund.

THE CHAIRMAN: That stands as the motion before the house.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: And use it for propaganda purposes.

DEL. FISCHER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the money that was left over from the check weighman fund be retained by local Patton and used for the purpose of agitation. Are you ready for the question?

The question was called for, put and carried.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. WALTERS: There is one more matter that was turned over to the secretary, and this will conclude our report. I would like to hear the secretary's report.

DEL. FISCHER: This matter of Detroit was already in the hands of the organization committee and was turned over to the hands of the incoming G.E.B.

DEL. WALTERS: Wouldn't it be in order now to discharge his committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: If the committee has no further report to make it is discharged. We have no other standing committees. They have all been discharged.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The committee on rules of order is to be discharged.

THE CHAIRMAN: That has been discharged, I think. The committee on constitution has been discharged. We are now under the head of new business.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the election of officers, and it would be first in order to find out how we are going to proceed. That is a question that has to be decided upon first.

DEL. FISCHER: Put the names on the blackboard as we did last year.

THE CHAIRMAN: The election of secretary-treasurer will be in order.

DEL. FISCHER: Nominations first.

DEL. KERN: I move that we proceed to the nomination of secretary-treasurer.

DEL. WALTERS: I move to reconsider our previous motion. The one that was defeated was that the officials of the organization be elected from the floor of the convention. I move that this motion be reconsidered. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you repeat the motion, please?

DEL. WALTERS: We placed a motion before this convention early in the convention that the officers of the organization be elected from the floor of the convention and take their seats at once. This motion was lost, and I move to reconsider this motion. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded to reconsider the action taken in the early part of the convention relative to the election of officers. What we did had only reference, I believe, to

certain officers, to the general officers, and did not refer to the members of the General Executive Board. It only had reference to the election of the editor of *The Bulletin*, to the secretary-treasurer and the office that was created yesterday in connection with assistant secretary-treasurer. You have heard the motion: what is your pleasure?

DEL. LIESNER: A point of information. I would like to know why this should not apply to all as well as to a part of the officials. It seems to me the rule ought to work both ways. I do not understand it. If we can elect part of them from the floor we ought to be able to elect them all from the floor. Another thing I wish to understand is this: Does that mean that we select only from those who are now present?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you can nominate whoever you please.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Whoever is a member.

DEL. HAGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I understand as the constitution now stands and according to the vote of this convention, that we are supposed to nominate three men for each office; that is, the secretary-treasurer, the editor and the assistant secretary-treasurer, or general organizer, as it now is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. HAGENSON: Each one of these three officers. We have to nominate three and submit them to the membership for a referendum vote, and whoever is elected becomes the officers. Now, that suits me well enough. I am not at all in favor of reconsidering that action. If so be that we were to cut that out, I believe a howl would go up from the rank and file of this organization that they did not have any voice in choosing the executive officers, and for that reason I hope that you will leave this matter as it stands now. I believe myself that it is the proper way to let them be elected by referendum.

DEL. TRAINOR: In regard to this motion to reconsider this matter, I think it is right and just, inasmuch as you can nominate the candidates on the floor of this convention for the Executive Board and for the secretary-treasurer and like officers, and you can then send them to a referendum vote. Now, I would like to know what the rank and file in the Eastern states know about William E. Trautmann, or what they know about Editor Edwards, or what they know about any of the Executive Board. Now, it seems to me that of any of these members that are elected or nominated here on this floor wish to do anything crooked, and they have the meanness to do it, they can get to the rank and file of this organization in the length of time that they have got to do it in, say two or three months, in order to put

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

themselves in this office. Now, I claim that this is the proper place to have the General Executive Board and general executive officers nominated and elected, right on the floor of this convention. They take office immediately, and the referendum vote can go out afterward just the same as it did before, and if they disapprove any of these people that go to the referendum, they then can say who they will select in their places. I think it is the proper course to pursue to elect these officers from the floor of this convention.

DEL. DE LEON: While I do not wish to occupy your time, I feel com{ . . . }²¹ here. The speeches made upon this motion gave coloring to the motion, and since no point of order has been raised as to some of them, the result would be that the speeches may have the effect of binding the motion. Delegate Hagenson stated that by the constitution we are compelled to nominate three. This matter came up last year, and you will find it in the stenographic report. The constitution says no such thing. The constitution says that the three receiving the highest vote shall be selected. Now, if there are not three receiving the highest vote, what folly, what child play, to nominate one person for any particular office that we may have in mind upon a plurality and then send out two dummies to be knocked down. It is not democratic, but a play to humbug the rank and file. The constitution provides that the three receiving the highest vote shall be sent out. It follows from that that there must be three receiving the highest vote before we can send three; but if the convention nominates but one man for national secretary-treasurer, for instance, or editor, it is the height of demagoguery to pick out two more, say John Jones—I don't mean this Jones (indicating Delegate Jones)—and Richard Roe for the purpose of being knocked down.

Now, as to the motion itself, I do not interpret the constitution the way Walters does as to require this motion to reconsider. Perhaps I might change my opinion if I saw it exactly as he does. We get these things in mind through our ears. We do not read these things; we do not see them through our eyes; there are no pictures on our minds, and I may be mistaken; but my impressions is from the language of what we have done hitherto and from the other provisions of the constitution, that our actions as a whole are submitted to the rank and file for approbation or disapprobation. It follows from that that whatever officer—in the singular—is elected by this convention, this convention being the supreme legislative power, that officer goes into

²¹ [At least one line missing at this point. No “pi” uncovered.—R.B.]

office immediately, subject to his being ousted if the referendum should demand it. I for one go again on record as considering it the height of demagogy to expect truth to come out of a general vote when the membership have not got the information necessary for an intelligent vote. As one delegate said, I believe Trainor, what folly if we nominated Delegate Richard Roe and somebody else, John Smith and John Jones, and sent them to the rank and file. The rank and file would vote upon those men without knowing them from Adam. That is a wonderful referendum. The referendum means a very sensible thing, but in order to make it sensible we must have information, and the referendum can not really go into effect under the system at present in vogue, while we are working on the firing lines of the capitalist class. So I oppose the motion not because I am against its spirit, but because I consider it utterly superfluous.

The action we take here has to be submitted to a referendum vote of the organization. When we elect our G.E.B. that G.E.B. goes into office immediately. If we have more than one, for instance, if in this body there should be more than one preference for national secretary, editor, general organizer or assistant secretary, of course the three highest would have to go to a referendum vote, and in a case like that nobody could take the office except the present incumbent. If he should be among the three highest, then he would hold over. Upon the subject of holding over I wish to say a word. We have got tangled up, and lots of people get tangles up regularly with this hold-over proposition. According to this hold-over proposition a convention may meet; it may be absolutely unanimous against an officer; it may want to remove him, as was the case of Sherman; without a dissenting vote it may want to remove him, according to the proposition implied by the motion of Walters, or rather by the interpretation of Walters, and consequently he would have to hold over until the referendum vote ratified the preference of the convention. Now, I am against establishing any such precedent. I voted against it at the last convention and shall vote against it here, if the matter shall be insisted upon. The action of the convention should be supreme and should go into effect and then be sent to the rank and file and trust to luck that they may have the necessary information to act upon. Therefore I am against this motion and the interpretation of the constitution that it implies.

DEL. WALTERS: I thoroughly agree with Fellow Worker De Leon, and the reason I made this motion was simply to do away with quibbling. At one of the sessions of this convention there was a matter

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

came up, a resolution that the general secretary-treasurer and assistant be elected from the floor and take office immediately. This motion was voted down, and that is the reason for my motion this morning.

DEL. DE LEON: Do you insist upon it?

DEL. WALTERS: No, I withdraw it, if that is the sense of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the motion being withdrawn?

DELEGATES: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: The contention is that according to the constitution it is not necessary to nominate here and then submit three candidates for each office, but that would be only in case there would be three receiving the highest number of votes, understand. We are to decide upon that.

DEL. THOMAS: I would like to know what is the status of this motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is now withdrawn. There is no motion before the house. We will proceed with the election of officers.

DEL. FRANCIS: I want the chairman to read Section 2 of Article II for the information of the delegates, and then there would be no such misinterpretation put upon it.

THE CHAIRMAN (reading): "The general secretary-treasurer and the assistant general secretary-treasurer shall be nominated from the floor of the convention, and the three candidates for each respective office receiving the greatest number of votes in the convention shall be submitted to the general membership of the organization for election."

DEL. FRANCIS: That means that you have to submit three candidates. The fellow that receives six votes, being one of the three highest, goes to the referendum.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how that is. At the last convention the officers were elected on the floor of the convention.

DEL. FISCHER: Nominated.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: They were nominated and a vote was taken by the delegates. There were five nominees for assistant secretary-treasurer and the three receiving the highest number of votes went on the ticket. There was but one nomination for general secretary-treasurer. That was the mode of procedure at the last convention.

DEL. FISCHER: And they take office in three months.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: No, according to the procedure established by the last convention, if there is more than one candidate for one office

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

the one holding the office holds over until the referendum has decided who is going to be the officer after his term expires.

GENERAL ORGANIZER AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

THE CHAIRMAN: Make your nominations for general organizer and assistant secretary-treasurer.

DEL. TRAINOR: I nominate Vincent St. John.

The nomination was seconded by many delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further nominations?

DEL. HAGGERTY: May I have a word about this?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

DEL. HAGGERTY: I desire to say that I am in hearty accord with the nomination. There is no man today in the domain of the labor movement, particularly that portion of the field that we occupy, that can take the place of the fellow worker who has just been nominated, and I sincerely hope that no other nomination will be made against him. (Applause.)

DEL. WILLIAMS: I move that the nomination of Vincent St. John be made unanimous.

(The motion was seconded in various parts of the hall and was unanimously carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is unanimous. (Great applause.) Now, Vincent St. John being the only nominee, according to the constitution as I would understand it, we would now proceed to elect him.

DEL. TRAINOR: He is elected, isn't he?

DEL. WALTERS: A point of information. My point of information is this: Is the organizer or secretary the highest official in the organization?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see why we should quibble about it?

DEL. WALTERS: I want the information. I have got to convey this information when I go East, and I want to know where I stand.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair would state that it is my opinion—you can have the ruling of the convention upon it if you wish.

DEL. WALTERS: I wish a ruling of the convention upon it.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the chair's opinion is correct it will stand as the ruling of the convention. If not, some one must appeal against it, and then you will have the ruling of the convention. I will state that both general officers have the same standing.

DELEGATES: Correct.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: They have different duties, that is all.

DEL. DE LEON: I desire information. Will you construe the motion to elect St. John unanimously, the motion nominating unanimously, as an election?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that we ought to proceed with the election now.

DEL. FISCHER: It was only a nomination.

DEL. DE LEON: We elected him, according to my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is simply a nomination; that is correct. Now, we will proceed.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The nomination must be put on a referendum vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The contention is this: There being only one, the whole matter is referred to the referendum vote; that is all. Now, all in favor that St. John stand as the nominate candidate of this convention will say aye; contrary, no.

DEL. GLOVER: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was decided to be unanimous.

DEL. GLOVER: No, I didn't get a chance upon it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can have a roll call if anybody desires a roll call.

(A roll call was asked for, but met with general dissent.)

GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we come to nominations for the office of general secretary-treasurer. Make your nominations.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I nominate William E. Trautmann. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further nominations?

DEL. HAGENSON: I nominate Fellow Worker Walsh.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further nominations?

DEL. LIESNER: I move the nominations be closed.

ORG. WALSH: I respectfully decline nomination. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker declines the nomination. Any further nominations?

DEL. BENSON: I nominate Fellow-Worker Haggerty.

DEL. HAGGERTY: Without entering into any preliminaries as to the cause or discussing any subject matter relative to it, I want to say that William E. Trautmann is the man for the place, and he has demonstrated it conclusively. (Applause.)

DEL. WALTERS: I move that General Secretary-Treasurer

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

Trautmann be nominated by acclamation. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the nomination of William E. Trautmann be made by acclamation. All in favor of this motion will say aye; opposed, no. Carried. Trautmann, do you accept?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor that William E. Trautmann stand as the nominee of this convention for the office of general secretary-treasurer will say aye; opposed, no. It is carried.

{EDITOR OF THE INDUSTRIAL UNION BULLETIN.}

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the election of the General Executive Board.

DEL. HAGENSON: The editor first, I believe.

THE CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon. That is correct.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I nominate Fellow Worker Edwards.

THE CHAIRMAN: Aiazzone nominates Fellow Worker Edwards for the office of editor of *The Industrial Union Bulletin*.

DEL. WALTERS: I move that he be nominated by acclamation. (The motion seconded.)

The motion was unanimously carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Carried. If he does not decline, he accepts. I take it that is granted. All in favor of Fellow Worker Edwards being the only nominee of this convention for the office of editor of *The Industrial Union Bulletin* will say aye; opposed, no.

(Motion unanimously carried.)

{GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD.}

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now take up the election of members of the General Executive Board.

DEL. DE LEON: Fellow Worker Chairman: At the last convention of this organization, as you will find in the minutes, the way we did was that the names of all the nominees were put on the blackboard, and then the roll was called, and each delegate, as his name was called out, voted for his choice of the nominees, and when they were through with the roll call the five having the highest vote were elected.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would have to provide a blackboard for that purpose. But there is Fischer, he has always got a scheme. That will be all right (indicating blackboard). I understand that the members of the General Executive Board are to be elected right here, aren't they?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. TRAINOR: Yes.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. HAGENSON: Mr. Chairman{,} before we proceed to this I would like a bit of information. The information I want is this: Can a man who is elected on the General Executive Board be employed as a national organizer, or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to answer that, that there is nothing in the constitution that would forbid that although I was instructed by my local union to vote against that, or, rather, to bring in a recommendation that members of the Executive Board should not employ themselves.

DEL. HAGENSON: Would a motion be in order to that effect, that a member of the General Executive Board could not be employed as a general organizer?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at this time. We have passed beyond that, and neglected to bring that up.

DEL. LIESNER: Fellow Worker Chairman: As I understand the constitution, as now amended, the general organizer has no vote on the General Executive Board. Now, if he becomes a member of the General Executive Board he has a vote, and he can consequently pass upon his own acts; so if we elect the general organizer as a member of the General Executive Board, we have a man passing upon his own acts.

DEL. DE LEON: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

DEL. DE LEON: My point of order is that the amendment to the constitution as adopted was that the general organizer, or the one who has been elected for general organizer, cannot be nominated for the G.E.B.

THE CHAIRMAN: That goes without saying, but the question that has been asked is, whether any member of the General Executive Board could be a national organizer. Now, I would say, on this score, that my local has instructed me to bring up before the convention such a proposition, but there is one thing that I do not see clearly. Now, with reference to the members of the General Executive Board, for instance, they are in a certain locality, and it is required that certain organizing work be done in that locality or in that vicinity; now, that member of the General Executive Board is the man to see to it that it is done, and if you adopt any resolution here otherwise, it would debar him from doing it. There is no such provision in the constitution now. Are you through, Fellow Worker De Leon?

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

DEL. DE LEON: No. I think that this whole procedure is out of order. A member of the G.E.B. is higher than a national organizer. But, to suppose that a member of the General Executive Board who is in certain locality where something is up, cannot exercise the functions of his office, is absurd. You would have to first go into and define strictly what organizing is, and you will find that, with the office of organizer—you cannot establish any hard and fast rule. But you cannot be hired by the General Executive Board as a national organizer. That goes without saying. That is the sense of it. But that you cannot do any work that may incidentally arise anywhere, that would hamper his effectiveness. Consequently, I should say that is out of order. But we are now under the head of election of officers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

DEL. AXELSON: Proceed.

DEL. SCHWEND: Fellow Worker Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you want to ask a question for information?

DEL. SCHWEND: I am not clear on this proposition yet. Now, it is evident that yesterday this convention was opposed to the national organizer having a voice on the Executive Board for the very reason that he would be in a position to pass upon his own official acts.

Now, the question that arises in my mind, and one upon which I am not clear, is this: Are we going to allow the members of the General Executive Board to be appointed as organizers? If we do, we are inviting the same difficulty that we tried to obviate yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN: You asked a point of information, didn't you?

DEL. SCHWEND: I want to understand whether it is the sense of this convention that these organizers shall be allowed to be members of the Executive Board, or whether the members of the Executive Board shall be allowed to become organizers, and as organizers and members of the Executive Board shall be allowed to pass upon their own official acts?

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I hold that the statement made by the delegate there, that no national organizer, no member of the Executive Board, elected shall be appointed by that board as a national organizer. That goes without saying. But a member of the Executive Board in doing, at times, organizing work is only exercising the functions of his office. And in that light, it goes also without saying that he is, in that sense, an organizer.

DEL. WALTERS: Mr. Chairman: If I understand this office that we created yesterday it was —

THE CHAIRMAN: Fellow Worker —

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. WALTERS: Now, let me have leeway, so that we get clear on this. This office we created yesterday allows that officer power to hire organizers and discharge them, and of course the hiring of organizers is subject to the approval of the General Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. WALTERS: Now, the question that arises in the minds of the delegates is this: Has this organizer, general organizer, as we call him, the power to hire members of the General Executive Board as organizers? That is the question these delegates wish to be clear on.

DEL. FRANCIS: It was the same thing before.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have stated that, that it would be improper that a member of the General Executive Board should be permanent general organizer. But in that case he would not be appointing himself. But if we should be called upon by this general organizer, any member of the Executive Board, or by the General Executive Board, to simply exercise the functions of their office, which is partly organizing. There is no doubt that if some delegate be elected here, representing some industry down in the South, and some organizing was demanded there, upon whom would the General Executive Board call but upon that man, if he is there and has the ability to organize? That is the way I understand the matter.

DEL. FRANCIS: Will you accept a motion, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion?

DEL. FRANCIS: Yes, I will move that it is the sense of the convention that no member of the General Executive Board shall be a national organizer.

(Motion seconded by Delegate Hagenon.)

DEL. FRANCIS:—a permanent national organizer.

(Motion seconded.)

DEL. KERN: That has no second.

DEL. HAGENSON: It has a second. You bet it has.

DEL. WALTERS: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are under the head of election of officers. The thing has been explained, and that is the sense of the convention. Now, then, the order of business is to make nominations for members of the General Executive Board. Nominations are in order.

DEL. SPEED: Fellow Worker Chairman: I would like to place in nomination, for a member of the General Executive Board, B.H. Williams.

DEL. TRAINOR: I second the nomination.

DEL. DE LEON: I wish to place in nomination F.W. Heslewood.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

(Nomination of Delegate Heslewood was seconded by several delegates.)

DEL. HERMANN: I nominate Fellow Worker Foote.

(Nominated and seconded.)

DEL. HENION: I nominate Fellow Worker Cole.

(Nomination of Delegate Cole was seconded by Delegates Aiazzone and Trainor.)

A DELEGATE: I nominate Fellow Worker Thomas.

(Nomination seconded.)

A DELEGATE: I nominate Fellow Worker Yates.

(Nomination seconded.)

DEL. AIAZZONE: I nominate Fellow Worker Katz.

(Nomination seconded by Delegate Trainor.)

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I nominate Fellow Worker Schwend.

(Nomination seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates will not make any nominations until they are recognized by the chair. The secretary cannot put them all down.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I nominate Fellow Worker Katz.

DEL. TRAINOR: I second the nomination.

A DELEGATE: I nominate Fellow Worker Speed.

DEL. SPEED: I decline.

(Delegate Trainor was nominated, but declined the nomination.)

DEL. WALTERS: I rise to nominate Fellow Worker Fischer.

(Nominated and seconded.)

DEL. SPETTEL: I nominate Fellow Worker Haggerty.

DEL. HAGGERTY: Mr. Chairman, I will have to decline. I am very grateful to you for the recognition.

THE CHAIRMAN: He declines. Any further nominations? We now have nine.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I wish to nominate Fellow Worker Jones of Minnesota.

DEL. JONES: I decline.

DEL. HAGENSON: I wish to nominate Fellow Worker Wagner, of St. Louis.

(Nomination seconded.)

DEL. OHMAN: I desire to place in nomination Fellow Worker Delaney of Buffalo.

(Nomination seconded.)

A DELEGATE: I wish to place in nomination Fellow Worker Trainor.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. TRAINOR: I declined once.

DEL. KERN: I nominate Fellow Worker Haggerty.

THE CHAIRMAN: He declined a while ago.

DEL. HUBER: I nominate this gentleman right here, from the transportation workers, Delegate Henion.

DEL. HENION: Fellow Worker Chairman and Fellow Workers: I decline.

DEL. DELANEY: I nominate Fellow Worker Walters.

(Nomination seconded.)

DEL. SCHWEND: I would like to place in nomination for a member of the Executive Board, Fellow Worker Katz.

DEL. OHMAN: I move you that the nominations close.

(The motion was duly seconded and carried.)

THE CHAIRMAN: At the last convention, how did they proceed there?

DEL. WALTERS: A point of order. My point of order is that the chairman should ask these nominees whether they stand or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be done.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: At the last convention every delegate was requested to name five of the nominees, to vote for five of the nominees, on roll call. When the names were called the delegates name{d} their selections among the names on the blackboard.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will ask the candidates now whether they will accept the nominations. Fellow Workers Williams, do you accept?

DEL. WILLIAMS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Williams accepted. Delegate Heslewood, do you accept?

DEL. HESLEWOOD: You bet your life I do.

DEL. DE LEON: I would request that the chair keep some order here. We cannot hear what is going on.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates will please keep quiet and I will call them off again. Williams and Heslewood accept. Foote, do you accept?

DEL. FOOTE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Cole, do you accept?

DEL. COLE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Thomas, do you accept?

DEL. THOMAS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strike off the name Thomas. Walters, do you accept?

DEL. WALTERS: No.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

THE CHAIRMAN: Strike off the name Walters. Yates, do you accept?

DEL. YATES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yates accepts. Delegate Schwend, do you accept?

DEL. SCHWEND: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Schwend declines. Strike out the name of Schwend. I accept. Fischer, do you accept?

DEL. FISCHER: I decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fischer declines. Wagner is not in this convention, so he stands. Delaney, do you accept?

DEL. DELANEY: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delaney accepts. Now, then, we have the following nominees: Williams, Heslewood, Foote, Cole, Yates, Katz, Wagner and Delaney.

DEL. DE LEON: I would request that the names be not stricken out by Fellow Worker Edwards, but that he wipe out the names of those that have declined.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wipe them out. That is fair.

DEL. SCHWEND: Fellow Worker Chairman, I rise to a point of information. I believe that the chair has stated that it is the sense of the convention that no member of the Executive Board shall be employed as a national organizer. Am I correct? Now, I notice there that we have a few names of those who I believe have been national organizers, and have done good work, and I believe it is the sense of this convention that those men ought to be continued; but in view of the ruling of the chair, or the sense of the convention, if these men are elected on the Executive Board they could not then be appointed as national organizers. Am I right?

DEL. AXELSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is the—

DEL. SCHWEND: That is the sense of the convention, as I understand it. Now, there is Fellow Worker Heslewood, Fellow Worker Williams, Fellow Worker Foote, Fellow Worker Katz, and some others that I believe should be national organizers of this body. I believe they are men who could do most effective work for the organization. But it is the sense of the convention that members of the General Executive Board shall not be organizers and not be in a position to pass upon their own work, I say they should not stand for election on the Executive Board.

DEL. FOOTE: Fellow Worker Chairman: I wish to make the point that I have never been a national organizer.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: I have never been a national organizer, and none of the delegates mentioned have always been national organizers. Anybody can be appointed, even if he is a member of the General Executive Board, to perform certain organizing work, because he is simply then exercising the functions of his office. The decision that was arrived at was that the sense of the convention was that no man should be employed as steady national organizer. But there may be any of the members of the General Executive Board that can be called upon to do the work of organizer.

DEL. AXELSON: Fellow Worker Chairman: In reference to the rule that we have passed before this, it seems to me that we are creating a contradiction now. We have been very careful so as not to have any man who is as salaried officer of this organization on this Executive Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of his organization?

DEL. AXELSON: Of this organization. Now, we have a general organizer. The general organizer is nominated on the Executive Board, and in doing that we {he?} can sanction his own work.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are no general organizers now.

DEL. AXELSON: How?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no one that holds any office now as general organizer, in this organization, that I know of.

DEL. AXELSON: Not now?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DEL. AXELSON: But it will be when this goes into effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, there is nothing before the house except voting on these men. We have ruled upon it already.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: None of those who are permanent organizers.

DEL. AXELSON: The chair does not understand me, nor do the members of the organization seem to understand me. We have passed upon it, that the general organizer should be on the General Executive Board, with a voice, but no vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. AXELSON: Now, they are going to nominate Fellow Worker Heslewood. Oh, I see now. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will proceed with the vote.

DEL. AXELSON: I had Heslewood in mind instead of St. John.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we will proceed with the voting. I will appoint two delegates as tellers, and I appoint Delegate Spettel and Delegate Axelson as the tellers to take the vote as it will be called, or, have you all got tally sheets? Then you can all be tellers. All right.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

SEC. TRAUTMANN: You write five names, or name the five, and we take note of all the names, and every one votes his full quota of votes.

THE CHAIRMAN: How about the candidates?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The candidates certainly have a perfect right to cast votes.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Now, then, we will proceed, and the secretary will call the roll.

DEL. DE LEON: I would suggest that the secretary state, at the same time, the number of votes each delegate has.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: He does so.

DEL. DE LEON: Mention the number before a delegate votes.

The roll was called by Secretary Trautmann, and the delegates voted for members of the General Executive Board, as follows, each casting the number of votes set opposite his name:

The result of the vote was announced by Secretary Trautmann as follows:

Heslewood received	119
Cole received	111
Katz received	102
Yates received	95 ^{1/2}
Williams received	93
Foote received	38
Delaney received	26 ^{1/2}
Wagner received	10

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The following candidates have received the highest number of votes. Heslewood, Cole, Katz, Yates and Williams. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I now declare the following duly elected as members of the Executive Board: Williams, Heslewood, Cole, Katz and Yates.

{COMMUNICATION.}

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Will you permit me to read a letter? I believe that it is important for this convention to act upon. We have just now received a letter from G.E. Wagner of St. Louis.

Secretary Trautmann thereupon read to the convention the letter referred to, dated St. Louis, September 23, 1907, calling attention to the fact that 25,000 shoe workers were out on a strike in St. Louis, and stating that they needed speakers there, and other aid, as they were

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

themselves not in good financial circumstances, and deeming that the convention being in session it was an opportune time to inform the Industrial Workers of the World of the situation.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will just say that we had formerly a good membership in St. Louis, and some of our former members are involved in this strike. It is the third largest shoemaking center in the country.

(It was moved and seconded that the communication be referred to the incoming General Executive Board.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the reading of the communication, and the motion that this be referred to the incoming General Executive Board. Are you ready for the question?

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

{INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS.}

THE CHAIRMAN: It is carried. Now, is there any other business before this convention? There is the installation of officers. I believe it would be proper to have the former Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Fellow Worker Haggerty, take that job in hand.

(The newly elected officers were then called forward, for the purpose of installation.)

DEL. HAGGERTY: The members of the Executive Board will please come forward, and the Secretary-Treasurer, and the Editor. Face the delegates, so that they can all see you. (Reading from the constitution.)

ARTICLE VIII.

Pledge for Officers.

Sec. 1. All officers in the I.W.W. when being installed into office shall be required to give the following pledge:

“Having been entrusted by my fellow wageworkers with the position I am about to assume, I do solemnly pledge my word and honor that I will obey the constitution, rules and regulations of the Industrial Workers of the World, and that, keeping always in view its fundamental principles and final aims, I will to the best of my ability perform the task assigned to me. I believe in and understand the two sentences: ‘The Working Class and the Employing Class have nothing in Common,’ and ‘Labor is Entitled to All it Produces.’”

Do you all agree to that, and endorse it?

THE OFFICERS ELECT: We do.

DEL. HAGGERTY: You all do. Is that all that is required?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes.

DEL. HAGGERTY: That is all that is required. I know every one of you, and I know that every one of you are men, and that you will do

your duty. (Applause.)

{COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF STENOGRAPHIC REPORT.}

J.H. WALSH (For the Committee on Revision of Report): Mr. Chairman: Relative to the publication now of all these proof sheets that have been handed in to us, I trust that the delegates will not try to correct the proof sheets, to show what they think they said. I notice that lots of you, in your corrections, are handing in something that you think you said, when as a matter of fact the stenographer got exactly what you did say. Now, this should go out as what you did say, and not as what you think you should have said. That would be an endless job, if we are to re-edit all of the proof sheets of these stenographic reports—for each delegate now to say what he thinks he should have said at that time.

The second thing is: Is it the desire now of this convention, for us to keep these proof sheets, and is that to be published in book form again? If so, we must keep all these proof sheets, to correct these up, because there are some places where the stenographers did not get the names right. You will see the place, in the proof sheet. I don't know who the delegate was. It was accredited to Secretary Trautmann, but I erased it in the proof sheet, because I knew that it was not he that said that. Whoever it was will know that, and will have to mark the proof sheet and send it in.

DEL. LIESNER: Is there anything further before the convention to be done?

THE CHAIRMAN: This matter is unsettled, and should be settled by the convention. What is your pleasure?

DEL. LIESNER: I move you that the report sheets be preserved as they are, and no further expense incurred.

(Motion seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion has been made and seconded, that the General Executive Board should go to no further expense in publishing the stenographic report, in book form.

J.H. WALSH: You understand this, do you,—that the type is already up now, and of course you cannot hold that for six months. You have got to give them an order. If not, it will have to all be set over again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you state your motion again?

DEL. LIESNER: My motion is that we correct the errors and print the reports as they now are without binding or any further expense, that is the meaning of my motion.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DEL. SPETTEL: I should be willing, with the understanding that the matter taken down by the stenographer will stand and not have the delegates when they see it in print as Fellow Worker Walsh suggests, correct their statements.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is out of the question. That cannot be done.

DEL. WALTERS: Don't you think in a matter like this that it would be better if some one who understands the printing business would submit some figures as to what the expense would be to have this printed in pamphlet form, so that we can intelligently vote upon this matter. We know that a great many members have sent in requests for this stenographic report and it was the understanding that they would be put in pamphlet form and wired together, or something of that kind. We should understand clearly whether we are able to print it in that form so that we may know what we are doing.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: We have the preserved 500 copies of each day's proceedings and have them at the present time, because the difference in the cost of printing that many more is not material. The printing of the report in book form, for 1,000 copies would cost, say, \$850.

DEL. FRANCIS: If I remember rightly the General Executive Board sent out notification to the locals to the effect that in view of last year's experience by which it has proved disastrous to the organization, in that we do not sell half the copies—and we had to pay express hire to move them about—I hope we can start a good bonfire with them some day; therefore, it was understood, in my local at any rate, that the binding up was an unnecessary expense, that any one interested in the convention should subscribe for the daily proceedings and do away with publishing it in book form.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: That was the idea.

DEL. FRANCIS: I think that is the way it was understood in the organization. They will get the proceedings according to the proposition submitted, and those who simply want to have a library—we can't afford to spend \$850 to bind this book for them and I am not of the opinion that they would be pleased at such an expense. Those who are interested enough to get these proceedings would not get the cloth bound report. They would not read them. I am, therefore, in favor of the motion that the situation be left as it is at the present time.

J.H. WALSH: These books may not be more than kindling wood at this time but these books in book form are going to be very valuable in the future. The earlier reports in the Western Federation of Miners

cannot be bought now and there is a continual demand for them. Now, if we hold this type, correct it up and put it in book form, and print 1,000 then we may have enough for the future.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I offer an amendment to the motion that we put them in book form.

(The motion was seconded by several delegates.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is made and seconded that 1,000 copies of the stenographic report of the proceedings of the convention be bound in book form.

DEL. LIESNER: I will favor that motion provided there will be enough books subscribed for to pay the expense; but I do not see how we can burden the treasury with that expense and have the books simply lie in stock. We can not afford to stock ahead for future demands. I realize the necessity for the preservation of these records. I appreciate it as much as any one. I think if we want them preserved each local in advance should subscribe for one or two copies or as many more as they can in order to insure the expense being covered.

DEL. AXELSON: I offer as an amendment to the amendment that before we proceed to publish the book we canvass all the locals and see how many there are that are willing to subscribe for this book, so that we may know that a definite number of books will be sold and according to that we can regulate the number that will be printed and bound.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: While that may appear practical, I can not see how the printer could hold that matter over until we ascertain who is to buy the books. The difference in price, once you decide that you shall have them in book form, the difference in price between 200 and 1,000 is such a small one that if we print 200 we might as well print 1,000. It would only be a difference in price of \$80 or \$100.

DEL. HAGENSON: I hardly see the necessity of printing these books now. I believe the record of this convention has already been subscribed for and most of it is in the hands of the biggest part of the locals. I believe that these records as they have been printed are good enough. There are 500 of them yet on hand and I believe you will find that will pretty near fill the bill of those that will be subscribed for in the future. While the book form would maybe be a little bit more suitable and more convenient still I think the records as they are now are sufficient.

DEL. DELANEY: Cannot those sheets that we have now be given a simple binding and kept in that way?

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE CHAIRMAN: Can the copies that you have now be bound as they are?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: Yes. They can be bound as a newspaper with perhaps a thin cover, or even stiff board.

DEL. DE LEON: What has been suggested here is putting the report in book form. The binding up of the *Bulletin* is not meant. Those who want to have this thing in book form, mean book form. All the arguments that they make against this are correct. It means either the piling {filing?} of the matter or holding of the matter and printing it later. That means so much more expense. But it is also true that while those books would be a drug on our hands today they would be invaluable tomorrow, and I am quite sure that it would pay well, and that if we put the stenographic reports away upon our shelves now they will be in great demand, as will likewise be the stenographic reports of the first convention. Is there no way of joining these two things? Can't we combine each of these thoughts by voting down the amendment to the amendment and the amendment and preserving the motion. We have today the stenographic report—I wish to speak presently on the matter of corrections. If in a few months we find there is a demand for it, we can always reprint the stenographic report. The expense would be so trivial that it would not be worth considering. If we defeat the amendment to the amendment and the amendment and carry the motion the matter remains right there, it remains in the *Bulletin* and as there are 500 of them in reserve, there will be enough of them in the safe in case of fire and they can always be set up.

Now, as to the matter of corrections. Men when they see themselves in print often disapprove of themselves and they want to make corrections and to put in instead of what they said what they should have said, but what they did not say. But it is also true, that stenographers are not infallible, in fact, they are very fallible, especially if they are not familiar with the terminology which is being used. I know they have done very well so far as I am able to judge; but looking over what I said on one or two occasions I find some errors. I know that I made two references to Mrs. Forberg's statement in the last convention. In one instance it was quoted incorrectly, as having been made at the convention; and there was one mistake where I referred to the fact that even if we agree upon not voting that that is indirect political action, and that you must emancipate the minds of the people of political errors before you can unite Democrats and Republicans in a revolutionary movement.

Another instance is where I referred to the statement made by Mrs.

Forberg last year that the first man to bolt the last convention was an anarchist.

I remember also that the stenographer left out one of those entirely. The other point was where I spoke of the difference between the I.W.W. and the S.L.P. I did not say that the difference between the two was merely a difference of opinion. I may be mistaken as to the correctness of what I said; I may be entirely off as to the difference, but I surely didn't say that. Now, I am certain that the same thing must have happened to others. But in a case of that kind the difficulty can be obviated easily. In case there is a demand—if the amendment is defeated, and the amendment to the amendment also defeated, and the motion carried to let things remain as they are—then if the demand arises, which I expect to see arise, for that stenographic report and the G.E.B. finds itself able to have this matter reopened, then I think it would be proper for the G.E.B. to send a copy of the matter to each one who participated in the debate—the stenographic reports are not to be destroyed—and the G.E.B. can surely set itself up as a jury or committee on press and if any one wants to insert anything that they did not say they can get hold of the stenographer and find out if they are trying to abuse the right of correction, but if the correction is one as to which there is some trace in the minutes then that correction can be made. Therefore I say defeat the amendment to the amendment and the amendment and leave things as they are.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is now a motion and two amendments before the house. The motion made by Delegate Liesner is that we leave the matter as it is now and that we go into no further expense at this time. The amendment by Delegate Aiazzone is that we order 1,000 copies of the stenographic report in book form. The amendment to the amendment by Axelson is that the locals be asked how many they want and that the secretary then be guided by the orders that he receives. We will now vote upon the amendment to the amendment, which is that the secretary shall communicate with the locals and find out how many they would order.

Upon the vote being taken the Chairman declared the amendment to the amendment lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the amendment by Delegate Aiazzone that 1,000 of the stenographic reports be ordered in book form. Those in favor of that amendment will say aye. Those opposed, no.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

The amendment was declared lost by the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now we come to the motion made by Delegate Liesner that the matter remain as it now is. Those in favor of that motion will say aye.

The Chairman declared the motion carried.

DEL. ROTKOVITZ: I wish to ask that the Chair will request Fellow Worker De Leon to address the convention on the principles of industrial unionism before the convention adjourns.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate De Leon declines.

DEL. DE LEON: If this convention does not know what industrial unionism means, it is too late now to tell them what it means; and if they do know, as I believe they do, it would be carrying coals to Newcastle.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further business to come before the convention.

PLACE OF THE NEXT CONVENTION.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The place for the next convention is the next business before us.

DEL. DE LEON: I rise to make a motion on that subject. The motion is that not later than seven months from this time the G.E.B. shall submit the question to a general vote. The time is determined by the constitution and in that way the matter of the place can be settled by a general vote. The reason I make that motion is because our membership may increase very rapidly in the west and we might at that time wish to hold the convention further west. I would like to see it held in Denver. On the other hand, perhaps our membership will increase very rapidly in the east among the textile workers, and it might be advisable then to hold the convention in Boston.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the matter with Paterson?

DEL. DE LEON: That district is supposed to be outside of the United States, so I will not suggest Paterson. I simply throw out this thought. One year is a short time, and I do not know that we shall progress so rapidly in any one direction; but it seems to me that it is premature for the convention to determine a year in advance where the convention should meet, and I think it should be left to the action of the membership by a general vote, say not later than {than?} seven months from the adjournment of this convention, or if you prefer to put it so, not later than four months before the holding of the next

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

convention. We shall then be able to determine the matter intelligently.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded that the place for holding the convention be determined by a general vote of the membership, not later than four months preceding the next convention.

DEL. SCHWEND: Is the motion that the time and place be fixed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Only the place. The time is fixed by the constitution.

DEL. LIESNER: I would ask in that event if this convention is not to nominate several places and then have those places voted upon.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would defeat the sense of the motion.

DEL. LIESNER: I mean to have list of places to vote on.

DEL. FRANCIS: I am opposed to this kind of a scheme, for the reason that even if there is a larger membership in the east than in the west we should not follow the membership. I tell you that Chicago is the headquarters of the organization. The only way you can keep track of the organization is when you are right where the officers are. Otherwise when committees want documents or information on some point and the officers are away from the place of the convention then we have to send away or we have to close up the offices here in Chicago. If the committee wants a document and it is not there, then they have to adjourn the convention and send to the headquarters in Chicago. I don't understand why we should always go on in the experimental way. We have been making experiments for years. It is the way to allow the officers to go a distance, so that in case they did something wrong you cannot reach it if you hold the convention away from headquarters. Headquarters is the place to hold the convention, especially with Chicago geographically located as it is. I am satisfied that the men who want to go to the convention to do the work will always want to go to Chicago and not go east and have to be on the railroad 28 hours. It is all right for those who have money to spend 28 hours on a railroad car, for those that have money for Pullmans that is good enough. But we are not used to Pullmans: I don't think it would be proper for me to make the organization pay for a Pullman and so I say to the delegates don't engage in any experimental propositions. Stay right here, the proper place is Chicago.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I concur with every word that the fellow worker has said. We have had some experiments in moving the convention, in the Western Federation of Miners, and although some

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

of them in that body are reactionary, we can at least profit by their experience in the past. They did change to Salt Lake one year and it cost them hundreds and hundreds of dollars to move the stenographer and the typewriters and trunks of stationery and documents, and when they got it all moved to Salt Lake City they found that they had after all left something in some pigeon-hole that they wanted and must have. Now, in the matter of the locals. We ought to remember that an injury to one is the concern of all locals, and the best place to hold a convention like this is in the central position in the country regardless of how many men you have in the west or in the east. If you want to do an injury to the men out on the Pacific Coast you will compel those men to go to some place in New Jersey, or on the other hand, if you hold it in the extreme west you would do an injury to some other organization in the east. One organization would save money while another would go busted in trying to send a man from the other end of the country. We should hold the convention in the most central part of America. The offices are here, the stenographers are here, the typewriters are here. You can get a hall for nothing and you have all the documents right at your hand. They are all in the pigeon-holes and you can get them in 20 minutes. For those reasons I am in favor of holding the convention here in Chicago.

J.H. WALSH: Not that I want to talk upon this motion as to the place of holding the convention, but I wish to say that there is a proposition that comes to us from Alaska. We are going to have a large membership there in the future. The Western Federation have had a local there for some time, and the Western Federation have always held their convention at a time in the year when men can not leave Alaska and get back again the same year. A person who comes from Alaska must come from there in June and go back by the first of October. They are then frozen in for eight months. If you hold a convention here in September they could not send a delegate from Alaska unless they kept the delegate out of Alaska until next June. Therefore Alaska asks that the convention be set at a time when they can send a delegate down here. That change would of course refer back to a constitutional amendment, and of course you cannot change that now, but I hope the members of the convention will think about this, because the northwest belongs to the I.W.W. and we must hold the convention in July or August if we would allow those people to participate in it.

DEL. DE LEON: I ask the privilege of withdrawing my motion and I will tell you why. I never imagined that the insulting remarks that

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

were made by Delegate Francis suggesting or imputing a scheme would possibly be made. In view of that fact, I certainly ask that that motion be withdrawn, inasmuch as it never crossed my mind—it is out of order to use unparliamentary language, and I think it is highly improper for Fellow Worker Francis to make such insulting insinuations which mean the bringing in of outside controversies which were entirely absent from my mind when I made my motion. The constitution does not provide that the convention shall be held in the city of Chicago. The constitution provides that this convention shall decide the place to meet in. The constitution leaves it open. But since the remarks have been made and since they were not called for by my motion or anything that I said, I beg to withdraw my motion.

DEL. FRANCIS: I wish to explain myself—

THE CHAIRMAN: That will do. I want to say, in answer to the delegate from New York, that had it been any one else except Delegate Francis, the chair would have called him to order. Delegate Francis has made repeated remarks that were not parliamentary, especially about the chairman; but the chairman did not call him to order because the delegates sufficiently know Delegate Francis. If there is no objection the motion will be withdrawn and there is nothing before the house but fixing the place for the next convention.

DEL. GLOVER: I move you that the city of Chicago be selected as the place for the next convention.

(The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that Chicago be the place for holding the next convention of the Industrial Workers of the World.

The motion was then put and carried.

DEL. FRANCIS: I now move that we change the time of the convention from the third Monday in September to the third Monday in July.

THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot do that at this time. It would have to go before the committee on constitution. It is out of order now because it is a constitutional provision. You will have to take that up at the next convention. Any other business? The next order before us is good and welfare of the organization.

{GOOD AND WELFARE.}

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I wish to make a statement in regard to a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

proposition which came up in the Western Federation of Miners, which has thrown considerable cold water on the cause of the I.W.W. among the miners out west. Probably one of the most important causes for such a big vote against the I.W.W. in the last convention of the Western Federation of Miners was this matter that I refer to. In the first place I don't believe a word that was said there by Petriella and Maningi; but they did throw cold water on our organization and it was the means of hurting our organization to a great extent among the miners. It has not been refuted yet by Delegate Jones, to whom the reference was made. It was claimed that Delegate Jones of this organization was an organizer in Minnesota and was organizing scab unions in the interest of the steel trust and against the Western Federation of Miners. Now, what I have to say is this: We have a stenographer here; we have Delegate Jones here and I am going for my part to see that the stenographer's report is placed in the hands of the miners, and I want to have Delegate Jones before this convention adjourns, make this thing clear so that we will get it and send it to the miners to show that he was not organizing scab unions, that I.W.W. men did not take the place of Western Federation men, and that Jones, whom we know to be true blue and who has served a term in prison for being in the I.W.W., was not organizing any union in the interest of the Steel trust. For these reasons I would like to have Jones speak before us.

DEL. JONES: I would like to have an opportunity to correct the stenographer's report after I get through. The other day, while looking over the files of the *Miners Magazine*, I discovered an extract from Petriella's report to the Fifteenth Annual Convention of the Western Federation of Miners about the condition in Minnesota, and near the latter end of this extract he makes this statement that Kirwan, Gunnerson, Wamsley and Sullivan were in that district, but not understanding the conditions could not do anything. The next two organizers, John Hill and Joseph Mantell, were both honest. This is where his "Royal Highness," O'Neill, chopped off. Now I was the next organizer in that district, and I went to Heslewood since he came back to the convention here and asked him what it meant. Heslewood made the statement that Petriella said that I had appropriated \$300 of the money belonging to the union in that district for my own personal use.

Now, to show you how I came to get into the movement, I will go into details. I joined Roslyn Miners' Union, No. 38, in 1898, or perhaps the spring of 1899. Shortly afterwards the lockout came and I was forced out of that district and went to eastern Canada. In 1902 I

went to Minnesota and went to work in Lincoln Mine in Virginia. They were paying \$2.50 a day for ten hours. Now, before I went to work in the mines in the west I had worked at the painting trade. The wages I could make in Minnesota in painting were far ahead of mining. Besides, I had left the Lincoln mine and gone into the Commonwealth mine, where they had an engineer who was not capable of handling the job and dropped three loaded buckets down the shaft in two weeks, and I thought it was time to quit.

Now, the Western Federation of Miners went on a strike in Colorado. The Colorado Coal, Fuel & Iron Company and other concerns were fighting it, and they went to Minnesota to get their scabs. Immediately the Western Federation of Miners sent organizers to Minnesota to organize the scabs in that district. Locals were organized in Eveleth and Sparta. In Eveleth they put a saloon keeper in as treasurer. In Sparta they put in a deputy sheriff as president, a livery man as treasurer and so on down the line. Kerwan went to Hibbing and stayed there for some time. These other men had been in the district but he got nine members. The charter had been put in there by Wamsley some two or three years previous to this, but had never been taken out. Now Kerwan took in those nine members and one of those was Karo, who was a business man in the clothing business. Now, Karo stands in with the mining companies and whenever a miner owes him a bill he can collect it through them. I was not familiar with Karo. I thought he was a socialist and would be honest. But that is getting ahead of my story. After these local organizations were organized in these different districts, there was no organization in Virginia. My partner and I, Jim Sullivan, in the painting business, hearing of this movement, we got out and organized the Virginia Miners' Union with myself as secretary. Now, these other fellows had failed to organize a local in Virginia, and we did it, material interests compelled us to organize or help an organization along, so as to get the workers in our own business, the painting industry, organized. We realized that the key to the situation was with the miners. They held the key to the whole situation. The wages in our business were only \$2.50, where I stood for \$4 a day, so that these painters could be shoved out of existence and the men themselves were getting \$4, the contractors would be compelled to raise their prices to the owners of the buildings. Haywood and Moyer did not believe in spending any more money in that district and wanted the district to organize itself so they asked the local unions to organize a

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

district union. This was done at Eve{leth}{ . . . }²² at that meeting. Peterson of Hibbing was there, representing the Hibbing Miners' Union. He was one of the men that Kerwan took in over there. Now, the constitution provided for \$5 a day and I thought that if we put an organizer on the road we should look at the wages in the district, that \$2 was the average wage, and so I asked one of the members to take the chair while I made a motion to the effect that he should be given \$3 a day and transportation. This will come in afterwards, when I get to the fight that was made to get me out, so that some of these members could get \$5 for themselves.

Now, I considered that Hibbing was the key to the situation when I went on the road, but in organizing in that district I found that the Finnish boys were lined up in the S.P., a pure and simple political party and they wouldn't have anything to do with unionism, didn't think it was necessary. The first day I got into Hibbing I was thrown into jail for the night, but the police chief would not come up against me in the morning and I had no trouble and was let out. Then they left me alone. I took some 48 members, Finns, into the organization. Then I went away, and while I was away Karo tells the Finns that they can not get the Italians and the other nationalities and the organization went to pieces. The money was still in the treasury. I had some \$300 of my own money. The Minnesota district union didn't have enough money in the treasury to pay me. When I used up my own money I was compelled to look up a further way of getting funds. Now, the boys in the local said, "You take the money from the local union and when the district union is able to pay you back, they will do so." Then the proposition came up in the 14th annual convention and George Stewart, who was present from Hibbing Miners' Union, made the motion to select me and I went. Previous to this Petriella came into the district, boosting his paper, from Michigan. What he wanted was to have them endorse the paper so that he could use that as a means for getting the organization to take hold of it. We went to the convention and made demands on the organization for an Italian organizer. I went to Kirwan and Kirwan made the remark, "I have got a stack of letters that high in the office showing that Petriella is crooked." The Executive Board sent Petriella into the district and St. John came in shortly afterwards to look over it. St. John went broke and so did Petriella and they both borrowed money from me which they knew was from the local union treasury. But St. John made the remark to me that this was

²² [At least one line of type missing at this point. No "pi" uncovered.—R.B.]

illegal. When St. John left the district Petriella went broke again and he came to me and wanted more money, which I refused, as the opposition to me as an organizer had been very bitter and I wanted to get out and let some of those people who thought they knew more than I did, get in and try it for themselves. My resignation was accepted by the Minnesota district union and I gave an order on the Minnesota district union to Hibbing local union, which was accepted by that local union.

Now there comes another proposition. In the Hibbing miners' union we bought 150 dues stamps from headquarters for \$25. I was rooming over a drug store at that time and in some manner the 150 stamps were missing. Petriella and Riley, who since has embezzled \$200 from John Billow of this city, wrote directly to headquarters to find out what they could do in regard to making me pay for this. Mahoney wrote back that I was to pay for the whole thing. The local union took action against that proposition. They accepted my explanation. It was reported to me afterwards by George Stewart, president of the Hibbing Miners' Union, that Petriella had organized an Italian branch and had borrowed 80 dues stamps from Hibbing Miners' Union, and had repaid them, but that the financial report of the Western Federation of Miners did not show where Petriella had bought any dues stamps from headquarters.

Now there is another proposition. When I left the Virginia Miners' Union they claimed that books had been issued in that district from the Virginia Miners' Union showing that I had collected money for initiation which had not been put on the books. My books were audited in the Virginia Miners' Union by the auditing committee and were accepted as correct. The man who took my place as secretary after I left the Virginia Miners' Union was the owner of an employment agency and he stood in with the administration that I had been fighting, that is the School Board. This School Board went all over the country trying to keep my sister from being employed by any School Board in that district. They tried to blacklist me in the labor movement, realizing the hold I had on the people in the district, and they took this method by giving out these books and putting my name to them, and Petriella helped on this proposition.

After I left, I went to Bovey, Minnesota, and went back into the painting business; that is to say I went to work for a painter by the name of Weston. I organized a building industrial local there and refused to take in members who were working in the mines, and told the boys who were working in the mines not to organize then in the

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

Western Federation of Miners until such time as the Western Federation went on record to stay by the actions of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Then along came this strike we have had, and Petriella came over with John Maki, the secretary of the Hibbing Miners' Union, and started in to organize the Federation. This was after they were on strike.

They asked me to help out, which I did. The night that Maki held his meeting there, every straw boss that worked in that district was in the room, and 140 members of the working class joined the Western Federation of Miners that night, even though these straw bosses were watching them.

The mining company realized that something had to be done to stop this. We could not get the Austrians, so we sent to Hibbing for Austrian organizers. They were to come over on the train Monday from Hibbing.

On Monday night a meeting of the Citizens' Alliance was held in Bovey and over 700 people attended that meeting, and resolutions were passed in regard to the deporting of agitators out of the district. They chased Desane off the streets and they found me in one of the saloons there. They rushed in and made propositions to hang me and all that sort of talk, and I was escorted home by the crowd. Instead of going home I ducked over to the Finns, where I knew there were some rifles in sight, and in the morning I told the two organizers for the Federation not to go near Coleraine Depot; to come with me to Holman, four miles below, and we would search the train there and get any of our members off and take them over through the woods into town.

Desane and Razine did not act on that; they went to the station. Eight or nine of us went to Holman, but no one showed up. Razine and Desane were captured by members of the Citizens' Alliance and deported to Grand Rapids, where they were arrested by the deputy sheriff and thrown into the county jail. We came back from Holman through the woods. In the meantime the Citizens' Alliance had left Bovey to follow us down to where we had gone. At noon I went back to work as usual, and a deputation waited on me, telling me that I was not to speak that evening in the meeting which was to be held. I told them I would speak, no matter what came or went.

At half past seven they arrested me and threw me into the local jail to keep me from speaking, and at 11 o'clock I was deported to the county jail with the rest of them.

Now, Charles Maki, secretary of the Bovey Miners' Union, reported to Petriella that I was arrested with these other two members. Petriella went to John Keyes, the attorney for the Federation in that district, and told him to take action in regard to getting Razine and Desane out, never mentioning me. Then Charlie Maki went to Hibbing and interviewed Petriella personally and asked him what was the matter. "Well," he said, "Jones was crooked," and he would not take him out.

Mahoney came into the district and was waited on by George E. Stewart and the Finns, and was requested to get me out at once. He made the statement that they would do all in their power to do so; that he knew Jones was honest and that he wanted him to go back on the road as an organizer for the Western Federation of Miners as soon as he got out; but he stayed in that district twenty days and when he left I was still in jail and two of the Finnish boys took me out on their own responsibility.

Now, when I got out I went to Duluth and met Petriella. Petriella in the meantime had been making excuses that he made a mistake, but that didn't go down with the members of the Western Federation, or of the working class, you might say, in Minnesota.

Hibbing Miners' Union had repudiated Petriella, so had the Bovey Miners' Union, and so had Mountain Iron.

Now, to understand why the other locals in that district had not repudiated Petriella, you must understand what kind of a machine he had there. He would take in Italians and Austrians whom he couldn't reach by word of mouth or through men who were true, and he would vote these members as he liked; using that vote, he has elected secretaries and given them a salary of \$75 or \$80 a month, if they would stay by him. Now, the rank and file were not class conscious, did not understand Petriella, but they are waking up to him. It will take six months to depose this machine, that is to get rid of these delegates to the district union. When the rank and file of the organization remove these representatives of the local from the district union, then we will have a complete change in that district. That is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now under the head of good and welfare. Is there any further business before this convention?

DEL. BOHN: Yes, I should like a point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Point of information?

DEL. BOHN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your point of information?

DEL. BOHN: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: Article I, Section 2, of the Constitution says: "The Industrial Workers of the World shall

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

be composed of actual wage workers,” brought together in an organization, etc. Now, I would like to ask, supposing any one of us, or anyone in our locals who is today a wage worker or a wage slave, and tomorrow he happened to become a slave driver, that is to say, he should become a foreman, is he supposed to belong to the organization any longer? Because he claims he is a wage worker also that he works at the same time, still at the same time he protects the interests of the employer in order to protect his own interests. So I do not think that we can depose a foreman or even a small boss if today he is a member and tomorrow he establishes some kind of business where he employs people and becomes a boss himself. Can we keep that man any longer in our organization?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bohn, you have asked a number of questions. In the first place, you said if a man becomes a foreman, a foreman is a wage worker and it is left with the local union whether they take him in or not. In some places a foreman means nothing, he is no more than an ordinary worker, he is a man that has a certain amount of work to do that the others have not. In other places a foreman means a member of the firm to a degree where it is not advisable for the organization to take him in. The constitution is clear upon that point, that only actual wage workers can be admitted as members. A foreman is an actual wage worker, but he can be kept out if you have any actual reasons to keep him out.

But if a man becomes an employer of labor, he is a wage worker no longer, and then he cannot become a member of this organization. Is that clear?

DEL. BOHN: But at the same time he protects his employer's interests.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that I have explained to you: that is a matter left with your organization. That is a specific case with your local union; your local union must deal with that. The constitution can make no such constitutional provision.

DEL. LIESNER: I want to ask for another point of information along the same lines. For instance, owing to my activity in the labor movement, I am on the black list today, and I have been out of employment since last May on account of it. I am endeavoring now to own my own job. I want to know what is the proper course for me to take? I hold that the proper thing to do is for me to take out a retiring card. Is that right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course.

DEL. COLE: As a further point of information on the same

question, the fact remains that a man who becomes well known within this organization, and as he comes known to the capitalist class, it is dangerous to his interest, because he is known as what we term a dynamiter or an agitator,—take that word dynamiter literally now,—and they will chase him from the employment which he has served. For instance, take a railroad man and when he becomes an agitator and when his agitation begins to show power, then they are going to do away with that man. They are going to blacklist him; and I want to tell you when you go down on the blacklist of a railroad company you are down on the blacklist of them all, every one of them. I know what it is, because I went through four years of that.

Now then, that drives you out of your occupation in which you have been trained. Now, the question that arises is this: suppose that you become a small producer in your own interest, does that necessarily take you from the ranks of the Industrial Workers of the World?

THE CHAIRMAN: It does.

DEL. COLE: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to state that we have been here ten days and we have had committees out to do the work. If anyone had any desire to change the constitution or to bring in anything in the shape of resolutions or amendments, that was the time to do it. Of course, so far as a point of information is concerned, that is in order now, but the constitution is clear upon that point, that only actual wage workers can be members of the organization. I presume, however, that there are such cases where a man who has been agitating for this organization is blacklisted and is compelled to become his own boss and own his own shop. He is not a workman then, or not an actual wage worker. While it may work an injustice to that man, still if we would abolish that it would open the door to a good many more who would come in under that condition of affairs.

DEL. COLE: Mr. Chairman, I submit to the rulings of this convention.

DEL. WALTERS: Mr. Chairman, we have had these resolutions introduced to have an interpretation put upon certain things. These resolutions were referred back in both cases to the General Executive Board. The convention would not make ruling in these things. Now, we are staying here wasting our time, and we have the convention practically making rulings on any proposition that any one wishes to bring up, and I hold that that is objectionable and is entirely out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has asked if there was any further

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

business. If there is not, it would have been proper on the part of the delegates to move to adjourn.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Fellow Worker Chairman, I won't take up but a minute of your time. I want to get clear on this matter that Fellow Worker Jones has been talking about. I want to do that for the sake of the stenographic report which is going to the miners.

He has not given all the enlightenment I wish for in regard to this Western Federation of Miners. I want to know of Jones if he had any organizer credentials signed by the members of the General Executive Board previous to the last convention?

DEL. JONES: From your organization?

DEL. HESLEWOOD: From the I.W.W.

DEL. JONES: I have never held and organizer's credential of any kind from any organization: no credentials: no papers.

DEL. HESLEWOOD: Did you ever organize a miners' local under the head of the I.W.W. without credentials in any town of the Western Federation of Miners?

DEL. JONES: No, but there was a fellow by the name of Boden sent in for a charter from Kewatin, Minnesota, but that was the individuals organizing themselves. The organization here took no official action in that, from what I understand; and I believe there was an organization of an I.W.W. local in Hibbing, which was organized by individuals in that locality. I wish to state further that previous to the W.F. of M. convention I wrote Trautmann that I could organize a local of the W.F. of M., and send a delegate to the convention who would stand for Industrial Unionism. I have his answer, of which I will forward a copy to *The Bulletin*. He said not to do so, for if we packed the convention it would be of no value. Shortly before my resignation was handed to Minnesota District Union, Petriella went to Buhl and made the statement to Garnett Riley, president of {the} district union, and to Maguire, delegate to the district union, that he would have me out of the organization in two weeks.

SEC. TRAUTMANN: I will answer all these questions. The locals in Hibbing and Kewatin were organized by individuals, by a man who is well known, who is a Russian, and who was attending the Second Annual Convention, had gone through the fight in Russia and was well known to me. Those he organized were mixed local organizations. The Hibbing local, as the correspondence will show, is composed partly of miners and others, but those miners went out on strike, and we have letters from the Western Federation of Miners there showing that they advised them not to strike, because their strike would in no way

benefit the strike of the Western Federation of Miners.

But the Hibbing local is now out of existence: every member of the Hibbing local has left the district, because they cannot work there any longer. I believe Axelson knows about these conditions and can bear me out. They were the best men in the district, and every one of them, I think, was true blue. I would almost vouch for every one who signed the charter obligation. These men wouldn't scab, and when they were being hounded continually they decided to strike, although it would not be of any benefit to the Western Federation of Miners. They struck rather than to serve under Petriella and his lieutenants.

I can say more about Petriella and I will say it now. We had a man up in the Iron Range and he went on Garibaldi day to address a meeting of Italian workers. What was the result? The so-called reform mayor of the town says he is a Petriella socialist. What does it mean? That is simply a padrone system. The Italians in the Iron Range are organized under a padrone system. The Italians coming over from the old country usually are under a padrone; he pays them to work and he gets his certain percentage or share and holds the whip over their heads.

Petriella does the same thing in Minnesota; holds a whip over the heads of the Italians, and many of the Italians who have gone through the labor movement are disgusted with his work; they know that no progress can be made until Petriella is removed from that district and his swindling game stopped because it is surely and simply a fraud and a swindling game which he perpetrates against the working class in Minnesota.

DEL. AIAZZONE: I want to speak in regard to the charge made by Petriella against Jones and show up what Petriella is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait a moment.

DEL. CAMINITA: We know all about that.

DEL. AIAZZONE: Maybe you do, but maybe somebody else does not.

(A motion was made by a delegate at this point that the convention adjourn. The motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to cut anybody off. I want to say that we are under the head of Good and Welfare, and that is the reason I have allowed this discussion to go on. Is there anything else before this convention?

DEL. THOMAS: Was there not submitted to the committee on organization a communication from Paterson?

THE CHAIRMAN: That was disposed of before you were reported

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

this morning as being present; it was decided that the money be returned and that they can keep that locally.

DEL. LIESNER: Point of information. I would like to inquire whether we can get the last issue of the report before we leave.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly, if you wait long enough.

SECRETARY TRAUTMANN: Mr. Chairman, and Fellow Worker Delegates: In order to accommodate all of the delegates it would be advisable that everyone should leave his address and we will mail the proceedings of the last day to every delegate. That I believe would meet with general approval.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else before this convention?

DEL. HESLEWOOD: I want to suggest that it would be advisable to take some action in regard to the meeting of the General Executive Board this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't that for the General Executive Board to decide, as to when they will hold that meeting?

SEC. TRAUTMANN: The General Executive Board should certainly convene here this afternoon, in order to wind up all the business of this convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before closing I want to say just two words, or maybe more than two words, but not many more. This convention has been opened without any speech making and it will be closed without any speech making. We simply came together to do the work and we did the work to the best of our ability. We don't want anyone's thanks and we are not going to give thanks to anyone. We return to our constituencies believing that we have done the best we could, and being convinced that this organization will grow until capitalism is overthrown. (Applause.) This convention now stands adjourned sine die.

And at the hour of 11:45 a.m. the third annual convention of the Industrial Workers of the World stood adjourned sine die.

CORRECTIONS.

In official report No. 3, for the session of September 18, in the remarks of Delegate Foote, second page, fourteenth line from bottom, change "they" to "to." In second succeeding sentence change "they" to "you" in both instances. In second column, fifth line from bottom of second paragraph, first word in line, change "industrial" to "mass."

In same issue of the report, in remarks of Delegate Levoy, third page, fourth column, make second sentence of second paragraph to

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

read, “We do not want to organize them and tell them to go and vote, because they do that any way.”

(The End)