

TESTIMONY
OF
William D. Haywood
BEFORE THE
Industrial Relations Commission



W.D.H.
Published by the
I. W. W. PUBLISHING BUREAU,
1001 W. Madison Street,
Chicago, Ill.

"An Injury To One Is An Injury To All"

Defend the Members of Your Class

*Give One Day's Pay for Defense
GET A DAY'S PAY STAMP
Give 5 Dollars EVERY WEEK*



Remember!

We are in for YOU
You are out for US

A challenge has been thrown to every Union man and sympathizer. What are you going to do? What is your answer? Answer with your dollars.

CONTRIBUTE! CONTRIBUTE FREELY!

Make all Checks and Money Orders payable to Wm. D. HAYWOOD, Treasurer, General Defense Committee, 1001 West Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Hundreds of Workers, Members of the Industrial Workers of the World, are being held behind prison bars in CHICAGO, FRESNO, OMAHA, SACRAMENTO, WICHITA and many other places in the United States. It is the intention of the Capitalists to crush all forms of working class organizations. If these men and women are convicted, and the purpose of the Federal indictments carried out, Labor's right to Organize as a Class will have been lost.

TESTIMONY

OF

WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD

BEFORE THE

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

PRICE 15 CENTS

Published by the
I. W. W. PUBLISHING BUREAU
1001 W. Madison Street,
Chicago, Ill.

Chairman Walsh: Will you please state your full name?

Mr. Haywood: William D. Haywood.

Chairman Walsh: Where do you reside, Mr. Haywood?

Mr. Haywood: Denver is my home.

Chairman Walsh: Denver, Colo.?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Chairman Walsh: Where were you born?

Mr. Haywood: Salt Lake City, Utah.

Chairman Walsh: And what is your Age?

Mr. Haywood: Born in 1869—February.

Chairman Walsh: At what age did you begin work?

Mr. Haywood: Nine years old.

Chairman Walsh: And in what industry, or what occupation?

Mr. Haywood: In the mining industry.

Chairman Walsh: Whereabouts?

Mr. Haywood: Utah—Ophir Canyon.

Chairman Walsh: Would you be kind enough, Mr. Haywood, just to sketch your history as a worker and a miner, up to the time you became a member of the association of the Western Federation of Miners?

Mr. Haywood: Well, after the first short period, we moved from there back to Salt Lake City, where I worked at different kinds of work until I went to the State of Nevada, when I was 15 years old.

Chairman Walsh: Well, now, in a general way, what sort of work did you work at, between the ages of 9 and 15?

Mr. Haywood: Why, I worked at driving delivery wagons, as a messenger boy, in a hotel as elevator boy and bell boy. It was when I was in the latter part of it, the fifteenth year, that I went to Nevada, and went to work in the mines permanently.

Chairman Walsh: At the age of 15?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Chairman Walsh: Will you kindly pitch your voice a little louder; the reporters seem to have difficulty in hearing you, and there are a number of spectators who would like to hear you. So you will speak a little louder.

Mr. Haywood: I went to work for the Ohio Mining Company in Willow Creek, Nevada, and worked there until I was 19; and then drifted around into the different mining camps of Utah, Colorado, Idaho, and back to Nevada again.

Chairman Walsh: Are you familiar with the formation of the Western Federation of Miners?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; being a miner, of course I kept acquainted with what the miners were doing and remember when that federation of miners was organized, and have since become acquainted with all of the circumstances that brought about the federation of miners.

Chairman Walsh: Will you please describe the conditions that led to the formation of the Western Federation of Miners?

Mr. Haywood: It was organized as the result of a strike that occurred in the Coeur d'Alene.

Chairman Walsh: What form of organization did they have prior to that time, if any?

Mr. Haywood: Local unions, and mostly branches or assemblies of the Knights of Labor.

The miners of the Coeur d'Alene had gone on strike against a reduction of wages, and the mine owners called in armed thugs, armed men from outside territory. There was a pitched battle between these guards and the miners, and in the course of the fight there was a mill blown up. This was charged to the miners, and the mine owners called on the governor for the militia. The militia was sent in there and martial law was declared, and nearly 1,000 men were arrested and placed in what they called the "bull pen." That was a hurriedly erected two-story structure built out of rough lumber, and these men were crowded in there with scarcely room to lie down—so many—with cracks in the floor above permitting the excrement from the men to drop on those below. The result of that incarceration

tion, there were many of them who sickened and died from the diseases that they caught there. At one period of this strike an injunction was issued and 14 of the leaders were arrested and sent to Ada County; 2 of them, I think, were sent to Detroit to serve terms.

It was while these men were in Boise that they conceived the idea of federating all of the miners of the West into one general organization. After they were released, being in jail for six or seven months, they called a convention, that was held in Butte, in May, 1893, and it was there the Western Federation of Miners was started.

Chairman Walsh: Had you been connected in any official capacity with any organization that preceded the Western Federation of Miners?

Mr. Haywood: No there was no organization where I was working at that time.

Chairman Walsh: Had you belonged to any labor organization up to that time?

Mr. Haywood: No.

Chairman Walsh: Proceed, Mr. Haywood.

Mr. Haywood: Following the organization, as it was started at Butte, came the first strike; that was in Cripple Creek in 1894. They went on strike to establish a wage of \$3.00 a day and maximum hours of eight.

Chairman Walsh: What was the wage at that time, Mr. Haywood?

Mr. Haywood: Three dollars, but there was an effort on the part of the mine owners to reduce it, as they had tried to do in the Coeur d'Alene. The strike was against a reduction of pay.

Chairman Walsh: The strike was against a reduction of pay?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; in the Coeur d'Alene, and it was practically so in Cripple Creek in 1894.

The mine owners had a sheriff in office. I do not think there is any use of mincing words. You know when the mine owners have the sheriff and you know when the miners have him. You know when the mine owners control the court and you know when the others control the court. Well, they had the sheriff

and he organized some 1,600 deputies. These deputies were proceeding against the miners who were picketed on the crest of Bull Hill. It was then perhaps the only time in the history of labor troubles in the country when the militia was used in the interests of the men. Governor Waite went to the Cripple Creek district in Denver and learned of conditions as they existed there with the result that he called out the militia. He put them in between the deputy sheriffs and the miners, and told the deputies to disperse or he would declare a state of insurrection.

The strike was settled by the Governor of the State being the arbiter of the men, and a banker of the name of David Moffatt, since deceased, as the arbiter of the mine owners. The \$3.00 a day was granted and the eight-hour law was established. The eight-hour law had not passed the legislature of the State of Colorado at that time, and it only applied to those quartz camps where the union was strong enough to enforce it.

There was no further trouble in the Cripple Creek district for some ten years, and the next big strike was in Leadville, in 1896.

Again the miners went on strike there to prevent a reduction of wages from \$3 to \$2.50 a day, and as had become customary the mine owners asked for the soldiers. Gov. Waite had been defeated in the election previous, and there was a governor by the name of McIntosh. He sent the soldiers at once. There were hundreds of men arrested, bull pens established, old abandoned shaft houses used as prisons, and the men subjected to some cruelties. They lost the strike; the wages were reduced 50 cents a day. In 1899—

Chairman Walsh: (Interrupting) Were there any fatalities in that Leadville strike?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Chairman Walsh: And was there any loss of life?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; and there was some loss of life.

Chairman Walsh: Did imprisonment follow in any case?

Mr. Haywood: There was no permanent imprisonment and no trials; with the end of the strike the strife was over.

In 1899 they had a strike in Lake City, and the militia was used again. I heard some talk this morning of gunmen being employed by union men, but the mine owners always had gunmen in the strikes with the Western Federation of Miners in the West, in the militia, when they could not get any other men.

In 1899 there was a strike in Lake City, and the same year the second great strike in the Coeur d'Alene. In that strike wages had been established at \$3.50 a day in nearly all of the mining camps, with, I think the exception of Bunker Hill; and the mine owners had generally said to the miners that if the wages at Bunker Hill were not increased it would be necessary for them to reduce their wages to that standard. A strike against the Bunker Hill was declared and became general throughout the district. The soldiers were called for; again a mill had been blown up and they charged the miners with the destruction of this mill, and it probably was the miners who destroyed it. The soldiers came, this time Federal troops. They were the black soldiers, the same who were afterwards dismissed from the Army down in Brownsville, Texas. And the treatment afforded to white men and white women by those black soldiers! I do not mention the fact that they were black because I like white soldiers any better, because I put them all on the same level, but they were colored soldiers in this instance.

Another bull pen was established. This time it was an old rambling one-story building, fenced in with barbed wire, where between 1,000 and 1,100 men were held for many months, between six and seven months, and a good many of the men died.

Chairman Walsh: Were they held on specific charges of crime?

Mr. Haywood: They were arrested without warrant and without charge.

Chairman Walsh: Were the courts not open or operating in the territory?

Mr. Haywood: The courts were open and operating, but a semi-state of martial law prevailed.

I recall one instance of a man who died in prison. His name was Mike Devine, he was a Catholic in religion. He had been sick for a long while, and was sick during the strike. Coming out of the hospital he was met on the street by one of the negro soldiers and pushed off of the sidewalk, and when Mike resented this treatment he was arrested and thrown into prison and he had a relapse, and he felt that he was going to die and he asked for a priest, and one Lieut. Lyons, who was there under Gen. Merriam, said to Devine, "You can make your confession in hell." And Mike died without the benefit of a confession.

The result of that strike was that wages were maintained at the same standard as had existed before the strike.

In the Western Federation of Miners there is little difference between the wage of the skilled and the unskilled. A man who handles a shovel gets a minimum wage of \$3 a day, while a man who runs a machine drill gets \$3.50 a day.

I have tried to mention the strikes that the organization has been mixed up in.

Commissioner O'Connell: Did you go up into the strike at Lead?

Mr. Haywood: There was a strike at Lead about this period—this was in 1899,—but that did not become serious, and the strike, or rather it is a lockout that is on there now, began at a later date.

In 1901 there was a strike in Telluride, Colo. There the company brought in scabs—strike breakers—and there was a fight between the union men and the scabs, and the union men came out best.

The strike was won without much court proceedings.

In 1902 and 1903 came the strike that is so well known as the Cripple Creek strike, and that strike was in the nature of a sympathetic strike. The men who were working in the mills in Colorado City, although entitled to the benefits of the 8-hour law which had been passed in Colorado at that time,

were working 12 hours a day 11 hours on the day shift and 13 hours on the night shift.

This condition prevails in the smelting plants of Colorado at the present time, and in some of the milling plants. They went out on strike in September, I think, 1902.

Chairman Walsh: Was the attention of the authorities called to the condition—that is, that the law was being violated with reference to the hours of labor?

Mr. Haywood: Oh, yes, indeed.

Chairman Walsh: Was the law inoperative, or why didn't they prosecute the officials?

Mr. Haywood: The smelter officials, or mine owners, do you mean?

Chairman Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Haywood: Did you ever hear of a mine owner or of a manufacturer being prosecuted for violation of a law? Well, they were not, anyway. The courts don't work that way.

In the following March the miners of Cripple Creek who were producing the ore that was reduced at Colorado City, went on strike.

Chairman Walsh: Was the law being observed as to them; were they working?

Mr. Haywood: They were the ones who first established the law.

Chairman Walsh: They established the law during the following strike?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Chairman Walsh: And they were having the benefits of the law?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; they never lost the effects of the first strike. They went on strike on the 17th of March, striking in sympathy and for the benefit of the men in Colorado City, and at that time strikes became very general through Colorado, there being some ten or fifteen camps, and included the smelters of Denver. The State was pretty well tied up, and most of the southern coal fields were on strike.

They were striking as they struck ten years before, for the enforcement of a state law. The laws at that time were inoperative at Cripple Creek. The

militia ran the district. They threw the officers out of office. Sheriff Robinson, I remember, had a rope thrown at his feet and was told to resign or they would hang him; and other officers were treated in the same way, and some 400 men were deported from their homes. Seventy-six of them were placed aboard trains and escorted by soldiers over into the State of Kansas, where they were dumped out on the prairie and told that they must never come back. Habeas corpus was denied. I recall Judge Seed's court, where he had three men brought in that were being held by the militia. While his court was in session it was surrounded by soldiers who had their gatling guns and rifles trained on the door. He ordered those three prisoners released, and the soldiers went after them and they were taken back to jail. That strike was not won. It was not altogether lost. There were some places where the 8-hour day was established and increases of wage were granted, but for the smelter men, as I said before, 12 hours pretty generally prevailed among the laborers.

Commissioner Lennon: What hours prevail in Utah?

Mr. Haywood: Eight hours.

Commissioner Lennon: In the smelters?

Mr. Haywood: Not in all the smelters; no. There are part of them who work eight hours, but there is an eight-hour law, nevertheless. That was the first one that was carried to the United States Supreme Court, and it was a similar law that was passed in the State of Colorado that was declared unconstitutional by the supreme court of that State. There is not much to be said about the courts in connection with that strike other than the writ of habeas corpus was denied; free speech was also denied; free assemblage also; bull pens were established; 1600 men were arrested in Victor and put into the Armory Hall; 1,600 men in one room, and this in the heat of June. There were also women arrested, and during the strike the Western Federation of Miners established stores for supplies for relief of the strikers and did business with people who were not strikers. These stores, which proved to be splendid establish-

ments, were broken into, looted, and safes broken open, scales and such things destroyed and carried off. They carried away fruit by the ton, and things that they could not carry away they destroyed; for instance, cutting open sacks of flour and sugar and dumping them on the floor and pouring kerosene oil over the quarters of beef, and such as that. This was done by members of the militia and of the Citizens' Alliance. Remember that you have a report here in Washington of that, written by Walter B. Palmer, that goes into the details of the labor disturbance in Colorado; also some Senate Documents, statements by the Western Federation and statements by the Mine Owners' Association.

It was during the period of those strikes that the Western Federation of Miners realized the necessity of labor getting together in one big union. We were on strike in Cripple Creek, the miners; the mill men were on strike in Colorado Springs. There were scabs in the mines and scabs in the mills, and there were union railroaders that were the connecting link between those two propositions. There seemed to be no hope for such a thing as that among any of the existing labor organizations, and in 1905 the officials of the Western Federation of Miners took part in a conference we called—the convention of the Industrial Workers of the World. That convention was held in Chicago in June, 1905, and the Western Federation of Miners, among other labor organizations, became a part of that movement.

And there has been a continuation of the same troubles that the Western Federation of Miners was involved in ever since that period. The federation itself, has since 1905 had several severe strikes. In Lead City a lockout, which practically disrupted the organization at that point. At Bingham Canyon, Utah, they were involved in a great strike, and you have all heard of it; the strike in the copper mines at Calumet, Michigan, where there were many casualties. The men were starved; the children of the miners were burned to death on Christmas Eve. There was no fire; they were trampled to death. A False cry of fire had been given, and in their attempt

to escape from the hall there were 95 women and children trampled to death. The Industrial Workers, when organized, became first involved in a strike of serious proportions at McKees Rocks, Pa. There was the first time that we went up against what were called the Cossacks, the black plague of that State. The Industrial Workers met them on a different basis to what other labor organizations had done, and told them, "For every man you kill of us, we will kill one of you," and with the death of one or two of the Cossacks their brutality became less.

I am trying to think of these incidents in sequence, as near as I can.

I think the next instance where the Industrial Workers had to contend with the law was perhaps the free speech fight in Spokane, where the members of the organization insisted on speaking on the streets in front of the employment agency offices. They were telling what the employment sharks—what they were doing; how they would employ men; that these men would go up to take jobs that they had picked for them; that they would be discharged and other gangs sent out. The authorities of the city took up the side of the employment sharks, and between 500 and 600 men and women, members of the organization, were thrown into prison. Several of them were killed. They were put in the hot box and then removed and put into a cold cell. Several died from pneumonia. They got no relief from the court, but, as the members of the organization persisted in carrying on the fight, finally the City of Spokane compromised by saying that they would let them all out of jail provided that the organization would not prosecute certain cases that had been made against the officers. I think that it was the following year that the free speech fight occurred in Fresno, California. There the authorities started to arrest men merely for speaking on the street corner, not causing a congestion of traffic. If I have it correctly, there was between 150 and 200 men thrown into prison there. They were crowded to more than the capacity of the prison. The hose of the fire department was turned on them. I am told that one night they were

compelled to stand up to their knees in water, but they won that fight; and perhaps the only one that they have lost at all was the free-speech fight in San Diego, of which at least one of your commission is more or less acquainted. I think it was Mr. Harris Weinstock that made a report on that—a partial report of that San Diego free-speech fight.

The law afforded men no protection there. They were speaking when arrested on what is called D Street—D Street is a cross street running into one of the principal thoroughfares. It was not a street that was traveled, but the authorities had got tired of hearing the discussion that was carried on at this street corner every night. The first speaker arrested was a single taxer and after him a Socialist. It was then that the Industrial Workers of the World became involved, and again I would say 135 men and some women, were badly abused and maltreated and thrown into the jails; they were beaten and whipped, and a man who was not a member of the organization had the letters "I. W. W." burned into his body, into his flesh, with a lighted cigar.

To recite all the atrocities that took place in San Diego and elsewhere would take up too much time of the commission.

I think this will bring us down to the time of the Lawrence strike, in which the Industrial Workers took charge. There, of course, as everywhere, I might say, that I have seen courts in action; they took the side of the capitalists. There were between 800 and 900 people arrested—men and women, girls and boys—there were some convictions, but a small proportion for the large number that were arrested. In Massachusetts they have a system of State Police, something similar to that of Pennsylvania, though they are not mounted. When the strike was called the State police came, and the park police, the municipal police from other cities, and then they brought in the militia. Several of the strikers were killed, none of the employers were, but they arrested two of the leaders of the strike for the death of Anna _____; she was one of the girls that was on strike. They had those men in jail for nine months and

would probably have convicted them if it had not been for the general strike on the part of the workers. After the strike had been settled and the demands had been gained, they added to their former demands that Ettor, Caruso, and Giovannitti be released from prison; they were finally acquitted. During the Lawrence strike there were strikes at Clinton and many other places in the textile industry.

At Clinton the police were again used by the mill owners, and they shot into a crowd of striking girls, wounding many of them seriously. In Little Falls the same treatment was accorded the strikers by the police, which is also true of the great strike at Paterson. Nearly everyone is acquainted with the details of that strike and its outcome.

Since the Paterson strike there has been trouble in Wheatland, California, where members of the Industrial Workers of the World organized 2,500 hop pickers, asking for better conditions in the hop fields of the Durst Brothers ranches. As the outcome of that demand two young married men, Ford and Suhr were arrested and charged with the killing of the district attorney. They were convicted, and have been sentenced to prison for life terms.

This, I think, briefly outlines the main strikes of the organization that I have been affiliated with and, I think, clearly portrays a condition that this commission should understand, and that is that there is a class struggle in society, with workers on one side of that struggle and the capitalists on the other; that the workers have nothing but their labor power and the capitalists have the control of and the influence of all branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial; that they have on their side of the question all of the forces of law; they can hire detectives, they can have the police force for the asking or the militia, or the Regular Army.

There are workers who have come to the conclusion that there is only one way to win this battle. We don't agree at all with the statement that you heard reiterated here day after day—that there is an identity of interests between capital and labor. We say to you frankly that there can be no identity

of interests between labor, who produces all by their own labor power and their brains, and such men as John D. Rockefeller, Morgan, and their stockholders, who neither by brain or muscle or by any other effort contribute to the productivity of the industries that they own. We say that this struggle will go on in spite of anything that this commission can do or anything that you may recommend to Congress; that the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class is an inevitable battle; that it is a fight for what the capitalistic class has control of—the means of life, the tools and machinery of production. These, we contend should be in the hands of and controlled by the working class alone, independent of anything that capitalists and their shareholders and stockholders may say to the contrary.

Personally, I don't think that this can be done by political action. First, for the very good reason that the wage earner or producing class are in the minority; second, that they are not educated in the game of politics; that their life is altogether industrial. That while they are the only valuable unit of society, still their efforts must be confined to the jobs where they work. A dream that I have in the morning and at night and during the day is that that there will be a new society sometime in which there will be no battle between capitalist and wage earner, but that every man will have free access to land and its resources. In that day there will be no political government, there will be no States, and Congress will not be composed of lawyers and preachers as now, but it will be composed of experts of the different branches of industry, who will come together for the purpose of discussing the welfare of all the people and discussing the means by which the machinery can be made the slave of the people instead of a part of the people being made the slave of machinery or the owners of machinery.

I believe that there will come a time when the workers will realize what the few of us are striving for—and that is industrial freedom.

Chairman Walsh: In how many of these places that you have spoken of—

Commissioner O'Connell: Just let me carry out this point if you please, Mr. Chairman. You say you don't believe it can be done by political action?

Mr. Haywood: No, sir.

Commissioner O'Connell: Have you in mind some other method by which it can?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir; I think it can be done by direct action. I mean by organization of the forces of labor. Take, for instance, the organization that you know, the United Mine Workers of America. They have about one-half of the miners of this country organized. At least a sufficient number to control them all. I think the United Mine Workers can say to the mine owners, "You must put these mines in order, in proper shape, or we won't work in them." They can compel the introduction of safety appliances, of ventilation systems, and save in that way thousands of lives every year. I don't think anybody will deny that they have that power to bring about that improvement. If they have the power to bring that about by direct action, they have the power to reduce their hours; they have the power to increase or at least to better the laboring conditions around the mines and have better houses. It seems to me there is no reason in the world why the miner should not enjoy, even in a mining camp, some of the advantages that the worker has in the city. And I think that free organization of miners, organized in one big union, having no contract with the boss, have no right to enter into a contract with the employer or any other combination of labor, to my mind. There can be each division of industry, each subdivision, be brought into a whole, and that will bring about the condition that I have described to you.

Commissioner O'Connell: You mean by that, that these economic organizations would create, or control questions of hours and things of that kind you spoke of, but as to the ownership, the right of ownership, what is the method that you have in mind

of your organization in connection with the method of taking over?

Mr. Haywood: Taking over through the organization. If you are strong enough to exact the things I speak of, you are strong enough to say, "Here, Mr. Stockholder, we won't work for you any longer. You have drawn dividends out of our hides long enough; we propose that you shall go to work now, and under the same opportunities that we have had."

Commissioner O'Connell: Well, you propose by your strength and numbers to declare ownership?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; exactly; through the organized efforts of the working class.

Chairman Walsh: Commissioner Weinstock has some questions he would like to ask you.

Commissioner Weinstock: May I ask you, Mr. Haywood, your present occupation?

Mr. Haywood: Secretary-Treasurer of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Commissioner Weinstock: The charge has been made that so-called labor agitators, as a rule, are either of foreign birth or foreign parentage. May I ask what was your parentage?

Mr. Haywood: My father was an American, and his father was an American, and his father was an American.

Commissioner Weinstock: So you date your American ancestry back several generations?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: You made the statement a little while ago that the wage-earning producing class is in a minority?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: May I ask what is the foundation for that statement?

Mr. Haywood: Well, government statistics.

Commissioner Weinstock: What do the government statistics show?

Mr. Haywood: Isaac Hourwich is the compiler of those statistics. Why, it shows very few states where they have even a slight majority.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, are you sufficiently familiar with the Federal statistics to tell us

about how many wage earners there are in the country?

Mr. Haywood: There are about 10,000,000 industrial wage earners.

Commissioner Weinstock: Including their dependents, assuming there are the usual number of 5 dependents to every worker, that would make about 50,000,000 of people?

Mr. Haywood: No; I don't think so. This includes the man and his wife and some of his children.

Commissioner Weinstock: No—in that 10,000,000?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: Now, assuming or admitting that the wage-earning producing class are in the minority, however, it would have to be admitted, I take it, that they at least have the balance of power, and whichever side they would throw their influence which would win?

Mr. Haywood: I think that is quite so.

Commissioner Weinstock: That is, they are relatively in the position that the Irish representatives in Parliament were in for many years; that is, they had the balance of the power, and while they had comparatively a small minority, yet whichever side they adhered to would win out.

Mr. Haywood: Politically.

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes; giving them of course great strength and great influence. And I take it the same might said of the wage-earning producing class in this country, that even though in the minority they at least have the balance of power. Are you at all familiar with the number of States where the initiative, referendum, and recall prevail?

Mr. Haywood: No; I have no definite knowledge as to the number of States.

Commissioner Weinstock: I take it you know, of course, that numerous States have adopted the initiative, referendum, and recall in recent years, and that the tendency now is in most of the States to follow the pace set by the advanced States?

Mr. Haywood: I can not see any State, even Oregon, where any benefit has accrued to the wage-worker.

Commissioner Weinstock: You think not?

Mr. Haywood: No; I think not. For instance, the unemployment condition in Portland, Oregon, is perhaps worse than in any other city, and has been during this last winter.

Commissioner Weinstock: Will you tell us what the membership of the I. W. W. is at this time?

Mr. Haywood: I would judge it is about 15,000.

Commissioner Weinstock: As you know, of course, this commission is seeking remedies for the industrial unrest; that is the function we are presumed to perform.

Mr. Haywood: Yes; I know.

Commissioner Weinstock: And we are inviting suggestions and opinions from all whose opinions and knowledge would lead them to express opinions that ought to carry weight with them. I take it that if the commission were to ask you what in your opinion is the remedy for industrial unrest, Mr. Haywood, that in all probability you would answer and say, I. W. W.'ism?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; I think that I would.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, then that clearly brings I. W. W.'ism within the province of the discussion of this commission, does it not?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: Because, if it is I. W. W.'ism, that is what we ought to recommend to Congress?

Mr. Haywood: No; Congress can not do anything with that.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, we could say that encouragement of the organization of I. W. W. would tend to minimize industrial unrest?

Mr. Haywood: I think that would militate against the I. W. W.'s if you did such a thing.

Commissioner Weinstock: If we recommended that?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: Why should it militate against the I. W. W.'s?

Mr. Haywood: It seems to me a recommendation like that, coming from gentlemen, would militate against the organization and have a tendency to dilute it and dilute its revolutionary strength.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, at all events, if that should be our conclusion, if after an exhaustive investigation we should find ourselves in a frame of mind such as you are in, it would become our duty to announce it, no matter what the results?

Mr. Haywood: You will not find yourself in that frame of mind. But if you were—

Commissioner Lennon (interrupting): You would take Mr. Weinstock into membership then?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: At all events, it becomes our province at this time, having invited you to give testimony here, and that carrying with it that your testimony is worth while, and you taking the ground that in your opinion I. W. W.'ism is the proper remedy for the removal of unrest, it becomes our province properly to discuss I. W. W.'ism and see what it really stands for.

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: Now, I am going to read here some quotations from I. W. W. authenticated literature, Mr. Haywood.

Mr. Haywood: Who is the author?

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, I will give you the authors as I go along, and I will invite your comments on it when I have finished reading the quotations.

The I. W. W. literature placed in the hands of the commission teaches militant action whenever such action may be deemed necessary. In a pamphlet published by the I. W. W. bureau of New Castle, Pa., entitled, "The I. W. W.—Its History, Structure, and Methods," written by the I. W. W. national secretary-treasurer, Vincent St. John, the following statement appears:

"As a revolutionary organization the Industrial Workers of the World aims to use any and all tactics that will get the

results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of 'right' and 'wrong' does not concern us."

In a pamphlet published by the Spokane local I. W. W., Spokane, Washington, entitled, "Industrial Workers of the World, Songs to Fan the Flames of Discontent," there appears the following:

"To arms, to arms, ye brave!
The avenging sword unsheath!
March on, march on, all hearts resolved
On victory or death."

In a pamphlet written by Arnold Roller, apparently an I. W. W. leader, under the title "The Social General Strike," there appears the following statement:

"In this manner the crisis of overproduction is the best guaranty for the success of a social general strike, because the products on hand permit the satisfaction of all needs before the complete reorganization, namely, by a general 'help yourself' on the part of the workers."

In another pamphlet entitled, "Industrial Union Methods," by William E. Trautman, which appeared originally in the Industrial Workers' Bulletin, is found the following:

"The Industrial Unionists, however, hold that there can be no agreement with the employers of labor which the workers have to consider sacred and inviolable.

"Industrial unionists will therefore sign any pledge and renounce even their organization at times when they are not well prepared to give battle or when market conditions render it advisable to lay low; but they will do just the reverse of what they agreed to under duress when occasion arises to gain advantage to the worker."

Under the head of "Sabotage" the same writer says:

"Inferior goods are turned out by silent understanding of all workers in one shop or plant; time is taken up with getting tools repaired and repair work attended to. These and similar methods are known under the compound name, 'sabotage.'"

In a pamphlet entitled, "The General Strike," by William D. Haywood, in which is published a speech delivered by him in New York, March 16, 1911, the following appears:

"I hope to see the day when the man who goes out of the factory will be the one who will be called a scab; when the good union man will stay in the factory, whether the capitalists like it or not; when we lock the bosses out and run the factories to suit ourselves. That is our program. We will do it."

In a pamphlet published by C. H. Kerr & Co., Co-operative, Chicago, entitled, "How Capitalism has Hypnotized Society," by William Thurston Brown, an I. W. W. writer and lecturer, appears the following:

"Would it be wrong for the united working class of America to say today, tomorrow, any time: 'not a wheel shall move on any railroad, not a bit of machinery shall be run in any mill, factory, or smelter, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Lakes to the Gulf, unless it is understood distinctly by the people of America that these tools of industry belong of right to the workers of the nation. And, meanwhile, since hungry men and women and children must be fed, and since your charity organizations have recognized the fact, and your churches have preached it, we shall take the food necessary for our sustenance until it is understood that this system of robbery is to stop forever.'"

In a leaflet issued by the I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, New Castle, Pa., entitled "Appeal to Wage Workers, Men and Women," by E. S. Nelson, the following appears:

"In case of a capitalist injunction against strikers, violate it; disobey it; let the strikers and others go to jail, if necessary. That would cost so much that the injunction would be dispensed with. Final, universal strike, that is, to remain within the industrial institutions, lock the employers out for good as owners and parasites, and give them a chance to become toilers."

In a pamphlet entitled, "The Crack of Doom, or the Fall of Capitalism," by Laura Payne Emerson, a resident of San Diego, and a recognized representative and lecturer of the I. W. W., appears the following:

"Industrial unionism, the capitalist well knows, spells the abolition of the wage system. The I. W. W. recognize no craft autonomy and no contract system. All workers in all departments of any industry are organized in one union. No worker or set of workers in any craft or branch of an industry can make a contract with an employer which he must consider sacred while later his fellow workers in the same industry are on a strike, thus enabling him to scab on his fellows while he carries a union card and cusses scabs. When the workers who make these great industries possible get ready for action they will no longer beg for some master to give them enough to live on, but take what belongs to them."

That is fairly representative, Mr. Haywood, of the attitude and propoganda of the I. W. W.—these extracts from these I. W. W. pamphlets and articles I have read?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; in so far as you have quoted from the I. W. W. pamphlet. You have a number of pamphlets that were not compiled by members of the I. W. W. The first that you quoted is the National Song of France, the Marseillaise. What you read from the Brown pamphlet, advocating the taking of food, was said in this city by Abraham Lincoln during war time, when speculators and gamblers in food stuffs ran the prices of provisions up 600 or 700 or 800 per cent, and the people came to Abraham Lincoln and asked him what to do, and he said: "Take your pickaxes and crowbars and go to the granaries and warehouses and help yourselves," and I think that is good I. W. W. doctrine. I do not see much there I would take issue with.

Commissioner Weinstock: You think, generally speaking, that it represents the sentiment and attitude and the creed of the I. W. W.?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, then, summing up we find that I. W. W.'ism teaches the following:

- (a) That the workers are to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least possible expenditure of time and energy.
- (b) The question of right or wrong is not to be considered.
- (c) The avenging sword is to be unsheathed, with all hearts resolved on victory or death.

(d) The workman is to help himself when the proper time comes.

(e) No agreement with an employer is to be considered by the worker as sacred or inviolable.

(f) The worker is to produce inferior goods and kill time in getting tools repaired and in attending to repair work; all by a silent understanding.

(g) The worker is to look forward to the day when he will confiscate the factories and drive out the owners.

(h) The worker is to get ready to cause national industrial paralysis with a view of confiscating all industries, meanwhile taking forcible possession of all things that he may need.

(i) Strikers are to disobey and to treat with contempt all judicial injunction.

If that is the creed of the I. W. W., do you think the American people will ever stand for it?

Mr. Haywood: There is one feature there that I do not like; I do not think you can present it as I. W. W.'ism; that is the manufacture of shoddy goods. That is the complaint we have against the capitalists at the present time. There are no goods that are perfect in capitalism. They cannot make enough profit out of them. You realize that as a merchant; in the manufacture of woolen goods they have learned how to use old clothes in the making of shoddy; in the manufacture of silk goods they have learned that silk is a peculiar fiber that will absorb four or five times its weight in tin, iron, and zinc, and I do not believe that goods should be adulterated in that way. I do not believe in the manufacture of such stuff, and palming it off on the consumer "as good as the best," or "as good as the purest." I do not believe in the poisoning of foods and the adulteration of drugs or any of the needs of the human family. I believe that there are plenty of all of the good things of life to reach all of the people.

Now there are many things I would like to explain to you, that is as to the tactics and the results. Do you know the results we are hoping for? We hope to see the day when no child will labor. We hope to see the day when all men able will work,

either with brain or with muscle; we want to see the day when women will take their place as industrial units; we want to see the day when every old man and every old woman will have the assurance of at least dying in peace. Now, you have not got anything like that today. You have not the assurance, rich man as you are, of not dying a pauper. I have an idea that we can have a better society than we have got; and I have another idea that we cannot have a much worse one than it is at present. So you see that the program of the I. W. W. is not such a bad thing after all, because while we do not ask any advise and are not requesting any help from any other than the working people at the present time, still we believe through the working class that we will find a way of making workers of all of them and that will include myself, too.

Commissioner Weinstock: I do not think that there is any room for issue, Mr. Haywood, between you and the rest of us on the question of the adulteration of foods.

Mr. Haywood: Well, you put in there that the I. W. W. wants to produce that kind of stuff.

Commissioner Weinstock: Where?

Mr. Haywood: In the conclusions you arrived at.

Commissioner Weinstock: I was not giving my own views, Mr. Haywood. Please remember that I was quoting from some industrial I. W. W. workers.

Mr. Haywood: From what you thought was.

Commissioner Weinstock: No; I will give you my authority all the way down the line.

Mr. Haywood: I told you that Brown—

Commissioner Weinstock (Interrupting): Is this what you take exception to: "The worker is to produce inferior goods and kill time in getting tools repaired, and in attending to repair work, all by a silent understanding;" that was this writer's explanation of what sabotage stood for?

Mr. Haywood: That was Roller's?

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes.

Mr. Haywood: Roller was not a member of the I. W. W.

Commissioner Weinstock: He was telling how sabotage should be employed?

Mr. Haywood: I have a better conception of sabotage.

Commissioner Weinstock: What is yours?

Mr. Haywood: That the worker should refuse to be a party with the boss in robbing the public.

Commissioner Weinstock: That is, that they should cease working?

Mr. Haywood: That they should cease putting adulteration in such things. It is the worker, is it not, that does it? The capitalist never goes into the shop and puts this adulteration into the food, and so forth.

Commissioner Weinstock: Let us eliminate the adulteration of food products and take the rest of the summary. Leave that out and let my question be, "Do you think the American people will stand for that kind of a doctrine?"

Mr. Haywood: Read me that over again.

Commissioner Weinstock (reading): "(a) That the workers are to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least possible expenditure of time and energy."

Mr. Haywood: Yes; I believe in the worker using any kind of tactics that will get the results. I do not care what those tactics are when the working class had arrived at that stage of efficiency and organization, I do not care whether it means revolution. That is exactly the very—

Commissioner Weinstock (interrupting): "(b) The question of right or wrong is not to be considered."

Mr. Haywood: What is right and wrong? What I think is right in my mind or what you think is right in your mind?

Commissioner Weinstock: "(c) The avenging sword is to be unsheathed, with all hearts resolved on victory or death."

Mr. Haywood: What that means is a general strike.

Commissioner Weinstock: "(d) The workman is to help himself when the proper time comes."

Mr. Haywood: When the proper time comes, when he needs it let him go and get it.

Commissioner Weinstock: (e) No agreement with an employer of labor is to be considered by the worker as sacred or inviolable."

Mr. Haywood. No agreement?

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes.

Mr. Haywood: He never wants to enter into an agreement. Let me explain something about an agreement. I heard you talk to Kobylak yesterday. What would a union man say if some member of that union entered into an agreement with the boss? He would say he was a bad man, wouldn't he? And that he ought to stand by the rest of the members of his union. Now, we say that union has only a little nucleus of industry; we say that a union has no right to enter into an agreement because the rest of the men employed in that industry ought to be considered. We say that no union has a right to enter into an agreement with the employers because they are members of the working class; and finally we say that the working class has no right to enter into an agreement because it is the inherent mission of the working class to overthrow capitalism and establish itself in its place.

You can let that about contract and agreement stand.

Commissioner Weinstock: "(f) The worker is to produce inferior goods and kill time"—we will cut that out, that which relates to the production of inferior goods and killing time; that is out of the subject.

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: "(g) The worker is to look forward to the day when he will confiscate the factories and drive out the owners."

Mr. Haywood: I would drive them in instead of out.

Commissioner Weinstock: I think that was your own quotation.

Mr. Haywood: I would make an arrangement to take every owner on the inside and give him a job alongside of me.

Commissioner Weinstock: Have you changed your views any since you delivered this speech on March 16, 1911, in which, among other things, you said this:

"I hope to see the day when the man who goes out of the factory will be the one who will be called a scab, when the good union man will stay in the factory, whether the capitalists like it or not; when we lock the bosses out and run the factories to suit ourselves. That is our program. We will do it." Are your views the same today as when you said that?

Mr. Haywood: I hope we can do that tomorrow.

Commissioner Weinstock: The next is, "(h) The worker is to get ready to cause national industrial paralysis, with a view of confiscating all industries, meanwhile taking forcible possession of all things that he may need."

Mr. Haywood: I do not understand the necessity of causing industrial paralysis; that is, when the workers are sufficiently organized they have got control of the machinery; you never saw a capitalist with his hand on the throttle; you never saw him on the stormy end of a No. 2 shovel; you read of him on his way to Europe and going down with the Lusitania or the Titanic; they are not interested in work. It is the workers who have control now of all of the machinery if they would only make up their minds to hold that control and maintain it for themselves.

Commissioner Weinstock: I take it, then, that you take no issue as a member of the I. W. W. with that statement here?

Mr. Haywood: No; I will let that go.

Commissioner Weinstock: And the last is, "(i) Strikers are to disobey and treat with contempt all judicial injunction."

Mr. Haywood: Well, I have been plastered up with injunctions until I do not need a suit of clothes, and I have treated them with contempt.

Commissioner Weinstock: And you advocate that?

Mr. Haywood: I do not believe in that kind of law at all. I think that is a usurpation on the part of the

courts of a function that was never vested in the courts by the Constitution.

Commissioner Weinstock: Therefore you would have no hesitancy in advising your fellow I. W. W.'-ists to do as you have done.

Mr. Haywood: I do not like to advise too much, but I would do it myself.

Commissioner Weinstock: Let me repeat my question once more: Do you think that the American people would stand for this program suggested?

Mr. Haywood: I think the American working class will stand for it when they know it.

Commissioner Weinstock: You think they would?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; I think so.

Commissioner Weinstock: Then how comes it that after at least 10 years of agitation, and earnest, hard work on the part of yourself and fellow propagandists and organizers you can only show a membership of 15,000, against perhaps, 2,000,000 or more of the American Federation?

Mr. Haywood: Well, how many could the American Federation show when they were 10 years old?

Commissioner Weinstock: I do not know; my friends over there (indicating) can answer that better than I can.

Mr. Haywood: That is not the question. We have these 15,000 members in good standing. How many people believe as we believe?

Commissioner Weinstock: Fortunately very few.

Mr. Haywood: That is not true, but may be fortunate for you that you think so. But there are a vast number of people in all walks of life that believe that the present system of society must be changed, and that this is the means of changing it.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, does not this preachment that I have just summarized practically mean this: That it is the organized and deliberate purpose of the I. W. W. to teach and preach and burn into the hearts and minds of its followers that they are justified in lying; that they are justified in stealing and in tramping under foot their own agreements and in confiscating the property of others, in disobeying the mandates of the court, and in paralyzing

the industries of the Nation; and is it not a fact that if all men and women in the Nation would accept such teaching that it would make society impossible; that it would make a Nation of thieves and liars and scoundrels?

Mr. Haywood: That is the creed of the capitalist as it exists today, and as they practice it; they lie, they steal, they disobey the mandates of the court; there is nothing they do not do that you have ascribed to the I. W. W. there.

Commissioner Weinstock: Very well; admitting that they do these things, does that make it right?

Mr. Haywood: No; that does not make it right.

Commissioner Weinstock: Then would it make it any more right for the workers to do it?

Mr. Haywood: The workers do not do it.

Commissioner Weinstock: This preaches it, does it not?

Mr. Haywood: It does not. Does it say I should lie?

Commissioner Weinstock: If I was to come in and take possession of your property and throw you out, would I be robbing you?

Mr. Haywood: You have a mistaken idea that the property is yours. I would hold that the property does not belong to you; that what you as a capitalist have piled up as property is merely unpaid labor, surplus value; you have no vested right in that property.

Commissioner Weinstock: You mean, then, that the coat you have on your back does not belong to you, but belongs to all the people?

Mr. Haywood: All right; that is not what I mean. I mean that there might be private property. I don't want your watch, I don't want your toothbrush, but the things that are publicly used; no such word as "private" should be vested in any individual in any of those things. For instance, do you believe that John D. Rockefeller has any right, either God-given right or man-made right, or any other right to the coal mines of the State of Colorado?

Commissioner Weinstock: He has a perfect right to them under the laws of the country.

Mr. Haywood: Then the laws of the country are absolutely wrong, establishing private ownership to them in anyone.

Commissioner Weinstock: Very well; who are the lawmakers of the country.

Mr. Haywood: Well, you know who they are.

Commissioner Weinstock: I know this: I know that in the State wherein I live, with the initiative, referendum, and recall, the people are absolutely the lawmakers of the State.

Mr. Haywood: All right.

Commissioner Weinstock: And they can be so in every State of the Union.

Mr. Haywood: You know who the people are.

Commissioner Weinstock: You and I am and the rest of us?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; the rest of our kind; we are parasites. The real people who have to be considered are the workers, the productive workers, the ones who make society, who build the railroads, who till the soil, who run the mills. I have done no work for 10 or 15 years, and I am a parasite; I recognize that. That is what you are and that is what the rest of them are that do not labor. You would not object to a society where you and I did actual labor, would you?

Commissioner Weinstock: Are we to understand, then, Mr. Haywood, that your interpretation or definition of a worker is a man who works purely with his hands?

Mr. Haywood: I said brain and muscle.

Commissioner Weinstock: But don't you exercise your brain in your avocation?

Mr. Haywood: I try to but I am not a productive worker. I am doing a think that I ought not to be called on to do.

Commissioner Weinstock: But if you say that a man who exercises his brain as well as his muscle is a producer, then you are certainly a producer?

Mr. Haywood: Well, I produce some trouble and things like that, but I really have not produced anything now since I left the mine.

Commissioner Weinstock: Then, if I. W. W.'ism is the remedy for the industrial ills and you have succeeded in at least getting 15,000 people to think as you do, you have produced something from your point of view, have you not?

Mr. Haywood: I would not say that is all my effort.

Commissioner Weinstock: You have aided in it; you have done your full share in it?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; and in so far as I contributed in doing that much even the workers would say that I have done a pretty good job.

Commissioner Weinstock: Would you deny the claim, for example, of a teacher of being a producer?

Mr. Haywood: No; a teacher is a producer.

Commissioner Weinstock: In your line of work you are a teacher, as you teach those around you. You go out and teach the principles you represent, and you are therefore as much a producer as the teacher, and you have no right to call yourself a parasite.

Mr. Haywood: Well, I will accept your correction.

Commissioner Weinstock: Now, will you tell this commission, Mr. Haywood, as an authority on the subject, wherein, assuming that you and the Socialists and the American Federationists have the same objective in mind; that is, the betterment of the worker—will you point out to this commission as clearly and concisely as you can wherein your methods differ and are better than the method of the Socialists, and of the American Federationists?

Mr. Haywood: Well, I do not like to set myself up as a critic.

Commissioner Weinstock: We have a right to your opinion, I think. You were invited here for that purpose and have certainly given the matter a great deal of thought and study and ought to be able to point out clearly to us the comparative advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. Haywood: Without saying—without criticizing trade-unions, which I regard as having accomplished great good in their time, there are many

things in the workings of trade-unions where they recognize the right of the bosses. The Industrial Workers of the World do not recognize that the bosses have any rights at all. We have founded the organization on the basis of the class struggle, and on that basis it must work out its ultimate.

The trade-union says, "Well, the boss has some rights here, and we are going to enter into contract with him." How long is it going to take to solve this problem if you have continuity of contracts? That is the thing we say.

The trade-union is organized on the basis of the tools they work with. Now, the tools are changing, and it is driving trade-unions out of business. For instance the glass blowers—glass was made by workmen who blew through a tube. A glass maker, a glass blower himself contrived a machine whereby this blowing is done automatically, and the glass blower, he is wheeling sand to that machine now.

We believe that everybody that works around that machine ought to be organized just as before; we believe that everybody that works around the glass factory ought to be organized, organized with regard to the welfare of each other. That is the reason I pointed out to you that in the Western Federation of Miners there was small differentiation in the wage scale. It is not true with the glass blower; he was paid from eight to ten dollars per day, while the boy off-bearer got a few dollars a week. Now, with us there was no boy went into the mine younger than 16 years of age, and when he went into the mine he got a man's wages, because we thought he was old enough to do a man's work. It was not a matter of skill; he did not have to serve any apprenticeship; we just took the position when the boy was old enough for the boss to exploit he was old enough to draw full pay.

Mr. Haywood: After the Socialist Party—

Commissioner Weinstock: Let us make this point, Mr. Haywood, before we take up the Socialist Party: I gather then from your statement that the two fundamental points in which I. W. W.'s differ from American Federationists is that you are opposed to

contracts with employers on the one hand, and you believe in one great union instead of craft unions. Does that make the difference?

Mr. Haywood: That makes two differences.

Commissioner Weinstock: In other words, you believe that by the adoption of the methods adopted by the I. W. W. that the ends can be achieved better and more quickly than under the methods followed by the American Federationists?

Mr. Haywood: Can you conceive of anything that labor can not do if they were organized in one big union? If labor was organized and self-disciplined it could stop every wheel in the United States tonight—every one—and sweep off your capitalists and State legislatures and politicians into the sea. Labor is what runs this country, and if they were organized, scientifically organized—if they were class conscious, if they recognized that the workers' interests was every worker's interest, there is nothing but what they can do.

Commissioner Weinstock: Granting an organization so colossal in its character would have great power for good, would it not have great power for ill?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; it would have great power for ill—that is, it would be ill for the capitalists. Everyone of them would have to go to work.

Commissioner Weinstock: Would it not also have great power in doing this—in establishing a new slavery? If the wage earner claims that under the present system of things he is in slavery, would not the colossal power of your plan simply be slavery with new masters?

Mr. Haywood: Such a labor organization would be a fine sort of slavery. I would like to work for my union in a shop that I owned best.

Commissioner Weinstock: If you were the "big injun" chief?

Mr. Haywood: No; to go right back to the mine where I came from.

That is the place that I would like to go, right tomorrow, and receive for my labor, without any stockholder, without any Rockefeller taking off any

part of it, the social value of what my labor contributed to society.

Commissioner Weinstock: To that degree, then, I take it, the I. W. W.'s are Socialistic?

Mr. Haywood: All right.

Commissioner Weinstock: Let me see if I understand the distinction correctly between socialism and I. W. W.'ism.

As I understand it, I. W. W.'ism is socialism, with this difference—

Mr. Haywood (interrupting): With its working clothes on.

Commissioner Weinstock: As an I. W. W., are you a believer in free speech?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: Are you a believer in free press?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: Now, if your idea prevails and you went to bed tonight under the capitalistic system and woke up tomorrow morning under your system, the machinery of production and distribution would belong to all the people?

Mr. Haywood: Under our system it would be under the management of the working class.

Commissioner Weinstock: There would be collective ownership?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: Of course, you are not anarchistic, you believe in organization, you believe in government?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, the anarchists believe in individualism, and carries it to the limit, without government?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: And if you believe in government, then you would have to have a ruler—

Mr. Haywood: Would you?

Commissioner Weinstock: You would have to have superiors; otherwise, how could you have government?

Mr. Haywood: It has been run at times without bosses.

Commissioner Weinstock: Without any officials of any kind?

Mr. Haywood: Without any officials; it was the glass workers of Italy.

Commissioner Weinstock: Taking society as we find it, as you know it and I know it, if you have organization you have to have officers?

Chairman Walsh: Let us have the glass workers' illustration; I never heard of it.

Mr. Haywood: The glass workers of Italy went on strike, and while on strike they determined to run competitive factories, and they built factories of their own, owned by the members of the glass blowers' union. They went to work in those factories; each man knew his work—what there was to do. If you have any surplus and different interests to divide up, then there is some occasion for a boss; but if—suppose, now, that these men who are working in glass factories co-operate, as in this instance, and had some occasion for a boss, they would elect him wouldn't they?

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes, sir; they would elect him, that is guaranteed, and would put certain responsibilities on him to carry out certain rules and regulations or laws that they might adopt.

Mr. Haywood: I cannot conceive of much rules and regulations that would need to be applied with a man of common sense. There would be sanitary regulations around the mine. They would not shoot during shift; they would keep the places well ventilated and clean and well timbered. What other regulations do you want?

Commissioner Weinstock: If this group in this room organized, it can not reasonably be expected to carry out its object unless it elected representatives and officers to carry out its wishes.

Mr. Haywood: But you take a motly group like this; no one can carry out its wishes, because they change every time they turn around.

But you take the workers that work in one industry; their interests can be well carried out.

Commissioner Weinstock: Now, would you confine this great army of workers, organized in one body, would you confine their functions and their efforts to industrial matters pure and simple, or would you at the same time have them also deal with the political conditions, with the government of our municipalities, of our Commonwealths, or our Republic?

Mr. Haywood: There would be neither county or State or National lines.

Commissioner Weinstock: There would be no political sub-division?

Mr. Haywood: Only what existed in the community.

Commissioner Weinstock: That is incomprehensible to me, Mr. Haywood; you will have to explain it a little more definitely.

Mr. Haywood: What is the government of the country? The government of many cities have been changed to the commission form.

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes, sir.

Mr. Haywood: The commissioner has the fire department, the public safety, and public improvement. Those are the different divisions. Why not have that same thing under industrial—

Commissioner Weinstock: Have it nationally?

Mr. Haywood: You have no community that is national in scope.

Commissioner Weinstock: How, then, would you have it?

Mr. Haywood: Have this group or this community wherever the industry was located. Do you suppose under normal conditions that there would be communities like New York or Chicago with great skyscrapers sticking up in the air?

Commissioner Weinstock: What would you say would be the size of the community?

Mr. Haywood: Some 50,000 or 60,000, where the people in that industry would dwell. There would be no lawyers or preachers or stockholders like built New York.

Commissioner Weinstock: What would you do with the City of New York?

Mr. Haywood: Tear it down, or leave it as a monument to the foolishness of the present day.

Commissioner Weinstock: How long do you think it will be, Mr. Haywood, knowing the conditions as you know them, before your ideals will be realized, before cities like New York and Chicago will be wiped out and replaced by urban communities?

Mr. Haywood: Well, Mr. Weinstock, if some one had asked me a year ago how long it would be before a world-wide war would take place I would not have answered them; but you see the people of many nations now pitted against each other, committing murder by the wholesale; and I would say that this can come just as quick as the war. I don't know when, but I know that there are people that are interested in bringing about a change of society; whether it will be the change that I have suggested here, or whether that is the right change—and I feel that it is—still I feel that it could come just as quick as other grave things have come.

Commissioner Weinstock: You think it will be an overnight affair?

Mr. Haywood: I think so; that is, as you mean overnight affairs, as war was an overnight affair.

Commissioner Weinstock: I have been asked to submit this question to you if you care to answer it: "What would you do with the lazy man and those that would decide which job each man should take, and what each particular man should do under your system?"

Mr. Haywood: I would give the lazy man the kind of work he would like to do. I don't believe any man is lazy.

Commissioner Weinstock: You don't know me, then.

Mr. Haywood: It is ingrown with you. You have not had a chance to do the thing you want to do; that is the reason you are lazy.

Commissioner Weinstock: I am thoroughly enjoying the work I am doing, Mr. Haywood. How would you decide on which job each man should

have and what each man should do? Who would be the judge; who would be the determining factor?

Mr. Haywood: I think that each man has a selection of his own, and would find his place in the group where the work was going on.

Commissioner Weinstock: You would permit a man to choose his own job regardless of his fitness?

Mr. Haywood: I think he would be the most fit in doing what he would like to do.

Commissioner Weinstock: I have known many merchants that thought they were great poets, and many poets that thought they were great lawyers, and many lawyers that thought they were great musicians, and they were not.

Mr. Haywood: Not in your judgment perhaps, but probably they were according to their own.

Chairman Walsh: Mr. Garretson has a question he wants to ask you before we adjourn.

Commissioner Garretson: Mr. Haywood, the thing I want to know is this: One of the commissioners has presented to you a certain summing up, which seems to me, instead of being a concept of your purpose is rather an indictment of your method. Now, I want to see if I have gathered correctly from what I have studied in regard to the I. W. W., accepting you as one of its principal spokesman and interpreters—whether or not I gather from that what you claim to be your purpose. I am going to read it in a concise form in my own language, and see whether it is fairly interpretative of not your method but your purpose. Is it your attitude that neither man or woman should have the right to possess, either by gift, inheritance, or accumulation, in amount of surplus value (I am using the ordinary phrase "surplus value") that it would make them independent, first, of labor in some form? That takes in the two forms you mentioned, mental or muscular, or extends to the duties and responsibilities that they owe to society or are accountable to that society for or that would enable them to influence other legislative processes, judicial processes, or social or executive processes that would apply their

form of influence. Is that fairly—I know it is rather long.

Mr. Haywood: I would say that neither man or woman should be possessed by inheritance, accumulation, or otherwise with anything that would give them that power.

Commissioner Garretson: Either of those powers?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Garretson: Just one further point—

Mr. Haywood (interrupting): For instance, I would say in foreign countries they have crowns and titles by divine right, but here they have everything without it. They have the sausage without the skin.

Commissioner Garretson: You hold by that every man has a divine right to that crown worn conjunctly with other men.

Mr. Haywood: That would suit me first-rate.

Commissioner Garretson: You accept that as the definition of divine right?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir; but that is as far as I will go with you.

Commissioner Garretson: Do you hold further that if your beliefs were made effective that the man that now stands in your estimation as a ruthless financier, or an exploiter of labor, by being deprived of the right to pile up surplus value or transmit it, having the incentive removed, that his energies would be directed to the common as well as the individual good?

Mr. Haywood: I think so. Now, the only standard of measurement that he has is gold and its accumulation. Under a different system of society he would work for approbation and the approval of his fellow man with all the happiness that would mate with a new society, and would be more of an incentive to him than all his gold.

Commissioner Garretson: Supposing, of course, that we could not grab the coin at the same time?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Garretson: I won't press it further than that.

Chairman Walsh: At this point we will stand adjourned until tomorrow. Will you please resume the stand at 10 o'clock? Some of the other commissioners have some questions they wish to ask you. (Thereupon, at 4:30 P. M. Wednesday, May 11, 1915, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, May 12, 1915, at 10 o'clock.)

Washington, D. C., Thursday,
May 13, 1915, 10 P. M.

Present: Chairman Walsh; Commissioners Harri-
man, Garretson, Lennon, Weinstock, and O'Connell.
Chairman Walsh: Mr. Haywood, will you please
resume the stand?

TESTIMONY OF MR. WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD (Continued.)

Chairman Walsh: Mr. Weinstock said he had not quite finished with you last night, and maybe some of the other commissioners would like to ask you some questions.

Commissioner Weinstock: At the hour of adjournment, Mr. Haywood, we were discussing the status of society as it would be if your remedies for the wiping out of industrial strife prevailed. My point was to see whether the condition would be better or worse than now. You remember that I asked you whether or not you believed in free speech and whether you believed in free press, and you said you did. The question that suggests itself to my mind is as to whether, under the conditions which you picture, we could continue to have free press and free speech. To illustrate, let us imagine that we are organized industrially, as you would want it, in one great, big unit, and everything were in the hands of the workers, who are supreme. That, of course, would mean organization; organization would mean the selection of executive officers. That, in turn, would mean the placing upon these executive officers responsibilities. With responsibilities there necessarily must be power. Now, with these officers in the saddle and supreme, unless human nature changed

very materially, there would be room for criticism perhaps on the side of the dissatisfied minority. This great group owning all of the machinery, as it would, for production and distribution, would own the press. So that in the first place there would be no opportunity for the dissatisfied minority or the critics to give publicity to their criticism and to their dissatisfaction. If they dared to raise a public criticism of those in power, in all likelihood they would be subject to the same criticism that I found in Guatemala when I visited there a few years ago. The condition I found there would probably exist under your utopia. Guatemala, a few years ago, elected a president who has only dared to show his head out of his doors three times during that period. Seventeen attempts at assassination have taken place, and yet, despite that fact, he rules his people with a rod of iron. Any man that dares to criticize the president or his policy can do one of two things—either get out of the country or lose his head.

Now with that concentrated power under your method, would it not after all mean that if there is such a thing as wage slavery today, as is maintained by those who think as you, then would it not result simply in a change of masters, and would the slavery not be of a far more severe character than the slavery, if there is slavery, under our existing system?

Mr. Haywood: In the first place, you presuppose a condition that perhaps will not take place at all. That is, you state that there would be officers with power. I can not conceive of that kind of society. In the industries each branch of industry would be operated by a group of workers who best know that branch, and among that group of workers if foremen or overseers were necessary they would be selected from among the workers. There would be no dominating power there, would there? I can conceive no need of a dominating, national, world-wide power that would have control of the press. The press is now under a dominating control, and under present-day conditions the militant minority has no method of expression. This commission alone has afforded the minority an expression which in a way

finds its way into the press. No other means has been established, excepting for small weekly newspapers, or something of that kind that are conducted by the minority. It seems to me that under a new society, and you will admit that human psychology will change if given an opportunity, the newspapers of the country would not be devoted to detailing murders and robberies and scandals and stock and bonds; they would be really for the information of the people, and under normal society it seems to me there would be no radical minority for expression. There may be minorities who were striving for change, for the introduction of new ideas or new ideals, but I think that they would certainly be given publicity, because society as a whole would be interested in its own advancement. I think that the conditions that you have described, instead of applying to the future society, very well represent the existing society. That is the condition that we have under capitalism today.

Commissioner Weinstock: Let me make sure, Mr. Haywood, that I certainly understand the objective of I. W. W.'ism. I have assumed,—I will admit that I have assumed in my presentation to you—that I. W. W.'ism was socialism with a plus; that is, that I. W. W.'ism in—

Mr. Haywood (interrupting): I would very much prefer that you would eliminate the reference to socialism in referring to I. W. W.'ism, because from the examples we have, for instance, in Germany, socialism has, or at least the Social Democratic Party, has been very much discredited in the minds of workers of other countries. They have gone in for war, and those of us who believe we are Socialists are opposed to war. So if you don't mind we will discuss industrialism on its own basis.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, in order that I at least may better understand the purpose, aims, and objects of industrialism, I must, in order to bring out the differences and compare it with the socialistic doctrine—you may not believe in the socialistic doctrine any more, and I do not; but my purpose is, so that we do not have a misunderstanding of the mean-

ing of words. Now, let me briefly state to you what I understand socialism stands for, and what I understand I. W. W.'ism stands for. The Socialists, as I understand it, is striving for the cooperative commonwealth, striving to bring about a situation whereby all the machinery of production and distribution shall be owned by all the people, where there shall be but one employer, and that employer shall be all the people, and everything shall be conducted substantially as the Army and Navy are conducted under our form of government. I understand that I. W. W.'ism believes in exactly the same objectives but differs in the methods—

Mr. Haywood, (interrupting): In the first place, I. W. W.'ism has no such thing as an army or navy, and certainly not as the Army and Navy are conducted at the present time.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, I did not say that the Socialists believe in a continuation of the Army and Navy—

Mr. Haywood, (interrupting): Some of them do.

Commissioner Weinstock: I said that they believed that everything would be managed as we now manage the Army and Navy. All the people manage the Army and Navy—

Mr. Haywood (interrupting): But you make a statement that is not true.

Commissioner Weinstock: The soldier and sailor has but one employer, and that employer is all the people. Now the only distinction that I have been able to discover between the aims and objects of those representing the I. W. W. doctrine, and those representing the so-called socialistic doctrines, is the methods of getting to the ends. The Socialists believe in getting it through education and political action, and you believe in doing it through direct action—

Mr. Haywood, (interrupting): And education.

Commissioner Weinstock, (continuing): And the general strike.

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: Therefore, the ends are the same, but to be reached through different pathways?

Mr. Haywood: No; the ends are not the same. Now, Socialists, while they present an industrial democracy, they hope to follow the forms of existing governments, having industries controlled by the government, eventually, however, sloughing the State. They will tell you the State is of no further use; and when industries are controlled by the workers the State will no longer function.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, then, am I to understand this, Mr. Haywood? I want that made very clear to me, because if the objective is as I understand you have tried to indicate, then I have been laboring under a misapprehension. Am I to understand that it is not the objective of the I. W. W. to have the State-owned industries?

Mr. Haywood: It certainly is not.

Commissioner Weinstock: I see. Then there is a radical difference between the I. W. W.'s and the Socialists, Mr. Haywood?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Weinstock: The Socialist wants the State to own all the industries.

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: And the I. W. W., then, as you now explain it, proposes to have those industries not owned by the State but by the workers—

Mr. Haywood, (interrupting): By the workers.

Commissioner Weinstock, (continuing): Independent of the State.

Mr. Haywood: Independent of the State. There will be no such thing as the State or States. The industries will take the place of what are now existing States. Can you see any necessity for the States of Rhode Island and Connecticut, and two capitols in the smallest State in the Union?

Commissioner Weinstock: Except that of home rule.

Mr. Haywood: Well, you have home rule anyhow, when you place it in the people who are interested, and that is in the industries.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, then, will you briefly outline to us, Mr. Haywood, how would you govern and direct the affairs under your proposed system of 100,000,000 of people, as we are in this country today?

Mr. Haywood: Well, how are the affairs of the hundred million people conducted at the present time? The workers have no interest, have no voice in anything except the shops. Many of the workers are children. They certainly have no interest and no voice in the franchise. They are employed in the shops, and of course my idea is that children who work should have a voice in the way they work—in the hours they work, in the wages that they should receive—that is, under the present conditions children should have that voice, children who labor. The same is true of women. The political state, the Government, says that women are not entitled to vote—that is, except in the 10 free States of the West; but they are industrial units; they are productive units; from millions of women. My idea is that they should have a voice in the control or disposition of their labor power, and the only place where they can express themselves is in their labor union halls, and there they express themselves to the fullest as citizens of industry, if you will, as to the purpose of their work and the conditions under which they will labor. Now, you recognize that in conjunction with women and children.

The black men of the South are on the same footing. They are all citizens of this country, but they have no voice in its government. Millions of black men are disfranchised, who if organized would have a voice in saying how they should work and how the conditions of labor should be regulated. But unorganized they are as helpless and in the same condition of slavery as they were before the war. This is not only true of women and children and black men, but it extends to the foreigner who comes to this country and is certainly a useful member of

society. Most of them at once go into industries, but for five years they are not citizens. They plod along at their work and have no voice in the control or use of their labor power. And as you have learned through this commission there are corporations who direct the manner in which these foreigners shall vote. Certainly you have heard something of that in connection with the Rockefeller interests in the Southern part of Colorado. You know that the elections there were never carried on straight, and these foreigners were directed as to how their ballot should be placed.

They are not the only ones who are disfranchised, but there is also the workingman who is born in this country, who is shifted about from place to place by industrial depressions; their homes are broken up and they are compelled to go from one city to another, and each State requires a certain period of residence before a man has the right to vote. Some States say he must be a resident 1 year, others say 2 years; he must live for a certain length of time in the county; he must live for 30 days or such a matter in the precinct before he has any voice in the conduct of government. Now, if a man was not a subject of a State or Nation, but a citizen of industry, moving from place to place, belonging to his union, wherever he went he would step in the union hall, show his card, register, and he at once has a voice in the conduct of the affairs pertaining to his welfare. That is the form of society I want to see, where the men who do the work, and who are the only people who are worth while—understand me, Mr. Weinstock, I think that the workingman, even doing the meanest kind of work, is a more important member of society than any judge on the Supreme Bench and other useless members of society. I am speaking for the working class, and I am a partisan to the workers.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, among your statements you said that under the present system labor has no representation. Did I get you correctly?

Mr. Haywood: I mentioned the different divisions of labor that have no voice at the ballot box.

Commissioner Weinstock: Take labor as a unit; take all the labor of the country as a unit, would you say it has no representation, no voice?

Mr. Haywood: There may be places where labor may be sufficiently strong to elect a Representative. I realize that in Congress at the present time there are a number of card men, but I do not believe those men were elected by labor, and certainly from their voice in Congress I do not believe they are representing labor.

Commissioner Weinstock: I suppose you, in common with the rest of us, appreciate the fact that whatever remedial legislation may have been enacted throughout the various States and in Congress, such as the child-labor laws, minimum wage for women and minors, the safety laws, the eight-hour and for women and children, and the Workmen's Compensation Act—as a rule, there may be exceptions here and there, but as a rule all of these remedial measures have been opposed by employers and have been advocated by the workers and their sympathizers. Now, if it is true that labor has not had a voice, except in isolated instances, as you point out, and then you doubt whether it is really labor's voice, how do you explain that in spite of the tremendous power of the employers throughout the nation these laws have been put on our statute books and are being enforced?

Mr. Haywood: I said I believe that labor had but few representatives, and that is true. I know there are men who are elected to the different State legislatures that have been assisted by labor's vote, and they have introduced this reform and remedial legislation. But can you show me a place where any of this reform legislation is in effect, even so far as child labor goes and the eight-hour law for women, unless there is an economic organization sufficiently strong to enforce it upon the employer?

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes; in the State of California.

Mr. Haywood: Is the eight-hour law for women observed in that State?

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes, sir; absolutely.

Mr. Haywood: I understand it is not.

Commissioner Weinstock: Then you are misinformed. I can state authoritatively, because I live in the State of California and am thoroughly familiar with the conditions there. There have been many, many actions brought against the violators of the law. They have been penalized, and there are some remote nooks and corners in some of the backwoods towns that cannot be reached.

Mr. Haywood: I understand that is so.

Commissioner Weinstock: But wherever it is possible for the labor department to reach it, it is reached, and the law is generally enforced.

Mr. Haywood: Do you believe that it is enforced by the law and the authorities under the law?

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes, sir.

Mr. Haywood: Or by the labor—the strong labor organizations of California?

Commissioner Weinstock: I suppose it is being backed by the labor organizations.

Mr. Haywood: California is the strongest union State in the Nation.

Commissioner Weinstock: If organized labor was not behind it, it might not be enforced as effectively as it is. Organized labor, naturally in sympathy with the law, leaves nothing undone to see that it is enforced.

Mr. Haywood: I appreciate that, and that is the reason it is enforced.

Commissioner Weinstock: Now, we are not a peculiar people. Humanity is no different in California than in any other part of the country, and whatever has been done there, and is being done there, can be duplicated all over the Union, and there is no reason why the same results cannot be obtained in Maine as in California.

Mr. Haywood: I heard a member of the child-labor commission report on the legislation in Maine. He said they had labor laws on their books in regard to the children employed in the fishing industry, packing sardines, and he said these laws were not lived up to, and it was only through the introduction of machinery that took the place of the children that

they were able to enforce the law; that is, that they employed children in spite of the law.

Commissioner Weinstock: Coming back, Mr. Haywood, to my initial question, we have a hundred million people in this Nation. Now, let us assume that under your system the industries would be organized as you would have them organized, and would be by the industrial workers; you still have not explained how the affairs of the Nation would be conducted. We would have foreign relations that would have to be dealt with; we would have to be prepared to protect ourselves against invasion, and we would have to conduct the affairs, the avenues of governmental service, our postal department, and our various other departments. How would you do that?

Mr. Haywood: Well, you seem to take into consideration that there is only this Nation in the world. Now, I cannot imagine if the workers of the world were organized as I have outlined to you, how there would be any invasion; they would all be interested in the same thing.

Commissioner Weinstock: You will admit this, that you can not expect the whole world overnight to adopt I. W. W. principles; it would have to be a gradual growth.

Mr. Haywood: It does not make any difference to me if it is not for a hundred years.

Commissioner Weinstock: What would you do meanwhile?

Mr. Haywood: The same thing we are doing now—plugging along and taking our part in this class struggle, fighting for better conditions, and hoping to get them tomorrow, but fighting for them, if we do not get them for a century. We are trying to educate such people as you, Mr. Weinstock.

Commissioner Weinstock: I admit that I need a heap of education.

Mr. Haywood: Maybe I do, too, but I can talk, and my working people understand the things we are striving for. It is hard to explain it to a person who has always been under a different environment. I realize that it is hard for you to explain this, but

you can talk to people who are in the shop, and they recognize that they ought to have a voice in the workings of that shop. Indeed there are many newspapers now who are saying that it is wrong for capital alone to direct industry; it is wrong to have the ideas of Mr. Rockefeller, who says that common labor is animate machinery. Common labor is a human being, collective human beings, and they ought to be considered in the same light as other human beings.

Commissioner Weinstock: Can you tell us, Mr. Haywood, especially for the information of the chairman and myself, as well as for the other commissioners, where Mr. Rockefeller said that common labor is animate machinery?

Mr. Haywood: I don't remember where I did see that, but somewhere.

Commissioner Weinstock: I was present for three days, or about three days, when Mr. Rockefeller was on the stand, and he was turned inside out, and almost every conceivable question that could be devised was put to him.

Mr. Haywood: When he comes here next week ask him if he didn't say that. I think you will find out that he did. I think that is his mind, and I think he has no other viewpoint.

Commissioner Weinstock: I will make a note of that.

Chairman Walsh: A request has just come up from the sergeant-at-arms that some of the persons in the rear of the hall are very anxious to hear what you have to say in answer to these questions, but are unable to do so and will you please pitch your voice a little higher?

Mr. Haywood: Pardon me.

Commissioner Weinstock: That is all the questions I have now.

Chairman Walsh: Commissioner Lennon has a few questions he wants to ask you.

Commissioner Lennon: Mr. Haywood. Mr. Weinstock asked you a question regarding the necessity of the exercise of power by officers as it might arise under your philosophy of administering the affairs

of industry. Is there a greater degree of social and industrial unrest over the exercise of power by officers under existing governments that has never been given to them by the people?

Mr. Haywood: I think that is one of the chief causes for industrial unrest, is the usurpation of power by people that now control industries, power that has never been given to them—power that they have taken.

Commissioner Lennon: In your recitation of events that took place under your observation, so far, as strikes, and so forth, were concerned, as an example of this exercise of power, without having been given to them by the people you mentioned the deportation of men from Cripple Creek. Were they deported by any court of proper jurisdiction after a trial as to whether they were guilty of any crime or not, or was it a usurpation of power of officials?

Mr. Haywood: They had never been arrested, never been charged with any crime. They were taken from their homes by the militia at the order of one Adj. Gen. Bell. He issued an order to his understrappers, giving them a list of names, and instructed them to take these men on special trains, assigning the train outside of the State of Colorado, and to immediately return on their return to him.

Commissioner Lennon: In the case of the two Coeur d'Alene strikes or lockouts, the one that was in Utah, at that canyon, I forget the name?

Mr. Haywood: Bingham Canyon?

Commissioner Lennon: Bingham Canyon; did you see any of this undue exercise of power by officers who had no authority under the law to exercise such power?

Mr. Haywood: During the two strikes in the Coeur d'Alene, I then was a member of the executive board of the Western Federation of Miners, and I went through the Coeur d'Alene district. I went from house to house at night, and, of course, could feel the spirit or lack of spirit, among the workers, who were afraid to move about. I met at that time men who were under indictment. I saw the bull pen; I know that there were thousands of men, or a thou-

sand men, at least, in this bull pen at that time, and I know that they were there without warrant and without charge; that they were never charged with any crime; that they were held for six or seven months, many of them.

Commissioner Lennon: In any case where this undue exercise of power did injury to these men, were they ever able to recover damages or satisfaction of any character for the injuries done to them?

Mr. Haywood: You remember yesterday I mentioned about the soldiers looting the stores of Cripple Creek. At that time we filed with the State Auditor of Colorado a claim, I couldn't say just how much, but something less than a hundred thousand dollars for damages that was done to the stores. A few years later the legislature by act granted \$60,000 as a return for the damages done by the soldiers to the Western Federation of Miners.

Commissioner Lennon: Were those men who were individually deported, were they ever able to secure any indemnity for the wrongs that had been done them?

Mr. Haywood: The nearest that was done to anything on their behalf, I had each man that I could reach afterwards file claims against the State for individual sums, some of them claiming \$5,000, some \$7,500, and other amounts. They were filed with the auditor of state and they stand in the auditor's office now and could be granted by the legislature, but up to the present time they have received no redress.

Commissioner Lennon: Taking the men that were imprisoned in the bull pens at the different places you recited and were never tried, they simply turned them out when they got through holding them? Were they ever able to secure any redress?

Mr. Haywood: Never.

Commissioner Lennon: I want to ask you a question or two on another phase of what has come before the commission.

Several questions were asked you yesterday regarding the right of property. Is it not true that all recognized titles of property are man-made, and if

man had the right to create titles they have the right to repeal those titles and substitute some other system?

Mr. Haywood: I absolutely agree with you. I think that the first warranty deed was a fake; that it was a put-up job, the same as many other jobs were put up in this city, and have been; that titles that are existing are wrong and against the best interests of the people, and that the people should revoke the existing titles to private property that is publicly used.

Commissioner Lennon: Government was supposed to be instituted among men for service, for the protection of their rights. I can not quote it, but for the protection of the people's rights, I cannot quote literally from the Declaration of Independence, but I think the understanding of the people that founded this Government was that if the Government then founded ceased to serve the best interests of the people, that the people have the right to overthrow it by legislative methods if they can, by revolution if that becomes necessary. Is that your conception?

Mr. Haywood: That is about what the Declaration of Independence says, and about what the Constitution conveys. I do believe that.

Commissioner Harriman: Mr. Haywood. I understand from what you have said today, and from what you have said before, that you do not believe in war. Now, if you don't believe in war, why do you believe in violence in labor disputes? One is war between nations, and the other is war between—

Mr. Haywood, (interrupting): You say I believe in violence?

Commissioner Harriman: Yes, sir; one of your contemporaries, I think St. John, I asked him the direct question last spring, if the I. W. W. believed in violence, and he said yes.

Mr. Haywood: But you said I believe in violence?

Commissioner Harriman: I thought you did.

Mr. Haywood: Probably I do; but I don't want it to be taken for granted without giving me an opportunity to explain what violence means. I think

you will agree that there is nothing more violent that you can do to the capitalist than to drain his pocket-book. In that sort of violence I believe, and we are trying to make it impossible for the growth of more capitalists, and to make useful citizens out of the existing capitalists. I give you an illustration of what I think violence is:

In Sioux City, Iowa, last month the authorities of that town came to the hall of the union and told a man, a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, that the chief wanted to see him. He said, knowing his rights as an American citizen, he said, "If the chief wants to see me, tell him where I am." He said, "No; you will have to go to the office." He said, "Have you a warrant?" "No." "Well, I will not go." The detective went downstairs and got a crowd of uniformed policemen and they came to the hall and took his man and all the other members that were in the hall and went to headquarters with them. The men were put in jail temporarily without a hearing. They were all thrown into jail, and the next morning refused a jury trial, refused a change of venue, and were sentenced to \$100 fine or 30 days in jail. One of them remarked to the judge, "Why don't you make it a hundred?" And he said, "In your case, I will just double the sentence." Those men were put in jail, and word went out to the other locals throughout the country, and foot-loose members started for Sioux City. They came in groups of twos and threes, and tens and fifties, and hundreds, until the Sioux City jails, both the city and the county were crowded to capacity. The authorities thinking to make use of the labor power of these men purchased from Sioux Falls, South Dakota, three carloads of granite, which they expected the members of the I. W. W. to break, making little ones out of big ones. This they refused to do. They went on hunger strike. Some 75 of those men were 86 hours without eating. The authorities found that they could not do anything with them, so they appointed a committee, or a commission, to go to see the men in jail, and asked them up on what terms things could be settled. The men said, "Unequivocal

release from prison, the re-establishment of the right of free speech," and one of the boys said, "New clothes for the ones the 'bulls' have destroyed," and upon those terms they were released. Those men were released from the prison in the face of the fact that they had been sentenced to jail by judges. That I regard as action more violent than the discharge of bombs in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, because they enforced the rights that this country gave to them; they compelled the authorities who are supposed to uphold those rights in seeing that they were granted. I believe in that kind of violence, and as I said yesterday when the workers are organized, it matters not to me what becomes necessary, if they are to get control of the means of life. The working class is the only class entitled to any consideration, and as Abraham Lincoln said, "To give to that class the full product of their toil is the righteous duty of any Government."

Commissioner Weinstock: Where do you draw the line, Mr. Haywood, between the worker and the non-worker?

Mr. Haywood: Oh, I think that it is easy to draw the line.

Commissioner Weinstock: Please tell us what your line is. Are you a worker?

Mr. Haywood: No. I told you yesterday that I thought you and I were parasites.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, you confine the term "worker," then, to the man who does manual labor?

Mr. Haywood: Oh, no; I said brain and muscle. Now, understand, Mr. Weinstock, we are not excluding from membership in the new society any man who has ability. We recognize the necessity of civil experts; we recognize the necessity for engineers and inventors and all useful citizens. What we cannot appreciate is why the great minds or the minds of great men have been used to make lawyers or preachers.

Commissioner Weinstock: Well, would you call an executive officer a useful citizen?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Weinstock: And despite the fact that he does not work with his hands?

Mr. Haywood: Why, I say we want brain workers, men who will sit down and map out plans. He runs industries now. Well, we don't propose to change the industries, excepting so far as to eliminate waste which ownership brings. Why should the railroaders of this country continue running the roads for the King of England? He is one of the largest owners in the Santa Fe. Why should the steel workers be running the steel plants for the potentates of foreign countries, who are largely holders of stock in that industry? That is the thing we are after. We want the people of this country to own the steel industry in this country. We do not think a Morgan is necessary to the running of that steel industry. We don't think a John D. Rockefeller, notwithstanding what Mr. Baer said about divine providence, is necessary. We think that the mines can run without providence and without Baer and without Rockefeller and be run a great deal better, and there be no such terrible trouble as has existed there if the men were running them in the interest of the people. There would be no Ludlow affair.

Chairman Walsh: Commissioner Garretson has a question he would like to ask you, please.

Commissioner Garretson: You stated yesterday in response to a question that it was not, from your own standpoint, desirable when this or that evil was palliated, because it did not work a benefit to the cause that you represented: that is, the propagation of that cause. In other words, the best harvest field that you find for organization is where injustice is the most prevalent. Is that correct?

Mr. Haywood: Well, that is usually the best place to carry on propaganda—is where injustice can be best seen, where it is felt.

Commissioner Garretson: Where it is the most apparent?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Garretson: And rub the hardest on the galled jade?

Mr. Haywood: That is true.

Commissioner Garretson: Is that one reason that the method that the I. W. W. follows is against a legislative program, because you believe it would defer the day of universal acceptance of your doctrine?

Mr. Haywood: Well, as I stated this morning, the majority of the workers have no legislative program; that is, they have no votes. They can not elect their representatives. You will readily admit that is true of children and true of most of the women and true of the black men and true of all the foreigners and certainly affects a part of the American citizens. Then what appeal is there? Where do they find any expression in legislative action?

Commissioner Garretson: The question would be whether an educative program directed along these lines would as effective as an educative program conducted on the other lines for the abolition of the legislative process. What I am curious about—possibly others of the commission are—is this: What will be the form—the medium, rather—of expression of these various bodies grouped on the industrial basis instead of grouped on what might be described now as the governmental basis? That is, the existence of States being abolished and the citizens of the country being grouped industrially. What is the medium of expression between those different groups as to their needs under your plan?

Mr. Haywood: Let me take the different phases that an individual represents in society.

Commissioner Garretson: Yes.

Mr. Haywood: We will take the home, for instance, in any industrial community. The father, mother, and children are the family of that home. When they leave that roof they go out to different branches of industry in that town. They then are no longer a family; they are a part of the group in the industry in which they are employed, and should of necessity be a voice in that group. They should have a choice as to the conditions under which that branch is conducted—conducted now for profit, conducted then for use—and we will naturally suppose that everyone will be interested in doing the work in the

best possible way with the best possible output. Leaving their industry, leaving their several groups, coming back to their homes, they will again become a family. But one family can not do the things essential for happiness, for their happiness, and for their comfort.

They would need to cooperate with other families of the community for the establishment of transportation, lighting systems, water-works—

Commissioner Garretson: You are talking now of local transportation?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; local.

Commissioner Garretson: Yes; go on.

Mr. Haywood, (continuing): Parks and amusements, education, schools. Why, I think that every child is entitled to the finest education that the Government could give—that is, that kind of a government—not the kind of education that we have now. That would be the relations of the individual to the industry and to the community. Now, as to national and international travel, let the railroaders belong to one organization, and you will agree that the railroaders can run the railroads better than coal miners can run them, or better than shareholders or stockholders can do it. Let them conduct the railroads and live in the community in the same basis as other industrial workers.

Commissioner Garretson: Well, now, you have placed the community life on exactly the old basis of the archaic condition of patriarchal control of the family, haven't you? You draw from your experience; I draw from mine. If the railroad is taken over as an industry in its present form—take a road that has been rather prominently in the eye for a few days, the Pennsylvania Railroad—suppose that to be taken over by the employees of the railroad and operated by them. After the expressions that you have given as to those in power, I am at a loss to understand how a community on the Pennsylvania Railroad at Pittsburg or Chicago is to arrive at a common understanding, first, of their necessities, and, second of the method by which those necessities will be met in the actual operation without

people in absolute control and direction and the power necessary to make their instructions mandatory for the train movement.

Mr. Haywood: You would be there to run the railroads.

Commissioner Garretson: Or under the sod.

Mr. Haywood: What?

Commissioner Garretson: Some other man will; some man will be there.

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir. It seems to me you can run them better—and we will take an arbitration board, for instance, the arbitration board sitting in Chicago. They have been looking out for the welfare of 65,000 individuals. Some of those people knew nothing about railroading, absolutely nothing. Well, they are not the people to look after the railroad interests. Take your own executive board; who can run the railroads any better than they?

Commissioner Garretson: Well, now, how can they make their instructions effective unless they are made responsible for it and given the concomitant power?

Mr. Haywood: Why, certainly, give them the power to run the railroads.

Commissioner Garretson: Well, then, you are a believer in a system of control and direction which is owned by the men themselves and backed up by the sentiment and action of the men themselves?

Mr. Haywood: Absolutely.

Commissioner Garretson: Yesterday possibly either I misunderstood or you phrased it unhappily in stating from your standpoint that there was no necessity for the exercise of executive power. Well, applied to transportation it would become an impossibility, because unless there was a head of that industrial group—

Mr. Haywood: Exactly, Well, in speaking of industries yesterday, when I made that remark it was in reference to political executive conditions.

Commissioner Garretson: Well, it was undoubtedly applicable to industry in general. Well, you know the transportation interest is one that can not be disposed of by intercommunication—that is, the

personal contact—because it is so widely separated. The man in Pittsburgh and the man in New York and the man in Boston have no means of operating except through an intercommunication through a controlling power. That controlling power has got to gather first, knowledge as to the necessity, and he has got to receive it in the community. For instance, there has got to be means of intercommunication through a medium regularly recognized to determine the needs of that community which have to be filled from the community that is distant. Is that not true?

Mr. Haywood: I recognize that.

Commissioner Garretson: That community has to have an estimate of what clothing it needs?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Garretson: It has first got to be indicated to the mills to create the material thereof?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Garretson: And known to the shop that turns that into clothing in its various forms. There has got to be a universal estimate of the food supply necessary, because without an intelligent production a market as it is known now ceases to exist for those things and ceases to be the dominative factor in determining production, because the profits of production, in the sense profit is now known, will cease to exist. Am I correct?

Mr. Haywood: You are correct.

Commissioner Garretson: And executive power must do it?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; and those executives you describe would be the representatives—

Commissioner Garretson: In other words, you would substitute the old folk-mote of the Saxon village?

Mr. Haywood: No; place the power in the hands of industry.

Commissioner Garretson: Would you put it further and follow the Saxon precedent higher up, the witenagemote?

Mr. Haywood: I don't know anything about that.

Commissioner Garretson: Well, those are represented by our State legislatures and by our National Congress, as the case may be.

Mr. Haywood: All right; anything that will take the place of the existing legislature, or let the legislature run—anything that will place the industries in the hands of the people and the direction in the hands of the workers.

Commissioner Garretson: In other words, you are willing to accept as much of the existing machinery as appears to be necessary for the carrying out of your ideas and not hostile thereto?

Mr. Haywood: I would accept so much of it, certainly. We are not going to tear down that we can not find something better to put in its place.

Commissioner Garretson: Have you a belief on this subject? Reference was made yesterday to the futility of the initiative and the referendum. Do you believe that with experience in the use of the initiative and referendum and a consequent education that will come from it, that it will become a more effective thing than it has so far demonstrated itself to be in actual use?

Mr. Haywood: I think that industrial government will bring legislation—the groups in the industries and the initiative and referendum will not become a burdensome thing, but that these matters of detail can be discussed in these groups or communities.

Commissioner Garretson: You believe that with responsibility placed upon the individual unit of the community that his conception of his responsibilities will increase?

Mr. Haywood: Certainly.

Commissioner Garretson: One practical question in regard to the Colorado situation. At the time of the Colorado strike were the metalliferous and bituminous miners all in one association?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; they were.

Commissioner Garretson: Both?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Garretson: At that time the Western Federation of Miners had in its membership both bituminous and metalliferous men?

Mr. Haywood: The Western Federation of Miners organized the coal miners of Colorado first.

Commissioner Garretson: Before it did the metalliferous men?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; but at the time of the 1903 strike they had become a part of the United Mine Workers.

Commissioner Garretson: Which strike?

Mr. Haywood: In 1903.

Commissioner Garretson: But the same agencies were arrayed against both crafts, both the metal and the coal?

Mr. Haywood: Oh, yes; they had the Mine Owners' Association.

Commissioner Garretson: That embraced all of the mine owners?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Garretson: Have you any definite knowledge or date as to when the miners separated into two separate associations, if they ever have separated?

Mr. Haywood: I do not think they ever have separated.

Commissioner Garretson: Did you hear the statement that was made by Maj. Broughton before this commission to the effect—and Maj. Broughton, you remember, was in charge of the militia in the field?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner Garretson: And that he was also under retainer by the Coal Mining Association of Cripple Creek, and that he had no connection with any other mining class in Colorado, during this period; did you hear that?

Mr. Haywood: No, I did not hear that; but I think it is true beyond any question of doubt that they were all members of the Citizens' Alliance in 1903.

Commissioner Garretson: And that they were furnishing the medium of communication, even if there was different existing groups?

Mr. Haywood: Absolutely.

Commissioner Garretson: That is all.

Mr. Haywood: I met the members of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. in the senate chamber and the assembly hall before the mines and the mining committee, and they were contending then against an eight-hour law.

Chairman Walsh: I have three questions that I have been requested to ask you that have been sent up, and I wish you would answer them as briefly as you can. One is, Do you not consider the exploitation of children in industry under the present system a form of violence of a very insidious and brutal sort?

Mr. Haywood: I most certainly do. It is only one of the terrible violences that are practiced by the capitalistic class.

Chairman Walsh: Then there is another question: Will I. W. W.'ism do away with crime and criminals? If not, how will you organize your society to protect the well-behaved many against the vicious few?

Mr. Haywood: Industrialism will do away with crime and criminals, as 95 per cent of the crime today is crime against property. Abolishing the wage system—abolishing private property—will remove 95 per cent of the crime.

Chairman Walsh: Now, I have here a formal question from some gentleman through a letter. He says that during the week prominent lawyers and sociologists have been asked a categorical question under the first section of the questionaire, namely, as to the prevalent attitude of courts in labor cases. I thought your whole testimony was directed to that end, but nevertheless, if you have anything further to say on that, I would be very glad to have you say it. What is your view of the prevalent attitude of courts in labor cases?

Mr. Haywood: I think, Mr. Chairman, that in citing the strikes, showing that the militia have been used in nearly every one; that many, thousands of men have been arrested without warrant; that thousands have come before the courts, and, although warrants have been issued, they were discharged. It seems to me that in answer to that question it is

safe to say that the courts are used, as a general rule, in favor of the capitalistic class.

Chairman Walsh: Now, there is one other question: Were you present during the testimony of Judge Cullen, formerly judge of the New York court of appeals?

Mr. Haywood: No.

Chairman Walsh: I understood you had a comment to make upon that from the field, as it were, as one who had been upon the ground. He discussed the matter from a legal standpoint.

Mr. Haywood: I have the speech made by Judge Cullen, and there are abstracts from his speech which I seem, in a way, to agree with.

Chairman Walsh: What are they?

Mr. Haywood: The militia and the use of the militia in the field.

Chairman Walsh: Did your observation in the field concur with the conclusions reached by Judge Cullen in his speech, which may be said to have been reiterated by him on the witness stand?

Mr. Haywood: Why, yes. I saw the militia at work; I saw them as I told you, and the militia was ordered to bring in three prisoners, and the militia absolutely refused to obey the order, because the court was at that time favorable to the strikers.

Chairman Walsh: As a matter of industrial unrest, does that sort of handling of men cause or does it not cause the most bitter resentment?

Mr. Haywood: The working class of this country have looked upon the courts with a great deal of awe and respect in the past; that is not true now. They look upon the courts as a tool of the employing class.

Chairman Walsh: Do the workers as a body have the frame of mind expressed by Judge Cullen (with reference to judges as a class when this form of what you might call legal oppression is practiced upon them) in his speech as follows (reads):

“The Governor might imprison or execute the members of the legislature or even the learned judges of the supreme court themselves. Frankly, I do not regard such a danger as likely, for I have great confidence in the common sense of the Amer-

ican people, and I imagine that if such a course were attempted not even the devotion of those learned judges to the principles of law they had learned would induce them to voluntarily surrender life or liberty, and that in their resistance they would be supported by the mass of the people."

Is that the attitude of mind the workers have—that when their rights are invaded by the force of the military power they feel they ought to resist, and that the most of the American people would support them if they understood it?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Chairman Walsh: So, from your standpoint in the field, and Judge Cullen's standpoint from the court of appeals bench, there is no disagreement on that proposition?

Mr. Haywood: Mr. Walsh, during the Cripple Creek strike of 1903, 1904, and 1905 the miners of that district would have killed every militiaman in the district if it were not for the fact that they believed the people of the United States did not understand it; if it were not for the fact that Roosevelt was in the presidential chair at that time, and there was a 10-company post of soldiers just outside of Denver. They knew their rights were being invaded, and they were willing to fight for their rights.

Chairman Walsh: Just as Judge Cullen says the people would fight if they attempted the same violence on the judges of the court?

Mr. Haywood: Yes; the American people have always fought for their rights, and they are going to fight for them again.

Chairman Walsh: Commissioner O'Connell has some questions to ask.

Commissioner O'Connell: That end of the table (indicating) have brought out the position of the independent workmen of the world that it is not necessary to discuss that further.

I want to get some information in regard to the citation of yesterday, in which you spoke of a man in the Wheatland hop fields that was branded with the letters I. W. W. with a hot cigar.

Mr. Haywood: That was in San Diego.

Commissioner O'Connell: Can you give the particulars of that, with the names, and so forth?

Chairman Walsh: We have that in our record.

Mr. Haywood: Did you embody that in your report, Mr. Weinstock?

Commissioner Weinstock: No; that circumstance occurred after I made my investigation.

Chairman Walsh: There is an investigation and it is in our report, because I read it; the name of the man was B. L. Reitman, and he was taken outside of the city, it is alleged, and his clothing stripped from him, and with a lighted cigar they attempted to burn the letters, "I. W. W." on his person; that part of it is in the record.

Commissioner O'Connell: And that was after you made your investigation?

Commissioner Weinstock: Yes; after I made my investigation.

Mr. Haywood: Was Nicolage (?) killed at that time?

Commissioner Weinstock: I do not remember.

Commissioner O'Connell: I will look it up.

Now, Mr. Haywood, I feel that you will agree with me that the ideas that you have just outlined to us are not going to become operative right away?

Mr. Haywood: Yes.

Commissioner O'Connell: It is not going to take place within the next month or the next year or several years; in the meantime we must be doing something, and this commission was created by Congress for the purpose of ascertaining what the underlying causes of industrial unrest are, the principal causes, and to make some recommendations to Congress. That would imply that Congress would be interested in doing something if we made certain recommendations right away for the relief of the people, particularly the working people.

Now, if you were a member of this commission, Mr. Haywood, what would you be in favor of recommending to Congress to take up immediately to relieve the people? What would you advise this commission to recommend?

Mr. Haywood: I think I would advise to meet the needs of the people, employment, work, such as the Government could do—reclamation, reforestation stations—such work as would meet the needs of the unemployed; that is, just as remedial measures.

Commissioner O'Connell: You consider, then, that unemployment, or temporarily so, is one of the underlying causes of industrial unrest?

Mr. Haywood: Certainly, when a man is out of work, when he has no means of obtaining food for his family, that certainly is a cause of unrest. That is a cause of the present discontent largely.

Commissioner O'Connell: And would also imply, as I take it from your answer to a question a while ago, that idle hands beget crime; if there is steady employment, crime decreases.

Mr. Haywood: That is always true; crime always increases in the winter when unemployment is greatest and suffering most intense.

Commissioner O'Connell: What would you do in the case of the itinerant worker, the casual employee who only has employment for a certain period of the year, for instance, picking fruit, or cutting ice in the winter, or doing logging in the summer, and all that?

Mr. Haywood: Of course, I think that all of these people should be organized, and we are going on to that end. We establish what we call the organized workers, and we will meet the vast body of workers employed in the harvest fields.

Commissioner O'Connell: Would you have the Government arrange for the carrying of people from one industry to the other, where they were wanted, without cost to the workmen?

Mr. Haywood: I think that workmen should be given free transportation; I don't mean in box cars, as has been suggested; I don't know by whom, that is fixed up, they ride that way now, but they should be given free transportation in proper conveyances in looking for work.

Commissioner O'Connell: The job and the man ought to be brought together by the Government itself, without cost to the man or the job?

Mr. Haywood: That may be a remedial remedy suggested by the commission.

Commissioner O'Connell: That is incidental to the unemployment, and what you believe to be the functional cause of industrial unrest. Have you in mind any other general question that might be effective in this direction, that this commission might suggest to Congress as a remedy? Of course, I don't mean that healthy unrest, we don't want that, but we want the unrest that creates the criminals and makes paupers and makes men helpless, that sort of unrest. Can you think of any other idea you might suggest to the commission? I am sure we would appreciate it, notwithstanding we probably feel that you are so imbued with your Utopian ideas of things that they would not modernize down to the affairs of today, that are effective today and tomorrow?

Mr. Haywood: Really, Mr. O'Connell, I don't think that I presented any Utopian ideas, I talked for the necessities of life—food, clothing, shelter, and amusement. We can talk of Utopia afterwards. The greatest need is employment.

Commissioner O'Connell: You think unemployment, insufficient wage, long hours of labor, employment of children, employment of women beyond reasonable hours, and at low wages, the unfair application of the laws by the courts, the unfair attitude of the courts as to the equity or opportunity of the poor man as against the rich man, to secure justice, all those things point toward unrest?

Mr. Haywood: They certainly do; they are the things that make unrest.

Commissioner O'Connell: They are the things that make for unrest?

Mr. Haywood: Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'Connell: And those are the things you think this commission ought to interest itself in at this time?

Mr. Haywood: If there was any possibility of Congress remedying these evils, I think this commission has a duty to perform in recommending such changes.

SONGS

Of The Workers

The Latest

I. W. W. SONG BOOK

General Defense Edition

CONTAINS sixty-four pages of satirical, humorous and inspiring songs of labor. Parodies on the well known popular airs. Wherever the English language is spoken, there will be found countless numbers of workers singing these real rebel songs



PRICES

Single Copies Ten Cents
\$5.00 a Hundred

Address

I. W. W. Publishing Bureau
1001 W. Madison St., Chicago, Ill.