

farming and mining, and the same man does both in the course of a year. But they would be offended if called barbarians, for they use that word generally to imply cruelty. Thus, according to them it is barbarous to dock a horse's tail, beat a woman, or shoot an animal not dangerous nor edible. They do not even beat their children, and at a very early age every person does as he or she pleases. Orphan children seem to have the freedom of every house. The insane are not confined. There are a good many idiots, which educated people ascribe to the close intermarriage. There is no incestuous practice, but as the same families live forever in the same spot, there is too much intermarriage. And by the way, they seldom have any legal marriage ceremony such as the Mexican laws require, but respect the tie quite as much as is common in this world. There is no polygamy. Divorce seems to take place when either party insists on it—as is natural where there is no binding ceremony.

When a man ceases to cultivate his field for two successive years, anyone else may take it and cultivate it. As there are not people enough to cultivate more than a tenth of the land, they are apt to use different fields every few years, and only the house-lot is permanent.

Mining is carried on in the same way, except that the final product is always intended for sale. Use-title is the only means of possession. In fact, after one man, the discoverer, has abandoned a mine, no other man can have the exclusive use, even by working it. I have often seen three or four men each burrowing independently in the same mine.

It is very surprising that so general a condition of affairs in Mexico should escape nearly all mention in our newspapers. This Indian form of land-holding is the real beginning of everything in Mexico; as we see it practised today it is the broken remains of an early civilization. Upon this as a foundation other systems have superimposed themselves by force, but the foundation is the same all over Mexico. South of the city of Mexico, on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and south of that, and also in Oaxaca, the old Indian system has not broken down. There the Indians have remained more independent, except in Yucatan. The Southern Indians are called Mayas, and they have less prominent cheek bones and more noticeable brain capacity than white people—while the contrary is true of the Yaqui and other northern Indians.



It is often said that the revolution in Mexico is caused by the peons. But that is not true on the whole. For the most part free Indians and wage-slaves are doing the fighting, and the real peon is taking the part the Negro took in our Civil war. The North has no peons to speak of, and it is the North that does most of the fighting.

In Colonial times, Spaniards settled thickly around the mining regions, but left the coasts to the Indians—the Spaniards ruled, but did not live there. Consequently, in mining regions, the population is overwhelmingly white; even the Indians will be nearly white there. In the 16th century a squadron of English pirates landed on the coast of Sinaloa, traveled inland to the gold-fields, and settled there. So there are whole towns of blue-eyed Indians. In

their way of living they cannot be told from other Indians. In those parts of the country where the Spanish-Indian blood is mixed, all kinds of atrocities are committed in warfare. But the pure Indian does not commit atrocities, although sometimes he kills an enemy on whom he has much to revenge. As for instance, when Manuel Bonilla was sent by Madero to pacify matters at Culiacan, after Diaz had abdicated, a Federal Colonel named Morelos (a very debonaire man, popular in the ballroom and successful in battle as well) was cooped up in Culiacan, and after a heroic resistance surrendered on Bonilla's promise that his life should be spared. During the night a delegation of Indians arrived from the scene of one of Morelos' forays, and told the townspeople that Morelos had had a blind man executed in Tamazula; that Morelos had seized the young women in every place he captured; that he had had the head of a dead Maderista named Clayton torn to pieces after the battle in which Clayton was killed, in order to get the gold fillings from his teeth. As soon as these things were known, a mob formed, stormed the jail, and killed Morelos at once. The plutocratic party has never ceased to marvel at the atrocity of the murder of this delightful soldier, yet they do not deny his acts. With my own ears I have heard wealthy, aristocratic, educated ladies tell my mother that the requisitioning of young girls by Diaz' Federals was a justifiable military necessity, too bad of course, but there must be peace, and Federals must be well paid to maintain it.

Peace has never meant anything for the Indian but evils that war is a relief from. In the Madero revolution a certain Diaz official (a white man) went over to the Maderistas. The plutocracy construed this as treason to his class. Soldiers were sent, who tied this man and his wife to posts, and then outraged his two daughters, aged five and ten, until the smaller girl was dead, and both parents had become raving maniacs. During thirty years of Diaz rule this procedure was an illegal but well-known expedient, resorted to by the Government not from lust, but as a dreadful means of punishment when all else failed. Can you wonder that anarchy has no terrors for that people?

B. F. BUTTERFIELD.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### THE SUN'S INDISCRETION.

New York, August 1.

The New York Sun is growing careless. It has always been the safe stronghold of privilege of all kinds, but it seems to be relaxing its vigilance. A long leading article in last Sunday's Real Estate section let the cat out of the bag. We learned from that that Realty, chief of calamity howlers in this city at least, has not been anything like so badly off as has been announced. Some men have made big "killings," and there has been a good, steady business done all winter. Can it be possible that Realty is crying calamity in order to discourage the efforts of our excellent Tax Department to educate the citizens of New York as to the value of their land? And also, could it be possible that calamity howling has been one of Realty's (by this we mean the real

estate speculator's) efforts to defeat the exemption on improvement legislation being fought for so stubbornly for three years now? If so, how very careless of the Sun to let the real conditions be known.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.



### PLUTOCRACY'S BLINDNESS.

Boston, August 17.

In its distortion of fact, perversion of history and stagnant misconception of social forces, the widely circulated Newark address of Mr. Vanderlip, President of the City Bank at New York, was a notable illustration of the argument by Mr. Brooks Adams in "The Theory of Social Revolution"—from which Mr. Vanderlip ventures quotations, misleading by vital omissions—that, "unless capital sets its house in order and submits to [not creates] law, it will suffer a cataclysmic disaster."

The banker asserts that his class, "business men of the whole nation, should see the need of such organization [as that of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce]. There is necessity for the association of these business organizations into effective forums for the discussion of current affairs." "Effective" forums, let it be noted—not fair and free forums—which would imply the "muck-raking" so vigorously howled down by "big business."

Mr. Vanderlip has actually discovered that "the foundations of the present order are threatened," but he is blind to the fact that they are so threatened that they must be relaid. He can only recommend that they be still farther weakened by more of that rubble which has been substituted for the solid stones able to bear the structure, concerning which alone it may be said: "The floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock."

Mr. Vanderlip can not reckon upon such incredible ignorance among his readers as to seriously anticipate the acceptance of his assertion that business men in the past have failed in the most practical manner to exhibit their full appreciation of "the effects of political tendencies upon business, upon property and upon property rights,"—and the inverse effects; by every form of corruption known to the lobby in what he calls "comparatively rare examples of greed, of blindness to social obligations, of unfairness, and even of dishonesty." Have they been rare? Have they not been so frequent, so flagrant and so disastrous that the community dreads even the advisory employment of business and financial "experts"? The suggested remedy for the pernicious influence which partially has been unearthed, with so much difficulty and with such a paralyzing effect, is more influence! The spokesman for his group exhorts its members to "band themselves together, first in small associations, and then to see that these associations are united in a common effort to impress upon the country those views which are the best results of your [their] experience, judgment and righteousness." Not by the use of money, he says. Oh, no! When he demands a ninety days' submission of purposed remedial legislation for attack by these associations, it is to be made by giving [without cost?] correct "infor-

mation" to the people throughout the United States, especially to the constituents of Congressmen! As to the regular organs of information, this precious advice is given: "If a newspaper is ill-informed, see to it first that it has every facility for correct information, and then, if it is still unfair, publish its unfairness in a way which will make unfairness unprofitable, and you will have no more of it." No use of money is suggested in thus stifling the press!

The patriotic course is to imply we are told a temporary "submergence of self-interest"—later to "bob up serenely"—for the sake of powerful teamwork by the body which Mr. Vanderlip represents, concerning whose attitude he is forced to acknowledge that "the opinions which come to me may be highly colored by prejudice; they may come from a single class, and they may fall entirely to represent the true situation."

Mr. Vanderlip condescends to a silly verbal fling at the new forces which he dreads with so little comprehension as "Cubists" and "Futurists." His most audacious misappliance of historical authority is his appeal to the example of Patrick Henry, James Otis, Samuel Adams and the Revolutionary committees of correspondence for consolidation of the movement among the states for freedom and equality as a logical precedent for the enslaving propaganda of his financial quasi conspiracy! It is not forgotten that the City Bank not long since issued a circular in the interest of the investor, vigorously protesting against the acquisition of those rights by a subjugated people, for which the fathers pledged their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor."

It is not to the working of law, however, the often delayed and inadequate expression of the popular will, that we refer the Vanderlips, but to that unmistakably settled will itself which can achieve and will achieve the elimination of the opportunity, intrinsically fatal, for capitalistic control, even if it involve the destruction of the present régime. Cooperation in brotherhood is the demand of the time. To the old order the word has gone forth:

"Thou art weighed in the balance, and art found wanting."

"God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it."

ERVING WINSLOW.



### THE HOUSEHOLD SERVICE PROBLEM

Further consideration must, it seems to me, convince the writer in *The Public* of May 29 at page 521 that no single remedy, even the Singletax, will cure so complicated a disease as the household problem. All hail the power of Singletax! but household service will continue a vexed and vexing question until some way is found to make housework a reputable business, just as the carpenter's, the banker's, the laundryman's, is a reputable business.

If it is a part of this "business" "to live in a home of refining influences with a comfortable room, etc.," what if the room is "somewhere up the back stairs"? The lady of the house is often thankful for the rescue of the back stairs and the carpenter who built them ate his lunch cheerfully regardless of where the family dined. It is sometimes desirable that maid and family dine together, but