

public places." So, in spite of all Constitutional guarantees, men may only say on the highways of Tarrytown what its landowners permit to be said. Trustee Pierson calls attention to a practical illustration of despotic power in this country which landlordism confers. Henry George suggested the possibility of such tyranny as one reason why landlordism should be abolished. Now Trustee Pierson—unconsciously probably—confirms his reasoning. He makes clear that the most extreme possibility of land monopoly, preventing the exercise by landless men of any natural right, is not merely theoretical. Tarrytown will serve as a horrible example of what land monopoly can do.

s. d.



Wages and Efficiency.

The minimum wage idea receives novel support at the hands of H. A. Millis, in the *Journal of Political Economy*, where it is claimed that a minimum wage would benefit employer as well as employe, because it would compel both to adopt more efficient methods of production. Manufacturers, the writer holds, often fall into and continue slovenly methods of production when labor is cheap, and will not of their own initiative adopt improvements that will permit of the payment of higher wages. When, however, wages are arbitrarily raised, as they would be under a minimum wage, law, the employer would be compelled to adopt better methods or go out of business.



This is the very point made by the trade unionist. Raise wages to a living point and business will adapt itself to it. To advance wages twenty-five per cent does not necessarily mean paying twenty-five per cent more for labor. It means in most cases improvements in method that soon meet the increase in wages, and often result in cheaper labor than before. High wages stimulate discovery and invention, and make the cost of high priced labor cheaper than low priced labor. A business that must depend upon low priced labor, either in the form of child labor or Oriental labor, rests upon a false basis. Wages constitute Labor's share of production, and must in all reason advance as production advances; but too often contented Labor means indifferent Capital. Hence, as long as we persist in maintaining an unnaturally restrained system of industry it will be necessary for Labor to arbitrarily advance wages from time to time, not alone as a means of obtaining its share of increased production, but as a spur to lagging Capital. s. c.

WHY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS EXIST.

Labor unions have been Labor's only weapon against organizations which have been more tyrannous and longer established and are deserving of as much denunciation.

That labor unions exhibit many of the weaknesses and worse, which their progenitors, i. e., organized capital, have possessed, is but natural, but should not excite a capitalist.

Labor unions will some day disappear, but probably no one will be able to kill them off. They are unnatural, just as other conditions in capitalist quarters are, and both will have to go along together until they can both together commit hari-kari.

In the meantime the "ceaseless conflict" to which Lincoln referred must doubtless continue. Adding to this conflict is very poor business and business men had better forget as much of the crimes of labor unions, and the crimes of organized capital as they can and get along with labor as well as they can until economic conditions are such that Labor can deal with them on something like an equal footing, and will not have to try and enforce its demands by strikes, dynamite, etc.

Fundamental to all of the above are, of course, some notions of what the remedies are, but that's another story and a long one.



But bring facts like these to the attention of the bitter opponent of existing trade unions and how does he reply? Here is what a very active and prominent one had to say:

"I know that you act from the best of motives but you do not realize the falsity of your position and the harm that is sure to grow out of it in case your expressions are extended to the ears of volatile and wilful men.

"The laws of this country provide for equal opportunity and protection for every man, and when a few men band together and parade the streets and attack other men who want to work, and destroy property because they can't rule it, the time to settle the question is *right then and there*, and not have a lot of soft heads excusing them over and over again, until they think they have a right to do these things.

"Perhaps I might add that I am in sympathy with organized effort, not alone among workingmen but also among other men who may perhaps work with their minds, as well as their bodies. I insist, however, that one law shall apply to them

all, and that they be compelled to keep the peace and not unfairly interfere with one another."



This is a fair sample. Like most comments of its kind it ignores the fact that the warfare between Capital and Labor is one of the superficial effects of the social system that is entirely wrong, the basis of which is special privilege and monopoly, and until such conditions are done away with the warfare must continue under no rule, or rules that will change with change in sentiment and circumstances.

The opponent of organized labor is engaged in a scrap over what these rules shall be. What is needed is a scrap for radical change of the underlying conditions so that the Capital-Labor war will cease. While it continues one can not but feel a strong inclination to side with the under dog, and that is always the laboring man, because special Privilege and monopoly is never in his favor, and always in favor of Capital.

Labor unions are just as unnatural as monopoly, but it is not for monopoly to throw bricks at labor organizations. That means labor organizations that can do things, not merely labor organizations proposed by some opponents that will take rules from and be governed by the monopolists. The way for Labor to do things is to get together and stand together and strike; and presumably also to boycott; and though it can not and should not be advocated or defended, it is hard to look upon the overt acts of organized labor with any greater indignation or less solicitude than upon the crimes of any other class. When manufacturers study their true relation to sound economics they will understand more of their true relation toward their employes and labor organizations, and have more toleration and less of the snarling, biting and scratching quality exhibited by some manufacturers at present.

By all means crime should be dealt with lawfully. But such dealing should not be the basis of an endeavor to wipe out a system or a class to which much crime might incidentally be traced. Let us invoke the law of the land under the rules of fair play, but let's not go any farther.



To the intimation that such a position is dangerous to society it need but be said that the type of agitation carried on by some capitalists is extremely dangerous, promoting class hatred in such a degree as to make wide-spread results possible under unfavorable conditions. The burden of that philosophy which would abolish Privilege

is Peace. The burden of that which ignores fundamental causes is distinctly War, and if the employers who fight organized labor succeed in ever starting it it will make quick work of them and their industrial enterprises. They, indeed, are playing with fire, and their failure to realize it is indeed a public misfortune.

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SEIZURE OF VERA CRUZ.

Mexico, June 6.

The attack on Vera Cruz was a complete surprise to all in the interior, as there had been so many "crises," with no result, during the past year that any reprisal for Huerta's impudence by the Americans was thought to be a remote contingency.

The American daily, however, the Mexican Herald, had been warned on April 20 of the impending event, and that same night it transferred its staff and presses on a special car from Mexico City to Vera Cruz, where it has since appeared regularly. After joyfully letting itself be influenced for years by Porfirio Diaz and Huerta, to whitewash or to conceal the crimes of Mexican despotism, this shameless sheet has now suddenly discovered that Mexico is unable to rule itself and is outdoing Hearst in its demand for an immediate invasion and annexation.

After the seizure, all private mail and messages were stopped by Huerta and the Mexican populace was then bombarded with official bulletins. In the Federal district Huerta's bulletins were unopposed but in the States the municipal authorities endeavored to counteract the danger to resident Americans inherent in the venom and mendacity of the Federal placards. The disgraceful conduct of the Spaniards during the excitement enabled us to better understand General Villa's antipathy to them.

On Wednesday, April 22, the Spaniards had Huerta proclaim that the Americans had sunk their warship, the Carlos V., at Vera Cruz. The same day the placards stated: "That Zapata had joined Huerta with his 20,000 men, that Villa had embraced General Velasco and the new friends had at once captured El Paso and Brownsville, that the Sonora rebels had invaded Arizona, and that all rebels were again brothers to Huerta and would sustain him against the hated invader." That afternoon there was some marching, and at night the Federal officers met the local Spanish leaders and planned big demonstrations for Thursday, a holiday.

The chief features of the Thursday processions of "patriots" were huge banners, bearing the device, "Muera a los Invasores." The marchers were government employes, students and some of the middle class; the masses held aloof. Most of the enthusiasm had to be manufactured by brass bands, and by the Spaniards who dragged American flags through the mud from their feet or from wagons. Some Spaniards even ventured to incite the mobs to anticipate the invasion and attack resident Gringos at once.

Luckily, the Spanish advice was unheeded and,