

class of which Bishop Potter is a distinguished member and ornament? The tenements of New York are owned by wealthy members of fashionable churches; the diamonds, laces, automobiles, yachts, blooded horses, etc., come, many of them, from the rentals of these humble 'American homes.' A list of the east side tenement owners of New York city would read very much like a list of New York's influential church-people. It seems to me that Bishop Potter might find a mission among his class that would accord better with the purple of his office than does helping to open taverns for the relaxation of dwellers in 'American homes.'" But really the well-meaning Bishop could do little good if he turned his attention to this wickedness in his own class. Suppose he aroused them to their guilt, and they stopped taking tenement house blood money. No matter what device they resorted to, they could merely turn the wretched mechanism over to others no less grasping. Individual reform cannot remedy this social evil. The evil is systematic, and only radical change of opinion regarding the system can avail. But that is a theory, and Bishop Potter says "you cannot save this Republic by theories." He will have none of your theories.—not while taverns are practical.

The sober statement of the origin and spirit of the Colorado disorder, which we are able to make this week over the signature of so judicial an observer as James H. Teller, a lawyer of Pueblo and brother of Senator Teller, can hardly fail to impress any fair-minded reader with the conviction that the responsibility for the trouble is not on the labor organizations.

It is indisputable now that the action of the State authorities, civil and military, was high handed to the point of revolution, and no one attempts to dispute it. Every newspaper correspondent sends back the same story in that respect. Nor does anyone defend it.

The thing is indefensible on any law-and-order theory. But attempts to excuse it are made on the ground that a reign of terror had been established by the labor organizations, and that this anarchistic lawlessness had to be met with government lawlessness.

The latest instance of this indirect defense of the lawlessness of the authorities is made by Walter Wellman, in his lurid letters from Colorado to the Chicago Record-Herald. He refers to the exasperation of the law-abiding people of the disturbed districts over several atrocious crimes of union men, and the intensification of this feeling by their acquittal in trials before juries packed with union officials. This is a typical excuse for what is one of the most menacing instances of lawless government in our history. Yet Mr. Teller's plain statement of the facts shows even that poor excuse to be without truth.

Not only is there no evidence that the crimes in question were committed by the unions, but one of them has been proved to have been committed by a detective of the employers' organization; not only have all the accused union men who have been tried been acquitted, but their acquittal was justified by the complete breakdown of the prosecution. As Mr. Teller says, all this talk about labor union terrorism as an excuse for military despotism, is pure assumption.

Apart from his narrative of facts, Mr. Teller offers a significant explanation of the vindictiveness of the mine owners. It is a new version of the old story of the beggar on horseback. They are plutocrats, not aristocrats. The plutocrat is harsh; the aristocrat has learned "noblesse oblige." One strenuously gratifies the brutal instincts of the slave driver; the other condescendingly practices the humanitarian precepts of the slave owner. The plutocrat founds aristocracies; the aristocrat is a stonion of plutocracies. They are alike except in genealogy

and manners. Each lives in the sweat of other men's faces—the one by traditional title, the other by personal conquest; and each believes in it—the one phrasing his faith in billingsgate, the other in litanies. It is harder in some respects, to be sure, to be the victim of a plutocrat's unpretentious greed than of an aristocrat's paternal protection; yet both come high, in labor, and even at greater cost wouldn't a real man prefer the Colorado miners' condition of enforced exile, to the "good" slave's condition of brute comfort?

Another point in Mr. Teller's letter is strikingly true and significant. It is his economic point, that the market price of the precious metals is so constant that alterations in the wages for their production affect the employer's own pockets and not the pockets of those to whom he sells. If wages rise his profits fall. This is because the employers are also owners of the mines, either as actual landlords or as tenants with a fixed term. They receive not only the profits of operation, but also the profits of ownership. The profits of operation would not fall with a rise of wages, but would tend also to rise. Legitimate profits of operation are governed by the prevailing rate of wages, being high when that is high and low when that is low. It would be absurd to suppose that legitimate profits of operation could be persistently low when the rate of wages was persistently high. Equally so is it to suppose that such profits can be persistently high when the rate of wages is persistently low. Profits of operation are really nothing but wages for a certain kind of productive skill, and we never make the mistake of supposing that high wages for unskilled labor are consistent with low wages for desirable skilled labor. In the case of the miners we are confused by the fact that the profits of mine-operation and the profits of mine-ownership go into the same treasury without distinction.

In most vocations, when wages

rise, either the consuming interest or the land-owning interest must suffer. Which it may be, depends upon which offers the least resistance. If higher prices would not seriously diminish production, production would go on as usual, though prices rose. In that case the consumer pays the higher wages. But if higher prices would check production to a degree sufficient to throw considerable land out of use, that land would compete for a job, and landlords would have to carry the rise in wages. It is precisely so with precious metal production, as with everything. In that vocation, however, the natural opportunities are more completely monopolized than in other vocations, and prices are as high already as demand warrants. To increase the price would correspondingly narrow the market. Consequently any rise in wages must come out of the mine-owning, as distinguished from the mine-operating, interests. But as the owning and the operating interests have a common treasury, higher wages seem to be at the expense of employers. That it is really at the expense of mine-owners would be obvious, if all royalties and other fixed payments for mining privileges were abrogated, and the owners' profits were kept in a separate till from the operators' profits.

The bitterness of the employers in the stockyards strike seems hardly less than that of the mine owners of Colorado. And it is the same plutocratic bitterness, characterized by the same beggar-on-horseback assumption of superiority, the same contempt for law and order, the same coldly calculating inhumanity, the same destructive spirit. Here are hardworking and by no means thrifless men and women, whose regular pay has been so small that within a week after their strike begins they are on the verge of starvation. Here are free-born American citizens forced by economic conditions to sell the products of their labor to the meat trust on terms that would have shamed any humane slave master

in the South before the war, and set in motion against him the protective machinery of the slave code. Here are men and women whom this trust employs upon more profitable terms than if it were to buy them outright as chattel slaves at a hundred dollars a head and care for them as masters in the South were compelled to care for their Negro slaves. Yet it drives them into a desperate strike in order to force still lower wages upon them; and at the first signs of disorder in this great writhing mass of humanity struggling for a chance to live, it yells lustily for the police. Law is what it wants when workingmen strike. Law! Law! Law! Don't you hear? Law! But law is not what it wants. It wants power, irresponsible power. This trust is a law-breaker by profession. It is a trust in flagrant violation of law. It is a thief caught in the act of stealing great volumes of water from the public mains. It is a tax dodger. It is a reckless violator of the sanitary code. By all means let the law be enforced. But let it be enforced impartially against it as well as in its favor. Of that "safe and sane" administration of the law which singles out one class for punishment and another for privilege, and for which the trusts have so great a liking, we have had enough.

It should be observed that the outcry against labor violence is not always well founded. The Governor of Nebraska has satisfied himself of this by personal investigation. There had been numerous reports of violence in connection with the meat trust strike, and troops were in demand from the offices of the trust. It was then that the Governor investigated. "Disguised as a common laborer," said the dispatches of the 1st from South Omaha, "Governor Mickey, of Nebraska, mingled this morning with the striking packing-house employes, listened to their talk, watched strike breakers run into different plants, and otherwise investigated for himself as to whether State troops were

necessary for the maintenance of order. Mr. Mickey had been in South Omaha only a few moments when it was reported that a carload of 'breakers' was coming. Scores of strikers made a rush, and with them went the Governor, but the crowd was orderly, and silently watched the strike breakers leave their car, and enter the Armour plant. There were forty of the non-union workmen. 'In the light of the reports of violence and disorder which have been spread I was agreeably surprised to see the strikers acting so well,' said Governor Mickey later." And so might other officials at other times and in other places be able to say if they were more solicitous for the good of society and less eager for the good opinion of men of money.

An illustration of the depth to which this notion that law is the luxury of the rich has sunk its roots, may be found in the Iron Age, a plutocratic trade paper. In its issue of the 4th this entertainingly ingenuous paper objects to labor organizations' heckling legislative candidates with reference to the kind of laws the candidates will vote for if elected. The American Federation of Labor having announced its purpose to question these candidates on government by injunction, the eight hour bill, and direct legislation, the Iron Age says:

It is simply another attempt to accomplish by force or duress that which the community has steadfastly refused to grant. The principle which actuates such a plan of procedure is precisely the same as the conception of sympathetic strikes to influence an impatient public against a hard headed employer or any of the other means employed to stir up wholesale trouble whenever a strike occurs that seems likely to fail. Candidates for office are to be threatened with defeat unless they yield to the dictates of those who assume to know the proper number of hours which should constitute a day's work, and who would also break down judicial obstacles to lawlessness in times of strikes.

There is something pathetic about the political ignorance (if it is not sordid dishonesty) of a paper which abhors the pledging of candidates by their constituents, as