

pose, see their nearest and most formidable antagonists in international jealousies and in the system of vast standing armies. Their whole weight is usually thrown into the scale of peace. Even in England, where this movement has been much less strong than in France or Germany, the socialist party has been almost unanimous in its protest against the South African war.

Coming back to our starting point of a comparison between the friendliness of international relations in Europe now with the same state of things in 1800, it must be admitted that there is much cause for disappointment. In few phases of the life of the world has this century, so amazingly fertile in progress, been able to record so little progress. There is nothing that deserves to be called friendship between any two nations, for the effusive sentiments of France towards Russia are not very warmly reciprocated by the Russians. The legal and formal relations of states are better than they were in the last century, but there is probably as much jealousy and suspicion now as then. Yet after all, things are better than they were in the days of Napoleon. The doctrine of statesman and the practice of states still lie far behind the ideals which were deemed so near of attainment forty years ago. But those ideals seem to be more and more making their way, however slowly, among the masses of the people.—James Bryce, M. P., in New York Post.

UNTRUE AS USUAL.

A few days ago the Omaha World-Herald published a dispatch purporting to be from the mayor of Oswego, New York, stating that the starch factory at that place had been closed by the "trust." The following letter discloses the utter lack of truth in reports sent out by fusion papers:

OSWEGO, N. Y., Oct. 29.—Joy Morton, Nebraska City: The dispatch from A. M. Hall, democratic mayor of this city and editor of a democratic newspaper, to the World-Herald, is a deliberate misrepresentation and is unwarranted by the facts in his possession. Our factory management is as it has always been. The works are temporarily closed for repairs to machinery as has been our custom for many years. It will be a shorter shut down this year than the average. We are now purchasing corn and will open on November 15, when we shall employ fully as many men as heretofore. Many of the starch factory employees are now working in the Kingsford Boiler and Machine works, and shall continue to do so until the starch factory reopens.

The closing was for repairs and for no other reason whatever. We have made more starch in Oswego this year than for a long time, notwithstanding the statements of our democratic mayor who is fully informed of their falsity.

T. P. KINGSFORD,
"President Oswego Starch Factory."

LIMITING THE OUTPUT OF LABOR

The English manufacturers are being so badly beaten by Americans when bidding on large contracts that they are beginning to look about for explanations, and they lay their disappointments largely to the labor unions, which, they say, have increased the cost of production very greatly, not so much by compelling the payment of high wages—for it is well known that wages are higher in the United States than in Great Britain—but by limiting the amount of labor a workingman is allowed to do in a day. They say that even if the American workman is paid 50 per cent more than the English laborer, this advantage is entirely overcome, provided the American produces 100 per cent more. It is an established fact that in the United States the productive power of labor is greater than in Great Britain, and while a part of this is due to greater skill on the part of the workman and to better machinery, the labor union rules do interfere to quite an extent with the natural product of labor as described by English employers.

But it is not alone in England that there is a growing disposition on the part of labor unions to limit the output of labor; the same disposition is manifested in the United States, and it threatens to produce serious consequences here as it has in Great Britain. It constitutes one of the serious economic problems of the day and demands fair, intelligent treatment. We have heard Irving M. Scott quoted, though we do not know with how much correctness, to the effect that the average day's work done in his shipyard today is nearly 50 per cent less than when he began building ships, and we know that in many industries the tendency of unions is to curb employees who are disposed to do more than the average amount of work. This policy by the labor unions is not due to laziness on the part of the members, nor is it to be accounted for by a desire to hamper their employers; it is the result of a mistaken economic theory which has been quite generally adopted.

We may assume that all will agree that what mechanics and laborers of all classes should aim to secure is as large pay as possible for their work and to labor only a reasonable number of hours. As industrial conditions improve wages should advance, and concurrently there ought to be a gradual reduction of hours, until no workmen labor more than eight hours. But how is the payment of better wages made possible? That is the question in which the whole matter is unfolded. Unfortunately, many workingmen have supposed the answer to be to diminish the amount of labor done by each person, so that more laborers will be needed, which is a radi-

cal misconception and will never lead to any general and sustained advance in the pay of labor. The true advantage of the workingman is to be sought in the opposite direction—by each producing as much as he can—since both labor and capital have to be paid out of the product and if little is produced there will be little to divide. This fact, that labor is paid out of the product and not out of an imaginary "wage fund," is one which theoretical economists were a long time in comprehending and workingmen cannot be blamed if they are slow in grasping it, but unless they do apprehend it they will never understand their true interests and their progress is likely to be obstructed by their own acts. It is all very simple if one stops to think it over. Why does anyone hire a workman? Generally to make money for himself. How much can he afford to pay the laborer? Enough to secure his services and yet leave something for himself, the employer. Under what conditions can he afford to pay the laborer higher wages? On condition that the laborer will produce more.

A significant fact of current history will emphasize this point. In the year 1895 there were employed in Europe 45,000,000 operatives and artisans to produce manufactured articles valued at \$17,000,000,000, being an average of \$380 for each operative; in the United States, during the same year, 6,000,000 operatives produced goods worth \$10,000,000,000, or about \$1,666 each. American labor was four times as productive as European labor and naturally American labor was better paid. If American labor had produced only as much as European labor the rates of pay which it received would have been impossible, because the wages paid to the American laborer are equal to the total output of the average European laborer, and, as before said, the product must pay both labor and capital. This ought to make it clear, that, in the long run, the way to increase wages is to increase product and the way to decrease wages is to decrease product.

One of the fundamental errors consists in assuming that there is only so much work to be done and that if a few men do too much there will not be anything left for others to do. There will always be work to do until every human want is satisfied, and that state of things is not likely ever to happen. Every improvement of machinery has resulted temporarily in throwing some labor out of employment and permanently in increasing the number of laborers needed. There are now more shoemakers than there were before shoemaking machinery was invented and more tailors than before sewing machines were conceived. And so it will ever be, the satisfaction of one human want creating a dozen others and enlarging endlessly the avenues for employment.—Oakland Enquirer.