

rest his stiffened back. He earned 40 cents a day. Worked ten hours. Yes; that was just four cents an hour. He had been at school a year or more, and could do a little sum like that. Why did he leave school? His father was killed in the mine, and he had to go to work for his mother. Same mine the father worked in? Yes; Markle's. What did he do with his money? Never saw any. What! All he got was these pay checks.

And then that 13-year-old boy produced checks showing that the Markle colliery took, week by week, every cent of the 40 cents a day they paid him, and applied it on a debt the dead father owed for the rent of the company's hovel in which he lived; and the father was killed in the Markle mine!

That is a message to the American people more important than anything Theodore Roosevelt, president of the United States, had to offer. It tells of a slavery infinitely more hideous than that which called the mighty armies of the union into being. It is not an isolated instance, for day by day stories even more horrible have been related by sworn witnesses before the commission. The crimes committed by the coal companies have been in the course of "business." They lie concealed in vouchers, time-cards, weigh-masters' receipts, time-checks, and an almost indissoluble conglomerate of corporation bookkeeping. The memories of them rankle bitterly in the hearts of an inarticulate people, who know but cannot tell their wrongs. When members of the new army of liberty, organized and splendidly led by John Mitchell, were here and there guilty of outbreaks of violence, the whole country rang with cries of condemnation, but we hold that if the United Miners had been guilty of all charged against them, their organization is still innocent and law-abiding beside the corporation that took a child's earnings to pay the debt of the father it had killed, and the managers of that corporation are among "the Christian gentlemen to whom God in his infinite wisdom committed the property interests of the country."

And how inconclusive, how inadequate such a story makes the whole arbitration proceedings. What is a 15 per cent. raise to a boy in such slavery? What has any arbitration to do with men who, like the owners of that colliery, should be driven out of the land with lashes? Should the

miners receive all they demand, and they will not, society will still be deeply in their debt. You may say that this is mere sentimentality; that some one must do the rough work of the world; that coal must be dug from the bowels of the earth and picked over in the breakers. Granted. But if your boy or mine, or the 13-year-old lad of any member of the comfortable classes stood in danger of being drafted at any moment to work in the breakers, the conditions of that service would very quickly be corrected, and machines of steel would do the work now committed to bruised and bleeding childish fingers.—Editorial in the January Pilgrim (Edited by Willis J. Abbot).

THE FELLOW BEHIND THE BUSH IS THE GROUND RENT MAN.

J. P. Kohler in the Brooklyn Eagle of Nov. 16.

We are all aware that when prices go up wages do not advance commensurately. This has been the wail of the workingman during the past few years and many of the late strikes for higher wages have been justified by intelligent people because of the well-known fact that the cost of living has very materially increased.

To measure correctly the relation which wages bear to prices, we must keep in mind the necessary factors in the production of wealth and the portion which goes to each factor in the division of the wealth produced. For out of the wealth produced must the wages of the workingman be paid.

Under modern economic conditions there are three factors in this production, and only three, viz.: land, labor and capital.

By land, I mean all the elements of nature that are here now and that were here before man's appearance on the earth. These natural elements include the earth itself, from its very center to the outermost star whose influence can reach us. They include the rain, the sunshine, the oceans, the lakes, the rivers, the waterfalls, the mountains, with their deposits of mineral ore, the wilderness, the prairie and all else that man goes to in its natural or wild state to get the things with which to feed, clothe and warm himself.

By labor, I mean the physical and mental energy which man exerts, alone or through association with others, in producing wealth. The miner, the builder, the sailor, the tail-

or, the teacher, the editor, the preacher, the musician, the actor, the doctor, and hundreds of others, are in this class.

By capital, I mean those tools or implements which man himself has made, and by and through the aid and help of which he, by labor, produces wealth from land. The "man with the hoe," by Millet, is a good representation of these three factors in their simpler form. The field of rough clods is the land; the man, with receding forehead, is labor; and the rude hoe, upon which he leans, is the capital. To-day we plow and sow thousands of acres by steam. We harvest the crop, thresh it and send it to market by steam. We have railroads and steamships and factories and coal breakers and elevators and printing presses and millions of men operating them. By the force of gravity at Niagara falls we get power to run all the trolleys in, and to light the city of Buffalo. We might get power enough from Niagara falls to run every railroad and every mill in the state of New York. Agriculture, manufacture and commerce in these days involve complexities sufficient to make the head swim, but all the natural forces, all the labor and all the implements or machinery engaged therein arrange themselves under the three heads or factors of production—land, labor and capital.

Now, what of the product of these three factors and how is it divided among them, for all the wealth produced comes from these three factors alone?

Each factor gets a share; the land a share, the labor a share and capital a share. The share going to land we call rent. The share going to labor we call wages. The share going to capital we call interest. Land, labor and capital, the factors. Rent, wages and interest, the shares.

The total product is divided among these three and among these three only. In legal nomenclature the term land includes the buildings and permanent improvements made thereon. In economic nomenclature the term land includes only what nature has given, and excludes all of man's improvements. In law the term rent includes the income from a building and improvements on land, as well as the income from the land on which the building stands. In economics rent means the income from the unimproved land alone, while the in-

come from the building and improvements is called interest.

If all the wealth produced is divided into three shares, whether equally or otherwise, it follows that diminution of one share means an increase to one or both of the other two. If, of a given product, the share called wages be decreased the shares called rent and interest may, one or both, be increased. If the share called rent be decreased the shares called wages and interest may both be increased.

To make the illustration so plain that no one can fail to understand—if a pie, large or small, be cut into three pieces each piece may be a third of the whole. Or one piece may be a half and the other two each a quarter of the whole. Or one piece may be forty-nine-fiftieths of the whole while each of the other may be only one one-hundredth of the whole. So it is with the wealth produced. As one share increases one or both of the other two shares decrease, and vice versa.

Whatever the amount of wealth produced, whether great or small, the share called wages and the share called interest may remain stationary, while only the share called rent increases. All the vast multiplicity of labor saving inventions, however much they may increase the volume of production, may be of benefit only to those who receive rent for the use of land.

Nothing more needs to be said to prove that wages may be increased without increasing the price. By a reduction of rent (the share going to the owners of bare land, or the forces of nature), the wages of all laborers may be increased; and the interest due to the owners of capital may likewise be increased.

In our modern labor troubles we see the owner of labor (the wage worker) and the owner of capital (the capitalist) fighting over the size of their respective shares. The laborer, ignorant of economics, wants capital to give it some of the share called interest. The capitalist, even more ignorant of economics than the laborer, seeks, by a reduction of wages, to increase the earnings of capital. While this fight is going on between these two the fellow who receives rent hides behind the bush and fires hot shots at both combatants.

Labor and capital should stop quarreling, shake hands and make up and then, both together, go after the fellow behind the bush and drive

him out of business. In other words, the entire product should be divided between labor and capital, and the share called rent, going now to individuals, should be eliminated, abolished, annihilated and wiped out entirely. Taxation should absorb it to support all forms of government.

Remember that by the term rent I mean the income derived from the forces of nature and from bare land—the immeasurable sums collected in all the cities and towns on the earth from the many by the few. A few illustrations will not be amiss:

In the anthracite coal fields the owners of the land collect from the operators what is called royalty. In some parts of the coal regions this royalty, which is rent, amounts to 20 per cent. of the output of the mine; that is, one ton of coal for the land owner and four tons for the operator, the operator paying all taxes and wages, beside keeping the mine in working condition. Coal mine royalties run much higher than 20 per cent. The operator thus pays for the privilege of taking coal out of the earth.

Farming on shares is a common thing the world over. The owner, who furnishes buildings and land, but not stock and implements, takes half or more of the crop; and the tenant farmer, who furnishes the implements, seed, stock and labor, takes the other half or less. The land of the farm is far more valuable than the buildings, and the farmer, who sows and reaps the crop, gives a large portion of it to the landlord for the mere privilege of tilling the earth.

At Minneapolis, Minn., the water of the Mississippi river falls over a precipice in the bed of the river and makes what is called the Falls of St. Anthony. At this point the river is not navigable and the owners of the land adjacent to the stream own to its middle. This tremendous water power (a mere force of nature) has been capitalized for millions. Great flouring mills and saw-mills are erected upon and around these falls and their owners pay large sums, as rent, to the company owning the falls, for the water power that drives the wheels in their mills. Whole families, without doing a stroke of work, live in continual luxury just because there is a little bump in the bed of the Mississippi river at Minneapolis, Minn.

Similar illustrations, including Niagara, Spokane, Hoosick, Willamette

and hundreds of others might be given.

Alexander Hamilton drew the will of a sailor named Randall, who early in the last century owned a few acres of land on Manhattan Island in the neighborhood of what is now Broadway and Tenth street. Hamilton advised the sailor to leave his farm to trustees to found a home for aged and worn-out seamen—a Sailors' Snug Harbor, as it were. The uptown store of A. T. Stewart, now John Wanamaker's New York store, was erected on a part of this Manhattan Island farm, under a lease, by the terms of which the ground rent is readjusted at certain intervals, but always readjusted upward.

And nearly all the buildings in that neighborhood stand on this Randall farm, on terms similar to those existing between Stewart and Wanamaker and the said trustees.

On Staten Island a group of magnificent buildings (Sailors' Snug Harbor) are occupied by aged and worn-out seamen and by a corps of highly paid officials. The money to erect the buildings, feed and clothe the sailors and pay the official salaries came and comes from the business men and residents who live and move and have a part of their being on the little Randall farm on Manhattan Island.

Just below Tiffany's, facing Union square, is a lot 50 by 90 feet belonging to the Spingler estate. A business building stands thereon and the estate gets yearly from the owners of the building \$50,000 net as ground rent for the use of this little bit of the earth's surface.

Need I speak of the millions of dollars that reach the coffers of the Astors, the Rhinelanders, the Goelets, the Lorillards, the Fishes and a few hundred others who own Manhattan Island, in the state of New York, and charge their fellow-men for living thereon? (I am not speaking of money paid for the use of buildings, but for the use of the land under the buildings.)

If these millions of dollars, used often to entertain and often to purchase the titles of worn out, decayed, decrepit and disgusting foreigners, were divided as interest and wages among the employers and employes, the business men and workingmen of New York city, as by right and justice they should be, the fear of failure or poverty and the skeleton of want and misery would be driven from every office, store, shop and home in the entire city.

Wages could be advanced a hundred per cent., living expenses could be halved and business men would cease to grow gray and wrinkled worrying about making ends meet. Ground rent, that drives human beings into garrets and cellars, where they huddle together like animals, is merely what the few charge the many for living on the earth. And yet we talk about justice, liberty and equality of opportunity. Bah!

When the city hall was built on Manhattan Island the city lay below toward the Battery. The wise men who had charge of the plans and construction reasoned thus: "This city hall will cost so much money. The city will never be built into the country beyond it. The farmers driving into town with their butter and eggs and cabbages are rough, uncouth people, who won't care whether they face marble or sandstone as they drive to town, so we will save money by building three sides of this city hall of marble and the fourth side, toward the country, of sandstone, which is cheaper." And they so built it.

Ye gods! Who are the "Four Hundred" of Manhattan Island to-day? Many of them are the descendants of those rough and uncouth farmers of a century ago, whose farms are now covered with the business and resident blocks of busy New York. Multi-millionaires, with money to burn, nearly every dollar of which measures ground rent squeezed out of the population, living and dead, of Manhattan Island, as lemon juice is squeezed out of a lemon in a squeezer.

Standing on Fulton street in Brooklyn, between Loeser's and Abraham & Straus', the other day, an old resident pointed out to me two corner lots, with buildings thereon. "The one," he said, "is worth \$135,000, the other, \$150,000. I can remember," said he, "when either corner, with its building, could have been bought for \$7,000." The difference between five per cent. on \$14,000 and five per cent. on \$285,000 is \$13,550. This sum, going yearly as ground rent, would do much to increase the wages of all the people employed in these two buildings without increasing the price of one article sold therein.

And by the elimination of this annual income, derived from the increased value of the land on these two corners, the price of every article sold on these two corners could be very materially "driven down to the purchaser" without diminishing the wages of any human being. Q. E. D.

Corollary: With a decrease in price to the consumer, and wages, or purchasing power, remaining stationary, increased consumption would inevitably call for increased demand for labor and capital in production, and both wages and interest would rise. This is the law of supply and demand. Business would thus be always good. Home consumption would keep pace with home production and foreign markets would be sought, not for the purpose of sale, but of purchase.

At present we seek foreign markets in which to sell because home consumption is not equal to home production; that is, wages and interest are low while rents are enormous. The great multitude are the recipients of wages and interest, while the few receive rent. The purchasing power of the multitude is low, the purchasing power of the few great. The multitude purchase almost exclusively in home markets, while the few purchase very largely abroad.

Thus it is that by the inequitable distribution of wealth into rent, wages and interest, instead of into wages and interest alone, we have hard times and panics instead of good times and continued prosperity, peace, comfort and happiness for all.

AN ESKIMELODRAMA.

'Mid Greenland's polar ice and snow,
Where watermelons seldom grow
(It's far too cold up there, you know),
There dwelt a bold young Eskimo.

Beneath the self-same iceberg's shade,
In fur of seal and bear arrayed
(Not over cleanly, I'm afraid),
There lived a charming Eskimaid.

Thro'out the six months' night they'd spoon
(Ah, ye of Sage, think what a boon),
To stop at ten is much too soon
Beneath the silvery Eskimoon.
The hated rival now we see!
(You spy the coming tragedy,
But I can't help it; don't blame me.)
An Eskimucher vile was he,
He found the lovers there alone,
He killed them with his ax of bone.
(You see how fierce the tale has grown)—
The fond pair died with an Eskimoan.

Two graves were dug, deep in the ice,
Were lined with furs, moth balls and spice;
The two were buried in a thrice,
Quite safe from all the Eskimice.

Now Fido comes, alas, too late!
(I hope it's not indelicate
These little incidents to state)—
The Eskimurderer he ate.

L'ENVOI.

Upon an Eskimo to sup
Was too much for an Eskipup—
He died. His Eskimemory
Is thus kept green in verse by me.
—The Cornell Widow.

"There's a feller here that's in a peculiar sort of a predicament," said the genial landlord of the tavern

at Pettyville. "You see, he stubbed his toe on a loose board in the sidewalk, right at the town limits, and fell over into the county and broke his arm; and now he don't know which of 'em to sue for damages."—Puck.

Constable—What, sir! Dae ye suggest that I wad tak' a bribe? Dae ye dare to insult me, sir?

The Erring One—Oh, excuse me, I really—

Constable—Bit now, supposin' I wis that kind o' mon, how much widge be inclined to gie?—Glasgow Evening Times.

This Is Official.—Texas is a symphony, a vast hunk of melliflence, an eternal melody of loveliness, a grand anthem of agglomerated and majestic beneficence. Texas is heaven and earth and sea and sky set to music. Grand Old Texas!—The Dallas News.

"What was the matter, captain?"

"Oh, nothing at all, but the engineer thought the screw was broke."

"Well, no one could see it under the water, so it would not matter anyway, would it?"—The Moon.

BOOKS

TOLSTOY.

One of the significant facts of history is that there have always been prophets in the world. If we go back through twenty-seven centuries, we shall find that not one of these centuries is without its prophets—men who, unblinded by the transient trend of things about them, see deeply and clearly the eternal truths of life, and who, unabashed by the dominant powers of their age, speak forth the ideas that should be, and so some day will be, dominant in the world.

It does not follow that these men are perfect. They have their weaknesses. They may indeed be mistaken about many unessential things. Their enemies may find defects to furnish excuse for criticism and sneers. But what makes their names now shine through the years is the fact that the essential messages which they utter—the "burdens" which they have to deliver—are seen to be true for their time and for all time.

The truths which these supreme men have to tell are found to be eternal and axiomatic. They find acceptance in the heart of every man who will clear the way for them through petty passions and prejudices. They fall in with the logic of the universe, and appeal to man's inmost reason, whenever this can be reached unblurred and unwarped by an artificial education or a blind conservatism.

In our generation a very remarkable fact has occurred, in that a great