

becomes one of the safest investments as well as the most lucrative. Kings are but the tools of a crafty Nobility. They usually do the bidding of those who placed them in power.

Some of the early Kings, like Henry VII, forced the rich to support the Government; but this became very unpopular; and as the large Land holders gained power they began to dictate to the King and finally under James I and Charles I and II they prevailed upon the King to borrow money from them to run the Government and place Excise (Tariff) Taxes on a number of articles of consumption from which the Government could pay the Interest upon the Borrowed Money (Bonds). Both these subtle, sure-footed political evolutions not only came about before the advent of machinery and the resultant growth of great cities, but they also laid the foundation of the most powerful agencies to rob workers with the least amount of protest, and give industrial Monarchs a permanent and increasing power to control the labor and lives of workingmen.

It must be seen that Renters or men on Mortgaged Land by the Associated Bond and Tariff Tax devices, paid two bills; the Rent or Interest bill and the cost of Government through Taxes on the food and clothing they used. Also that the Nobility drew two incomes from the producers of wealth—Rent, and the Interest on their Government Bonds through the Tariff Tax medium. And since we have these same agencies of the Wealthy to divert wealth from Producers to Nonproducers, we have with it all the same economic inconsistencies of Poverty in the midst of Plenty, of class-rule over Government and Industry, of a commercial savagery that fosters Strikes, Blacklists, multiplied laws, increased crime and all the political jugglery and office seeking practiced in the name of Democracy to uphold this treasonable set who are heirs to the great estates of the early Nobility.

—DR. THOMAS L. BRUNK.

“TELL me whence are you rich? From whom have you received? From your grandfather, you say; from your father. Are you able to show, ascending in the order of generations, that that possession is just throughout the whole preceding generations? Its beginning and root grew necessarily out of injustice. Why? Because God did not make this man rich and that man poor from the beginning. Nor, when he created the world, did he allot much treasure to one man, and forbid another to seek any. He gave the same earth to be cultivated by all. Since, therefore, his bounty is common, how comes it that you have so many fields, and your neighbor not even a clod of earth? . . . The idea we should have of the rich and covetous—they are truly as robbers, who standing in the public highway despoil the passers.”—*St. John Chrysostom (Greek Church, A.D. 347-407).*

Greenfield, Pa.— A Village Tragedy

BUSINESS district: Greenfield Av., Kaercher St. to Wheatland St.

June 1910. Sixteen merchants engaged in business.

Of these sixteen, four owned the real estate they used.

Of these sixteen, three are still in business. Two sold to successors who are still in business. Both of the predecessors owned the real estate they used.

Of the three original who are still in business: Two owned their real estate when they started. The third acquired his through a wealthy friend.

Of the three who still remain in business after 17 years:

One is wealthy and owns much real estate.

One has lost out in business and wants to quit but is hanging on in order to sell his real estate to the best advantage. He can sell his real estate at a profit of \$10,000.00 after using it 17 years.

One has made a bare living in business but can sell his real estate at a profit of \$5,000.00, having had it 8 years.

During these 17 years 84 merchants in all have engaged in business in Greenfield. Twenty eight remain. Six businesses are still going in the hands of successors. Fifty have passed from the scene.

Of the 84, three have made good as merchants. Five have made good as landlords. None who started as his own landlord or became one, has failed, or sold out at a loss, or quit at a loss.

With two exceptions no tenant has made good. In connection with these two exceptions it may be noted: One rents his business premises but has owned his residence since before starting business. The other rents his business premises but resides with his wife's parents who own their residence.

In these 17 years land values have more than doubled. The Greenfield dump increased in value over \$50,000.00, selling this Spring for \$72,000.00.

Though extensively acquainted in Pittsburgh for over thirty years I have known but four retail merchants and one wholesale man who knew or cared to know the cause for general business distress. The cause of business distress in general has never been discussed by the Chamber of Commerce or the Boards of Trade or the Credit Men's Association.

A business men's slogan: "None but landlords shall survive."

—H. W. NOREN.

THE first thing that the student has to do is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership. Such an idea is quite unknown in English law. No man in law is absolute owner of his lands. He only owns an estate in them.—Williams, "Real Property," 12th ed., p. 17.