

although on account of the depreciation of the measure of value, those who do not wish to know or hear the truth may produce statistics to prove the contrary. They will surely ask, "Where did all the war millionaires come from?" The answer is easy: "They did not get it from what was produced during these years, for we consumed more than we produced. They made these millions at the expense of the capital of others." The world during the past five years can be compared with the thoughtless man who has a home or a farm left to him and immediately places a heavy mortgage on same, buys an auto, diamond rings for the wife and fine clothes for the children, and in general lives like a prince. When the house-servant and the man who drives the auto see such extravagance they say: "We are the only ones around here who work. All this money is coming from our labor." Then the trouble begins.

Small Wealth per Capita

A trillion dollars looks like a lot of wealth. It is a considerable sum, but when you divide it by the number of people on earth, about one billion seven hundred millions, we get a sum that comes within the scope of the minds of most of us, namely, about \$600. Whether one believes in the Bible or not, he must admit that what was said about toiling for a living is true, otherwise, after some six thousand years of toil and sacrifice, we would have accumulated more than \$600 each. If we allowed no credit for the things that God put on the earth for man's use, which he could take without any exertion, and if we start with a capital of one dollar, this capital has increased at the rate of about one half of one per cent. a year.

Let us take the case of the United States, a comparatively new country to civilization. The estimated wealth of the United States in December, 1917, was two hundred and twenty billions of dollars. If we assume that the accumulation of this wealth started four hundred years ago, and that the value of the natural resources, such as wild prairie lands and timber, which required no human exertion to create their present assessed value, amounted to the low sum of \$100,000,000, then the increase would be considerably less than 2% per year. Further, if we entirely ignore the value of the natural resources and started with a capital of one dollar, then the increase would be less than 7% per year. But we know as a matter of fact that this latter figure is not correct, for that would mean that the wealth of the country would double every ten years.

Railway Operation as Example

Enough has been said to show how foolish is the doctrine that there is wealth enough in the world for all of us to live in comfort and ease if it were equally distributed. We must look some place else for the oppressors of the poor. The miser may accumulate millions, but they are only saved up for the future happiness and comfort of the human race; none of them are carried across the River Styx. They will continue to serve the world for years after their accumulator has been forgotten.

We will assume that the average man will accept as an axiom the statements that it is impossible for the world to consume more than it produces, that the capital of the world is not large, and that the rate of increase is small and must be maintained in order to supply the means by which industrial workers can make a living. If the above be granted, then we can logically say that the oppressor of the poor is the man who consumes more than he creates.

It is a hard problem to say how much a man has a right to consume, therefore a difficult thing to lay your hand on the real culprit, but as a great majority of the industrial workers spend all they get, let us analyze the subject from the point of remuneration for services and try to find out who, if any, are being paid for more than they create.

Because the writer is more or less familiar with the railway business, and further, because of published facts of that business in the United States, we will take that industry as an example.

If the United States had not taken over the operation of the railways, and the private companies had to pay the wages that are now being paid, it is a safe guess that 50% of the railways would now be either in the hands of receivers or ready to be taken over by receivers, and the bondholders would not be getting interest on their capital. There would practically be no dividends paid on stocks,—only by the very few strong companies. This burden is being carried by the general taxpayer, and I do not believe that there are very many who think that the holders of railway securities are getting what is justly due them, to say nothing about getting too much, and the majority of the people know that if 50% of the roads were in the hands of receivers that the security-holders would not be getting a just return on their capital; therefore, we can eliminate them from the class of oppressors of the poor.

The shippers of the country, whether rightfully or not, believe that freight and passenger rates are high enough. If that view be correct, the railways are being paid for all they create, and we practically have only the employees left among which to find the oppressors of the poor, if there are any in that industry.

High-Salaried Officials

The radical labor leader will at once point to the high-salaried officer and say, "There is the man." Representative Sims has published in the Congressional Record a list of the names of railway officials who were paid \$20,000 or more per year in 1917, the last year of private operation. There were about two hundred names on this list—about one hundredth of one per cent. of the total number of employees. The aggregate amount paid these two hundred men was \$6,644,074, or a little over \$33,200 each per year. If the services of these officers had been dispensed with, and the money divided among the other employees, they would have each received less than \$4 more per annum than they were actually paid. Surely these two hundred men were not very grievous oppressors of the poor.

Director-General Hines, on November 14th, 1919, submitted to the president of the senate a report in response to the August 20th resolution of the senate calling for information re rates of pay of railway employees. (For further and more detailed information, see "Railway Age," October 3rd, 10th, November 7th, 14th, 1919.) The figures in this report show that several classes of organized labor are receiving as much and in some cases more than is being paid to the division officers.

Recently, in speaking to a railway superintendent who had formerly been a locomotive engineer, I was told that on account of the depreciated value of the dollar, it was getting next to impossible for him to make both ends meet,—he had to dress well and keep up his end in a small town, and was finally compelled to sell his automobile to one of his locomotive firemen.

Organized Labor Taking All

He said, further, that he did not see how the company could afford to raise his pay, for if they did, then they would have to raise the salary of thousands of others who were unorganized, and he did not see how it could be done, as organized labor is taking all and more than the company can afford to pay. He asked and answered this question: "Do you think it is just that a locomotive engineer should get more pay per month for working seven to nine hours per day, three or four days a week, than I receive for working seven days a week and from ten to twenty hours per day? Whom do you consider is the greater producer?" The answer was: "He has the advantage over me that he has back of him the brute force of a large combination; and still they talk about the wrongs of the poor and brotherly love! I cannot understand how a locomotive engineer that preaches such doctrines, and in some cases draws from \$2.50 to \$3 per hour for actual time worked, can look in the face of his auto-driver, whom he pays at the rate of thirty to forty cents per hour, when he knows that it requires more brains, five times as much energy and more responsibility to drive an auto-