WEALTH AND WAGES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

12

touching the sub-structure of the State edifice. There lies in one of the old galleries in Germany a picture painted over 200 years ago. The rude and rough painting shows not the touch of a master hand, but it well illustrates the thought of the people. On his knees, the immense muscles of his thighs showing the strain, with his broad back bent over and the hands flat on the ground, is a giant German laborer, and on his back is seen the trader, the merchant; and on his back, again, is seen the lawyer, the doctor, the soldier; and on theirs is the bishop, the priest; and on theirs again, topping the pyramid, of which the base is the broad shoulders of the laborer, stands the king.

Carrying out the idea of this old picture, we will consider Class 2, 3 and 4, all under the head of capital, and Class I. under that of labor; and now let us look at the condition of British capital and labor, and after that, compare the same with conditions in the United States, and then we can answer the problem, as stated above, Does capital press too heavily on labor?

The wealth of the United Kingdom in 1800 was £1,800,000,000; 1840, £4,000,000,000; 1860, £6,000,000,000; 1883, £8,720,000,000. Thus the total wealth of the United Kingdom in 1883 was five times greater than it was in 1800. The income of the United Kingdom for 1883 was £1,265,000,000, divided as follows: 4,620,000 families of working classes, £447,000,000 – £96 12s. to each family; 2,046,000 families of gentry, middlemen, professions, etc., £818,000,000 – £400 to each family. Over four and a half million families had £96 12s. a year, whereas two millions families had £400 a year.

Prof. Thorold Rogers says: "In no period of England was the condition of manual labor worse than from 1782 to 1821, during which period traders, capitalists and manufacturers, accumulated fortunes rapidly, and rent of farm land doubled."

This "misery" is the result, Spencer would say, of a "large, farseeing benevolence," and philanthropy should not interfere. There were, however, in the early part of this century those who saw the chasm broadening between the rich and the poor, and who heard in the low tones of discontent the possibilities of a time when capital might try to hide its head before the rush of a combined labor movement. Thackeray exposed, with his mild satire, the foibles of those who lived in the palace. Dickens, the immortal novelist, disclosed in Oliver Twist the horrors of the poor buse. The stolidity of the British public was made to think, and the

tish workman to-day thanks God for the deep tenderness of Dickens, who, in his "Tale of Two Cities" and in "Oliver Twist," laid base the