

Title	The influence of so-called marginal rent upon the marginal expenses of production.
Sub Title	
Author	Buchanan, D.H.
Publisher	慶應義塾理財学会
Publication year	1922
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.16, No.3 (1922. 3) ,p.291(1)- 308(18)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	論説
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19220301-0001

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

コール原著 貴島憲譯

定價二圓五十錢
送料十錢

勞働賃銀論

新刊 解放叢書

資本中心の世の中、何人も無關心なること能はざるは賃銀問題なり。勞働者にとりては、實に死活の問題にして、資本家によりては、其の特權の問題なり。此兩者に屬せざる階級ありとすれば、其の人にとりては、生活不安の原因たらざるを得ざるべし。我國の今日に處し、明日に備へんとするものは、本書に來れ!!

<p>◇勞働組合指針 <small>コール原著 中村信太郎譯</small></p> <p>定價 二・五〇 送料 一・二〇</p>	<p>◇生理學上より觀たる勞働者 <small>リト教授原著 柳路義太郎譯</small></p> <p>定價 二・五〇 送料 一・二〇</p>
<p>◇勞働組合論 <small>ロイド原著 荒畑寒村譯</small></p> <p>定價 二・五〇 送料 一・二〇</p>	<p>◇勞働問題の現及將來 <small>法學博士堀江錦一著</small></p> <p>定價 三・二〇 送料 一・二〇</p>

東京 橋本町 大ダイ 橋本町 三橋南
大阪 三橋南 大ダイ 橋本町 三橋南
東京 橋本町 大ダイ 橋本町 三橋南
大阪 三橋南 大ダイ 橋本町 三橋南

振替 東京三三六一八
大阪二七一五五

三田學會雜誌 第十六卷 第三號

論 說

The Influence of So-called Marginal Rent upon The
Marginal Expenses of Production.

D. H. Buchanan.

In this magazine for March 1921 I undertook to show that much of the disagreement about the relation between economic rent and the marginal expenses of production had been due to misunderstanding.⁽¹⁾ I stated that Ricardo and Jevons had discussed entirely different questions and that both had been correct in their answers. I maintained further that both their questions had been reasonable at the respective times in which they were formulated and that, with a supplementary statement for a possible exceptional case, the answers constituted a consistent and satisfactory doctrine of the subject. In another article in May 1921 I stated the position thus arrived at as follows:—

(1) Page 92 et seq.

- (1) Rent of land for a general use, such as the production of "raw material" or "agricultural produce", does not influence the price of that commodity, relatively to others, if there is no competing use for the land.
- (2) Rent of land for a particular use, such as the production of corn or cotton, does influence the price of that commodity, relatively to others, if there are other competing uses for the same land.
- (3) In case a piece of land is specially fitted by nature for the production of some one particular commodity, so that it will produce that commodity regardless of the price at which it may be sold, such rent as it earns has no influence upon the price of the commodity.⁽¹⁾

In the present paper I propose to examine, in the light of the theory embodied in these three propositions, that theory which states that the marginal expenses of production of a particular commodity includes the economic rent paid for the poorest land given to that use. (In the March article referred to above this theory was stated as one of three most commonly met with in present day literature on the subject.) This theory separates land into different divisions according to the various uses to which it is normally put. The land taken for the lowest paying use may be added to by drawing directly from no-rent land. But further land for most uses must be drawn away from the production of other commodities for which it already commands a rent. The poorest land for any given use is called "marginal land" and the rent which is paid for it is called "marginal rent". Such part of this "marginal rent" as the next less productive use of that land

⁽¹⁾ Page 69 et seq..

would pay is stated to be a marginal expense of producing the commodity actually furnished. Advocates of this theory are not equally explicit but it is usually stated or inferred that the total of the rent paid on this poorest land for the given use will be only just sufficient to keep the land from going over to the competing use. Hence it is commonly stated that the "marginal rent" (inferring its entirety) is an expense of producing the marginal units of the commodity.

The better pieces of land for this use receive higher rents, corresponding to their greater productivities. The differences between these rents and that paid on the poorest land for the use are called "differential rents". It is claimed that the "marginal rent" is a marginal expense of producing the commodity and that the differential rents are not. The following quotations appear to uphold this view:—

"Every piece of marginal land- that is, the poorest land in use for some particular product- is worth something for the raising of a less valuable product, until we finally reach land that is worth nothing for any purpose. In the cost of wheat, therefore, there must always be included the rent which the marginal (or no-wheat-rent) land would earn if employed for the next lower use."⁽¹⁾

"...the wheat farmer pays a marginal rent to cover what the poorest wheat land would be worth for grazing purposes.....Marginal land for some of the uses to which land is put is actually no-rent land. More commonly the marginal land for any particular use itself affords a rent because, though marginal for the given use, it is above the margin for some other use to which it might be applied. Rent is thus composed usually of a

⁽¹⁾ Seligman: Principles of Economics, 5th Ed. Revised.) pp. 377-8.

differential and of a marginal element. The differential element is an expense of production only to enterprisers using superior land for the given purpose, while the marginal element must be paid by all enterprisers engaged in the given branch of production and hence figures as an element in the normal expense of production."⁽¹⁾

"--marginal land (i. e. the worst land in use for any kind of service)--. The marginal land for a particular purpose, e. g. growing wheat, market gardening, city building, in developed industrial communities, almost always pays a rent ---. ---. The old economic theory held that the marginal land paid no rent. But this is certainly untrue of most uses of land in developed countries. --- the worst wheat-growing land pays some rent. The marginal land for market gardening pays a considerable rent, and, where we come to city building ground, the least eligible sites pay a rent far above the ordinary level for agricultural uses."⁽²⁾

And in another book :—

"What really invalidates the Ricardian treatment is the fact that most land in use has several alternative uses or can contribute toward several different supplies. -----
' Though the worst grazing land may pay no rent, the worst wheat land might be better for grazing than the worst grazing land, in which case it can only be obtained for growing wheat by paying a little more than its differential rent for grazing purposes ; this rent for the worst wheat land will be a positive rent and will enter into wheat prices ; again, the worst market-garden land competing for a given market may be tolerably good wheat land, and, if so, the

⁽¹⁾ Seager : (Principles of Economics,) pp. 234, 240.

⁽²⁾ J. A. Hobson : (The Industrial System,) pages 94, 95.

rent which it could get for wheat forms a marginal rent for market-garden land."⁽³⁾

"If the marginal land used for gardening will yield a rent for wheat, the value of the marginal produce of garden products must equal the cost of the labor employed plus the rent of the land when used for wheat."⁽³⁾

"Take the case of a particular industry-----The least efficient operative may be termed the marginal operative, just as the least valuable land may be termed the marginal land.-----Take the case of wheat. From the supply side its price is fixed by the costs of the marginal producer on marginal land. Into these costs *ex hypothesiss* differential rent does not enter.-----

"High rents do not make high prices any more than the height of the barometer governs the state of the weather.. On the contrary it is the high prices that make the high rents.

In qualification of this statement it must be added that a rent charge comes into play in settlement of price when the marginal land for a given purpose can only be obtained by buying out somebody who requires it for another purpose. The marginal factory in the outskirts of a town has had to win its site from agriculture in all probability, and to do so it has had to pay for the land a charge equal at least to *its rentable value for agriculture*. This charge, in being incurred at the margin, is an unavoidable element in marginal cost, and therefore

⁽¹⁾ J. A. Hobson : The Economics of Distribution, Pages 120-121.

⁽²⁾ Patten : The Theory of Dynamic Economics, p. 58. It is not easy to quote from Patten's text and show that he takes "marginal land" for a given use to be the same as the poorest land in that use. But the context reveals that this is unquestionably his supposition. I have therefore included his statement among those which uphold the theory under examination.

enters into the supply price of the article produced in the factory.”⁽¹⁾

And again:—

“---a payment for marginal land for any purpose, if it bears a rent, is an element of the cost which helps to settle price.”⁽²⁾

“Let us assume that a rise in the price of wheat makes it profitable to extend wheat cultivation to land that has heretofore been employed for grazing.---That the farmer of the marginal wheat land (formerly grazing land) must pay the owner of this land an amount that is equal to its rent as grazing land must be admitted. It must also be admitted that this is a payment at the margin of wheat production it will enter into the determination of the price of wheat.---the scarcity of any good is reflected in the fact that it yields a monopoly, or marginal surplus, or a surplus that enters into the determination of price. ---the amount which would have been paid for the land for grazing purposes is a surplus of this kind. For it is secured by the owners of the marginal land in wheat production in common with the owners of the better land employed in the producing of wheat, and thus---certainly enters into the determination of the price of wheat.”⁽³⁾

I shall now attempt to show that this theory is inadequate, I believe it to be built upon a false conception of the margin of production and that it therefore arrives at a false conclusion as to what are the marginal units of supply. Having selected non-marginal units as the marginal ones

⁽¹⁾ Chapman: Political Economy, pp. 213-218.

⁽²⁾ Chapman: Outlines of Political Economy, p. 298. See also p. 288. This author objects to calling this “marginal” payment for the use of land “economic rent.”

⁽³⁾ MacFarlane: Value and Distribution, pp. 139, 132. This author objects to calling this “marginal” payment for the use of land “rent” at all.

it necessarily selects non-marginal expenses of production as the marginal expenses. After showing that the theory is built upon false premises I shall make some suggestions as to what led to taking those false premises. At the end I shall add a short section calculated to show the inadequacy of one of the best known criticisms of the theory under examination.

* * * * *

The first thing to be noted about this theory is that it attempts to discover the marginal expenses of producing a *particular commodity*. It does not consider the land as used merely for “food” or “raw produce” and undertake to find the marginal expenses of producing that commodity. It undertakes to discover the marginal expenses of producing such particular commodities as “wheat”, “garden products”, live-stock and uses of city building sites.

The second thing to be noted is very closely related to the first, and is that the economic rent which is considered is not simply the “income received by land” but is the income received by a *particular piece of land* for the production of a *particular commodity*. This theory carefully distinguishes between the rents which different particular commodities will pay for a given piece of land.

The third, and perhaps most important, thing to be noted is that this theory assumes that different commodities are competing for the use of certain pieces of land. It further assumes that the land will be taken for that use whose value allows it to pay the highest rent.

It is clear, then, that the proponents of this theory are endeavoring to solve Jevons’ problem and not Ricardo’s.⁽⁴⁾

⁽⁴⁾ Compare with the March article above referred to.

They do not look at rent as merely "the price paid for the use of land" but as the price which the normal price of a particular commodity will allow that particular commodity to pay for a particular piece of land under consideration. They attempt, moreover, to discover the marginal expenses of producing one among many particular articles which, taken together, might be called "produce". They do not even limit its range to "corn" or "raw produce" or "agricultural produce" but attempt to cover any and all commodities whether rural or urban. It is also clear that these writers do not assume that the land is taken from Nature and that it has only one possible use,—that it must be taken for that purpose or return to Nature. These writers assume, on the contrary, that different products with different marginal expenses of production and different prices are actively competing for some of the land. These writers do not do as Marshall says the classical economists did and suppose,

"... that all kinds of agricultural produce can be regarded as equivalent to certain quantities of corn; and that all the land will be used for agricultural purposes, with the exception of building sites which are a small and nearly fixed part of the whole."⁽¹⁾

On the other hand they do as Jevons did. He spoke of potatoes and clover and turnips and added that even the rotation of these different particular commodities did not invalidate the reasoning. He said that,

"each portion of land should be applied to that culture or use which yields the largest total of utility, as measured by the value of the produce; if otherwise applied there will be a loss."⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ Marshall: Principles of Economics, 7th Ed., p. 434-5.

⁽²⁾ Jevons: The Theory of Political Economy, 4th Ed., Preface, p. xlix.

These things make it clear, I trust that this theory is not to be compared to Ricardo's, embodied in proposition No. 1 at the head of this paper. Also that it is not to be compared to proposition No. 3, where a part of the hypothesis is that the land has one use to which it will be put regardless of the price of its product. And it will be clear, I trust, that it is as a substitute for proposition No. 2, which considers particular products and particular rents and the competition of several such products for the use of the same land, that it must be considered. What, then, is the point at issue between our theory as embodied in proposition No. 2 above, elaborated in the March, 1921, article, and this one?

Most advocates of this theory recognize an extensive, no-rent, margin for products produced on the poorest land of most countries. They also recognize the existence of the intensive, no-rent, margin on all rent-paying land. Then, they state that the poorest, though it be rent-paying, land for the given use constitutes a third margin; upon this last margin economic rent is paid and is a marginal expense of producing the commodity, because it must be paid in order to keep the land from going to the next lower use. This seems decidedly like the theory stated in my March, 1921, article. It was stated there that units of a particular commodity were on the margin of not being produced at all on three different margins: and that two of these were these same extensive and intensive no-rent margins while the third was a margin on which economic rent becomes a marginal expense of production.⁽³⁾ The theories really appear to be much alike. They agree as to the two no-rent margins. And they agree as to the existence of the third margin where rent is charged. But they disagree as to *where* this third, or "product-changing margin" is found. They differ as to *which pieces of land in a given use* it is whose rent is a marginal expense of

⁽³⁾ Pages 119-120.

production for the given commodity. The theory under examination states that this margin is on the *poorest* land for the given use. The theory which I uphold states that it is on *whichever* pieces of land now in that use are "on the margin of going over to another use" and are held in place only by the fact that the normal price of the article produced is such as to give them a rental as good or slightly better than they could earn otherwise. The land may be the *poorest* for the use or it may be the *best* for the use, or it may be some piece between these extremes. Giving the reasons for believing that it is the rent paid on *whichever* piece of land is on the margin of leaving the production of that commodity rather than that paid on the *poorest* piece of land for the use is the main task of the present paper. They can be given, however, in a very short space.

The central facts which make it certain that this third, or "product-changing," margin of production of a particular commodity is not only on the poorest land for that use are: (a) that no expense of production affects the exchange value of a commodity except as it operates upon its supply:—and (b) any expense of producing the supply of a commodity which must be paid in full in order to keep that supply at its normal amount is a marginal expense of producing it. *The whole matter rests upon potential influence upon the normal supply of the particular commodity.* Absolutely nothing else from the supply side can affect it. Whether certain units come from the poorest or from the best piece of land in that use affects the case not in the least. *The whole matter depends upon whether or not those units would be produced if the price were to fall.* The particular product of the highest paid laborer in the automobile industry is a marginal expense of producing automobiles if the going price of the product is only barely sufficient to allow him a wage which will keep him from going over to the building of aeroplanes or to other work.

His share of the product is on the margin of not being produced at all.⁽¹⁾ This is a marginal use of labor. It is one of those points at which productive power is "on the margin of shifting" from a use which has come to pay less to one which promises to pay more. It is a place at which "changed relations of supply and demand manifest themselves."⁽²⁾

Exactly the same thing is true of land. If the best land in market-gardening is "on the margin of going over" to use for building sites it is in a position to influence directly the supply of garden products. And if the price of garden products should fall, through a change in demand, say, making it impossible for gardeners to pay the customary rental, that land would leave the product and go over, not, be it carefully marked, to a "*lower*" but on the contrary, to a *higher* use. Or, if an increasing demand for dairy produce should arise, it is quite possible that some of the pieces of land half way between the poorest and the best for garden products might go over to that use rather than that the poorest land should go over to wheat.

The entire matter depends upon the fact that so many units of supply of the particular commodity, garden produce, is needed to satisfy the normal demand for it. And for the production of that amount, with the supplies of all the different kinds of productive power as they are in the community and the uses to which they can be put, profitably (i. e., under the general conditions of demand and supply) about so many units of productive power in the form of land is needed. If the demand for the commodity falls, the rewards paid for the powers used, or for some of them, must fall or the supply must be curtailed by some of the agents used for that purpose going out of that line of production. Now just as it is not the lowest-paid laborer who will leave

(1) This is the principle which locates the "marginal shepherd" for Marshall. *Prins.* pages 516-517 and note.

(2) *Ibid.* p. 522.

a given work first upon a fall of wages, so it is not the lowest-paid piece of land which leaves first. The laborer whose wage in that line will become equal to what he can get in another line with the smallest fall in the price of the commodity will leave first. And the piece of land whose rental will be made equal to the rental it can earn in another use by the smallest fall in the price of the commodity, is the land which will leave that line of production first. It is the product of this land which would fail to be brought to market if the price of the particular commodity should fall. It is necessary to pay this land its normal rent if its part of the supply is to be kept on the market. The normal pay for the use of non-land agents plus the rent for this land is an expence of producing marginal units of the supply of the commodity in question. It may be said with negligible error that the rent actually paid on the land thus on the margin of going over to another use is a marginal expense of producing the commodity grown upon it. This is true because, as already stated, units of a given grade of labor, of land and of every other kind of productive power, are applied to all their different uses as far as it is profitable. As Marshall puts it,

“--equality is maintained between its values for each use by the constant tendency to shift it from uses, in which its services are of less value to others in which they are of greater value --.”⁽¹⁾

That is, it is an artificial and inexact description of the facts of production which insists that a different “grade” of land is required for the production of each kind of commodity.

Labor of the same grade is applied to many different kinds of production. Land is likewise applied. And, just as many laborers of a given grade tend to earn the same amount in the work

(1) Principles of Economics, 7th Ed., page 522.

for which they are employed as they could earn in another occupation so, many pieces of land of a given grade tend to earn the same amount in the use to which they are put as they could get in other uses. The earnings of land are thus “equalized” and unless the total amount of rent is paid to certain of these pieces (as likely to be better pieces for a given use as the poorest) they will leave that line of production.

The total rent on one of those pieces thus “on the margin” of deserting that line of production is a marginal expense of producing the commodity which it furnishes.

This conclusion is not arrived at in any indirect manner. It is reached by going straight to the only conditions which can affect prices,- conditions which affect relative supplies. The only question asked is this: “At what places do we find produced those units of the supply which would fail to be produced if the price were to fall?” It finds them at the points indicated. The produce from pieces of rent-paying land on the “product-shifting” margin is on the margin of not being produced at all and has economic rent as one of its necessary expenses of production, but those pieces of land are as liable to be the better or best pieces for the given use as the poorest. This theory which teaches that it is necessarily the rent on the poorest land for a given use which is a marginal expense of production is not true to the facts of the case.

* * * * *

Perhaps a fuller appreciation of the position here taken may be gained if a word is added as to *why* writers have been led to this position. I believe there have been two main causes.

(1) The principal cause appears to lie in their failure to recognize clearly that they are discussing a different question from that treated by Ricardo. There is an apparently half-unconscious

attempt to apply Ricardo's reasoning to an entirely different problem.

(2) The second cause grows partly out of the first. It is an inconsistent use of the term "marginal". This inconsistency appears to be due partially to (a) a confusion of two usages of the same term, "marginal" and partially to (b) a misinterpretation of Ricardo.

I have stated elsewhere that,

"The term 'marginal' has frequently been used in economic literature in two distinct and unrelated senses. One of those senses makes 'marginal' mean the poorest in quality of a number of units of a good, or of a producing agent. The other makes it refer to the last of a group of units, all of which are quality and, therefore, interchangeable, which will be taken for some use."⁽¹⁾

It will be evident that these two meanings are not the same. Furthermore, that all kinds of marginal reasoning, such as that dealing with marginal utility, marginal expenses, etc., depend upon the second of these meanings. These writers appear to have used this term in the two senses and then to have confused the two. That confusion follows most naturally, unless the dual usage is made with great care. If the poorest land in a given use is "marginal" land then it seems natural to suppose that the product from it is also "marginal", and that its expenses of production are the marginal expenses of producing that commodity. But, as I have already shown, this is not true. The poorest land in a given use is "marginal" in a different sense, from having its product "on the margin of not being produced at all" and hence only drawn out by the normal price. The word "marginal" is used in senses which are different and which are not interchangeable.

⁽¹⁾ This Magazine for March, 1921, Page 95.

It cannot be stated definitely that this inconsistent usage is also due in part to a misinterpretation of the Ricardian doctrine, but it seems probable. Ricardo undertook to find the places at which income-earning agents shifted away from the production of raw produce. That was the *principle* that underlay his analysis. An *incident* was that he found one of these places on the poorest land for that use. It was a fact that this land produced the marginal units of the supply, but the *essential fact* about these units was not that they came from the poorest land, since often called "marginal", but that they were the units of the supply which were just barely drawn out by the price offered.

The point of Ricardo's analysis was in the fact that the produce was there "on the margin of not being produced at all". The fact that it was produced on the poorest land was in reality only an incident. It seems difficult to explain how anyone should select the units of a particular commodity from the poorest piece of land in that use as necessarily "marginal" units unless it were believed that this incident of the earlier analysis were its essential point.

* * * * *

Concerning Professor Hollander's Criticism.

Perhaps the best known and most authoritative criticism of this theory hitherto published is that of Professor Hollander. The following note may be found useful to readers who care to compare his position with the one set forth here.

It should be stated that his criticism was written some years prior to the publication of some of the quotations criticised in the above paper and that it cannot be expected that it would necessarily apply to all of them. Quotations are given, however, from Patten and Hobson.

Professor Hollander states that this theory is based upon two things as follows:—

- (1) "Denial of the existence in actual cultivation of no-rent land", and,
- (2) "neglect of intensive cultivation."⁽¹⁾

While these two positions are stated to be at the basis of the theory they are not given the same place in Hollander's discussion. Most of his discussion deals with No. 2, and goes to show that the Ricardian theory of Rent and Price does not depend upon the existence of no-rent land but on the existence of the two margins, extensive and intensive, upon which labor and capital costs of production are equal. His principal claim is that

"marginal land will be cultivated intensively until a no-rent use is reached. The cost of the increment produced by this final application of labor and capital will be the cost of the real marginal product, and into this index of normal cost rent does not enter."⁽²⁾

I shall make three criticisms of this position.

(1) First, it fails to recognize the existence of the two problems discussed separately by Ricardo and Jevons. It undertakes to apply Ricardo's reasoning to Jevons' problem, to which it is, as I have already shown entirely inapplicable.⁽³⁾ Ricardo thought of the land as having no alternative use so that the withholding of its rent could have no influence upon the supply, and hence upon the price, of its product. It must be used for "raw produce", accepting the rent that commodity offered, or return to nature. Both Jevons and the persons who uphold this "marginal

⁽¹⁾ Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. IX, page 175.

⁽²⁾ Ibid, page 185.

⁽³⁾ This Magazine for March, 1921, page 111 et seq..

rent" theory work upon a different problem and with a different hypothesis. In their case it is supposed that the land has other competitive uses and that if the commodity usually produced fails to pay the usual, or normal, rent the land will go over to another use. Some pieces of land for a particular use are therefore so situated that the entire product from them is "on the margin of not being produced at all". The two cases are entirely different and Ricardo's theory does not apply to the other problem.

(2) Second, Hollander's position as to what is "the real marginal product" seems to me to be erroneous.⁽⁴⁾ This follows logically from his failure to recognize the fact that he is not discussing Ricardo's problem. His criticism is ostensibly based upon the Ricardian analysis but it also involves the overlooking of Ricardo's main principle; it is built upon an incident of the solution of Ricardo's particular problem rather than upon his central idea. Ricardo sought to discover those points at which changes were brought about in the relative supplies of urban and rural produce. In Marshall's words, he was "watching the marginal uses of" labor and capital. And he was doing so because, again in Marshall's words, he knew that "it is only at the margin that any of those shiftings can occur by which changed relations of supply and demand manifest themselves." That was the central thing in his analysis. An incident of it was that he found these shiftings to occur on no-rent land and at the intensive margin on rent-paying land. Since, by hypothesis, there is no no-rent land for the production of the commodities under discussion, one of the two places discovered by Ricardo is out of the question. But instead of applying Ricardo's *principle* and looking for places at which units are "on the margin of not being produced at all", Hollander follows the *incidents* of his discussion of a different question, and insists that all the marginal units

⁽⁴⁾ See quotation above, p. 16.

of a particular product must be found on the remaining one of the two. That is, he insists that all the "real marginal product" comes from the intensive margin on these rent-paying (which in this case includes all) pieces of land. Any normal agricultural community furnishes numerous examples of units of particular products on the margin of not being produced at all which are not produced on either the intensive or the extensive margins, but on the "product-changing margin".

(3) A third criticism of Professor Hollander's discussion should be made, although it appears that the subject of it has not contributed toward his taking the position outlined above. I refer to his usage of the term "marginal" in two distinct senses as I have already referred to its use by the authors criticised above. Throughout his discussion the "poorest land for a given use" is taken as "marginal land". Such usage appears to me to be likely to lead to the assumption that the product of this land is "on the margin of not being produced at all", which, as I have already shown, is not true. It seems that the usage should be avoided.

The End.

労働組合に関する諸問題 (三完)

堀江 歸一

三 ワンピツダユニオン

労働組合の聯合と合併

労働組合が其勢力を大ならしめるに就て、他の組合と聯合するのが宜しいか、其れとも他の組合と合併するのが當つて居るかと云ふことは、從來一個の問題として、論究された所であり、又實際上にも之を解決す可き資料がある。殊に近年事業主が次第に事業の經營を大規模のものとして、労働者に當らうとする一方に、政府も亦常に労働組合に對して、傍觀者の地位に立たず、時に或る干渉を加へようとし、又或る立法が偶然に労働組合に影響を及ぼす場合に於ては、此問題が自ら注目を惹くことゝ爲るのである。元來労働組合が或る程度まで發達すれば、必ず或る都會に其本部を置く。其本部の所在地は即ち組合に屬する労働者の多數を吸引す