

mon subsistence? As to the vast majority of them can it be said that they are leaping and plunging in agony under the pitiless lash of hunger, fainting at the rope and trampled in the mire? Are they not with their families living in tolerable comfort, with bread enough and not without enjoyment? Has it not been proved beyond doubt that their wages have risen greatly and are still rising? Have not the working classes, unlike the horses, votes? Is there really any such sharp division as is here assumed to exist between labor and wealth? Are not many who have more or less of wealth and who could have seats on the top of any social coach, laborers and producers of the most effective kind? Can so good a writer be the dupe of the fallacy that only those who work with the hands labor? What is the amount of the hereditary property held by idlers in such a country as the United States, compared with that of the general wealth? Do the holders even of that property really add by their existence to the strain on the workers as the passengers by their presence add to the strain on the horses? Supposing they and their riches were annihilated, would the workers feel any relief? Would they not rather lose a fund upon which they draw to some extent at need? The hereditary wealth which is here taken to be the monster iniquity and evil, what is it but the savings of past generations? Had those who made it spent it, instead of leaving it to their children, should we be better off? Then, as to the feelings of the rich toward the poor: can a Bostonian, as this writer is, look round his own city and fail to see that heartless indifference has its seat only in the souls of a few sybarites, and that philanthropy and charity are the rule?

Utopists and communists are set at work by the belief that equal justice is the natural law of the world, and that nothing keeps us out of it but the barrier of artificial arrangements set up by the power, and in the interest, of a class. Break down that barrier by revolutionary legislation, and the kingdom of equal justice, they think, will come. Would that it were so! Who would be so selfish and so ignorant of the deepest source of happiness as not to vote for the change, whatever his wealth or his place on the social coach might be? Unhappily, neither equal justice nor perfection of any kind is the law of the world,