

overcrowding, the rich suffer from the burden of overgrown establishments. If the poor drink alcoholics to get rid of fatigue, the rich drink them to get rid of *ennui*.

Not only does each extreme have its evils and dangers, but the unequal distribution of wealth has evils and dangers of its own. One of these is the perverted use of great wealth in a manner to humiliate, degrade, or demoralize the poor. Unequal distribution of wealth produces a caste feeling, breeding contempt for the poor by the rich, and envy of the rich by the poor. Corresponding to differences in wealth grow up differences in the mode of living, education, language, and manners, differences which distinguish the "gentleman" and "lady" from the common herd, and which gradually become confused with innate differences, which are quite another matter. Aristocracies are almost always founded on wealth and are therefore almost always on a false basis. There are undoubtedly wide differences between men. If so-called aristocrats were really all the name would imply, the "best" in body, mind, and heart, much could be said in favor of their segregation from the "vulgar" crowd, and the development from them of a better race of men. But a plutocratic aristocracy is based, not on what men are in themselves, but on what they possess outside of themselves.

Because of the differences in wealth the poor serve the rich. The relation of master and servant is not simply a commercial relation. It also represents a marked difference in caste.

Probably the worst demoralization of the poor, growing out of inequalities of wealth, is the prostitution of the daughters of the poor for the sons of the rich. Some of the students of prostitution believe that it rests on this economic basis. For the white-slave traffic most people are blaming those who engage in it, just as for drunkenness most people blame the saloon keeper. Doubtless these agents have their share of moral responsibility. Yet they are merely