

sible for the evils of which socialists complain and try to win the sympathy of the masses toward Catholicism, while exciting prejudice against Protestantism. One Catholic writer declares socialism so threatening that a revolution is scarcely to be avoided; and another thinks it possible to avoid it only by overthrowing the principles which were promulgated by the Reformation. All who examine the subject carefully admit that by mere denunciation socialism cannot be overthrown. Its just demands must be recognized and met. This, Professor Wagner, of the Berlin university, admits as freely as Bismarck. But as soon as practical solutions of the difficult problems are demanded, all feel their inability to meet the case. When in parliament the Catholics advocated in general terms the cessation of labor on Sunday, the fixing of the maximum hours of daily labor, and the diminution of work in factories by women and children, Bismarck replied that the Government would be thankful for suggestions how these ends might be realized. Other parties offered suggestions, but no practical solution of the difficulties presented by socialism has been found. In State and Church, and public meetings and literature, the subject is continually discussed; but the discussion only leads to a fuller realization of the difficulties of the case.

That in the discussion, the abuses of wealth are considered by those who do not side with socialists, is certainly a favorable sign. In *Die Grenzboten* there is a significant article on the Duties of Wealth (*Die Pflichten des Reichthums*), in which the author gives the substance of an address delivered in Vienna by the ministerial councillor, Dr. Steintal. He says that the address received no attention from the press of that city, a press "which has so degenerated as to become a satellite of the wealth suddenly acquired by speculation at the Exchange." The writer holds that amid the agitations of the day nothing is more opportune than to emphasize the duty of wealth. Yet, nothing is more neglected. This neglect explains past social revolutions and present conflicts. "What are the duties of wealth? Not revolutionists, not socialists, not communists have taught them, but the representatives of highest culture, namely, Greek philosophy, Christianity, and the modern view of society. All agree that it is the duty of the rich to use his superabundance to relieve the necessities of the poor." The ancient Greeks emphasized the duties of wealth as is evident from the teachings of their wise men and the practices of the wealthy. Diogenes compared those who used their wealth selfishly to fruit-trees and vines in places exposed to birds and beasts of prey. Euripides held wealth to be a trust from the gods, liable at any time to be withdrawn. Plato even declared that a very good man cannot be very rich, being unwilling to acquire means unjustly, and always ready to give. Aristotle demanded that the rich should give generously, and held that it was better to

be a spendthrift than a miser, since the former merely lacks prudence, but the latter has a bad character. The ancient Greeks were intent on fulfilling the duties of wealth. In all conditions of life the poor man received help readily. In Athens, the rich built only modest houses, in order not to offend the poor; and, for a similar reason, rich ladies were not permitted to ride to the Olympic games, but were obliged to go on foot. One did not live merely for himself and his family, but also for his fellow-citizens; and even the modern Greeks think and act in the spirit of their great ancestors. Still more earnestly did Christianity preach the duties of wealth, as is evident from the numerous well-known passages of the New Testament—particularly the saying of Christ: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." Christianity teaches that the rich man is to give liberally and in secret; and it establishes the law that he who does not work shall not eat. Animated by this spirit, the church fathers taught that the surplus of the rich should be used to meet the needs of the poor; and Augustin and Bossuet declare that he retains foreign property who does not share his wealth and superabundance. Modern thought confirms the same view. Wolff held that property is not intended to be so used that one class shall be in need, but for the welfare of the community. Fichte regarded benevolence a duty of wealth. Bentham held that the demand of the poor is greater than the title to superfluous wealth. These views have deeply affected the present age. "The rich man who refuses to comply with these duties of wealth, is accordingly regarded by public opinion as degraded." Wealth should be acquired justly and used nobly. Some regard nothing sacred but property; as Ihering says: "Those to whom nothing else is sacred, namely, the miserable egotist, whose life cannot show a single act of sacrifice; the gross materialist, who regards only what he can seize with his hands; the pessimist, who transfers his own worthlessness to the world—all are agreed on the sacredness of property; and for the sake of property they appeal to an idea which they otherwise ignore and, in fact, despise." Not always has wealth had command of social position. Regarding great wealth as, not the result of industrial, agricultural, or intellectual pursuits, but as usually gained only by fortunate speculation, the Egyptians and Indians assigned speculators to the lowest caste. It is sad, that greed for wealth has thrust into the background the honorableness of labor. "Men no longer work in order to work and because they take pleasure and satisfaction in their calling, but to earn money; and they choose the work which with least effort secures most money." The rich should recognize and meet the duties of wealth before society and the state forces them to do so. "There has been a struggle for existence; it has been claimed that it was necessary, and this has