

cept the definition of the Smith school of economists this is justification enough. But this is precisely wherein we differ. We could accept Fawcett's definition if the words "as ordained to social welfare" were added.

Wealth is but a means to an end: that end is the welfare of society, and by society I do not mean the state as it is commonly understood and especially not the state when it is understood to be the political party, which happens for the time being, to be in power — I mean society as composed of the individuals of a nation. The end of the individual is his eternal salvation — the object of society is to facilitate the attainment of this end. Wealth is one of the necessary means for this attainment. Therefore the science of wealth is directly subordinated to moral science. — Therefore we must consider man not only as a *hand* but also as a *heart* and *mind*. This it is the duty of political economists to consider when investigating the laws that govern wealth as to its production etc. It is their duty, for instance, to investigate the laws that govern the production of wealth while the *natural right* is secured to the laborer, of being able to

live so as to attain his end, to support his family and to educate his children.

Again take the example which Fawcett gives: — Compulsory Education. Speaking of this he says substantially that political economy treats of such a question in as much as it affects wealth without regard to the increase or decrease of morality that might ensue from its adoption. As well might political economy treat of all kinds of fraud, for surely fraud affects the distribution of wealth.

Political economy is from its very nature as we have shown, subordinated to Moral Science, and to separate them rigidly, cannot be productive of other than the most disastrous results.

This is no meteoric theory shooting across the firmament of political science, but the teaching of a school of economists which I regret to say is unrepresented in English. In Continental Europe, however, it has a numerous following.

Lepay and Claudio Janet (not to my knowledge translated into English) can be recommended to those wishing to study political economy from a Catholic point of view.

J. T. FOLEY, '88.

VICTOR HUGO, AS SEEN IN "*LES MISÉRABLES*."

A great man was this Victor Hugo; a mighty power for good or evil.

A man of transcendent ability, who wrote prose and poetry with equal grace and charm. Intellectually a giant, morally a pigmy, there is no man of modern France, who ever wielded such a power over the minds of all classes, nor ever one who used his power to the furtherance of a more censurable purpose. We would not accuse Victor Hugo of doing such an act wilfully — no, we believe that he was honestly sincere and desirous of the general good, but the fact is painfully evident that his pernicious doctrines have driven thousands of persons into the mire of Communism and false Socialism.

We do not intend to offer here anything approaching a review of Victor Hugo's

works, or a criticism of his style, but merely to draw attention to a few of the more prominent and dangerous socialistic tendencies of his book — *Les Misérables*. It is written in that elegant, forcible, and charming style, of which Victor Hugo was so consummate a master. Though clothed in this elegant dress, the skeleton is as hideous as ever a shroud enclosed, and it is truly painful to see such beauty of diction wasted upon such useless, yea absolutely injurious matter. Indeed, it may be truthfully asserted of *Les Misérables* that of all the evil works thrown upon French society during the past half century, it has been the most widespread in its ravages and the most disastrous in its results. The reason for this is not far to seek. In *Les Misérables*, the