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4. Social Darwinism
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4. Social Darwinism

The singular impact of Darwin in fields other than biology can be attributed largely to one man, Herbert Spencer (1820-1903). It was Spencer, not Darwin, who coined the expression "survival of the fittest." Although neglected today except by historians of nineteenth century thought, Spencer's influence on his own time was so great that Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was able to wonder if "any writer of English except Darwin has done so much to affect our whole way of thinking about the universe." Herbert Spencer was born into a traditionally nonconformist English family of modest means. He refused a university education and trained for a career as a civil engineer. He was employed first as an engineer and later as an editor of the Economist, a publication advocating free trade. By 1853 his major ideas were fixed and he spent his remaining years systematizing and propounding them.

Spencer's rise as an influential philosopher and social scientist can be matched only by his decline. In the United States, where he was accepted with the least reserve, well over 350,000 of his philosophical and sociological treatises were sold between 1860 and 1903. Lionized during much of his lifetime, he outlived his vogue. Before his death he witnessed a merciless attack against his philosophy by major figures in all areas of scholarly thought. Despite the number and strength of his detractors, however, Spencer's ideas have so deeply and lastingly pervaded the American scene that they can still be read or heard in the opinions of many newspaper editors, the appeals of advertisers, the exhortations of many politicians, and the personal philosophy of many businessmen and plain citizens.

Social Darwinism can be described as the attempt to expand Darwin's theory of biological evolution into a cosmic philosophy based on evolution as a universal and scientific law. Darwin was more cautious than most of his followers and did not attempt to explain the universe in terms of evolution. Spencer, however, traveled far beyond Darwin's theories dealing with the biological structure of species and individuals. He argued that *

The scientifically minded Spencer included also the conservation of energy as one of the principles which enable the human mind to understand the progress of human societies. Spencer, however, preferred the term "persistence of force" rather than conservation of energy. Through the use of these two "scientific" principles, evolution and persistence of force, Spencer constructed a cosmography. The evolutionary process was explained by Spencer as leading from the simple to the complex. The universe, including animal organisms, began as an undifferentiated mass. Stars and planets arose out of primitive nebula as a result of persistent force acting upon them. By the same process, the protozoa developed from incoherent homogeneity to coherent heterogeneity. Persistent force makes it inevitable that the homogeneous, or simple, will develop into the heterogeneous, or complex, illustrated by the higher animals and man.

Spencer contended that this same process of evolution from the simple to the complex occurs also in societies. Wherever it occurs, the evolutionary process will eventually come to an end, or reach a state which Spencer called "equilibrium." Increasing heterogeneity cannot continue forever, but must culminate in a state "of the greatest perfection and the most complete happiness." Thus Spencer, with the aid of two scientific principles, presented the universe, nature, and society as having a clearly recognizable meaning and direction.

It was the application of this comprehensive law of evolution to society as a whole that won for Spencer his great popularity in America. He was convinced that evolution provided the law for the development of society. With this insight he constructed a science of society which he called sociology. He elaborated this view in his book Principles of Sociology (1876-1896), a work which also had considerable influence on the rise of sociology in the United States.

Spencer envisioned an ultraconservative role for sociology. Its objective was to illuminate the complexity of the social organism, and to show the futility of attempting any quick changes in it. Just as the species is modified gradually over long periods of time, so does the social organism evolve slowly, often imperceptibly. His sociology then condemns any attempt to tamper with this inevitable process. Social reformers were to be fought with the tools of science.

Evident in Spencer's philosophy is a deep faith in progress. He firmly believed that progress will occur, however, only if man does not actively attempt to bring it about. Any attempt to interfere with the social process will hinder it. This is quite a different attitude than that held by the men of the Enlighten-
They believed that progress was possible only if men increased their knowledge and made use of reason in order to gain greater control over their environment and themselves. In this respect the social scientists of the present century have more in common with Condorcet than with Spencer. The following excerpt from "Progress: Its Law and Cause," an essay first published in 1857, conveys some idea of Spencer's views on this subject:

The current conception of progress is shifting and indefinite. Sometimes it comprehends little more than simple growth -- as of a nation in the number of its members and the extent of territory over which it spreads. Sometimes it has reference to quantity of material products -- as when the advance of agriculture and manufactures is the topic. Sometimes the superior quality of these products is contemplated; and sometimes the new or improved appliances by which they are produced. When, again, we speak of moral or intellectual progress, we refer to states of the individual or people exhibiting it; while, when the progress of Science, or Art, is commented upon, we have in view certain abstract results of human thought and action. Not only, however, is the current conception of progress more or less vague, but it is in great measure erroneous. It takes in not so much the reality of progress as its accompaniments -- not so much the substance as the shadow. That progress in intelligence seen during the growth of the child into the man, or the savage into the philosopher, is commonly regarded as consisting in the greater number of facts known and laws understood; whereas the actual progress consists in those internal modifications of which this larger knowledge is the expression. Social progress is supposed to consist in the making of a greater quantity and variety of the articles required for satisfying men's wants; in the increasing security of person and property; in widening freedom of action; whereas, rightly understood, social progress consists in those changes of structure in the social organism which have entailed these consequences. The current conception is a teleological one. The phenomena are contemplated solely as bearing on human happiness. Only those changes are held to constitute progress which directly or indirectly tend to heighten human happiness; and they are thought to constitute progress simply because they tend to heighten human happiness. But rightly to understand progress, we must learn the nature of these changes, considered apart from our interests. Ceasing, for example, to regard the successive geological modifications that have taken place in the Earth, as modifications that have gradually fitted it for the habitation of Man, and as therefore constituting geological progress, we must ascertain the character common to these modifications -- the law to which they all conform. And similarly in every other case. Leaving out of sight
concomitants and beneficial consequences, let us ask what
progress is in itself.

In respect to that progress which individual organ-
isms display in the course of their evolution, this question
has been answered by the Germans. The investigations of
Wolff, Goethe, and von Baer, have established the truth
that the series of changes gone through during the devel-
opment of a seed into a tree, or an ovum into an animal,
constitute an advance from homogeneity of structure to
heterogeneity of structure. In its primary stage, every
germ consists of a substance that is uniform throughout,
both in texture and chemical composition. The first step
is the appearance of a difference between two parts of
this substance; or, as the phenomenon is called in physi-
ological language, a differentiation. Each of these dif-
ferentiated divisions presently begins itself to exhibit
some contrast of parts: and by and by then secondary
differentiations become as definite as the original one.
This process is continuously repeated -- is simultaneously
going on in all parts of the growing embryo; and by endless
such differentiations there is finally produced that complex
combination of tissues and organs constituting the adult
animal or plant. This is the history of all organisms what-
ever. It is settled beyond dispute that organic progress
consists in a change from the homogeneous to the heter-
geneous.

Now, we propose in the first place to show, that this
law of organic progress is the law of all progress. Whether
it be in the development of the Earth, in the development
of Life upon its surface, in the development of Society, or
Government, of Manufactures, of Commerce, of Language, Lit-
erature, Science, Art, this same evolution of the simple
into the complex, through successive differentiations, holds
throughout. From the earliest traceable cosmical changes
down to the latest results of civilization, we shall find
that the transformation of the homogeneous into the heter-
geneous, is that in which progress essentially consists. *

Spencer’s ideas were embraced ecstatically in a fiercely
competitive, industrially expanding America which was eager for
justification of a laissez-faire philosophy. He glorified com-
petition because it led, he believed, to the survival of the
fittest. His passionate individualism and dislike of government
reportedly led him to refuse even the aid of the postal service.
He delivered each of his manuscripts by hand to his publisher.

As early as 1850, Spencer had begun to develop his ideas
along these lines in Social Statics:

Pervading all Nature we may see at work a stern dis-
cipline which is a little cruel that it may be very kind.

* Herbert Spencer, Essays Scientific, Political, and Specu-
That state of universal warfare maintained throughout the lower creation, to the great perplexity of many worthy people, is at bottom the most merciful provision which the circumstances admit of. It is much better that the ruminant animal, when deprived by age of the vigour which made its existence a pleasure, should be killed by some beast of prey, than that it should linger out a life made painful by infirmities, and eventually die of starvation. By the destruction of all such, not only is existence ended before it becomes burdensome, but room is made for a younger generation capable of the fullest enjoyment; and, moreover, out of the very act of substitution happiness is derived for a tribe of predatory creatures. Note, further, that their carnivorous enemies not only remove from herbivorous herds individuals past their prime, but also weed out the sickly, the malformed, and the least fleet or powerful. By the aid of which purifying process, as well as by the fighting so universal in the pairing season, all vitiation of the race through the multiplication of its inferior samples is prevented; and the maintenance of a constitution completely adapted to surrounding conditions, and therefore most productive of happiness, is ensured.

The development of the higher creation is a progress towards a form of being, capable of a happiness undiminished by these drawbacks. It is in the human race that the consummation is to be accomplished. Civilization is the last stage of its accomplishment. And the ideal man is the man in whom all the conditions to that accomplishment are fulfilled. Meanwhile, the well-being of existing humanity and the unfolding of it into this ultimate perfection, are both secured by that same beneficial though severe discipline, to which the animate creation at large is subject. It seems hard that an unskilfulness which with all his efforts he cannot overcome, should entail hunger upon the artizan. It seems hard that a labourer incapacitated by sickness from competing with his stronger fellows, should have to bear the resulting privations. It seems hard that widows and orphans should be left to struggle for life or death. Nevertheless, when regarded not separately but in connexion with the interests of universal humanity, these harsh fatalities are seen to be full of beneficence — the same beneficence which brings to early graves the children of diseased parents, and singles out the intemperate and the debilitated as the victims of an epidemic.

There are many very amiable people who have not the nerve to look this matter fairly in the face. Disabled as they are by their sympathies with present suffering, from duly regarding ultimate consequences, they pursue a course which is injudicious, and in the end even cruel. We do not consider it true kindness in a mother to gratify her child with sweetmeats that are likely to make it ill. We should think it a very foolish sort of benevolence
which led a surgeon to let his patient's disease progress
to a fatal issue, rather than inflict pain by an opera-
tion. Similarly, we must call those spurious philanthro-
pists who, to prevent present misery, would entail greater
misery on future generations. That rigorous necessity
which, when allowed to operate, becomes so sharp a spur
to the lazy and so strong a bridle to the random, these
paupers' friends would repeal, because of the wailings it
here and there produces. Blind to the fact that under the
natural order of things society is constantly excreting
its unhealthy, imbecile, slow, vacillating, faithless
members, these unthinking, though well-meaning, men advo-
cate an interference which not only stops the purifying
process, but even increases the vitiation — absolutely
encourages the multiplication of the reckless and incom-
petent by offering them an unfailing provision, and dis-
courages the multiplication of the competent and provident
by heightening the difficulty of maintaining a family.
And thus, in their eagerness to prevent the salutary
sufferings that surround us, these sigh-wise and groan-
foolish people bequeath to posterity a continually in-
creasing curse.

Returning again to the highest point of view, we
find that there is a second and still more injurious mode
in which law-enforced charity checks the process of adapta-
tion. To become fit for the social state, man has not
only to lose his savageness but he has to acquire the
capacities needful for civilized life. Power of applica-
tion must be developed; such modification of the intellect
as shall qualify it for its new tasks must take place;
and, above all, there must be gained the ability to sacri-
fice a small immediate gratification for a future great
one. The state of transition will of course be an un-
happy state. Misery results from incongruity between
constitution and conditions. Humanity is being pressed
against the inexorable necessities of its new position —
is being moulded into harmony with them, and has to bear
the resulting unhappiness as best it can. The process
must be undergone and the sufferings must be endured. No
power on Earth, no cunningly-devised laws of statesmen, no
world-rectifying schemes of the humane, no communist pan-
ceas, no reforms that men ever did broach or ever will
broach, can diminish them one jot. Intensified they may
be, and are; and in preventing their intensification the
philanthropic will find ample scope for exertion. But
there is bound up with the change a normal amount of suf-
fering, which cannot be lessened without altering the
very laws of life. Every attempt at mitigation of this
eventuates in exacerbation of it. All that a poor-law or
any kindred institution can do, is to partially suspend
the transition — to take off for a time, from certain
members of society, the painful pressure which is effect-
their transformation. At best this is merely to post-
pone what must ultimately be borne. But it is more than
this: it is to undo what has already been done. For the circumstances to which adaptation is taking place cannot be superseded without causing a retrogression; and as the whole process must some time or other be passed through, the lost ground must be gone over again, and the attendant pain borne afresh.

At first sight these considerations seem conclusive against all relief to the poor -- voluntary as well as compulsory; and it is no doubt true that they imply a condemnation of whatever private charity enables the recipients to elude the necessities of our social existence. With this condemnation, however, no rational man will quarrel. That careless squandering of pence which has fostered into perfection a system of organized begging -- which has made skilful mendicancy more profitable than ordinary manual labour -- which induces the simulation of diseases and deformities -- which has called into existence warehouses for the sale and hire of impostor's dresses -- which has given to pity-inspiring babes a market value of 9d. per day -- the unthinking benevolence which has generated all this, cannot but be disapproved by every one. Now it is only against this injudicious charity that the foregoing argument tells. To that charity which may be described as helping men to help themselves, it makes no objection -- countenances it rather. And in helping men to help themselves, there remains abundant scope for the exercise of a people's sympathies. Accidents will still supply victims on whom generosity may be legitimately expended. Men thrown off the track by unforeseen events, men who have failed for want of knowledge inaccessible to them, men ruined by the dishonesty of others, and men in whom hope long delayed has made the heart sick, may, with advantage to all parties, be assisted. Even the prodigal, after severe hardship has branded his memory with the unbending conditions of social life to which he must submit, may properly have another trial afforded him. And, although by these ameliorations the process of adaptation must be remotely interfered with, yet, in the majority of cases, it will not be so much retarded in one direction as it will be advanced in another.*

More than thirty years later when, as we shall see, socialists and some liberals were attacking Laissez-faire and urging in its stead another ideal, Spencer returned to the lists with The Man Versus The State (1884). In a chapter entitled "The coming Slavery," he discussed the price society would have to pay if it abandoned the laissez-faire tradition:

And now when there has been compassed this desired ideal, which "practical" politicians are helping socialists to reach, and which is so tempting on that bright side which socialists contemplate, what must be the accompanying shady side which they do not contemplate? It is a matter of common remark, often made when a marriage is impending, that those possessed by strong hopes habitually dwell on the promised pleasures and think nothing of the accompanying pains. A further exemplification of this truth is supplied by these political enthusiasts and fanatical revolutionists. Impressed with the miseries existing under our present social arrangements, and not regarding these miseries as caused by the ill-working of a human nature but partially adapted to the social state, they imagine them to be forthwith curable by this or that rearrangement. Yet, even did their plans succeed it could only be by substituting one kind of evil for another. A little deliberate thought would show that under their proposed arrangements, their liberties must be surrendered in proportion as their material welfares were cared for.

For no form of co-operation, small or great, can be carried on without regulation, and an implied submission to the regulating agencies. Even one of their own organizations for effecting social changes yields them proof. It is compelled to have its councils, its local and general officers, its authoritative leaders, who must be obeyed under penalty of confusion and failure. And the experience of those who are loudest in their advocacy of a new social order under the paternal control of a Government, shows that even in private voluntarily-formed societies, the power of the regulative organization becomes great, if not irresistible; often, indeed, causing grumbling and restiveness among those controlled. Trades-unions which carry on a kind of industrial war in defence of workers' interests versus employers' interests, find that subordination almost military in its strictness is needful to secure efficient action; for divided councils prove fatal to success. And even in bodies of co-operators, formed for carrying on manufacturing or distributing businesses, and not needing that obedience to leaders which is required where the aims are offensive or defensive, it is still found that the administrative agency gains such supremacy that there arise complaints about "the tyranny of organization." Judge then what must happen when, instead of relatively small combinations, to which men may belong or not as they please, we have a national combination in which each citizen finds himself incorporated, and from which he cannot separate himself without leaving the country. Judge what must under such conditions become the despotism of a graduated and centralized officialism, holding in its hands the resources of the community, and having behind it whatever amount of force it finds requisite to carry out its decrees and maintain what it calls order...
And then after recognizing, as they must if they think out their scheme, the power possessed by the regulative agency in the new social system so temptingly pictured, let its advocates ask themselves to what end this power must be used. Not dwelling exclusively, as they habitually do, on the material well-being and the mental gratifications to be provided for them by a beneficent administration, let them dwell a little on the price to be paid. The officials cannot create the needful supplies; they can but distribute among individuals that which the individuals have joined to produce. If the public agency is required to provide for them, it must reciprocally require them to furnish the means. There cannot be, as under our existing system, agreement between employer and employed -- this the scheme excludes. There must in place of it be command by local authorities over workers, and acceptance by the workers of that which the authorities assign to them.

"But we shall be on our guard against all that -- we shall take precautions to ward off such disasters," will doubtless say the enthusiasts. Be they "practical" politicians with their new regulative measures, or communists with their schemes for re-organizing labour their reply is ever the same: -- "It is true that plans of kindred nature have, from unforeseen causes or adverse accidents, or the misdeeds of those concerned, been brought to failure; but this time we shall profit by past experiences and succeed." There seems no getting people to accept the truth, which nevertheless is conspicuous enough, that the welfare of a society and the justice of its arrangements are at bottom dependent on the characters of its members; and that improvement in neither can take place without that improvement in character which results from carrying on peaceful industry under the restraints imposed by an orderly social life. The belief, not only of the socialists but also of those so-called Liberals who are diligently preparing the way for them, is that by due skill an ill-working humanity may be framed into well-working institutions. It is a delusion. The defective natures of citizens will show themselves in the bad acting of whatever social structure they are arranged into. There is no political alchemy by which you can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts. *

Spencer's popularity in America -- a popularity bordering on idolatry in some instances -- owes its existence to the coinciding of an individual and a set of circumstances which seemed made for each other. As a philosopher, Spencer enjoyed an influence almost without parallel in American history. From the tycoons of Wall Street to the aspiring laborer, men seemed to find in Spencer not only the justification for their own

ambitions but the absolution of those nagging anxieties which occasionally troubled their consciences.

Furthermore, in Spencer Americans had a friend who shared their enthusiasm and optimism about the wonders of their rapidly developing nation. When Spencer wrote that Americans "might reasonably look forward to a time when they had produced a civilization grander than any the world has known," he surely did not diminish his popularity in a country that had been subjected to the trenchant criticism of European intellectuals from de Tocqueville to Bryce. On the other hand, it would have been only natural for Spencer to have believed that his faith in America was confirmed by the intelligent reception that he and his works received here.

Perhaps the strongest single factor that led to Spencer's acceptance in America was the evidence that this country itself provided which tended to substantiate his claims. In less than a century America had evolved from a relatively simple, geographically small, predominantly agrarian society into a nation which had subdued the wilderness of vast territories, multiplied in population, and embraced the Industrial Revolution with enthusiasm and fantastic success. Not only did the country as a whole seem to demonstrate Spencer's idea that social organisms change from a simple and homogeneous form, but within every aspect of American life this change was taking place in terms that immediately affected his life. Conditions that otherwise might have confused and concerned even the wisest citizen of those tumultuous times, if interpreted by Spencer's standards, seemed to become crystal clear and wholly satisfactory.

Here we come to the core of the second reason for Spencer's success in America. The pervading tone of his writings, infinite appreciation of what existed. Using his theories as a guide, one could acknowledge, without shame, those aspects of modern life that blotted the record of accomplishments (such as the slums, sweatshops, and widespread use of child labor). They could be accepted complacently as added proof that America was progressing, that the unfit were being weeded out at a great rate, and that so long as the government could be persuaded not to impede this process, all would be well.

This theme appeared most appropriate in a country where traditionally there had been a high value placed on economic individualism. The right to life, liberty, and property, with special emphasis on property, was a philosophy which always had had powerful and persuasive supporters in the United States. It was contended that each man had a right to what he had earned or accumulated. He might wish to share with less fortunate members of the community, but it was not considered one of government's functions to see that wealth was shared. At a time when the Progressive reform movement was gaining strength in the United States (1898-1917), the advocates of laissez-faire warmly welcomed the support of Spencer and his followers, whose antagonism
to reform was as strong as their own. As the social Darwinists saw them, the reformers in their misguided efforts to ameliorate misery were only threatening to retard nature's progress.

Spencer's appeal was not limited to those whose comfortable position in society would have seemed to have attested to their fitness. Spencer was an inspiration to many members of the working class who were exhilarated by the struggle and firmly convinced that no obstacle could prevent them from proving their own ability to survive and flourish in a competitive society. Had the western frontiers not been settled, they might have been pioneers; but the industrial age had its own frontiers, and, they were sure, its own great rewards.

The most energetic and influential American exponent of Social Darwinism was an Episcopalian rector who had lost his religious faith, William Graham Sumner (1840-1910). The void which he might have felt as a consequence of this loss was quickly filled by a new faith in the teachings of Darwin and Spencer. From his post as professor of political and social science at Yale University (1872-1910), Sumner led a crusade for the moral, economic, and political truths which he believed were revealed by the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest."

Few American teachers have had such an influence as Sumner. He is reported to have had a wider following than any other teacher in Yale's history, despite a cold and dogmatic manner. The following brief exchange between Sumner and a student provides a key not only to the professor's teaching method, but also to his political and economic philosophy:

"Professor, don't you believe in any government aid to industries?"
"No! It's root, hog, or die."
"Yes, but hasn't the hog got a right to root?"
"There are no rights. The world owes nobody a living."
"You believe then, professor, in only one system, the contract-competitive system?"
"That's the only sound economic system. All others are fallacies."
"Well, suppose some professor of political economy came along and took your job away from you. Wouldn't you be sore?"
"Any other professor is welcome to try. If he gets my job, it is my fault. My business is to teach the subject so well that no one can take the job away from me."

As well as being one of the outstanding defenders of a severe and consistent laissez-faire philosophy, Sumner was also one of the pioneers in the development of academic sociology. His Folkways (1907) and Science of Society (edited after his death and published in 1927) remain classics in this field. In addition, Sumner wrote many articles for popular magazines such as Colliers. He was convinced, as was Spencer, that a scientific
examination of society, viewed from an evolutionary position, led to the certain conclusion that deliberate reform and revolutionary movements were futile. The social organism must be left alone to wisely and selectively filter out the weak, and provide sustenance for the strong. That it was the function of the social sciences to make this process clear is brought out in the following selection from an essay written in the 1880's and entitled "The Challenge of Facts":

Socialism is no new thing. In one form or another it is to be found throughout all history. It arises from an observation of certain harsh facts in the lot of man on earth, the concrete expression of which is poverty and misery. These facts challenge us. It is folly to try to shut our eyes to them. We have first to notice what they are, and then to face them squarely.

Man is born under the necessity of sustaining the existence he has received by an onerous struggle against nature, both to win what is essential to his life and to ward off what is prejudicial to it. He is born under a burden and a necessity. Nature holds what is essential to him, but she offers nothing gratuitously. He may win for his use what she holds, if he can. Only the most meager and inadequate supply for human needs can be obtained directly from nature. There are trees which may be used for fuel and for dwellings, but labor is required to fit them for this use. There are ores in the ground, but labor is necessary to get out the metals and make tools or weapons. For any real satisfaction, labor is necessary to fit the products of nature for human use. In this struggle every individual is under the pressure of the necessities for food, clothing, shelter, fuel, and every individual brings with him more or less energy for the conflict necessary to supply his needs. The relation, therefore, between each man's needs and each man's energy, or "individualism," is the first fact of human life.

It is not without reason, however, that we speak of a "man" as the individual in question, for women (mothers) and children have special disabilities for the struggle with nature, and these disabilities grow greater and last longer as civilization advances. The perpetuation of the race in health and vigor, and its success as a whole in its struggle to expand and develop human life on earth, therefore, require that the head of the family shall, by his energy, be able to supply not only his own needs, but those of the organisms which are dependent upon him. The history of the human race shows a great variety of experiments in the relation of the sexes and in the organization of the family. These experiments have been controlled by economic circumstances, but, as man has gained more and more control over economic circumstances, monogamy and the family education of children have been more and more sharply developed. If there is one thing in regard to which the student of history and sociology can affirm with
confidence that social institutions have made "progress" or grown "better," it is in this arrangement of marriage and the family. All experience proves that monogamy, pure and strict, is the sex relation which conduces most to the vigor and intelligence of the race, and that the family education of children is the institution by which the race as a whole advances most rapidly, from generation to generation, in the struggle with nature. Love of man and wife, as we understand it, is a modern sentiment. The devotion and sacrifice of parents for children is a sentiment which has been developed steadily and is now more intense and far more widely practiced throughout society than in earlier times. The relation is also coming to be regarded in a light quite different from that in which it was formerly viewed. It used to be believed that the parent had unlimited claims on the child and rights over him. In a truer view of the matter, we are coming to see that the rights are on the side of the child and the duties on the side of the parent. Existence is not a boon for which the child owes all submission to the parent. It is a responsibility assumed by the parent towards the child without the child's consent, and the consequence of it is that the parent owes all possible devotion to the child to enable him to make his existence happy and successful.

The value and importance of the family sentiments, from a social point of view, cannot be exaggerated. They impose self-control and prudence in their most important social bearings, and tend more than any other forces to hold the individual up to the virtues which make the sound man and the valuable member of society. The race is bound, from generation to generation, in an unbroken chain of vice and penalty, virtue and reward. The sins of the fathers are visited upon the children; while, on the other hand, health, vigor, talent, genius, and skill are, so far as we can discover, the results of high physical vigor and wise early training. The popular language bears witness to the universal observation of these facts, although general social and political dogmas have come into fashion which contradict or ignore them. There is no other such punishment for a life of vice and self-indulgence as to see children grow up cursed with the penalties of it, and no such reward for self-denial and virtue as to see children born and grow up vigorous in mind and body. It is time that the true import of these observations for moral and educational purposes was developed, and it may well be questioned whether we do not go too far in our reticence in regard to all these matters when we leave it to romances and poems to do almost all the educational work that is done in the way of spreading ideas about them. The defense of marriage and the family, if their sociological value were better understood, would be not only instinctive but rational. The struggle for existence with which we have to deal
must be understood, then, to be that of a man for himself, his wife, and his children.

The next great fact we have to notice in regard to the struggle of human life is that labor which is spent in a direct struggle with nature is severe in the extreme and is but slightly productive. To subjugate nature, man needs weapons and tools. These, however, cannot be won unless the food and clothing and other prime and direct necessities are supplied in such amount that they can be consumed while tools and weapons are being made, for the tools and weapons themselves satisfy no needs directly. A man who tills the ground with his fingers or with a pointed stick picked up without labor will get a small crop. To fashion even the rudest spade or hoe will cost time, during which the laborer must still eat and drink and wear, but the tool, when obtained, will multiply immensely the power to produce. Such products of labor, used to assist production, have a function so peculiar in the nature of things that we need to distinguish them. We call them capital. A lever is capital, and the advantage of lifting a weight with a lever over lifting it by direct exertion is only a feeble illustration of the power of capital in production. The origin of capital lies in the darkness before history, and it is probably impossible for us to imagine the slow and painful steps by which the race began the formation of it. Since then it has gone on rising to higher and higher powers by a ceaseless involution, if I may use a mathematical expression. Capital is labor raised to a higher power by being constantly multiplied into itself. Nature has been more and more subjugated by the human race through the power of capital, and every human being now living shares the improved status of the race to a degree which neither he nor any one else can measure, and for which he pays nothing.

Let us understand this point, because our subject will require future reference to it. It is the most shortsighted ignorance not to see that, in a civilized community, all the advantage of capital except a small fraction is gratuitously enjoyed by the community. For instance, suppose the case of a man utterly destitute of tools, who is trying to till the ground with a pointed stick. He could get something out of it. If now he should obtain a spade with which to till the ground, let us suppose, for illustration, that he could get twenty times as great a product. Could, then, the owner of a spade in a civilized state demand, as its price, from the man who had no spade, nineteen-twentieths of the product which could be produced by the use of it? Certainly not. The price of a spade is fixed by the supply and demand of products in the community. A spade is bought for a dollar and the gain from the use of it is an inheritance of knowledge, experience, and skill which every man who lives in a civilized state gets for nothing. What we pay for steam transportation is no trifle, but imagine, if you can, eastern Massachusetts
cut off from steam connection with the rest of the world, turnpikes and sailing vessels remaining. The cost of food would rise so high that a quarter of the population would starve to death and another quarter would have to emigrate. To-day every man here gets an enormous advantage from the status of a society on a level of steam transportation, telegraph, and machinery, for which he pays nothing.

So far as I have yet spoken, we have before us the struggle of man with nature, but the social problems, strictly speaking, arise at the next step. Each man carries on the struggle to win his support for himself, but there are others by his side engaged in the same struggle. If the stores of nature were unlimited, or if the last unit of the supply she offers could be won as easily as the first, there would be no social problem. If a square mile of land could support an indefinite number of human beings, or if it cost only twice as much labor to get forty bushels of wheat from an acre as to get twenty, we should have no social problem. If a square mile of land could support millions, no one would ever emigrate and there would be no trade or commerce. If it cost only twice as much labor to get forty bushels as twenty, there would be no advance in the arts. The fact is far otherwise. So long as the population is low in proportion to the amount of land, on a given stage of the arts, life is easy and the competition of man with man is weak. When more persons are trying to live on a square mile than it can support, on the existing stage of the arts, life is hard and the competition of man with man is intense. In the former case, industry and prudence may be on a low grade: the penalties are not severe, or certain, or speedy. In the latter case, each individual needs to exert on his own behalf every force, original or acquired, which he can command. In the former case, the average condition will be one of comfort and the population will be all nearly on the average. In the latter case, the average condition will not be one of comfort, but the population will cover wide extremes of comfort and misery. Each will find his place according to his ability and his effort. The former society will be democratic; the latter will be aristocratic.

The constant tendency of population to outstrip the means of subsistence is the force which has distributed population over the world, and produced all advance in civilization. To this day the two means of escape for an overpopulated country are emigration and an advance in the arts. The former wins more land for the same people; the latter makes the same land support more persons. If, however, either of these means opens a chance for an increase of population, it is evident that the advantage so won may be speedily exhausted if the increase takes place. The social difficulty has only undergone a temporary amelioration, and when the conditions of pressure and competition are renewed, misery and poverty reappear. The
victims of them are those who have inherited disease and depraved appetites, or have been brought up in vice and ignorance, or have themselves yielded to vice, extravagance, idleness, and imprudence. In the last analysis, therefore, we come back to vice, in its original and hereditary forms, as the correlative of misery and poverty.

The condition for the complete and regular action of the force of competition is liberty. Liberty means the security given to each man that, if he employs his energies to sustain the struggle on behalf of himself and those he cares for, he shall dispose of the product exclusively as he chooses. It is impossible to know whence any definition or criterion of justice can be derived, if it is not deduced from this view of things; or if it is not the definition of justice that each shall enjoy the fruit of his own labor and self-denial, and of injustice that the idle and the industrious, the self-indulgent and the self-denying, shall share equally in the product. Aside from the a priori speculations of philosophers who have tried to make equality an essential element in justice, the human race has recognized, from the earliest times, the above conception of justice as the true one, and has founded upon it the right of property. The right of property, with marriage and the family, gives the right of bequest.

Monogamic marriage, however, is the most exclusive of social institutions. It contains, as essential principles, preference, superiority, selection, devotion. It would not be at all what it is if it were not for these characteristic traits, and it always degenerates when these traits are not present. For instance, if a man should not have a distinct preference for the woman he married, and if he did not select her as superior to others, the marriage would be an imperfect one according to the standard of true monogamic marriage. The family under monogamy, also, is a closed group, having special interests and estimating privacy and reserve as valuable advantages for family development. We grant high prerogatives, in our society, to parents, although our observation teaches us that thousands of human beings are unfit to be parents or to be entrusted with the care of children. It follows, therefore, from the organization of marriage and the family, under monogamy, that great inequalities must exist in a society based on those institutions. The son of wise parents cannot start on a level with the son of foolish ones, and the man who has had no home discipline cannot be equal to the man who has had home discipline. If the contrary were true, we could rid ourselves at once of the wearing labor of inculcating sound morals and manners in our children.

Private property, also, which we have seen to be a feature of society organized in accordance with the natural conditions of the struggle for existence produces inequalities between men. The struggle for existence is
aimed against nature. It is from her niggardly hand that we have to wrest the satisfactions for our needs, but our fellow-men are our competitors for the meager supply. Competition, therefore, is a law of nature. Nature is entirely neutral; she submits to him who most energetically and resolutely assails her. She grants her rewards to the fittest, therefore, without regard to other considerations of any kind. If, then, there be liberty, men get from her just in proportion to their works, and their having and enjoying are just in proportion to their being and their doing. Such is the system of nature. If we do not like it, and if we try to amend it, there is only one way in which we can do it. We can take from the better and give to the worse. We can deflect the penalties of those who have done ill and throw them on those who have done better. We can take the rewards from those who have done better and give them to those who have done worse. We shall thus lessen the inequalities. We shall favor the survival of the unfittest, and we shall accomplish this by destroying liberty. Let it be understood that we cannot go outside of this alternative: liberty, inequality, survival of the fittest; not-liberty, equality, survival of the unfittest. The former carries society forward and favors all its best members; the latter carries society downwards and favors all its worst members.

For three hundred years now men have been trying to understand and realize liberty. Liberty is not the right or chance to do what we choose; there is no such liberty as that on earth. No man can do as he chooses: the autocrat of Russia or the King of Dahomey has limits to his arbitrary will; the savage in the wilderness, whom some people think free, is the slave of routine, tradition, and superstitious fears; the civilized man must earn his living, or take care of his property, or concede his own will to the rights and claims of his parents, his wife, his children, and all the persons with whom he is connected by the ties and contracts of civilized life.

What we mean by liberty is civil liberty, or liberty, under law; and this means the guarantees of law that a man shall not be interfered with while using his own powers for his own welfare. It is, therefore, a civil and political status; and that nation has the freest institutions in which the guarantees of peace for the laborer and security for the capitalist are the highest. Liberty, therefore, does not by any means do away with the struggle for existence. We might as well try to do away with the need of eating, for that would, in effect, be the same thing. What civil liberty does is to turn the competition of man with man from violence and brute force into an industrial competition under which men vie with one another for the acquisition of material goods by industry, energy, skill, frugality, prudence, temperance, and other industrial virtues. Under this changed order of things the inequalities are not done away with.
Nature still grants her rewards of having and enjoying, according to our being and doing, but it is now the man of the highest training and not the man of the heaviest fist who gains the highest reward. It is impossible that the man with capital and the man without capital should be equal. To affirm that they are equal would be to say that a man who has no tool can get as much food out of the ground as the man who has a spade or a plough; or that the man who has no weapon can defend himself as well against hostile beasts or hostile men as the man who has a weapon. If that were so, none of us would work any more. We work and deny ourselves to get capital just because, other things being equal, the man who has it is superior, for attaining all the ends of life, to the man who has it not. Considering the eagerness with which we all seek capital and the estimate we put upon it, either in cherishing it if we have it, or envying others who have it while we have it not, it is very strange what platitudes pass current about it in our society so soon as we begin to generalize about it. If our young people really believed some of the teachings they hear, it would not be amiss to preach them a sermon once in a while to reassure them, setting forth that it is not wicked to be rich, nay even, that it is not wicked to be richer than your neighbor.

It follows from what we have observed that it is the utmost folly to denounce capital. To do so is to undermine civilization, for capital is the first requisite of every social gain, educational, ecclesiastical, political, aesthetic, or other.

One of the many charges brought against Social Darwinism resulted from a conflict between aspects of this philosophy and the traditional American belief in equality of opportunity. It was pointed out that lifting oneself up by his own bootstraps is admirable -- but quite impossible if one has no boots. And how, some wondered, could it be contended that the fittest survive in a society where people began under such unequal conditions? If the government was not to take action to prepare the children of "unfit" parents for the battle, who should? What, if any, were the obligations to their fellows of those controlling great amounts of wealth? In the face of socialism and of growing reform movements within capitalism these questions had to be dealt with. If the laissez-faire philosophy was to be given a moral justification in harmony with the old ideal of equality of opportunity.

To these and other problems Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919)

Carnegie's life follows literally the classic rags to riches parable. The son of a poor Scottish immigrant, he started his career as a textile worker. Through thrift and successful investments he managed to accumulate a modest fortune. Convinced of the increasing need for steel in a modern industrial society and of the potentialities of the new Bessemer process, Carnegie invested heavily in the steel industry, rapidly becoming its leading figure. In organizing the United States Steel Corporation in 1901, J. P. Morgan bought out Carnegie's interest in the industry for approximately $500,000,000.

Carnegie gave away during his lifetime about $350,000,000. Included in this philanthropy are the following: (1) the Carnegie Institute of Washington (1902), set up for the purpose of advancing scientific research in fields not otherwise generally covered; (2) the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission (1904), established for the purpose of recognizing the efforts of individuals who save, or try to save, human lives threatened by accidents; (3) the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1905), instituted "to encourage, uphold, and dignify the profession of the teacher and the cause of higher education" in the United States and Canada, in part through providing pensions to certain retired members of the profession; (4) the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (1910), set up "to hasten the abolition of international war, the foulest blot upon our civilization," chiefly through a program of education and sponsorship of efforts to develop an international law; and (5) the Carnegie Corporation (1911), established with an original endowment of $135,000,000 to advance and diffuse knowledge in the United States and the British Empire. This was undertaken in many ways, including adult education, the sponsorship of publications, and the financing of special projects in institutions of higher learning. All of this followed the pattern which Carnegie had earlier laid down in The Gospel of Wealth (1889):

The problem of our age is the proper administration of wealth, that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The Indians are to-day where civilized man then was. When visiting the Sioux, I was led to the wigwam of the chief. It was like the others in external appearance, and even within the difference was trifling between it and those of the poorest of his braves. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us to-day measures the change which has come with civilization. This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, may, essential, for the progress of the race that the houses of some should be homes for all that is

The houses of some should be homes for all that is
highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Maecenas. The "good old times" were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated then as to-day. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both -- not the least so to him who serves -- and would sweep away civilization with it. But whether the change be for good or ill, it is upon us, beyond our power to alter, and, therefore, to be accepted and made the best of. It is a waste of time to criticize the inevitable.

It is easy to see how the change has come. One illustration will serve for almost every phase of the cause. In the manufacture of products we have the whole story. It applies to all combinations of human industry, as stimulated and enlarged by the inventions of this scientific age. Formerly, articles were manufactured at the domestic hearth, or in small shops which formed part of the household. The master and his apprentices worked side by side, the latter living with the master, and therefore subject to the same conditions. When these apprentices rose to be masters, there was little or no change in their mode of life, and they, in turn, educated succeeding apprentices in the same routine. There was, substantially, social equality, and even political equality, for those engaged in industrial pursuits had then little or no voice in the State.

The inevitable result of such a mode of manufacture was crude articles at high prices. To-day the world obtains commodities of excellent quality at prices which even the preceding generation would have deemed incredible. In the commercial world similar causes have produced similar results, and the race is benefited thereby. The poor enjoy what the rich could not before afford. What were the luxuries have become the necessities of life. The laborer has now more comforts than the farmer had a few generations ago. The farmer has more luxuries than the landlord had, and is more richly clad and better housed. The landlord has books and pictures rarer and appointments more artistic than the king could then obtain.

The price we pay for this salutary change is, no doubt, great. We assemble thousands of operatives in the factory, and in the mine, of whom the employer can know little or nothing, and to whom he is little better than a myth. All intercourse between them is at an end. Rigid castes are formed, and, as usual, mutual ignorance breeds mutual distrust. Each caste is without sympathy with the other, and ready to credit anything disparaging in regard to it. Under the law of competition, the employer of thousands is forced into the strictest economies, among which the rates paid to labor figure prominently, and often there is friction between the employer and the employed, between capital and labor, between rich and poor.
Human society loses homogeneity.

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantages of this law are also greater still than its cost -- for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. But, whether the law be benign or not, we must say of it, as we say of the change in the conditions of men to which we have referred: It is here; we cannot evade it; no substitutes for it have been found; and while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome, therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment; the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few; and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential to the future progress of the race. Having accepted these, it follows that there must be great scope for the exercise of special ability in the merchant and in the manufacturer who has to conduct affairs upon a great scale. That this talent for organization and management is rare among men is proved by the fact that it invariably secures enormous rewards for its possessor, no matter where or under what laws or conditions. The experienced in affairs always rate the man whose services can be obtained as a partner as not only the first consideration, but such as renders the question of his capital scarcely worth considering; for able men soon create capital; in the hands of those without the special talent required, capital soon takes wings. Such men become interested in firms or corporations using millions; and, estimating only simple interest to be made upon the capital invested, it is inevitable that their income must exceed their expenditure and that they must, therefore, accumulate wealth. Nor is there any middle ground which such men can occupy, because the great manufacturing or commercial concern which does not earn at least interest upon its capital soon becomes bankrupt. It must either go forward or fall behind; to stand still is impossible. It is a condition essential to its successful operation that it should be thus far profitable, and even that, in addition to interest on capital, it should make profit. It is a law, as certain as any of the others named, that men possessed of this peculiar talent for affairs, under the free play of economic forces must, of necessity, soon be in receipt of more revenue than can be judiciously expended upon themselves; and this law is as beneficial for the race as the others.

Objections to the foundations upon which society is based are not in order, because the condition of the race is better with these than it has been with any other which has been tried. Of the effect of any new substitutes proposed we cannot be sure. The Socialist or
Anarchist who seeks to overturn present conditions is to be regarded as attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests, for civilization took its start from the day when the capable, industrious workman said to his incompetent and lazy fellow, "If thou dost not sow, thou shalt not reap," and thus ended primitive Communism by separating the drones from the bees. One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends — the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings-bank, and equally the legal right of the millionaire to his millions. Every man must be allowed "to sit under his own vine and fig-tree, with none to make afraid," if human society is to advance, or even to remain so far advanced as it is. To those who propose to substitute Communism for this intense Individualism, the answer therefore is: The race has tried that. All progress from that barbarous day to the present time has resulted from its displacement. Not evil, but good, has come to the race from the accumulation of wealth by those who have had the ability and energy to produce it. But even if we admit for a moment that it might be better for the race to discard its present foundation, Individualism, — that it is a nobler ideal that man should labor, not for himself alone, but in and for a brotherhood of his fellows, and share with them all in common, realizing Swedenborg's idea of heaven, where, as he says, the angels derive their happiness, not from laboring for self, but for each other, — even admit all this, and a sufficient answer is, This is not evolution, but revolution. It necessitates the changing of human nature itself — a work of eons, even if it were good to change it, which we cannot know.

It is not practicable in our day or in our age. Even if desirable theoretically, it belongs to another and long-succeeding sociological stratum. Our duty is with what is practicable now — with the next step possible in our day and generation. It is criminal to waste our energies in endeavoring to uproot, when all we can profitably accomplish is to bend the universal tree of humanity a little in the direction most favorable to the production of good fruit under existing circumstances. We might as well urge the destruction of the highest existing type of man because he failed to reach our ideal as to favor the destruction of Individualism, Private Property, the Law of Accumulation of Wealth, and the Law of Competition; for these are the highest result of human experience, the soil in which society, so far, has produced the best fruit. Unequally or unjustly, perhaps, as these laws sometimes operate, and imperfect as they appear to the Idealist, they are, nevertheless, like the highest type of man, the best and most valuable of all that humanity has yet accomplished.

We start, then, with a condition of affairs under
which the best interests of the race are promoted, but which inevitably gives wealth to the few. Thus far, ac-
cepting conditions as they exist, the situation can be
surveyed and pronounced good. The question then arises,
-- and if the foregoing be correct, it is the only ques-
tion with which we have to deal, -- What is the proper
mode of administering wealth after the laws upon which
civilization is founded have thrown it into the hands of
the few? And it is of this great question that I believe
I offer the true solution. It will be understood that
fortunes are here spoken of, not moderate sums saved by
many years of effort, the returns from which are required
for the comfortable maintenance and education of families.
This is not wealth, but only competence, which it should
be the aim of all to acquire, and which it is for the
best interests of society should be acquired.

There are but three modes in which surplus wealth
can be disposed of. It can be left to the families of the
decedents; or it can be bequeathed for public purposes;
or, finally, it can be administered by its possessors
during their lives. Under the first and second modes
most of the wealth of the world that has reached the few
has hitherto been applied. Let us in turn consider each
of these modes. The first is the most injudicious. In
monarchical countries, the estates and the greatest por-
tion of the wealth are left to the first son, that the
vanity of the parent may be gratified by the thought that
his name and title are to descend unimpaired to succeed-
ing generations. The condition of this class in Europe
to-day teaches the failure of such hopes or ambitions.
The successors have become impoverished through their
follies, or from the fall in the value of land. Even in
Great Britain the strict law of entail has been found
inadequate to maintain an hereditary class. Its soil is
rapidly passing into the hands of the stranger. Under
republican institutions the division of property among
the children is much fairer; but the question which
forces itself upon thoughtful men in all lands is, Why
should men leave great fortunes to their children? If
this is done from affection, is it not misguided affec-
tion? Observation teaches that, generally speaking, it
is not well for the children that they should be so bur-
dened. Neither is it well for the State. Beyond provid-
ing for the wife and daughters moderate sources of income,
and very moderate allowances indeed, if any, for the sons,
men may well hesitate; for it is no longer questionable
that great sums bequeathed often work more for the injury
than for the good of the recipients. Wise men will soon
conclude that, for the best interests of the members of
their families, and of the State, such bequests are an
improper use of their means.

It is not suggested that men who have failed to
educate their sons to earn a livelihood shall cast them
adrift in poverty. If any man has seen fit to rear his
sons with a view to their living idle lives, or, what is highly commendable, has instilled in them the sentiment that they are in a position to labor for public ends without reference to pecuniary considerations, then, of course, the duty of the parent is to see that such are provided for in moderation. There are instances of millionaires' sons unspoiled by wealth, who, being rich, still perform great services to the community. Such are the very salt of the earth, as valuable as, unfortunately, they are rare. It is not the exception, however, but the rule, that men must regard; and, looking at the usual result of enormous sums conferred upon legatees, the thoughtful man must shortly say, "I would as soon leave to my son a curse as the almighty dollar," and admit to himself that it is not the welfare of the children, but family pride, which inspires these legacies.

As to the second mode, that of leaving wealth at death for public uses, it may be said that this is only a means for the disposal of wealth, provided a man is content to wait until he is dead before he becomes of much good in the world. Knowledge of the results of legacies bequeathed is not calculated to inspire the brightest hopes of much posthumous good being accomplished by them. The cases are not few in which the real object sought by the testator is not attained, nor are they few in which his real wishes are thwarted. In many cases the bequests are so used as to become only monuments of his folly. It is well to remember that it requires the exercise of not less ability than that which acquires it, to use wealth so as to be really beneficial to the community. Besides this, it may fairly be said that no man is to be extolled for doing what he cannot help doing, nor is he to be thanked by the community to which he only leaves wealth at death. Men who leave a vast sum in this way may fairly be thought men who would not have left it at all had they been able to take it with them. The memories of such cannot be held in grateful remembrance, for there is no grace in their gifts. It is not to be wondered at that such bequests seem so generally to lack the blessing.

The growing disposition to tax more and more heavily large estates left at death is a cheering indication of the growth of a salutary change in public opinion. The State of Pennsylvania now takes — subject to some exceptions — one tenth of the property left by its citizens. The budget presented in the British Parliament the other day proposes to increase the death duties; and, most significant of all, the new tax is to be a graduated one. Of all forms of taxation this seems the wisest. Men who continue hoarding great sums all their lives, the proper use of which for public ends would work good to the community from which it chiefly came, should be made to feel that the community, in the form of the State, cannot thus be deprived of its proper share. By taxing estates heavily at death the States marks its condemnation of the selfish millionaire's unworthy life....
There remains, then, only one mode of using great fortunes; but in this we have the true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth, the reconciliation of the rich and the poor — a reign of harmony, another ideal, differing, indeed, from that of the Communist in requiring only the further evolution of existing conditions, not the total overthrow of our civilization. It is founded upon the present most intense Individualism, and the race is prepared to put it in practice by degrees whenever it pleases. Under its sway we shall have an ideal State, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense, the property of the many, because administered for the common good: and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if distributed in small sums to the people themselves. Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them than if scattered among themselves in trifling amounts through the course of many years.

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of wealth: To set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and, after doing so, to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community — the man of wealth thus becoming the mere trustee and agent for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.

The best uses to which surplus wealth can be put have already been indicated. Those who would administer wisely must, indeed, be wise; for one of the serious obstacles to the improvement of our race is indiscriminate charity. It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown into the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy. Of every thousand dollars spent in so-called charity to-day, it is probable that nine hundred and fifty dollars is unwisely spent — so spent, indeed, as to produce the very evils which it hopes to mitigate or cure. A well-known writer of philosophic books admitted the other day that he had given a quarter of a dollar to a man who approached him as he was coming to visit the house of his friend. He knew nothing of the habits of this beggar, knew not the use that would be made of this money, although he had every reason to suspect that it would be spent improperly. This man professed to be a disciple of Herbert Spencer; yet the quarter-dollar given that night will probably work
more injury than all the money will do good which its thoughtless donor will ever be able to give in true charity. He only gratified his own feelings, saved himself from annoyance -- and this was probably one of the most selfish and very worst actions of his life, for in all respects he is most worthy.

In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to rise the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by almsgiving. Those worthy of assistance, except in rare cases, seldom require assistance. The really valuable men of the race never do, except in case of accident or sudden change. Every one has, of course, cases of individuals brought to his own knowledge where temporary assistance can do genuine good, and these he will not overlook. But the amount which can be wisely given by the individual for individuals is necessarily limited by his lack of knowledge of the circumstances connected with each. He is the only true reformer who is as careful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and, perhaps, even more so, for in almsgiving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue.

The rich man is thus almost restricted to following the examples of Peter Cooper, Enoch Pratt of Baltimore, Mr. Pratt of Brooklyn, Senator Stanford, and others, who know that the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise -- free libraries, parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste; and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people; in this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good.

Thus is the problem of rich and poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free, the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a trustee for the poor, intrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself. The best minds will thus have reached a stage in the development of the race in which it is clearly seen that there is no mode of disposing of surplus wealth creditable to thoughtful and earnest men into whose hands it flows, save by using it year by year for the general good. This day already dawns. Men may die without incurring the pity of their fellows, still sharers in great business enterprises from which their capital cannot be or has not been withdrawn, and which is left chiefly at death for
public uses; yet the day is not far distant when the man who dies leaving behind him millions of available wealth, which was free for him to administer during life, will pass away "unwept, unhonored, and unsung," no matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of such as these the public verdict will then be: "The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced."

Such, in my opinion, is the true gospel concerning wealth, obedience to which is destined some day to solve the problem of the rich and the poor, and to bring "Peace on earth, among men good will."...

...let us endeavor to present some of the best uses to which a millionaire can devote the surplus of which he should regard himself as only the trustee.

First. Standing apart by itself there is the founding of a university by men enormously rich, such men as must necessarily be few in any country.... Here is a noble use of wealth.... It is reserved for very few to found universities, and, indeed, the use for many, or perhaps any, new universities does not exist. More good is henceforth to be accomplished by adding to and extending those in existence. But in this department a wide field remains for the millionaire as distinguished from the Croesus among millionaires.

Second. The result of my own study of the question, What is the best gift which can be given to a community? is that a free library occupies the first place, provided such a part of the city property as its public schools, and, indeed, an adjunct to these....

Third. We have another most important department in which great sums can be worthily used -- the founding or extension of hospitals, medical colleges, laboratories, and other institutions connected with the alleviation of human suffering, and especially with the prevention rather than with the cure of human ills....

Fourth. In the very front rank of benefactions public parks should be placed, always provided that the community undertakes to maintain, beautify and preserve them in-...
Seventh. Churches as fields for the use of surplus wealth have purposely been reserved until the last, because, these being sectarian, every man will be governed in his action in regard to them by his own attachments; therefore gifts to churches, it may be said, are not, in one sense, gifts to the community at large, but to special classes. Nevertheless, every millionaire may know of a district where the little cheap, uncomfortable, and altogether unworthy wooden structure stands at the crossroads, in which the whole neighborhood gathers on Sunday, and which, independently of the form of the doctrines taught, is the center of social life and source of neighborly feeling. But having given the building, the donor should stop there; the support of the church should be upon its own people. There is not much genuine religion in the congregation or much good to come from the church which is not supported at home.

Many other avenues for the wise expenditure of surplus wealth might be indicated. I enumerate but a few -- a very few -- of the many fields which are open, and only those in which great or considerable sums can be judiciously used.

The gospel of wealth but echoes Christ's words. It calls upon the millionaire to sell all that he hath and give it in the highest and best form to the poor by administering his estate himself for the good of his fellows, before he is called upon to lie down and rest upon the bosom of Mother Earth. So doing, he will approach his end no longer the ignoble hoarder of useless millions; poor, very poor indeed, in money, but rich, very rich, twenty times a millionaire still, in the affection, gratitude, and admiration of his fellow-men, and -- sweeter far -- soothed and sustained by the still, small voice within, which, whispering, tells him that, because he has lived, perhaps one small part of the great world has been bettered just a little. This much is sure: against such riches as these no bar will be found at the gates of Paradise, *