

than one side. If they know how to profit by it so as not to let themselves be drawn into a narrow rut it is a great gain.

Another circumstance that must act favorably on the spirit of social education in Switzerland seems to be this: In an old democracy like Switzerland, where every one is interested in public affairs, where every citizen is often called upon to vote, and consequently to form an opinion on laws of great social importance, professors and students in the higher institutions are naturally inclined to take a special interest in the social side of every science that relates to man.

We feel keenly the truth so well formulated by M. Fouillee in the preface to his last remarkable work: "The further we go, the more every science becomes inseparably practical and theoretical, until it can no longer disconnect itself from its social and economic applications. The moral sciences in particular are growing more and more socialized."

This is why we can perceive, especially in the universities of Bern, Zürich, and Geneva, the tendency, to conceive and treat in a social spirit all the sciences that lend themselves to it, such as law, philosophy, morals pedagogy, hygiene, history, etc., thus unconsciously following the example given by another great French Philosopher, in applying this method to esthetics, morals, and religion in his works: *L'art au point de vue sociologique* (Art from a sociological point of view by M. Guyau.)

In all the higher educational institutions of Switzerland there are courses in political economy, theoretical and applied. The Universities of Geneva and Bern only offer a course in Sociology, properly so called. At Geneva this course is given by Professor Vuarin, the economist, well known, among other works, by his collaboration of the *Revue d'Economie politique*, directed by M. Gide. At Bern the course in Sociology is given by Dr. Ludwig Stein, professor of philosophy. Besides philosophic studies, M. Stein has written a large work: *Die sociale Frage im Lichte der Philosophie*, which one only need glance through to gain an idea of the boldly reformitory, but always evolutionary, spirit of his sociological teachings.

While rejecting for future society the collectivism which seems to him too sudden a leap to find a place in the evolution of humanity, he seeks a synthesis between equality and liberty, and believes it possible to attain it by means of the socialization of rights, the monopolizing by the state of all the new productive forces (products of the mines [soud-sol], waterpower, etc.) and by a system of production based in part on private property strongly controlled, in part on collective property, the whole destined to end in a higher type of the individual and of humanity.

The principal science auxiliary to the social sciences, statistics, which is rather a scientific method than a science, is also taught in most of our universities.

"BEGINNER" ANSWERED!

The Few Who Capture the Earth and Means of Living, Leave the Masses in Dependence, Degradation and Misery. The Cunning That Effects It Is Immoral and Inhuman.

BY R. C. HENSLEY.

The claim made by "Beginner" in the TORCH of March 6, that there has been rapid advancement of the lower or wage-earning class I do not deny, and there are good historic reasons for it; but that they will continue to so advance is simply flying in the face of facts, and of all the present evidence in the case. The advancement that the common people have made in the last 100 years or so, has been due mainly to the opening up of America, with its unbounded resources, and the consequent opportunities which have opened a field for liberty of thought and action which has had no parallel in all the history of the past, nor is it likely to have again in the future.

At the time of the discovery of America, the churches and nobles of the old world practically owned the land, wealth and machinery of the world, and hence the means of production. The common, or laboring classes were mere serfs and bondsmen under their control. This state of affairs had been brought about gradually, and by the same law that is bringing about the same condition today—the law of the "survival of the fittest," the law of cunning and of brute force.

This law of brutes evidently will not be the standard when men become civilized. It will be succeeded by the survival of the moral and social best. Then rather will it be the duty of the strong to help and protect the weak—both mentally and physically. If America had not been discovered and opened up, thereby giving great opportunities to the poor and the landless class, in what way would they have been able to have released themselves from their thralldom of poverty? Now, as then, the master's greed is never satiated, but their cry is for more and more, continually; and like a falling body, the further it goes the greater its velocity, so now, with like momentum, are the grand aggregations of wealth building up.

And yet in the face of the vast aggregations of capital with their trusts and tariffs that have grown up in this country in the last few years, and the enormous power that they command by which a few men are able to dictate the finances of the whole country, and make and unmake prices, careers and business at will—"Beginner" can't see but that we are still on the high road to an up-building of the lower classes! Let him visit our sweatshops, overcrowded in every city.

Let him attend strikes in full blast and learn that those strikes are not to enable workers to get rich, but to get bread for the hungry homes of the over-worked and under-fed poor. Let him see how the mines, the farms, ranches, lumbering and railroads are made to pay our masters by constant sweat, ignorance and degradation; and then the thousands—nay millions, who cannot get enough work or means to live, and so perish miserably!

Let "Beginner" be silent till he can get eyes to see facts. The eyes he has have been blinded by reading political capitalistic newspapers, and silly books on "political economy." Then his talk about the creation of wealth by the intellect of the rich! Bah! Such nonsense! The laborer and the genius of the craftsman have created all the wealth of the world. According to "Beginner's" own statement in the Carnegie case, this is plain enough, for he says that Carnegie's ability laid in the fact that he knew how to select and use able men as co-workers. We are told that he cheaply secured the talent, the ability of a German chemist, who gave him the secret of his process how to make steel cheaper, then by cunning, shooting, and low wages, he got control of other skilled and good workmen, and hence his wealth!

Now, sir! In all fairness, I ask you, if according to your theory that a man is entitled to the invention or discovery of his mind and the work of his hands, was not this German, this laborer under Carnegie, entitled to the wealth he produced, instead of Carnegie? And then this is what makes your "blood boil" is it? Because the people wont bow and cring and crawl to a man who by his own confession had no genius or ability of his own, but had the legal power to make a forceful hiring of some who had, and could produce what you call his wealth thereby. Such was the ability of this great hero of yours! What is it really? Let me label it for you by the modest name. It was simply unconsciousable, selfish CUNNING! That is all—just ability enough to take advantage of some one elses' circumstances.

But now I am going to expose the morality of forceful cunning, on a higher pedestal—that of our common humanity, or "socialism," if you prefer that name. Did you ever hear that all men are brothers and must rise or fall together? That there is no such just thing as one man building himself up at the expense of his country and his fellow-man? That he who would be a benefactor, or even a just man, must give the thoughts of his brain, given him by nature and humanity, to his fellow-man FREE! Free as the air we breath! That he has no human right to make a selfish monopoly of his intellect because

he happens to be cunning, or to know something that is of vital importance to the human family? That he can establish no toll gate and make all pay endless tribute who are in need of what he has appropriated? I say to you, No! For the thought of man belongs to men, and should be as free as air to his fellow-man. Like the air, the value of intellect is immeasurable. We can only justly pay for the time and labor in applying it. He who discovers how to propagate a new variety of fruit—apples, peaches, or potatoes, is just as great a benefactor to the world as the man, who by his intellect reduces or traps the man who reduces, the cheapness of the means of a production of steel. Man and society must be ever and justly protected against the cunning and violence of intellect as much or more than against physical violence, for they are far more dangerous.

I know that this may be hard for my friend "Beginner" to understand, because he seems a believer in the law of the right of discovery. He thinks that if a man finds any thing, that it is his. I suppose that he is angry and his "blood boils" again, when he thinks that Columbus and his heirs ought, "by right of discovery" to have a clear field and a perfect title to all America—"to have and to hold for ever?"

No, my dear sir, this wont do. We must protect the weak as against the strong intellectually as well as physically. You have no more right to take away a man's means of a livelihood by cunning of intellect, no more than you have by physical force. The law of our land denies you the right of brute force to take away what another man has worked for, earned or created for his living, and when we become civilized it will deny you the right to do it by intellectual cunning or the power of your law. Central Point, Ore., March 12, 302.

"Beginner" Leads to Socialism?

EDITOR TORCH OF REASON:

In the article against Socialism, in TORCH of March 6, "Beginner"

(1) Argues, "that the progress of the class at the foot has been and will be inevitably upward." Granting that this is true, is it an argument against socialism?

Let us see. He portrays truthfully the condition of the "bond thralls" a few centuries ago. That milder servitude when the "serfs of the soil" were not allowed to leave the estate where they were born, was one step upward. "Later, the masses could go where they pleased," and had "as much freedom as was compatible with hereditary nobility comprising lawgivers by birth.

"Still later" he says, "came 'triumphant democracy,'" and he pictures triumphantly the great progress democracy has made possible