

## CHAPTER VII

# CONCLUSION

We stand to-day where we stood a hundred years ago, — all the social struggles concern trade and poverty. But our perception of the underlying causes of these struggles, and of the means of allaying them, is infinitely better.

Nobody desires that man's power of production and of transforming land from a wilderness into a well organized place of habitation with the easiest and best means of communication should diminish. We are, as a matter of fact, not able any longer to live under the productive conditions of the past or the old inadequate conditions of communication and habitation. No organization of trade would have the least chance of being carried through, if the consequence would be a depression of trade.

But neither do we want to allow poverty to exist. There are two ways of abolishing it, which of those the future is going to adopt will depend on what are recognized as being the causes of poverty.

If poverty is due to the fact that there are so many men whose physical and mental powers do not suffice, there is no other way out than to give the poor what they are not able to procure for themselves. So large are the resources which are now available for trade, that it seems no longer impossible to see to it, that nobody starves or is cold, lives without sun and air, or lives in rags and poverty in miserable loneliness.

But if poverty is due to the fact that healthy individuals who want to and are capable of working are debarred from a chance of supporting themselves or are exposed to constant robbery, which deprives them of the wages of their work, the means which should be adopted to avoid poverty, becomes quite different. Social evolu-

tion is then determined by two contrary forces, the constantly growing will and capacity to work and the destructive struggle for the profit of work.

Existing conditions may seem to be a blending of both those forces, in such a way that poverty should be regarded, in part, as a consequence of the exploitation, which is still prevailing in society, in part, as a consequence of the fact that the exploited ones, who toiled harder and got poorer food, have also gradually developed a poorer mental power, and are therefore now unable to produce work which can be placed on an equal footing with that of the well-to-do classes. According to this view the class of poor consists, in part, of those who have become succumbed in the social struggle because their luck was against them or because they were incapable, in part, of those, who have become incapable by being born and brought up in low conditions. The efforts of society should then, in the first place, be directed towards preventing the ranks of the poor from constantly increasing by existing injustice making it possible to deteriorate healthy and capable human material by throwing it into poverty and unemployment, and, in the second place, towards relieving the pressure of poverty for those who are not able to support themselves. A great deal of this kind of aid has for its only object to relieve poverty, a part of it aims, however, at re-creating the psychic energy which is needed to bring the individual's productive capacity to the level of that of those individuals who subsist on their own work. Between those forms of relief, we may call them charitable and educational, there is a deep contrast. The former contains practically an admission, that you do not any longer expect the person in question to perform a man's work, while the latter contains a sure expectation, that the person who is in receipt of aid will become able to dispense with further help and subsist on his own work. But the danger that the aid may become a mere relief and prevent the re-creation of psychic energy, which makes subsidy superfluous, is imminent. We should steer our course between those two rocks; the one which is constituted by the fact that the consciousness of being wholly thrown upon one's own resources and to have no expectation of aid, creates despair and kills the small degree of mental power of which one may be in possession, the second, which is constituted by the fact that the consciousness of obtaining relief, if one is unable to support

oneself, prevents the full evolution of one's mental energy, and at the same time its further growth.

It is decisive for the progress or decay of future society that this problem should be solved. Proudhon's violent warning against subsidy and relief, because those were the sure means of tying the lower classes in bondage, and the constant efforts of the present time to increase subsidy and facilitate the access to it, precisely because it is hoped by this means to free the lower classes from the pressure of poverty, stand in the deepest contrast to each other. Proudhon regarded the system of poor relief as an expression of the fact that the relieved persons were considered to be worthless; in the present day we regard it as a recognition that the relieved person at one time or another has made himself deserving of relief, and that it is not his fault, that he has not been able to support himself by honest work. Poor relief is thus a method, not without danger, of remedying such existing social injustice, as for some reason cannot be abolished.

All that we know of the evolution of mental energy supports the view, that our various instincts of activity and our control over them stand in a direct proportion to the health of our body and the capacity of our brain to co-ordinate all the different functions, which display themselves at any given moment. The tired brain cannot produce the power which is needed for harmonizing all the different functions, and the efforts to perform them is felt as an agony, while the relaxation of such effort is felt as a relief. But to the healthy mind this work of harmonization is a source of delight, and all the functions of the body operate better when their mutual co-ordination is satisfactory. The productive capacity of the brain grows by use, our self-control becomes stronger, easier and more productive of delight by being used.<sup>1)</sup> We may express this fact by saying

---

<sup>1)</sup> In "La médecine psychologique", 1923, P. Janet gives an excellent and easily accessible description of this fact. See the above description by MacDougall of psychic energy. "Just as an explosion of petrol produces quite different effects, according as it happens outside or inside a well-built car, thus the same chemical processes produce quite different effects according as they occur in an unorganized material, in a low amoeba, and in the human brain. In the first case they take only the form of transplantations, in the second case they serve the purposes of nourishment and propagation, and in man they are transformed into will and thought." J. Danysz, *La Genèse de l'Energie psychique*. 1921, pp. 199 ff.

that man becomes more healthy and content, when he is able to develop the intellectual energy which is demanded in order to work, than by being enabled to lead an existence without purpose or effort.<sup>2)</sup> His only worth as a social being lies in the work which he produces, and all measures which serve to make man more capable and to augment his mental energy should be regarded, not as burdens, which society imposes on the individual, but as points of harmony where the interests of individual and society meet. The functions of all the various organisms are controlled by the functions of the brain, which thus preserve the healthy evolution of the individual. Not only bodily comforts (such as food, open air, and exercise) increase the capacity of the brain, but it may also be increased through mental influences. The functions of the brain create a physico-chemical state of balance in the organism and new possibilities of action, which are as a rule durable, and which through their existence modify the physiologic state of balance not only of the individual, but also that of his progeny.<sup>3)</sup>

The question of how to give man a better brain is one of the most important problems involved by our work to create favourable social conditions.

#### *Hygienics of the Race.*

The immense progress of the science of heredity, which has taken place of late, leaves no doubt that if it was possible to subject man to a breeding control, similar to that to which we subject our domestic animals, it would be possible to create a human stock with the most desirable qualities.<sup>3)</sup> The questions are; would it be possible to create unanimity as to what quali-

---

<sup>1)</sup> According to Janet one of the characteristic features of nervous diseases and disturbances of the balance is the fact that the performance of the many social actions of daily life in relation to one's family and surroundings, demands the evolution of such energy as the person in question is not able to produce. P. Janet, *Opus cit.*, p. 164.

<sup>2)</sup> J. Danysz, *Opus cit.*, pp. 172 ff. Concerning the conditions under which the evolution of the individual may influence the dispositions of the progeny i. e. where there is a possibility of acquired qualities being inherited, see: W. Johannsen, „Arvelighed“, 4de Udg. 1923, pp. 81—86; W. Peters *Die Vererbung geistiger Eigenschaften und die psychische Konstitution*, 1925, pp. 20—24, 305—319.

<sup>3)</sup> G. K. Chesterston, *Eugenics and other Evils*, 1922.

ties were most desirable, and would it be possible to utilize the necessary methods of breeding. It would be of less consequence that at first we would have to reckon with an incomplete understanding of the laws of heredity; the necessary knowledge and routine would soon be acquired.

For the carrying on of a human breeding establishment it would not be necessary to fix a common standard for all men. On the contrary, a great number of varieties would certainly prove fortunate. The purpose of such breeding would be rather to determine how man must not be. Perhaps unanimity might be established as to the two main points of our present moral valuation, one being the fact, that we condemn those individuals whose mental energy is so poor as to give them a narrow and egoistic mind, the state of balance of which is so uncertain as to make them act mainly in excitement and passion, and as to make them unable to control themselves by slow consideration and the use of reason, and the other being the fact, that we regard those individuals as unfit whose brains are too dull to make them understand what happens around them. It is scarcely thinkable, that we in our efforts to improve the human stock should strive for anything else but for the augmentation of those dispositions which we consider favourable, and for the decrease of those dispositions which we consider unfavourable, and at the same time endeavour to create such external conditions as would make the favourable dispositions develop as fully as possible.

#### *Eugenics.*

Within the extremely narrow limits which are drawn by any single individual's personal perception, the consideration of what sort of children one may expect to bring into the world influences the individual's attitude towards his duty of propagation. But if those considerations are to have any influence on the social stock, they should be made on a far wider basis and to a much larger extent. The efforts to bring about this state is called "eugenics". Two methods may be adopted. Either man's self-determination may be appealed to by making him clearly see the consequences of his actions; he has to determine, whether he is fit to bring children into the world, or whether he is likely to bring children into the world to meet suffering and will then, instead of receiving thanks that he

brought them into the world, become the object of their imprecations. All progress and moral evolution is attached to man's self-determination, and we may expect the best results both for the present generation, whose self-determination is growing much stronger and wiser, and for the next generation which will be the fruit of a strongly increased moral power.

It would be quite another matter if we in distrust of the self-control of private individuals would place the decision of the question of the breeding of children in the hands of the State.<sup>1)</sup> As in all other spheres where it is a question of State or private enterprise the thing to be feared would be, if State interference would not tend to weaken mental energy. The whole of society is based on the fact that man creates society as a safeguard for the evolution of his various instincts. A social regulation of the instinct of propagation has taken place through the legal institution of the family, but this regulation is supported and asserted by the fact of its being a subordination of the propagation instinct to a whole complex of other instincts. A system of propagation, which was regulated by the State, would detach this instinct from the complex, or it would through the prevention of propagation, so to speak, put the individual outside society, and in that case it would then only be possible to assert it as one of those means, which society demands a right to use in order to protect itself against individuals who are injurious to society. But in that case the task of improving the human race would have been given up, in so far as the fact of preventing the coming into existence of injurious forms, is different from that of improving the quality of the rest of the stock.

As soon as society wants to do more by way of eugenics than to insert a new paragraph in the penal law, this must be given up, as such eugenics would wholly transform the character of social life.<sup>2)</sup> Of how far it is possible to influence human life by artificial methods, when the way to biology has once been laid open, the interesting book "Daedalus or Science and the Future", written by

---

<sup>1)</sup> W. Johannsen, Arvelighed. 1923. Chap. XIV.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. William MacDougall's project for government by the élite. National Welfare and National Decay. 1921.

J. B. S. Haldane in 1923, is a striking evidence; it will not only be possible to decide whether boys or girls are to be born, it will be possible to separate the pairing and sexual instinct from propagation, and institute an artificial hatching of men, and it will be possible to determine whether men in their nature are to be gentle or warlike, sagacious or imaginative. In a pamphlet of a similar character "Icarus or the Future of Science, 1925", the eminent mathematician, philosopher, and sociologist, Bertrand Russell, called attention to the danger in investing society with such far-reaching authority. A general judgment is always more injurious to the richness and variety of life than individual judgments. We place great authority in the hands of society, believing that it will be utilized in the way we expect; but here as everywhere else, there will instead of ideal authorities be average party members, who, if they were able to decide what sort of men were to be born, would make provisions that only staunch party members were born or a population who would submit to those in power and obey them, but were incapable of having any will of their own.

Also the question of the birth-rate occupies the public interest to-day. In a few countries like France the citizens' arbitrary restriction of births has caused a complete disturbance in the position of the country towards the neighbouring countries. Countries like Germany are threatened by congestion. It is lamented that the upper class, which possesses the greatest psychic energy, is particularly tempted to restrict the number of children, so that the increase essentially takes place in the masses. The truth of the assertion that the upper class consists of the best fitted, those who possess the most favourable dispositions, may be contested. A pronounced social circulation is taking place in our societies, men rise from the lower class to the upper class, and from this they sink once more into the lower class. We should reckon that favourable dispositions are evenly distributed throughout the population, in such a way that fortunate external conditions are all that is needed to make them develop. There is no reason for society to take any step in order to secure that it is essentially the upper class that brings children into the world.

Under the impression that an unevenness in the distribution of the population exists which may become fatal, Malthus's old doc-

trine becomes once more of significance.<sup>1)</sup> Malthus thought, as we saw above, that the population grows at a quicker rate than the means of subsistence; by this theory he justified the social conditions of his age, the fact that a few had taken all the seats at the table of life so that those, who came after, had to be content with the crumbs or die from starvation. But even though we would admit in theory that it was possible that the earth would some time become over-populated, this possibility would lie so far in the future that we could not reckon with it now, at any rate, it does not explain the population problem of the present generation. In primitive times abortion and infanticides were practised to a great extent. Right up to the present day emigration has subjected new localities to habitation. In North America there lived formerly only about a million Indians, to-day more than one hundred million individuals are living in U. S. A., and in a single State like New York there is ample room for more than two hundred millions. But since the War emigration has become more difficult and some places are actually over-populated. But it is incomprehensible that there are still people who believe in Malthus's doctrine after the criticism to which it has been subjected by Spencer, Henry George, and Krapotkin. The difficulties to gain a subsistence which may arise in different places, are always due to a faulty division of labour and not to a shortage of the subsistence.

Great parts of the earth are only sparsely populated because they are harrowed by diseases. The mortality is considerable, and those individuals who survive are without energy, unbalanced and unfit for any proper social life or regular work. Malaria and intestinal worms, besides many other destructive diseases like tuberculosis and syphilis, have prevented the colonization of tropical countries. If these diseases were once conquered, it would happen, as was the case in Panama, that it would suddenly be seen that there was abundant space on the earth. The decay of the civilizations of Greece, Italy, and Spain was, to a great extent, due to disease. Malaria was brought into Greece in the age after Pericles and this was the main cause that the Greek nation so suddenly lost its energy. As late as in the last war an army of about 800,000 men, which was

---

<sup>1)</sup> K. A. Wieth-Knudsen, *Formerelse og Fremskridt*. 1908.



standing in Macedonia, was made unserviceable by malaria. In Italy malaria appeared after the year 200 B. C. and transformed the inhabitants of Rome into tired and pleasure-loving individuals, who sold themselves to the changing rulers. Only the countries north of the Alps have been spared those diseases, and have therefore been able to develop an energetic civilization, which has gained them the mastery over the world. It is one of the world's most important steps forward, that it has now discovered what is the cause of the weakened energy of many tribes, and how it will be possible by means of sufficient hygienics to change countries, decimated by fever, into healthy and civilized places of habitation.<sup>1)</sup>

Even though our countries are spared most of the harrowing diseases, we have plenty of tasks to solve to keep the energy of the nation alive by taking care to suppress the germs of disease. The war against tuberculosis will, to a large extent, become a war against unhealthy living-places in dark, sunless alleys and damp cellars, against insufficient nourishment, and the like. We have only just begun seriously to take up those tasks which we meet here; but even the small results which have hitherto been reached in this way must strengthen us in the belief that the present generation is not degenerate and requires to be purged or replaced by a new generation. It has sufficient latent energy, and healthy dispositions, which only require that the swamps should be drained and the middens removed, in order to be transformed into vital energy.

A special question, which is connected with the whole care of the health of the nation, which society takes upon itself, is the question of teetotalism.<sup>2)</sup> If it were the case, as is the case with malaria and intestinal worms, that drunkenness harrowed the whole population, an objection could scarcely be raised to society protecting itself against it by prohibition, and wanting to keep it outside its boundaries. But however great misfortunes may be caused by drunkenness, the actual state of affairs is this that the victims are the exceptions, and that it rests with each single individual whether he wants to resist the temptation of excessive enjoyment of alcoholic

<sup>1)</sup> R. Binder, *Health and Social Progress*, 1920; *Major Social Problems*. 1920.

<sup>2)</sup> J. Héricourt, *Les Maladies des Sociétés*, 1918; A. Delbrück, *Das Alkoholverbot in Amerika*. *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsych. u. Sociol.* 1925.

liquids. If filth and discomfort and cheerlessness have been removed from the surroundings of man, so as to make him improve in health, the temptation of getting drunk will be reduced and the strength to resist the temptation will have increased, so that the responsibility may be justly laid on each single individual. It is only possible for the idea of prohibition to gain ground in our societies, if we underestimate the average individual's capacity to control himself. All that is done by means of information and moral education to make every single individual understand the dangers attached to drunkenness is to the good; but there is no sufficient basis for making the State a guardian in this case more than in many other cases; to this must be added that it will be impossible to carry through prohibition without such minute supervision of every individual's actions as will arouse resistance and irritation in most people.

Through the control of sanitary conditions, which has been mentioned above, man's mental power will increase. Health displays itself in the fact, that man does not think of his body and does not notice it much, but is full of interests and takes up his work without any feeling of fatigue. But when this task, to make man healthy, has been solved, the conditions under which he lives should be made so plastic that the power, which has been created, may find an outlet. Our societies are however like all organizations apt to become so rigid that they prevent the display of power. Everywhere in the organic world we meet this state of affairs; structures have been formed which at first increase the openings for work, as they facilitate the utilization of new expedients for the employers, but which are later on prone to diminish the chances of work by barring the way for new uses.<sup>1)</sup> It is such a rigidity of the structure of the body which causes individuals to age; rigidity in the social structure causes societies to age. Besides solving the health problem it becomes also the task of society to prevent the social institutions from becoming rigid.

---

<sup>1)</sup> H. Klaatsch, Die Stellung des Menschen im Naturganzen, Abh. No. XII in Die Abstammungslehre, zwölf gemeinverständliche Vorträge, 1911; Menneskets og Kulturens Opstaaen og Udvikling, translated into Danish by Th. Mathiassen. 1924.

*Structural Systems.*

The preferential position, which man holds in the animal world, is to a large extent due to the fact that the structure of his body has preserved a flexibility, which the animals have lost, and that man is by this means forced to a number of changing adaptations which put his powers of observation, comparison, and thinking into operation. Herman Klaatsch imagines himself to have proved that the limbs and organs of the animals were developed as extremely well-fitted specialized implements, which were able to perform quite definite functions, but were also restricted to the performance of those functions, while the organs of man continued being useful for less circumscribed purposes. In this way the animals got advantages on certain points, which made it possible for the different species to survive so long as the state of the surroundings remained essentially the same; but they paid for this advantage by the loss of their possibilities of progress and power to adapt themselves to new surroundings. Man, however, preserved a flexible nature of his organic structure and was thus able to adapt himself to changing circumstances. MacDougall calls attention to the fact that the same relation exists between the rigid instincts of the animals, which only give little scope for the intellect, and man's more general and indefinite instincts, which allow such wide scope for intellect, i. e. judgment and choice.<sup>2)</sup> Durkheim calls attention to the fact that heredity, which acts as a hindrance to the free division of labour, plays a precisely different rôle among men from what it does among the animals, because it does not, as is the case among the animals, tie the individuals to certain functions, but gives them an increasing capacity to utilize their energy for the most various tasks.<sup>1)</sup> We see the same line of development appearing in the relation between the primitive languages with their numerous terms for special objects and special situations, and the more advanced languages with the few general terms and the rich and varied compound words for the description of concrete objects. Everywhere it involves danger to the course of evolution, if society through its organizations forces the individuals into too definitely

---

<sup>1)</sup> William MacDougall, *An Outline*, pp. 113 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> Emile Durkheim, *De la division*, etc. Liv. II. Chap. IV.

prescribed ways of life. It is the perception of this fact, which is expressed in the principle, which we have proved above, that the only way of promoting the evolution of society is to give the individuals the widest possible sphere of action and to demand that they should assert their liberty.

The question with which we are faced is the question of large scale enterprise as compared to small scale enterprise. We disregard the trade organizations proper, because they are pure militant organizations, and are not in the least based on efforts to promote the life of trade. If the hostile relation between employer and worker ceases by it being made impossible under cover of the law to carry on a systematic robbery by one party of the other party, the trade organizations, as they are now, will dissolve spontaneously, and they will only subsist as societies for relief and as educational societies, the purpose of which is to educate their members and arouse their feeling of duty in relation to their work.

Large scale enterprise is, however, an organization the *raison d'être* of which is found in its necessity for the most favourable development of production. Work is carried on at comparatively less expense in the large factory than in the small workshop, the waste is less and the machines are better. The social democracy was built up on the presupposition, which was regarded as a matter of course, that large scale enterprise would conquer and small scale enterprise disappear. It is true, that from various quarters objections have been raised to this law of accumulation with reference to the fact that small scale enterprises are still growing and increasing in number. But this objection is evidence of a misunderstanding of the question. Small scale enterprises are of a local nature; large scale enterprises are to a constantly increasing degree the only ones which gain admission to the world-market, to business on a large scale. There is, as far as is known to me, only one example of small scale enterprises having gained admission to the world-market without losing their independence, namely, the Danish co-operative dairies and co-operative butcheries.

But even though this example is so far unique, it shows, that it is possible to satisfy the demands of the world-market without surrendering the individual independence of small scale enterprise. The world-market demands that the seller should be able to deliver

(mass production), and that he should be able to deliver the quality which the purchaser desires. Danish co-operative farming has fulfilled those conditions by collecting the raw material from many small producers and preparing it under one authority according to industrial methods. The independence of the small holding depends on the procuring of the raw products; but the individuality is of no importance in the industrial preparation. Is it possible that there might also in other spheres be room for small scale undertakings in the form of independent businesses which have a chance of being admitted to the world-market?

The necessary condition must be that the many places of manufacture (the small workshops) are able to work in such a uniform manner as to make it possible for them to have a common business office, which receives orders, but which has nothing to do with production. It is possible to fulfil this condition under the productive conditions of to-day. It is, for instance, impossible to tell whether a tin has been made in this or that workshop. One single workshop is only able to guarantee the deliverance of one hundred tins, but one hundred workshops may undertake a common delivery of ten thousand pieces.

In the second place, it is a necessary condition that the many small workshops should be able to carry on production, at less working-expenses than the large factory. So long as steam remained the working-power, this was impossible. The large factories are the products of the steam-engine. But with the use of electricity, it is possible, to a large extent, to carry through the splitting up of the factory into many minor workshops, and thus the collective working is made cheaper. It is thus possible to talk of a transition from large scale enterprise to small scale enterprise, and there is no doubt that the latter offers the most favourable conditions to the free division of labour.

In most cases it is not only a question of production, but also of fitting one branch of production into another. One wheel must catch on to another wheel, and everything should be prepared in such a way, that there is no waste of time and no conflict or confusion. The navy's work, the mason's work, and the carpenter's work, etc., should fit into each other when a house is to be built, each piece of work is to be given a certain period for performance, one

piece of work should not wait for the other to be performed. But this circumstance does not involve that the individual pieces of work become dependent on the person who acts as manager and organizer; a number of well-thought-out mutual agreements and mutual confidence are the only necessary conditions in order that good faith may be maintained. There are those who regard compulsory agreements as safer than free agreements, but experience shows the opposite to be the case. It is owing to the existing state of coercion that the workers' dislike of the employers so often makes it impossible to have a work performed in the course of any fixed period, and that it has become a kind of religion to many workers to perform the least possible work in compensation for the wages they receive.<sup>1)</sup>

Many collective enterprises like, for instance, Henry Ford's factories in their latest stage of development cannot be divided into small enterprises, their existence being only rendered possible by the worker being as far as possible made into an automaton. Such enterprises require, if they are not to decay into slavery and working tedium, that a morality, which is based on the demands which the small scale enterprise makes on the individual, should prevail. The relation between worker and employer should in full reality and not only on paper be based on a free contract, i. e. each party should have a chance of going elsewhere, if the conditions do not satisfy them. This was already the case in the primitive pastoral societies. The leader of the horde, who decided the migrations to the new pastures and determined the work of each separate member of the horde, was subject to no other restriction of his arbitrary will, than the risk, which he incurred, if he was unreasonable, of the members of his horde dispersing and joining another horde.<sup>2)</sup> Every working administration which is not to stereotype and debar the chances of work, should be of such a voluntary nature; this fact is best expressed by the circumstance that it is not the large scale enterprise, but the small scale enterprise which is the prevailing form of trade.

But the perception of this circumstance is also bound to lead to a denunciation of the State's interference with trade. State manage-

<sup>1)</sup> J. E. Barker, *Economic Statesmanship*, 1918, pp. 128 f.

<sup>2)</sup> C. N. Starcke, *Die primitive Familie*, p. 63.

ment will always promote large scale enterprise at the expense of small scale enterprise; it will create large and rigid organizations. The social democratic party takes up an unfavourable attitude towards small scale enterprise, precisely because it cannot be brought under a central administration.

All that leads towards large scale enterprise, leads at the same time towards State administration. Most of the reasons which are adduced in defence of large scale enterprise, may also be adduced in favour of State administration.

All experience of the advantages involved in small scale enterprise will, on the other hand, be just as many reasons against large scale enterprise. The citizens should be allowed to carry on their businesses at their own will, the State is only to be the general guardian of law.

#### *Education.*

One of the spheres within which the right of State interference has been asserted most strongly is that of education. From many quarters it is regarded as one of the greatest advances of civilization that both the children's education and adult education have become vested in the State.<sup>2)</sup> This view is quite plausible, when we regard the educational establishments as necessary links in social life, like high-roads and railways. We would regard that society as being badly governed, in which high-roads and lines of traffic were left to decay; in the same manner we would consider it an evidence of deficient evolution, if the citizens' access to education was hampered and the system of education insufficient.

It is the object of the school to instil knowledge in the growing generation and develop its capacity to acquire knowledge and to work in a regular, connected fashion. The growing generation should be enabled later on in life to acquire the technical knowledge which it needs.

But it is also the object of the school to initiate the growing generation into what we may call the spiritual technique of society. The physical technique which has enabled us to develop our means of transport and trade, and our industry, is the *sine qua non* of the power which man has gained over nature. But besides this a spi-

<sup>1)</sup> B. Russell, *Principles of Social Research*, 1916, p. 147.

ritual technique develops in the structure of our society, which consists of social ideas, which form the basis of our legal system, our valuation of art and science, our knowledge of our national history, and the moral standards which form the norms of our individual lives. This spiritual technique is in any age an expression of the control which we have gained over ourselves. It strengthens our moral force perhaps to a still greater degree than physical technique increases our economic powers. The more definite the spiritual traditions are, the more easily we find the right course for the spending of our spiritual power. But here as everywhere else it holds good that the danger is extremely great, that the structure shall become too rigid. If the power of adaptation dies, we are on the road to die from old age spiritually.

What is the part which is played by the school in this, and how is a choice to be made between the regular educational system of the State and free, individual small scale education?

The school relieves the home of a burden in taking upon itself a task, which the home has no time or capacity to perform. This is not the place to examine, how this task should be defined or performed; attention shall only be called to the conditions, which have made the authorities take over the task and institute it as a large scale undertaking.

As far as the instillation of knowledge is concerned only one single circumstance places the large scale undertaking in a more favourable position than the small scale undertaking, this is with regard to material, collections of different kinds, and manual workshops for carpentry. They are only used a few hours by every form, and it is therefore impossible for the small school to provide them or make them as good and complete as is possible for the big school, where the great number of forms utilize the material to a fuller extent. We may compare this to the technical expression which we use of a machine when we say that it is "working without load". But this consideration only plays any rôle worth mentioning in the towns, and not in the parish schools. And the schools in the towns might on this point make a different arrangement, instead of incorporating the small schools in the forms of a big school.

By merging the small schools into the forms of a big school we put a stop to the difference which the small schools might display



in the use of the existing material, i. e. in their demands for the acquisition of knowledge. We here meet the first serious conflict between those two systems. There are those who find great advantages in the small schools with their different individualities, there are others who regard the uniformity found in the big schools as the object which should be aimed at, taking it for granted that it is always the best possible which is reached. The campaign against the small schools becomes a fight against indifference and mediocrity. But it is only possible to maintain this point of view, if we take it for granted that the homes themselves are indifferent to the quality of the school, and that the control of the quality of the teaching, which is given, should be vested in the authorities, if need be, in public authorities which stand outside the homes. The small private school may be an expression of the interest of the parents in their children's education, and in that case, the different individualities of the small schools may mean an advantage in culture, which is missed in the big schools. The more the big schools supersede the influence of the homes, the weaker becomes the interest which the homes take in the organization of the school, and the more justified becomes the big school, when it expresses a lack of confidence in the homes.

But all over the world it has been seen that the competition between big schools and small schools, between State (board) schools and private schools has been based on the attitude which the school takes up to what we call the spiritual technique. It is religious or social views which claim a right to decide the spiritual life, which is to prevail in the school to which the parents are to entrust their children. On the basis of this consideration the question of a big school or a small school becomes the question of the equal right of the various views of life to make themselves felt. Every monopolized school, and a big school will always be a monopolized school, will be synonymous with the prevalence of a definite view of life to the exclusion of all others, a view which does not prevail by means of its own inherent power, but by means of the support it receives from society.

The big school or the State (board) school is to stand as the great evidence that we are all equal members of the same society. The campaign against the small schools or the private schools has been

a link in the class warfare. The feeling of social solidarity was to be strengthened by everybody having been educated in the same school. Furthermore the access to this common school was to be open to all, and this would only be possible, if it was free to all and society defrayed all expenses from the common funds. The children's education, it was maintained, was not to be dependent on the parents' purse.

Nobody can overlook the fact that the campaign of the schools has been an extremely important link in the class warfare, and also in the struggle between religious and social views of life. The board school was instituted in Denmark in 1814 as a modest aid for those who were not lucky enough to be able to attend other schools; in the country it became a school for ordinary people, in the towns a school for the proletariat. To-day it is the necessary basis of all teaching, in the country a real people's school, in the towns an infants' school of so high a standing that no private school is able to compete with it. But if everybody was to have a right to send his children to the board school and perhaps was even forced to do so, the school would have to take into consideration the different views of life which are found in the various homes, and strive not to violate the parents' feelings. If it was not possible to find a common idea, on which everybody agreed, the object of the big school as an organ of the common management would be frustrated. It is impossible that religion should become such a common property, and it should therefore be separated from the school; but to declare religion to be a private affair is only another way of saying that it is a matter of no importance from a social point of view. It would be possible to place the feeling of solidarity as the uniting factor, if all classes within society agreed that the regard for the welfare of society should take precedence over everything else. But if each social class regards the welfare of society as synonymous with its own welfare, this expedient is excluded, and the big school becomes, not a means of arousing the spirit of solidarity in everybody, but a means of subjugating the minds into obedience to the existing social order already in youthful years. As has been shown in our descriptions, the object is not to strengthen society by making the members uniform, but it is, on the contrary, to make society into a system in which each single individuality gets its own place and

value.<sup>1)</sup> The task of society cannot be the suppression of the individuals, it must be the evolution of them, it being impossible to secure social progress and social solidarity by any other method.

The big school enforces uniformity and suppresses the individualities; only in the small schools is it possible to give the necessary scope to the differences, and the society which cherishes the small school will by doing so show that it has confidence in its citizens, and the citizens' love for society will grow, because the whole life of the gregarious instinct is dependent on the safety which we seek, in order to be able to live our life under the freest possible evolution of our circulation instincts.

Perhaps it might be said that the object of the school is to train the growing generation in the mental technique rather than in material technique. The making of character has therefore been regarded as its principal task. The most important means in the moulding of character must be to train the children in making a choice and coming to a decision. But it is only possible to do so in a satisfactory manner in the home and in the small schools; the big school is an impediment to the cherishing of real self-determination.

### *Religion.*

These considerations lead us on to a fuller understanding of the struggle between religious and social views of life, which is such a prominent feature to-day. It is the war against dogmas and the socially powerful church institutions, which has led to a fight against the absolute government of the world of which God was to be the expression. The belief in God and the belief in a ruling order of the world, which leads the good to victory and punishes the wicked, and determines what is good and what is evil, independent of human whims, independent of casual circumstances of time, is in reality the same.<sup>1)</sup> When the age wants to discard religion, because it is impossible to maintain the belief in the exist-

<sup>1)</sup> In this place I shall refer to MacDougall's statement, "Now prudent control of an impulse implies a much higher type of mental organisation, a much greater degree of mental integration, than is implied by the mere inhibition of an impulse through fear". An Introduction, p. 285.

<sup>2)</sup> H. Kelsen, *Das Problem der Souveränität und die Theorie des Volksrechts*, 1920, p. 21.

ence of God in the face of natural science, this is only another way of expressing the fact, that we imagine that natural science will teach us that there are no values in Nature, that good and evil have the same chances in Nature. But this view is mistaken. We saw above how Carver took up the view set forth by Descartes, that Nature in her fixed lawful form is God's idea of the world, and teaches us what is good and what is evil, what has the necessary conditions of thriving eternally and what is doomed to die. It is not natural science which has killed God, but men's decreasing desire to give the principles which they want to carry through in society and in their own lives, an eternal and unchangeable validity. Man allows himself to be more and more seduced by the idea that prudent calculation, regard for the moment, etc. may replace an unconditional sense of duty and honesty. We maintain proudly that the time has come when we need no longer put our trust in God, but have taken affairs into our own hands. But are we right in thus trusting ourselves? We are not competent to manage our own affairs if we do not build on something which stands immovable whether we want it or not, something which we may not violate without being wrecked ourselves. It is only a superficial consideration, which in our egoism may find a sufficient basis of our morality. The individual's egoism is only restricted by the group to which he belongs. And the egoism of the group is only restricted by the larger group, the individual nation by the respect for that something which comprehends all nations and is greater than each single nation. We may call that thing humanity, but this is an empty and abstract term, as we cannot catch sight of the common goal towards which all nations are striving except by seeing it in the form of the laws of God, which bind them all, and cause each of them to have the same set of leading ideas, or to decay. If the belief in a common God, i. e. our profound, unconditional obedience to those leading ideas, falls away, the ideas cease to bind us; we interpret them as we think fit, we lose the capacity to stand up with any strength against all the egoism and class fanaticism which are apt to seize the leading places in society.

God is the strong foundation of the individual who wants to preserve his own opinion independent of the opinions of the day, or to value the existing legal order, whether it is as it ought to be, or

whether it is only a prevailing system of power. It is without purpose to institute a big school, a school which is common to all and administrated by the public authorities, in order to secure the prevalence of a certain religion. Religion passes from the homes to the schools, and not vice versa. A State (board) school will be incompatible with religious liberty in the homes. The big State (board) school becomes, however, the most useful means, if we want to disregard the religion of the homes. If this is done successfully, the consequences will not fail to assert themselves; the desire for power will everywhere supersede the desire for justice.

*Democracy and Government by the Majority.*

How great the danger is to society, if the great medium of control of all our actions, which we call God, is replaced by our own shrewd exploitation of the existing situation, is best seen in the forms assumed by political life. Under a struggle against privileges, political democracy grows up as the positive expression of the maxim that there should be no privileges, but it begins by elevating itself into a privileged aristocracy, in asserting the right of the majority to be the lawful form in which it is possible for the desire for power to make itself the master of justice. It was under a fight against the kingdom by the grace of God or against an aristocracy by the grace of God that democracy gained its way onward, and, looked at from this point of view, we should notice how its victory has gone hand in hand with the tendencies of the age that are hostile to religion. The will of the people becomes the only accessible expression of the will of God (*vox populi vox Dei*); but the fact that the will of the people itself is just as secret and difficult to discover as that of God, and the fact that the only opinion possible to ascertain is that to which fifty-one per cent of the citizens agree, make the legal means of determining the judicial order of society the sum of all that sets a crowd of people or the feelings of a crowd in movement; and how far this is from offering security for teaching society what is just, we need waste no words on proving.<sup>1)</sup> Without a profound conviction that democracy has a deep religious foundation, that it is the immediate expression of our all being the children

<sup>1)</sup> R. Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie*, 1911, Kap. 1 & 2.

of God, and of all our differences being nothing as compared to this fundamental likeness, it is impossible to understand how anybody should dare to place the fate of society in the hands of the majority. The power of government may be entrusted to the few who are capable of governing, but the danger that private interests shall prevail with those in power is far less than the danger that they should prevail with those who make the laws.<sup>2)</sup> A society which always governed itself wisely would need no government, but the prevailing system of government seems to exclude the possibility of the people giving itself a government. Democracy must take man's sense of justice for granted, in spite of all his lust of power and greed. But how is it possible to reconcile this belief in man with the experience gained from the system of party government and government by the majority?<sup>3)</sup> The government should enforce the social will of the whole population; but when party division itself shows this will to be divided, and government gets its mandate from the majority, it seems at the outset to be an insoluble task to make the government the representative of the social will.

There is surely no way out so long as the parliamentary machinery remains an expression of the discordance of the people instead of being an expression of its unity. The statement which was made by Bagehot fifty years ago, still holds good. "It is the decisive point whether society can bear discussion". The fixed set of habits, interests, etc., which keeps society together, cannot suddenly be broken up without everything being dissolved; it should be possible to fit the new into the old as a well-reasoned and recognized variation. This happens by means of discussions, where argument is opposed to argument, and where the points of view of the opponent are gradually assimilated by oneself. But the debates which are carried on in that parliament which has been constituted by party election, are, as Graham Wallas pointed out, not discussions, but struggles of wills. The point is not to convince the opposite party or to be willing to be convinced oneself. The point is to have a firm

<sup>1)</sup> J. J. Rousseau, *Le contrat social*. L. III. Chap. IV.

<sup>2)</sup> G. Simmel, *Soziologie*, pp. 194 ff. The belief in the majority is not a belief in the right of numbers, but a belief in the fact that the social will (that which Rousseau calls "volonté générale") expresses itself in the people as a whole, and is therefore more easily perceived in the majority.

intention of carrying one's will through. Actions and not arguments are the decisive factors, and the political future of a party depends on the results which it attains. Even though only a part of the people support the party in the beginning, the knowledge that everything is thriving under its management will from all quarters be taken as evidence that it is right in its principles. Solidarity, which constitutes the strength of every people, will grow, when the feeling of security is growing externally together with the feeling of being able to repulse encroachments, and internally together with the liberty of the citizens, liberty being not one citizen's right to threaten his fellow-citizen, but each single citizen's security against encroachments.<sup>1)</sup>

The danger of party government is not found in the fact that its existence depends on what it performs and not on its arguments. The danger lies in the fact that a long time may pass before the actual consequences of the actions of a government become manifest, and that it is perhaps then impossible to repair the destructive consequences of those actions. The danger lies in the fact that everybody carries on the struggle from the point of view of his party. The reason why all class warfare is judged to be hostile to society is the fact that it makes the ears of both parties deaf to the arguments of the opposite party, and that the advantages which a class gains momentarily are regarded as advantages gained by society. If, e. g. socialism is to make any justified claim on adhesion, it must make the class which has promoted it permanently in a better situation. Our passions are aroused by the influence of our party or class and we judge only from momentary circumstances, and are unable to use our reason as the only instrument which may tell us something of the future. We feel poverty, we suffer from want of light and air, from insufficient nourishment, and from a feeling of insecurity for to-morrow and for our old age. In bitterness at all this suffering we raise the class warfare in order by force to gain a more reasonable part of the good things of life. We exult, when we gain political power and obtain these good things. We ignore the question of whether we have deserved them. Is it possible that

<sup>1)</sup> F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *Democracy at the Crossway*, 1918; Brougham Villiers, *Modern Democracy. A Study in Tendencies*, 1912; Ch. H. Pearson, *National Life and Character*. 1913.

society may provide them without being ruined, if we do not render anything in compensation for what we get? The future will show if socialism or its opponents are right, not by the arguments pro and con being weighed more carefully, but by seeing whether society is going to thrive or decay. We will never be able to ensure ourselves completely against mistakes, but we ought to strive to do so to the greatest possible extent. Our political democratic system is not favourable for this purpose, precisely because it is based on struggle and not on unity. The minute discussion which is carried on concerning capitalism versus socialism, concerning a free life of trade versus a life of trade that is regulated by the State or by society, will not influence the course of evolution to any extent worth mentioning; it is the private interests which will try how much they may achieve. But this is playing a risky game, and it is to be desired that the arguments pro and con might become of greater significance.

There is no doubt that a society which hampers the free division of labour goes to meet its ruin, that a society which weakens the harmonious relation between our gregarious instinct and our instincts of circulation, will dissolve into conflict or sink into inertia. This is bound to happen, whether we want it or not. But is it possible to make capital give up its tyrannical greed or to make socialism increase the working hours in order to avert those social consequences?

The only way in which this miracle might happen, would be, if we in the political unions might discuss matters on the basis of a common desire to reach the best possible result, and not on the basis of the contrariness of the conflicting desires of the classes. The immense difference, which exists between violent debates and peaceful discussions of special questions, is evident to everybody. The former are futile; they do not induce any of the parties to change their opinions, they only make each party realize its strength more clearly; what one wins, the other loses. But the latter are fruitful. All meet in order to promote a question, to arrange a question of trade as favourably as possible, to solve a question of traffic, to constitute a scientific association as advantageously as possible; nobody has any preconceived opinion which he wants to carry through, he entertains only more or less distinct views as to how



the matter in question ought to be approached. The mind of every single individual is open to the arguments of his fellows; the opinions of everybody modify themselves in the course of the discussion, and the final result becomes the sum of the honest convictions of all; it is the cause which conquers, and everybody sees his advantage in this.

*The New State.*

The idea of replacing the casual interests of the moment by such a group government is in reality a revival of the ideas of Godwin. Its object is to construct the State on the basis of the individual parishes and districts, the small groups being the living unities, and, through the union of these, larger groups are formed until the national State is reached. M. P. Follett has attempted to describe what would be the nature of such a social organization in his book "The New State".<sup>1)</sup> It is in reality written from the point of view of the same train of ideas of which Duguit made himself the spokesman; social authority rests neither in the parts or in the whole, but in their interplay. It is not the parts which, to a certain extent, relinquish authority for the benefit of the whole, or the whole which transfers a certain degree of authority to the parts; the whole and the parts constitute in reality a unity, and the parts operate at times through the whole, the whole at times through the parts. The wholes, the States, the Nations have no chance of surviving, if they are not in their natures federations. The first thing, which each member of a federative government should learn, is that the interests of the whole or the parts, or the interests of the various parts, should not be staked against each other.<sup>2)</sup>

This seems to be a fantastic ideal. Already in a small district union the individual peculiar interests will make themselves felt to the detriment of or within the sphere of the district interests. The question whether a tramway is to be laid through the street in which I live, or through that in which my neighbour lives, sets all the peculiar interests into operation, and each citizen will try by every means at his disposal to gain the other members of the union

<sup>1)</sup> M. P. Follett, *The New State*, 1918. New Impression, 1920, p. 299.

<sup>2)</sup> M. P. Follett, *The New State*, pp. 166 ff.

in favour of the opinion which is in his interest. From the very beginning private interests conceal themselves in the form of group interests. But precisely this fact is the important point; in the group's discussion of a matter there is no question of gaining proselytes, but only of elucidating the matter as thoroughly as possible. During this discussion the different opinions will be welcomed precisely because they serve to open up new vistas of possibilities. The group is not a platform of canvassing or a voting-machine, but a place where the citizen's way of voting is being prepared in his own mind. Everything which makes the individual impervious to pertinent considerations that are being discussed in the group, like, for instance, private interests, party feeling, etc. makes him also unfit to partake in the group life. It is very few people who will be able to partake in real group discussions, without their narrow-mindedness, their egoism, their party blindness being, so to speak, shaken. Their social consciousness grows and will soon make itself felt, so that the individual everywhere, where he is to give his vote, votes under the influence of what he thinks right and proper as regards the case in question, and not according to party orders.

There are, however, certain difficulties which hamper such free personal voting on individual questions. In the case of most votings it will not be a matter of one single question, but of several connected questions; it is impossible to change party every day, or to change it with each new question which arises; free voting leads into vagueness, while voting by party gives firmness and organization.<sup>1)</sup> M. P. Follett cherishes the conviction that all these difficulties will disappear, if the discussions which precede the voting are completely free, determined by the group and not by the party. If, as is the case now, each party represented its own set of interests, and sent its candidates to Parliament, it would be futile to believe that the candidates would be able to find each other there. In that case, it will be incumbent on each party to win, but not to find out the truth. Fruitful co-operation must take place before the elections for parliament. We have no use for parliaments which abound with conflicting interests. The opinions of the groups have become too crystallized at the time their representatives are sent up to Parlia-

---

<sup>1)</sup> M. P. Follett, *Opus cit.*, pp. 218 ff.

ment, and have often been hardened into prejudices.<sup>1)</sup> Therefore everything should be done in order to prevent this hardening as long as possible, and to make it a habit and necessity to everybody to live his life to its full extent, in such a way as to make it fit into all the various group interests which make all humanity one great entirety, which has need of and does not suppress their individual peculiarities. I am myself whole and undivided, I am a link of my group whole and undivided; I am through my group a link of a larger group, the State, whole and undivided. I am everywhere and for ever myself wholly and fully, rising from height to height, always higher, always my whole self rising.<sup>2)</sup>

In this group life is found the right proportion between all interests, the gregarious instinct and the instincts of circulation. No private purpose attains its full force, when it is not seen as contributing to general welfare, in such a way as to make it possible for the individual with all his powers and understanding to make himself the spokesman of it within the group; and no purpose of the group is of any value, if it does not make life freer and fuller for the single individual. What we call a herd, a crowd, kills the individualities and provides the most unfavourable conditions for intellect; but the group makes stringent claims on the intellect of each single individual and adds, so to speak, one cubit to his stature. The party, which counts votes, is a herd, and the party leaders are whips, and their interest is to make the party into a well-oiled voting machine. It should be the aim to replace the party by the group, and this is only possible if we are able to carry through a true democracy in such a way as to make the aim of each single individual the contribution he may be able to make to the welfare of the whole of society, he having perceived that his liberty and personality does not consist in his isolation, but in his connection with society.<sup>3)</sup>

This is the true essence of democracy.<sup>1)</sup> Democracy is not a form of government or of the social life of individuals, who according to their natures are alien to each other. It is not a form of government directed by the lower classes against the upper classes, but a form of government in which everybody is valued according to the har-

<sup>1)</sup> Opus cit., p. 308.

<sup>2)</sup> Opus cit., p. 319.

<sup>3)</sup> Opus cit., pp. 150, 178, 231.

mony between his own interests and the interests of the whole which he represents. Neither the rich nor the poor have per se any special privileges to maintain, our attitude towards them is only decided by the deepest possible understanding of the conditions of social life. We disapprove of the poor man's attempt to profit at the cost of society, just as much as of the egoism of the rich man.

But such a future in which we all meet on an equal footing for common discussion in our various groups, their organizations, cannot be realized when mutual distrust prevails. Instead of fear of our fellow-men, mutual confidence should prevail.<sup>2)</sup> This confidence is rooted in the existence of the group life itself, which in some people is based on sentiment, in others on intellectual claims, but it never gains absolute power, until an organization has been created which secures the free evolution of the instincts of circulation at the same time as it prevents them from colliding. Liberty is the necessary condition of confidence; only where liberty is possible may men live safely together. We do not measure liberty by the number of limits which we draw to the interference of the State, but by the legal order which enables ourselves to fill our place among our fellow-men.

#### *Abolition of Class Warfare and Race Struggle.*

On this possibility of instituting a free and just society, the strength of which is a living feeling of unity, depends our future. It is necessary in order to create security for the small nations against the great powers, but it is still more necessary in order to secure the future of the European race. The superiority of the European race is due to its military power, its machines and its organization. The day is not far off when the coloured races will have learned to use the white man's weapons and machines. By the force of their numbers they will be able to overthrow the rule of the white men and ruin their countries through plundering, or they will by means of industrial competition be able to destroy the sources of riches which the white men have hitherto imagined themselves to possess in their industry. It is to be feared that the

---

<sup>1)</sup> Opus cit. Chap. XIX.

<sup>2)</sup> Opus cit., p. 341.

coloured races will continue being satisfied with the low wages which correspond to their present state of dependence and low standard of living. They will through industrial competition also compel the working-classes of the European countries to be content with modest wages, and in this way our whole civilization will be destroyed. But there is no actual foundation for this train of ideas; for nothing would be able to support such a large world industry, as that which would grow up, when all nations learned to use our machines, except an increase in consumption all over the world. It is impossible to debar the nations from consumption in the long run without killing industry itself. It is possible that diseases, as has been mentioned above, may for interminable ages prevent the coloured races from shaking off the rule of the white man; but we strive to conquer these diseases, and the day on which this happens the coloured nations will vent a terrible stream of bitterness and hatred all over the world,<sup>1)</sup> if we have not before then taught them that the superiority of one nation over another does not consist in power to plunder, but in power to lead it onward in prosperity and security.

Low wages constitute a brutal injustice, as they are synonymous with the exclusion of the worker from a reasonable share of the goods of civilization. But for the promotion of industry it is not necessary that low wages like a dark shadow should accompany the dazzling light of the world industry. It is the avaricious monopolization of land, which enslaves the workers and destroys all feeling of solidarity between them and their employers. If we in our own civilization have failed to exercise justice and prevent violence and transgression, we should not expect this civilization to be able to assert itself as a world civilization. The only weapon by means of which we may expect lastingly to subject the whole world to us, is the vital force of the ideals of justice and solidarity, which alone is able to produce harmony between our gregarious instinct and the whole set of circulation instincts which constitute our existence. If trade continues to be a form of mutual robbery the consequences are sure to appear. The numerous local warfares, which have been produced by trade through the ages, will, when trade itself becomes

---

<sup>1)</sup> Ch. H. Pearson, *National Life and Character*, 1913, p. 141.

organized on a world standard, become world wars, in the sanguin-  
ariness of which all civilization will be laid waste. Only if trade  
assumes the form of a system of mutual service, under which one  
man does not block the way of his fellow, and under which the ac-  
cess to the labour market is open to all on equal terms, will the  
internal struggle in our societies be replaced by peace and security,  
and by increased power.