

ing. The stronger dictate terms to the weaker, which they must accept. It is a form of industrial warfare said to be fair play; but one is fighting in armor and in companies, the rest unarmed and singly.

The collectivists wish for a truce, and they look to the further extension of governmental control to remedy this evil, as it did with the earlier feudalism. It hopes for government to grow strong enough and extensive enough to substitute organized and legally controlled universal co-operation, or at least national co-operation, instead of the present competitive system. The three stages, then, would be slave labor, wage labor, and national co-operative labor. The collectivists point to the success of such national enterprises as the post-offices, the system of national public education. They also bring examples to show that, where fairly tried, municipalities have succeeded in managing their own water and gas supply; sanitary matters now have to be regulated by the municipalities; and they argue that gas supply and street railways should be managed by the municipalities, and railroads by the state. They go further, and conclude that it would be wise for the state to own and manage all the materials of production, and that the citizens should each and all become civil servants in the employ of the state. It is difficult, in a very brief outline, to do justice to any theory, yet I trust that this is not only a concise, but also a perfectly fair account of the leading principles underlying Spencer's position, and that of the collectivists.

Perhaps I may be allowed now a few words of estimation of these two positions, in neither of which, I believe, is to be found the full and correct statement of the problem to be solved, nor a satisfactory solution of the real difficulty before our civilization.

First, with reference to Spencer's account, which is the one that is accepted by the majority of English-speaking people as the most reasonable; a kind of sensible compromise between two fanatical extremes. But Spencer's theory does not reconcile these extremes, nor solve the difficulty. Instead of the extreme of pure individualism, or the extreme of pure despotism, we have both of them on our hands, merely juxtaposed; not reconciled, but set up to fight it out about the limits. Each is absolute within its own sphere, and the spheres are mutually exclusive, and the problem, or the battle, is to keep them mutually exclusive.