

—" *Vox populi, Vox Dei.*" Triumphant democracy thus threatens to sweep away every social barrier. The individual is supreme. "*L' état c'est moi.*"

But just here a great difficulty presents itself. Granting the individual to be supreme, what is said individual going to do about it? Will he dispense with social control altogether? If he continues to tolerate it or use it, to what extent, on what grounds, according to what principles? This is the great problem for the individualist to solve.

What is the place and function and justification for collective or social action?

Let us note a few problems that all turn upon the enquiry concerning social or collective action. What, to begin with, is the place of government in our national life? How should government be constituted? How conducted? How regulated? In English history we read of the stages of the struggle through which we have passed in our endeavors to obtain the boon of "representative government." Yet we are far from satisfied. Some, like Professor Dicey, claim that representative government needs to be amended by a division of labor, whereby every department of it will be carried on by a committee of experts; and this sounds reasonable. On the other hand, many claim that legislation affecting the whole people should be more directly decided upon by the whole people by a vote, or "Referendum." This also sounds reasonable; but these two reasonable proposals are in apparently opposite directions, and both propose to amend what has long been regarded as the highest form of government. Then there are proposals and agitations for further extension of the franchise; demands for what has been termed "the emancipation of women"; the claim that women, too, should be directly and by vote consulted in regard to legislation that affects everyone in the community. This is a far-reaching question. There are difficulties about the proper functions of a government. Should government merely restrain or control individuals and corporations, or should it become an active participator in corporate action? Should government undertake and carry on certain enterprises usually conducted by individuals or corporations? In the debate—sometimes acrimonious—that goes on between the individualists and the collectivists, there is usually a failure to see that already in the great corporations we have abandoned strictly individualistic action without having arrived at fully collective action. The result is that the large corporation is sometimes dreaded, sometimes lauded by both individualists and collectivists.