

So that, seated securely, flanked on the one hand by a continent of kinsmen in South America, and on the other by the dominions of Australia, New Zealand, India, and her wards and provinces of the Near East, the mistress of Africa can serenely await the unrolling of the Map of Time until, in the long course of

ages, the northern ice-sheets finally retire once more into their Arctic fastnesses, and the proverbial New Zealander of Macaulay actually sails away to view in reminiscent mood the place where once had stood Old London Bridge.

JOHN C. ELLIOT.

Butte, Montana.

COMMON GROUND FOR SOCIALIST AND INDIVIDUALIST.

By JOHN W. BENNETT.

SOME weeks ago three well-known representatives of different schools of sociological thought, socialistic and individualistic, met in New York and had a talk. At the end of the interview they seemed to feel that there were essential differences between them, so essential that they could not work together for social and economic reform.

This is typical. Writers on sociology and economics almost universally take the same view. Socialism and individualism are taken ordinarily as the opposite poles of economic thought. Is such the fact? This is a question of most vital interest as bearing upon the attitude of reformers and their followers toward the practical pressing issues of to-day.

So far as extreme socialists and extreme individualists are concerned, there may be essential antagonism. Certainly they think themselves irreconcilably opposed to one another. But a common-sense view of the situation discloses no good reason why social reformers who are socialists and social reformers who are individualists may not work shoulder to shoulder for the advancement of a common cause.

No individualist is so extreme as to deny that each human being has a social as well as an individual existence. All individual liberty, each individual right,

is qualified by the individual rights and liberties of others with whom the very nature of things compels the individual to live in social contact. Each individual cannot have a planet of his own. If he had he would contend with the inhabitants of other planets about the light of the sun and moon. It is doubtful whether the human individual with a world to himself, could such a thing be conceived, would find himself as happy as we other mortals who are packed upon this planet with another billion and one-half of beings more or less like ourselves.

Man is a social animal. The individualist who carries his theories to the veriest length of anarchy cannot conceive of any other kind of human. As social animals it is necessary that men should live together. The only question is whether they shall live in harmony coöperating with one another and helping one another; or live in strife, crowding one another aside, tramping one another down, rending one another.

It is not necessary, however, to carry this discussion along upon theoretical lines. Practically the things which call most loudly for reform have been taken out of the sphere of contention between socialist and individualist. It would be as much to the point to argue for an absolute monarchy in a controversy over popu-

lar or legislative election of United States Senators as to contend for individualism in the regulation of corporate activities. Our government in all its branches has passed beyond the stage of absolute monarchy. In fields of corporate activity, we have passed the individualistic stage of industrial organization. The question of individualism, as a practical question, cannot enter at all into the problem of dealing with the corporation. It has but the most remote theoretical bearing.

Corporations are socialistic organizations. In them individuals associate in order to unite their forces to carry out in harmonious coöperation industrial enterprises. Where more than two hands are necessary to an enterprise, there must inevitably be social coöperation. Certain industrial activities have been found monopolistic in their very essence. For great enterprises requiring union of intellect, union of fortune, union of skill, the corporation has been found the most fitting instrument. For monopolistic enterprises, the corporation has been found the only fit instrument. Imagine a railway, or an insurance enterprise, a great steamship line, an express service, a telegraph or a postal service conducted by one individual or many individuals acting competitively.

It is needless to bring forward proof of the corporation's advantages in certain lines of business. The fact that it has absorbed the mightiest industrial activities and is growing daily in power and comparative importance, proves fully that it has in it something essential in meeting present conditions of social and industrial evolution.

Yet the corporation is merely a socialistic association of individuals for common benefit. They associate because they can do better by association than by individual effort the things which they have set out to do. This is fully recognized and acted upon by a large and growing percentage of our industrial population.

Each free and independent citizen of this great nation, for instance, cannot conduct his own railway. He finds it necessary to give the task over to a corporation and in order to make that corporation efficient in the task it has undertaken he gives the corporation governmental functions—eminent domain, the taxing power, etc. Now in practice we have found that this arrangement gives the railway power to oppress the citizen who gives it being. It also discriminates between citizens whom it was instituted to serve equally and ends by corrupting and controlling their government.

Broadly speaking there is but one way that citizens individually or collectively can defend themselves against the railway which they have created. They must control it. Obviously they cannot control it while its management is in the hands of officers and directors responsible only to stockholders and not so very responsible to them. This is especially true since the material interests of the men who fill the offices and directorate of the railway and own its stock are in conflict with the material interests of the citizens whom they serve. Control, if it come at all to the citizen, must come through his government. Leaving the organization of the railway as it now is, it has been proven to a demonstration that the railway controls the government rather than the government the railway.

What is true of the railway in this regard is true also of the telegraph, the telephone, the gas company, the electric, light company, the water company, the postal service and a great number of services of like character, monopolistic in their nature and requiring in their most efficient administration quasi-governmental powers. In this vast industrial field individual effort is totally inadequate to meet requirements. Organization of individuals into service and industrial corporations—socialism in its broad and non-technical sense is an absolute essential.

Assuming then that the industrial ac-

tivities, especially the public-service activities, which are now being carried on by corporations, cannot be carried on successfully upon the individualistic plan, there is nothing left in connection with corporations for the socialist and the individualist to fight about upon principle. At least they cannot fight over the main bone of contention—individualistic effort *versus* social or coöperative effort. For them then as for the rest of us the dividing problem narrows to what sort of corporation or association shall do the work. Shall it be done by a private irresponsible corporation or a public corporation responsible to those it serves?

For railways and such services the people in their social capacity furnish the right-of-way. Also the capital, the business and the employés. The question at issue narrows down to whether the managing officers and directors shall be responsible to the people whom they serve or irresponsible—whether they shall be autocrats ruling the people or officers serving the people.

The decision of this problem, again, brings up no question of principle between the socialist and the individualist, if they be both democratic and look at the problem from the standpoint of the great industrial masses. Individualism cannot be applied except as to the autocrat who under private control rules the public-service corporation and through it the government and the people. The private corporation is no more individualistic in the sense of giving play to individual freedom or initiative than is the public corporation. Each is socialistic within its sphere. The individual must decide between irresponsible socialism exploited for the benefit of an autocracy of wealth and responsible socialism controlled by the masses and conducted for their benefit. The question and the only question for socialist or individualist is one of control, of government, of administration. Shall the corporation be conducted upon autocratic lines, or shall its government be democratic? Shall an

autocracy of wealth rule industry and through industry rule politics? Shall it make the idea of popular government a fraud and a pretense, or shall our democracy extend both to industry and politics? Are we to insure continued political and industrial liberty or submit to political and industrial autocracy? Are we to lose the freedom we have or gain more freedom? These are the important questions to be decided and it is very evident that the democratic individualist and the democratic socialist are necessarily of one mind as to what is desirable.

Fortunately upon this point nobody can take neutral ground. The public-service or industrial corporation is not in fact merely its officers and stockholders but also its employés. Less directly but none the less certainly are the persons who furnish the business part of this corporation. All these must submit to autocratic socialism so far as they are touched by the industry or corporation involved, or have democratic responsible socialism in this service or industry. Individualism in this matter is not within their reach. All must support public-ownership of monopolistic activities or corporate private-ownership which is autocratic socialism.

I repeat, democratic socialists and democratic individualists do not disagree as to the desirableness of having these monopolistic industrial activities controlled by all for the benefit of all. Their quarrel is as to how it shall be done. Here again it is not a quarrel on principle.

Narrowly viewed, the theories of the democratic individualist are most damaged by the adoption of public-ownership of public utilities and monopolistic industrial activities, yet he is inclined to favor the plan. The democratic socialist whose theories would be accepted *pro tanto* by adoption of public-ownership, seems most inclined to object. It would not be doing things his way. Socialism to be the real thing must come through a revolution inspired by class-conscious-

ness of the proletariat. The socialistic rose would not be so sweet by any other name. Indeed, it seems that the manner of plucking it alone gives perfume to this socialistic rose.

To us of the great masses who have labeled ourselves neither individualist nor socialist and who are not so particular about supporting theories as we are about getting results, all this seems absurd, almost grotesque. Is the mere method—the way—of bringing the change about more important than the change itself? Is class-conscious uprising an indispensable part of socialism? Will not the socialist accept the same results arrived at in some other way? Would not socialism be as much socialism under the name of public-ownership? Would it not be as much the real thing brought about by proper use of the ballot as by class-conscious uprising of the proletariat? If it would, the socialist and the individualist have no quarrel here, certainly none on principle.

There is but one way of bringing about democratic socialism. We must convince the majority of our citizens that it is a desirable thing and get them to vote it in. An autocracy might establish socialism by some other method, a democracy cannot. In democracy the getting of the majority and the favorable expression of that majority are absolute essentials, revolution or no revolution. If that majority and that expression can be had in favor of that portion of socialism known as public-ownership, without class-conscious uprising and revolution, then revolution is unnecessary. If not the majority and the expression must still come after revolution. They at least are indispensable.

There is now ready to our hands a work which would mean a long step in making socialistic industrial organizations servants of the whole people, responsible to the whole people. Democratic socialists can secure the votes of democratic individualists in doing that work. Public-ownership of public util-

ities, now corporation exploited, is a thing upon which both can unite without yielding an inch of principle. Why do they not unite? In that way they might sooner than by any other method turn the individualistic democratic and the socialistic democratic minorities, each by itself hopeless, into that essential majority having power to act. The alternative is long-continued waiting while industrial autocrats exploit both. Why wait?

The whole history of mankind has shown that social amelioration is a gradual process. Human intelligence, whether it be individual or mass intelligence, moves only from the well-known to the less well-known. Like infants learning to walk, they push the go-cart experience from point to point, holding to it in the mean time as their indispensable support. True, there have been revolutions, as in France. But when the pendulum of social organization came to rest after extreme oscillations the dial marked no further progress than in countries where social amelioration moved gradually along. In fact anything apart from gradual social change is almost unthinkable. The social organism must learn proficiency in its new ventures before undertaking others. Just as the child is incapable of covering the whole range of human knowledge from alphabet to calculus without taking the intermediate steps in education, so the social organism cannot progress from cave-dwelling to the millennium skipping intermediate points. The very nature of the human animal prevents that sort of progress, and so far as we can now see, nothing can change that nature radically.

Surely there is pure gain for the democratic socialist in taking the proffered help of the democratic individualist and with it wresting from autocratic capitalists the vast industrial activities now exploited through irresponsible although socialistic corporations. He would in this manner establish a school of socialism which would necessarily educate

more followers for him in a year than his present preaching of class-conscious uprising would in a life-time.

As for the individualist, he, too, can only gain. When his individualistic ancestors struck for political freedom they did not strike for anarchy or pure individualism in government. They knew that in any state of society short of ideal, government was necessary. The question before them and the only question was who should control that government. Should it be an autocratic government irresponsible to the governed, or should it be a democratic government controlled by those who supported it? By political liberty, in other words, our ancestors did not mean that every man should have a government of his own—did not mean anarchy, but only the equal right of all to participate in and control the government. And the only thing the democratic individualist can mean by freedom in industry, is the equal right of every worker to participate in and control industry. According to our present lights this can be brought about in the fields corporation-ruled, only by establishing the democratic order in industry, which in the language of the day means public-ownership.

To put the situation more tersely, the great vital issue confronting the masses to-day is industrial liberty. This liberty is absolutely necessary not only to protect the masses from the exploitation of an autocracy of wealth which takes from them the fruits of their toil, but also to preserve for them that political liberty painfully won through centuries of bloody conflict. The immediate form of that issue is public-ownership, including municipal-ownership, and in this form it must first be met.

Is it not utter folly for democratic individualists and democratic socialists, both believing implicitly in the necessity of industrial liberty, to divide upon academic questions of remote application, dissipate their strength and let the great immediate, vital issue go by default? Should they persist in doing so they will

miss a golden opportunity for doing something worth while for the cause of human progress.

When democratic socialists and democratic individualists have established public ownership of corporation-exploited industry, when they have made this field of industry democratic and responsible, then if they find they can agree no longer, let them separate. Let there be a new alignment of forces. But they should not as now continue to travel the same road in the same direction bickering about non-essentials while important work is left undone. Reform forces are now inclined to act like firemen who would quarrel over next year's water famine and refuse for that reason to tap the hydrant lest they deplete the supply while the house burned about their ears.

After all, it is not so certain that when we arrive at something like a sane social order democratic socialists and democratic individualists will find themselves so far apart. In my judgment their paths of theory even are convergent not divergent. To a great extent they look at different sides of the shield. The veriest anarchist will not deny the right of human beings to associate themselves voluntarily for mutual help. Once admit this and there is little to quarrel about between democratic socialists and democratic individualists tending toward the same goal of ideal social organization.

In any real political democracy the association is practically voluntary. Men support the order because they deem it best for themselves as well as for others. They associate to help one another. In any real democracy, the government is not a thing apart. It is but one aspect of the whole people, the people performing the governmental function which in sane social organization means the function of general service. Neither the democratic socialist nor the democratic individualist denies the right of the people to do this nor their wisdom in doing it. Where then is the objection to applying democracy to industry? If the peo-

ple find it wise, why not a voluntary industrial association of the whole people for the purpose of serving one another in industry? Why should not the whole people perform the social function which is the industrial function, if the whole people deem it wise? If it be proper and right and wise that the people organize a voluntary association for industrial purposes, where is the treason to individual liberty in using the democratic voluntary organization called government in the performing of industrial service functions? Where is the ground for difference of opinion here between the socialist and the individualist who are both democrats? No question of principle is involved. Only a question of expediency. What is best to do? If democracy finds it best to coöperate in industry using its governmental organization as an instrument, who shall say it nay? Who would say it nay any more than in the field of politics?

Should democracy find that it can best perform an industrial function through social organization, let it perform such function in that way. When it becomes sufficiently intelligent, it will do this. If it is finally found that some industrial functions can best be left to individual effort, intelligent democracy will leave them to individual effort.

Should we produce a social order in which every worker was able to use his natural capacities and acquirements in the most effective way and receive in return an equivalent of what this activity produced with the right to spend it as he pleased, it is difficult to see how the fact that he had used his talents in association with others could injure him in any way or hamper his individuality. Social assistance in any event is absolutely necessary to production among civilized men. Individuality has full scope only in consumption, in the regulation of one's pleasures and impulses, in the regulation of his household, in ordering the life he leads. No coöperative social order would or could interfere with such things as these. There is no reason founded upon individualism, why an intelligent democracy should not do anything it finds wise to do and in any manner it chooses.

In fact the more closely one analyzes the general principles which divide the democratic individualists and the democratic socialists, the more visionary they appear, but these intangible, unsubstantial things serve to dissipate the strength of forces making for righteous progress and to prolong the rule of oppression and greed in politics and industry.

JOHN W. BENNETT.

Minneapolis, Minn.

BRITISH EGYPT.

By ERNEST CROSBY,

Late Judge of the Mixed Tribunal at Alexandria.

PART III.

WE HAVE now followed the course of history until both risings against the consequences of Ismail's extravagance have been put down, in the Soudan as well as in Egypt, and the Khedive now rules over both countries in name, and the Diplomatic Agent of

Great Britain in fact. That Agent, formerly Sir Evelyn Baring and now Lord Cromer, is a born administrator, and his greatest talent, as might be inferred from his family-name, is finance. For over twenty years he has had a definite task to perform, and that is to bring Egypt to a point of solvency and keep her there, and he has performed this