

servile and take dictation from them. That his going upon the bench at what is commonly regarded as a great pecuniary sacrifice, is genuinely in furtherance of a sincere ambition to serve higher interests than the plutocratic schemes for which corporations are a mask, there are many good reasons for believing. Whoever reads Mr. Dill's recent oration at Oberlin, will have no difficulty in detecting in it a true note. While Mr. Dill has had much to do professionally in the interest of corporations and trusts, he seems to have grasped the fundamental truth that trusts depend not upon mere organization, but upon monopoly already established; and his attitude toward these privileges has not been especially friendly. It is hardly probable that Mr. Dill while on the bench will be able to exert any influence against privileges firmly imbedded in the law; but in dealing with the development of newer ones, he may prove his essential democracy sufficiently to commend him to the people as a champion of their rights in another than the judicial arena.

Secession versus imperialism.

To those who have fondly believed that the war for the Union was patriotic and its resulting emancipation of slaves a religious achievement, our comment upon it in connection with the Scandinavian situation (p. 193), may very likely have come with a shock. But the thought is well worth considering that our war probably freed the slaves only a little sooner than the advancing economic forces would have done it had the two sections peaceably separated, and that its most notable outcome is the career of imperialism upon which it has launched us.

We were little federated States then, working out the principles of freedom; we are a nation with a big N now, working out, as Rome did, the doctrines of imperialism, and possibly to the same disastrous end. True indeed is it that

it is little countries and not big ones that give the world big men and big principles. It was little Judea, not big Egypt, that gave us the great prophets. It was Greece, not Persia, that gave us the great philosophers. Little England gave us great principles of citizenship, and little Switzerland towers higher in her manhood than in her mountains. We had much of goodness and true greatness to expect of the little States, even if they had broken the links of federation, which we cannot hope for from the powerful and correspondingly autocratic centralized government that we are now erecting. As to the slave of the South, whoever understands economic forces realizes that he would have been freed by them ere now; and whoever knows the old Southern character can hardly doubt that both races would in freedom have been nearer to an equality if the States had not been coerced by war and the slaves freed by an invader.

We of the North are too much disposed to think of the Southern soldier as fighting for slavery. He no more fought for slavery than the Northern soldier fought against it. Slavery was accidentally a concrete cause of the quarrel; but what the Northern soldier fought for was the Union, and what the Southern soldier fought for was the liberty of his State. Defeated in that struggle and bound to their sister States by an imperialistic tie, the new generation of the South has changed in character from the old. Innate love of liberty has been swept away from the new South, and a mad desire for wealth, coupled with an increasing instead of diminishing indifference to the rights of others, has taken its place in the South as in the North. The young Southerner celebrates the patriotism of his Confederate father, and we along with him of our Revolutionary grandsires; but neither section seems to care for the spirit of liberty which once animated both. With the end of the Civil War, State lines began to fade and im-

perialism to loom up, no bigger than a man's hand at first but of truly imperial dimensions now. Of course the Civil War and its results are unalterable facts; but it behooves those of us who believe that with the aid of the history of the past we see somewhat into the future, to keep before our fellows this truth: Governments in and of themselves are nothing; it is only as they affect the development of humanity that they are to be considered. If in our vanity we admire our strong and strenuous government as it influences the grand politics of the world, let us not be blind to the fact that it may at some time undermine the integrity of our citizenship and subject our people to the fate of all the democracies that have tried to realize dreams of empire. There is such a thing as liberty, and such a thing as power, but they are not of the same household.

MAYOR DUNNE'S TRACTION POLICY.

The eagerness and unanimity with which the traction-franchise press and other agencies of the traction corporations have "jumped on" Mayor Dunne's so-called "contract" plan for financing and immediately establishing municipal ownership and operation of the traction service (pp. 215-216), is prima facie proof of the excellence of the plan for its avowed purpose.

This proof is corroborated by the trivial character of the objections they put forward, by their assertions that the plan is the same in principle though worse in detail than the "tentative ordinance," and by their transparent pretense that Mayor Dunne has receded from his policy of immediate municipal ownership and operation as impracticable.

From their weakest objection to their unconcealed demands for the restoration of the "tentative ordinance," their method of attack is a demonstration of their bad faith. Under pretense of criticizing a particular plan for securing municipal ownership, they are trying to obstruct all plans for that object, in the evident hope of perpetuating ownership and op-