

Court of Capital and Labor. Nothing is lacking, not even the roaring climax of Marcus A. Hanna as chief justice. With Capital on the outside as the lion was, with Labor on the inside like the reconciled and digestible lamb, and with Mr. Hanna on top, the Easley experiment can hardly fail to succeed—at least in some respects.

It is refreshing to one's democracy to be assured by so prominent an eastern Democrat as Edward M. Shepard, lately the Democratic candidate for mayor of New York, that municipal government is not altogether a matter of business but presents political as well as business problems. The phrase, "municipal government is business not politics," has a seductive sound, but the sentiment is utterly false. If municipal government were business and not politics, none should vote without a stake in the city—a financial interest in its affairs; and strictly the influence of each vote should be in proportion to the financial stake of the voter. That the first of these corollaries to the business theory of city government is recognized by advocates of the theory is evident from the spirit in which they discuss municipal questions; and sometimes they give themselves "dead away" in unmistakable terms. During the recent New York election, for instance, ex-Mayor Hewitt, that excessively interesting type of the un-democratic Democrat, declared for a financial qualification for voting at municipal elections as if it were a generally approved principle. But this theory is distinctly repudiated by Mr. Shepard. At Philadelphia on the 10th, speaking to the subject, "The Municipal Problem," he said:

It has been said that the problems of municipal government are business problems simply. This is not correct. Every municipal problem is a political problem in the proper, though not necessarily in the partisan, sense of the term. Ours is a democratic country. Every municipal problem is a political one that must be determined in the light of popular elections. Since that is the fact, every detail of municipal ad-

ministration depends either directly or indirectly upon the opinions of the voters in the community. I think if we recognize that municipal government is a political affair we will have made some headway in dealing with this problem. The populace must in some way be harnessed to the chariot of political progress. Without that you may make headway for a year or two, with this experiment or that, but you will find yourself defeated at the end.

The necessity for regarding municipal government as a political task is becoming stronger with the drift of our population, on the one hand, toward cities, and the drift, on the other, of our legislative and judicial law-making toward centralization of power in the general government. The once vital conflict between state and nation appears to be reviving in the new form or in a variation rather of the old feudal form, of a conflict of city and empire. That is to say, as the central government overshadows the state at home and reaches out for world-wide power abroad, the resistance of local independence to imperialism becomes concrete in American municipalities somewhat as the protest against feudalism became in the middle ages concrete in the free cities of Europe. It is extremely important, then, the more especially as plutocracy is so marked a characteristic of the new imperialism, that the democratic idea of political equality be retained unimpaired in our municipalities. When municipal government comes to be regarded as business and not politics, the sway of plutocratic imperialism will be well nigh complete.

When the state Grange of Pennsylvania met at Johnstown early this month it adopted a series of resolutions of the utmost importance with reference to the idea of restraining trusts by centralizing power over them in the general government. Farmers are among the principal sufferers from trusts. It is encouraging therefore to find so representative a body of their branch of industry as the Pennsylvania Grange taking an

intelligent stand against making of this evil an excuse for enormously increasing the power of the government at Washington. The resolutions are well worth reproduction in full:

Whereas, the march of centralization in government has already gone very far; and whereas, the tendency of power is to drift farther and farther away from the people in whose hands it properly resides; and whereas, it is now proposed by the president of the United States in dealing with trusts to have the federal authority "assume the power of supervision and regulation over all corporations doing an interstate business;" and whereas, since practically all corporations in a sense are engaged in interstate business, either in buying or in selling across state lines, the extension of this power to the federal government would reduce the states to the grade of counties; and whereas, the president also recommends the erection of another department of government to be known as the department of commerce and industry and to have jurisdiction over all interstate business, it is Resolved, that the Pennsylvania State Grange views these steps toward paternalism and centralization with alarm. It deprecates the increase of federal offices. It doubts the wisdom of enlarging the federal power. It objects to the policy of removing the people's business from the people's own immediate control. It particularly opposes a proposition which might properly appear in a socialistic programme; and it resents the erection of a department of government under which the people of the states would lose control of the corporations of their own creation and of industries operating within their borders and under their protection. The Pennsylvania Grange adopted these resolutions with full knowledge of their profound significance. They were not accepted perfunctorily; they were vigorously discussed. This fact makes their adoption by a large vote especially important. It indicates that the farmers of Pennsylvania are not ready to be caught in imperial traps with anti-trust bait. For the proposed federal regulation of trusts is imperial, no matter which party proposes it. As the foregoing resolutions say, it would virtually make the regulation of all business a federal function.

In support of this method of dealing with trusts—a dangerous method.