

four miles long. Moreover the patronage was almost exclusively a terminal patronage. That is to say, population along the line was so sparse that almost all the passengers carried got on at one terminus and rode to the other. Thus the hauls were nearly all long hauls. But notwithstanding this disadvantage, the branch made money with its 2½-cent fares. When the destroyed bridge had been restored, the whole eight-mile run was reestablished and fares were raised again to 5 cents. This was done about two weeks ago. But the fact remains that a Chicago street car line four miles long, with none of the advantages of a midway patronage, has been run at a profit with 2½-cent fares. One instance like this is more valuable, many times over, than the testimony of labor leaders who get windfalls of money, or those who have Republican nominations thrust upon them, at about the time when Mr. Hanna needs that kind of testimony and gets it.

A Berlin dispatch which describes Dr. Hermann Klaatsch as "one of Germany's most distinguished anthropologists," tells of having just published a book which "runs full tilt against the Darwinian theory of the descent of man." Darwinism seems to be having a hard time of it these days at the hands of the scientists. It is almost a pity, for there has grown up about it a great body of approving doctrine regarding all sorts of infamy, from the burning of "niggers" to the plundering of "inferiors" of every description. Darwinism has taken the place in credulous minds of the story of Jonah and the whale, and in selfish hearts of the biblical curse upon Ham. It is a new kind of credulity and the common refuge for "scientific" pharisees. What will the credulous and the "superiors" do if Darwinism fails them?

A great many citizens, unfortunately, want only so much honest government as will not interfere with their interests.—Puck.

A SATIRE ON THE FARMERS THAT FARM FARMERS.

Dean Swift's method for his satires has given way in our time to a method that differs radically from his in only one respect. This difference makes it, perhaps, all the more effective for present needs. The fabulous setting which Swift adopted, while it had the advantage of at once advertising his satires as fiction, thus avoiding the possibility of inadvertently playing a practical joke upon the incautious, had also the disadvantage of interesting readers so deeply in the story as to minimize to their minds, or altogether to conceal from them, the intended lesson. The new method loses that advantage, but it gets rid of the corresponding disadvantage.

It is not in the category of stories at all, but of arguments; and instead of dealing with fabulous peoples and countries, it deals in a very serious manner, excessively so if anything, with real persons and places and the real questions that concern them. Yet in subtle and often quite elusive ways it repeatedly injects the reduction to absurdity.

Vebelin's delightful "Theory of the Leisure Class" is probably the best known example of this style of satire. Love's "Japanese Notions of European Political Economy," though not so well known and varying somewhat as to method, is another example. A more recent one takes the form of a speech reproduced as a pamphlet, and is ostensibly from the pen of a Gilbert M. Tucker, who is described on the title page of the pamphlet as "editor of the Country Gentleman, Albany, N. Y." The speech purports to have been delivered before the "Farmers' National Congress, at Macon, Ga., October 9, 1902, its subject being "The Menace of the Arid Lands."*

This ostensible speech seems to be a subtle satire on the stock ad-hominem arguments for protection and land monopoly, to which it applies the reductio ad absurdum with consummate skill. We doubt

*To be had (free, probably) on application to the De Laval Separator Co., at Randolph and Canal streets, Chicago; 1213 Filbert street, Philadelphia; 217 Drumm street, San Francisco; 327 Commissioners street, Montreal; 75 York street, Toronto; 248 McDermot avenue, Winnipeg; and 74 Cortlandt street, New York.

if there is any better instance of an application to either subject of the light touch of restrained satire.

One might venture the guess that this satirical speech was suggested by a series of resolutions adopted unanimously by the National Grange of Patrons of Husbandry at its meeting at Lewiston, Me., in 1901; for the resolutions are quoted at large in the body of the speech and their phrases are freely borrowed. They recite that—

the one great burden on the farming interests of the United States consists of the perpetuation of the superannuated policy of the government in giving away its arable lands to anybody and everybody who will occupy them, thereby constantly maintaining and increasing a most unfair competition with farmers already established, and diverting to the far West thousands of men who would naturally furnish the much-needed force of labor for farmers who have bought their lands and paid or agreed to pay for them.

Also that—

this injury would be continued for many generations longer, should any project be adopted for bringing into cultivable state the immense tracts of the public domain now arid.

After those recitals come the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That this body, representing in large measure the agricultural interests of the whole country, denounces all projects for irrigating any portion of the public domain at the public expense;

Resolved, That an authenticated copy of these resolutions be forwarded by registered mail to the President of the United States, with the request that he refer to the matter in his message to the coming Congress, and that he withhold Executive approval from any bill intended to pave the way for government irrigation should the advocates of such a measure succeed in securing its passage by the two Houses.

When the motive for those resolutions is considered—namely, to restrict agricultural competition, so as to raise the prices of produce, and to maintain competition among agricultural laborers, so as to lower wages—the resolutions themselves read like a satire which some practical joker might have induced the National Grange to father. Yet some persons do regard it as a proper function of government to make business good for them at no matter whose

expense; and these resolutions may have had their source in the absolute good faith of genuine selfishness. Whether they had or not, the satirist in question has made excellent use of them.

He begins attractively with an exposition of the brag and blow in our periodicals about agricultural prosperity in the United States. As he correctly shows, this is usually supported with Department statistics indicating that nearly \$2,000,000,000 was divided among the farmers of the United States in 1902.

"Occasionally," he comments, "it occurs to one of these hurrah writers to do a little further calculation, generally in a foot note, or at any rate inconspicuously and as if the final results, which do not appear to come out quite as expected, must be susceptible of some explanation and could be of no great consequence anyway. One such glorifier of our tremendous agricultural prosperity computes that if the value of the three great cereal crops were distributed evenly among the families engaged in raising them, each family would receive—each family, mind you, each whole family—\$180. One hundred and eighty dollars for a family, as its gross returns, not by any means net profit, for the grain marketed by its working members during a year of enormous abundance."

In this introduction no satire is intended. Its purpose is evidently to draw attention to the deplorable fact, and it is a fact, that farmers as a class are really not very prosperous. With the same purpose the writer quotes a farmer friend, "a man of considerable means, not acquired in agriculture, but a real farmer and the descendant of generations of farmers, occupying ancestral fields of large dimensions in one of the most productive regions of New York, fields that have always been carefully tilled and abundantly fertilized, with due attention to rotation and to the selling of finished products"—in other words a competent farmer of the first class—who said: "The fact of it is, the drift of things in this country is steadily reducing our farmers to the peasantry

of the old nations of Europe; a condition in which sustenance, of a very plain sort, may reasonably be expected, but in which there is positively no hope for anything better than unceasing toil, no opportunity whatever of accumulating even the most modest competence."

Such observations, too pointed to have come from the pen of a genuine protectionist or land monopolist, serve the purpose of warning the reader. They prepare him to apprehend the satirical trend of the argument as it unfolds, in which the writer professes to explain the cause of this retrogression among farmers. Now to the satire.

"Every American has a more or less clearly conceived apprehension," it solemnly begins, "of the fact that all our prosperity rests upon our agriculture, and is, therefore, pretty certain to understand, if he thinks about the matter at all, that our agriculture ought to be fostered."

That is good protection doctrine, even if protectionists don't practice in this respect what they preach.

The writer then remarks that "it is quite possible to foster our agriculture by methods that will certainly degrade our agriculturists," and intimates that this has been done, by reminding his readers that there was a time when "no distinction could be drawn, in the United States at least, between the prosperity of farming and the prosperity of the farmers. Here is a hint that our present agricultural prosperity is not so beneficial to farmers who farm farms as to farmers who farm farmers.

But the writer wisely avoids saying anything so translucent. He realizes that it would mar the subtlety of his satire. Instead of giving himself away by indicating the ramifications of privilege which have generated the agricultural specialty of farming farmers, he adroitly attacks the present operation of our public land system, under which, with "insane haste," as he says, the government offers the public land, "practically for nothing, to anybody and everybody who will take it."

He does not dwell, however, upon the competition of these new farms in the markets of the world, with its

tendency to reduce the prices of farm products. An argument on that point would lose its sharp edge, and this satirist is too acute to have made such a blunder. He passes the point with the simple remark that in his opinion "the injury in this direction is rather less than might be supposed, and that it is in fact very far from being the darkest element of the problem." Two other "channels of mischief" lend themselves much better to the story of his ironical dialectics.

The first of these is—

the absorption by the new lands of the men and women who ought to supply, and in the normal condition of things would supply, an abundance of labor at moderate wages for established farmers. The demand for really efficient farm help, at prices that farmers can afford to pay, is left largely unsatisfied—to the injury of the farming interest, and perhaps most of all to the overburdening of the wife of the small farmer with tasks of which hired servants should greatly relieve her—by the facility with which the persons who ought to supply it can go West and become farmers on their own account, your property and mine being freely offered them for that purpose. Why should anybody work for you, except perhaps at extravagant compensation, when the government is willing and anxious to make him a landed proprietor himself, practically without money and without price?

Could subtle satire be more pointed without losing its subtlety? What more could be reasonably asked, even by the most ardent disciple of Henry George, than this apparent simplicity, which confesses that the wages of agricultural laborers depends upon the abundance of free land?

The next bit of irony is like the other, but widens out so as to include a larger class:

Nor is it farm labor alone that is drawn from its natural home by the recklessness of Uncle Sam in giving everybody a farm. A class of people better off financially go West also, and take their money with them, the class among whom the farmer looks for tenants [note the light touch involved here in speaking of a farm landlord as a farmer], if he wishes to let his property, for purchasers if he wishes to sell. Why should a man of some means hire your farm or buy it, if he can get one of his own for nothing. . . ?

The naivete with which our satirist, imitating the kind of argument he is poking fun at, slurs over the fact that what government gives to farmers, when it gives them anything, is not farms but natural sites on which to make farms, is simply charming. The evident spirit of his question would be better rendered, if plain speaking instead of satire were the design, by asking, "why should a man of some means hire the land you have monopolized, or buy it, for the purpose of making himself a farm, if he can get land for that purpose for nothing?" This is a question that probes, but the satirist was right in choosing the more delicate form.

Having thus dealt with the three "objections" to free land—lower prices of products, higher wages for work, and lower ground rents and location prices—our apocryphal speechmaker sums up in this delicious fashion:

Now notice, please, how these three wrongs converge to drain the very lifeblood of the established farmer who has bought his farm and paid for it, or (still worse) owes something on it. The value of his crop is reduced by unfair and illegitimate competition; the supply of labor that he needs is minimized and therefore its price enhanced; and the class among whom he ought to be able to find tenants or purchasers is seriously restricted. The same malign influences act, of course, on all his brother farmers. Their profits, like his, are fearfully diminished, and many of them, like him, are offering their farms to anybody who will pay a decent rent [an indecent rent being, of course, implied as the result of more intense land monopoly] or buy at a reasonable price. . . . The American farmer ought to be not only the most independent being on earth, but one of the most envied. Of all property in this country a farm ought to be the most desired, and the greatest in demand. There should be a dozen would-be purchasers or tenants bidding against each other for every farm that there is supposed to be a chance to get.

It being still understood that by "farm" the writer means a natural opportunity for farming—for, of course, he does not mean farm improvements, since they would not increase in value no matter how extensively farm land were monopolized—the idea of promoting intense competition on the working farmer

side and getting rid altogether of competition on the farm landlord side, amounts to an inspiration in satire.

Nor does the writer spoil his effusion by allowing it to be supposed that he has fallen into the narrow prejudices of a class and really believes these absurd things as related to farms. He perfects his satire by transferring the reader to the neighborhood of cities, where sites grow in value not in consequence of anything the owners do, but of the development of the city. Cleverly assuming that this manifest abuse of all sound principles of land tenure is just and wise, the writer in question puts this morsel into his supposititious speech:

The possession of a farm in the United States, especially in the older settled regions, should be, and under normal conditions would be, like the possession of land in the environs of a great and fast growing city, certain to enrich the owner, or at least his children, by natural and inevitable increase in value from the increasing demand of a multiplying population.

Yet a ray of hope is discerned by our sarcastic writer:

The arable public land has been so recklessly wasted and worse than wasted, so forced upon an already fearfully overloaded market, that it is now nearly gone. I suppose it is within bounds to say that there hardly remains unappropriated a desirable homestead in any State washed by the Mississippi or its affluents; and they are scarce anywhere. As the Year Book of the Department of Agriculture some years ago said: "All the best parts of the public domain have been appropriated, and comparatively very little good agricultural land remains open to settlement." It would seem that we are within sight of the beginning of the end of the mischief, and might hope now for a gradual improvement of farm property [meaning land, of course, as distinguished from improvements], the supply of wild land being nearly exhausted, while our population is increasing by leaps and bounds.

But the irrigationists have well nigh extinguished this ray of "hope" by securing the passage of a law—for the purpose of rendering fruitful by irrigation and then giving away I don't know how many hundreds of millions of acres of land now arid, thus postponing to the time of our great-grandchildren or later the condition of affairs which shall cre-

ate a sharp demand, with constantly rising prices, for agricultural land. Unless that bill be repealed and similar projects defeated for years to come, we have before us only a second stage in the work of spoliation. And that is my objection to the whole irrigation scheme in all its protean forms, to any scheme for increasing the cultivated area of the United States until such time as the land that has been bought and is cultivated by individual taxpayers shall come into such demand, by the growing requirements of our growing population, as to multiply very greatly its present money value.

When our versatile satirist has finished with the question of irrigation as one of public policy, he turns to the equities of it. A great deal having been said, in support of the irrigation project, about "furnishing homes for the homeless," he draws this parallel:

If some of our Western friends were owners of valuable lots in Boston, which they preferred to keep vacant until a growing demand should bring an increase in their selling value, and the Bostonians living around these lots should endeavor to seize them, under color of developing Boston and providing homes for the homeless, one can imagine the indignation of the owners and the opinion they would express of the shameless rapacity of the plotters. Their own plan is precisely the same, except for a difference in the location of the coveted booty.

This is the cleverest touch in the whole satirical speech. The parallel is perfect, and the writer so declares. As he says, the two cases are lacking in nothing but identity of location, and of course that is immaterial. Yet the writer has the self-restraint to go no farther than to assert the parallel. To have said, what he doubtless means, that the Boston case ought in equity to be governed by the principle of the free land policy, and not the free land policy by the indignation of Boston lot monopolists, would have deadened the satire. This inference he could fairly leave to his readers. Only those who are totally devoid of the sense of humor will fail to see the point.

Another light touch in this speech must not escape mention. It is the description of its author as editor of "The Country Gentleman."

Papers with that title invariably represent country people of leisure—not hoboes, but people whose leisure is elegant. Like the hobo, they live in the sweat of other men's faces, but their requirements demand more sweat. Working farmers are not country gentlemen within the connotation of such papers. It is peculiarly appropriate, therefore, that a satirical speech such as we have described, which pretends to advocate a system that would perpetuate the power of farmers of farmers over farmers of farms, should purport to have been delivered by the editor of a "Country Gentleman."

NEWS

The report of the arbitration commission appointed by President Roosevelt to inquire into the merits of the anthracite coal strike, announced last week (p. 793), has now been published. It occupies 87 printed pages and is signed by all the members of the commission. Following is the commission's own summary of the award it makes:

1. That an increase of 10 per cent over and above the rates paid in the month of April, 1902, be paid to all contract miners for cutting coal, yardage, and other work for which standard rates or allowances existed at that time, from and after Nov. 1, 1902, and during the life of this award. The amount of increase under the award due for work done between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 1, 1903.

2. That engineers who are employed in hoisting water shall have an increase of 10 per cent on their earnings between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903; and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of the award they shall have eight-hour shifts, with the same pay which was effective in April, 1902, and where they are now working eight-hour shifts the eight-hour shifts shall have an increase of 10 per cent in the wages effective in the several positions in April, 1902.

That hoisting engineers and other engineers and pumpmen, other than those employed in hoisting water, who are employed in positions which are manned continually, shall have an increase of 10 per cent in their earnings between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 1, 1903; and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of the award they shall have an increase of 5 per cent in the rates of wages effective in the several positions in April, 1902, and in addition

they shall be relieved from duty Sundays, without loss of pay, by a man provided by the employer to relieve them during the hours of the day shift.

That firemen shall have an increase of 10 per cent in their earnings between November, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 3, 1903, and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of the award they shall have eight-hour shifts, with the same wages per day, week or month as were paid in each position in April, 1902. All employes or company men other than those for whom the commission makes special awards shall be paid an increase of 10 per cent between Nov. 1, 1902, and April 1, 1903, to be paid on or before June 1, 1903, and from and after April 1, 1903, and during the life of this award they shall be paid on the basis of a nine-hour day, receiving therefor the same wages as were paid in April, 1902, for a ten-hour day. Overtime in excess of nine hours in any day to be paid at a proportionate rate per hour.

3. During the life of this award the present methods of payment for coal mined shall be adhered to unless changed by mutual agreement.

In all of the above awards it is provided that allowances like those made shall be paid to the legal representatives of such employes as may have died since Nov. 1, 1902.

4. Any difficulty or disagreement arising under this award, either as to its interpretation or application, or in any way growing out of the relations of the employers and employed, which cannot be settled or adjusted by consultation between the superintendent or manager of the mine or mines and the miner or miners directly interested, or is of a scope too large to be settled or adjusted, shall be referred to a permanent joint committee, to be called a board of conciliation, to consist of six persons, appointed as hereinafter provided. That is to say, if there shall be a division of the whole region into three districts, in each of which there shall exist an organization representing a majority of the mine workers of such district, one of said board of conciliation shall be appointed by each of said organizations and three other persons shall be appointed by the operators, the operators in each of said districts appointing one person.

The board of conciliation thus constituted shall take, up and consider any question referred to it as aforesaid, hearing both parties to the controversy and such evidence as may be laid before it by either party; and any award made by a majority of such board of conciliation shall be final and binding on all parties. If, however, the said board is unable to decide any question submitted or point related thereto, that question or point shall be referred to an umpire, to be appointed, at the request of said board, by one of the circuit judges of the Third judicial cir-

cuit of the United States, whose decision shall be final and binding in the premises.

The membership of said board shall at all times be kept complete, either the operators' or miners' organizations having the right at any time when a controversy is not pending to change their representation thereon.

At all hearings before said board the parties may be represented by such person or persons as they may respectively select.

No suspension of work shall take place, by lockout or strike, pending the adjudication of any matter so taken up for adjustment.

5. Whenever requested by a majority of the contract miners of any colliery, check weighmen or check docking bosses, or both, shall be employed. The wages of said check weighmen and check docking bosses shall be fixed, collected and paid by the miners in such manner as the said miners shall by a majority vote elect, and when requested by a majority of said miners the operators shall pay the wages fixed for check weighmen and check docking bosses out of deductions made proportionately from the earnings of the said miners, on such basis as the majority of said miners shall determine.

6. Mine cars shall be distributed among miners who are at work as uniformly and as equitably as possible, and there shall be no concerted effort on the part of the miners or mine workers of any colliery or collieries to limit the output of the mines or to detract from the quality of the work performed unless such limitation of output be in conformity with an agreement between an operator or operators and an organization representing a majority of said miners in his or their employment.

7. In all cases where miners are paid by the car the increase awarded to the contract miners is based on the cars in use, the topping required and the rates paid per car which were in force April 1, 1902. Any increase in the size of the car or in the topping required shall be accompanied by a proportionate increase in the rate paid per car.

8. The following sliding scale of wages shall become effective April 1, 1903, and shall affect all miners and mineworkers included in the awards of the commission. The wages fixed in the awards shall be the basis of and the minimum under the sliding scale.

For each increase of 5 cents in the average price of white ash coal of sizes above pea coal, sold at or near New York, between Perth Amboy and Edgewater, and reported to the bureau of anthracite coal statistics, above \$4.50 a ton f. o. b., the employes shall have an increase of 1 per cent. in their compensation, which shall continue until a change in the average of said coal works a reduction or an increase in said additional compensation hereun-