

When the manner in which Aguinaldo was captured, and the glittering prize his ignoble captor received as a reward, are considered in connection with those letters (except the sarcastic one, if it is sarcastic), a serious question of comparative civilization arises, and one wonders whether all the virtues really are monopolized by the white man.

This wonder grows when we turn to the horrifying official report from China, partially divulged on the 6th by the state department, which tells, so reads the Washington news dispatch:

1. Of the Chinese married women who announce to their families that on a given day they will depart this life.
2. Of Chinese women who submit passively to death at the hands of their relatives as an honorable method of suicide.
3. Of Chinese girls who drown themselves in water hardly up to their waists to escape brutality at the hands of soldiers from European nations.
4. Of Chinese husbands who bid their wives kill themselves after suffering indignities.
5. Of Chinese towns where it is difficult to find a female between the ages of ten and 50.
6. Of Chinese families murdered—fathers, uncles, brothers and mothers—that the young women might fall into the hands of the European soldiers.

The official report charges the atrocities here hinted at to the French and the Russians, exonerating the British, the Germans and the Americans. This exoneration may be just; but what of it in the minds of the outraged Chinese? How can they be expected to distinguish the different bearers of the white man's burden? If "all Chinamen look alike to us," may not an American, virtuous and mild mannered butcher though he be, look like a barbarous Russian to them?

Not long ago local self-government was conferred upon San Francisco by the adoption of a charter of an unusually advanced type. San Francisco was to be allowed to work out her own municipal salvation, and

the state was to keep hands off. Nothing has yet happened to disappoint the expectations of the friends of this truly democratic charter. But the republican politicians have begun to tinker it. Gov. Gage, who was elected over that unwavering democratic democrat, James G. Maguire, has signed a bill to nullify the merit system of the municipal civil service which the charter established. This act of his is fitly characterized by the San Francisco Star when it says:

In signing the bill intended to destroy the civil service system in San Francisco, Gov. Gage has disgraced himself and his party. In this the Star not only speaks as an advocate of genuine civil service reform, but also as a champion of a far more important principle—that of local self-government. The charter was adopted by the people of this city, and was solemnly ratified by the legislature. In that charter are provisions for its amendment by the people of this city, by direct vote, on their own petition, in any manner that they may desire. Under such circumstances, it is an insult to the voters of the city for the governor and legislature to attempt to change one of the most important sections in the charter, either for better or worse. More than that, it is a denial of the right of the people of this city to manage their local affairs. Once the right to so interfere in the local government is established, all hope of decent city government, of municipal ownership, or of anything except high taxes and no return, will go glimmering. The people of San Francisco are competent to run the government of the city, and the politicians who think otherwise will find themselves beaten by the very trick intended to destroy their enemies.

Tom L. Johnson's entry into office as mayor of Cleveland was as meteoric as his election. During the incumbency of his predecessor, Mr. Farley, an arrangement had been made to turn over the lake front to a railroad corporation, and the ordinance for its consummation had passed the council. But before Mayor Farley could approve this ordinance, as he intended to do, Johnson went into the courts and procured an injunction. This injunction remained in force until 11 o'clock on the morning of the 4th. Whether it

would have been longer lived, depended upon the action of the court at that time and was problematical. So Johnson solved the problem for himself. Though it has been usual for newly elected mayors to go into office a week or more after the election, there is no legal limitation of that kind. The new mayor becomes mayor by law as soon as he qualifies, a fact of which Johnson took advantage. Soon after ten o'clock on the morning of the 4th he demanded and received his certificate of election, took the oath of office, filed his official bond, and half an hour before the expiration of the injunction order had taken the place of Mr. Farley as mayor. It is needless to add that the lake front grab will not be consummated for at least two years to come.

It is not generally known that Johnson has tied up the Columbus street car monopoly by legal proceedings. He had offered, in conjunction with ex-Attorney General Monett, to take the system and operate it for 3-cent fares (see vol. iii., page 692), with a privilege to the city to buy at any time at a fair valuation; but the council by a small majority undertook to grant a long term franchise on the basis of 5-cent fares, with seven tickets for a quarter until gross receipts should reach \$1,750,000, and thereafter with eight tickets for a quarter. Johnson advised an appeal to the courts, and Thomas Ross, a resident of Columbus, brought suit accordingly. Now the Columbus street car monopoly offers to compromise on the basis of eight tickets for a quarter, but Mr. Johnson advises against acceptance. It is his idea that street car monopolies can be forced to reduce fares to three cents each, without the wholesale humbug; that in connection with this reduction arrangements for municipal ownership can be made which will culminate at an early day; and that the consequent rise in land values, giving to landlords the money value of these municipal benefits, will popularize Henry George's single tax reform, as