

letter, pretending his men were hungry, made capital out of the holy rite of hospitality, then flung Aguinaldo to the ground and made him a captive. They violated the laws of war, the laws of hospitality, and the laws of God; and the people of the United States, instead of mutinying against this act of damnable lying and perfidy, thought it a shrewd trick on Funston's part and the Senate promoted him." Those are plain words and true ones. But why credit the Senate with promoting the spy? The Senate only confirmed him.

If Tom L. Johnson is a "boss," as the Hanna party of Cleveland call him, he is the kind of "boss" that American municipal politics have long needed. Without secret wire pulling or promises, but open-and-above-board, within sight and hearing of the whole people, he has "bossed" his party into nominating a Republican for high office because in a lower office that Republican has been loyal to the public interests in spite of the opposing pressure of Mr. Hanna's street car ring. Another of Mr. Johnson's acts of "bossism," if that is the proper name for it, is as unique and encouraging. He has "bossed" all the Democratic candidates for seats in the city council of Cleveland, into signing a written promise—not a platitudinous promise, but as specific as words can make it. Following are its terms:

We, the Democratic candidates for the city council, appreciate the widespread public interest in questions which are being discussed in this campaign, and believe that the people have a right to know our views upon these questions. To that end we indorse and commend to the voters of this city the following statement: We will vote for any measure necessary to secure three-cent cash street railroad fare with universal transfers and possible municipal ownership, and we will oppose and vote against any measure for the renewal or extension of existing franchises or the granting of any new franchises without all of these provisions. We will vote for and support all measures the purpose of which is to bring about a just and equal system of taxation as advocated in the platform of the Democratic party of Cuyahoga county. We will vote for and support any meas-

ure providing for a municipal lighting plant for our city. In addition to this expression of our views upon specific questions we pledge ourselves to the people to carry forward the improvement of the city in every way consistent with a due regard for economy and to exercise such supervision of the expenditure of public money as will secure for the people a fair return for every dollar invested.

This new style of political "boss" is something to wonder at as well as to applaud.

Compare it with "Boss" Hanna's style. "Boss" Hanna nominates a lawyer for mayor whose first obligation is to Hanna's street car interests. "Boss" Hanna nominates for vice-mayor a labor leader who was instrumental in getting a committee of his labor organization to report against three-cent fares and in favor of Mr. Hanna's own scheme for adjusting his street car interests—a committee which got curiously mixed up, by the way, with at least two suspicious payments of considerable sums of money. "Boss" Hanna pledges all his candidates to give him his own terms for street car franchises. No wonder "Boss" Hanna's candidate for mayor declines the challenge of Johnson to debate the issues of the campaign, even though Johnson offered to give his adversary all the admission tickets to the debates.

The question of three-cent fares, with municipal ownership as soon as legally possible, is the leading issue in Cleveland; and notwithstanding all the efforts of the Hanna party to shift and confuse it, it is the only issue. One of these attempts at befogging the campaign, a goody-goody movement to attack Johnson for permitting vice and crime to flourish, came to a sudden end when the public attention was called to the fact (p. 537) that "Boss" Hanna's Supreme Court had interfered with Mayor Johnson's attempt to get rid of the incapable superintendent of police, and that Mr. Johnson has had no responsibility in the matter since, the responsibility for such vice and crime as does flourish resting

upon this Republican police superintendent. With the way thus clear for the street car issues, with the the Democratic candidates pledged for 3-cent fares and equal taxation, and with the Republicans pledged the other way, Mr. Hanna's only chance is to convince the people that 3-cent fares are too low to allow a reasonable profit. This is the meaning of his interesting flirtation with labor leaders of easy politics.

It must require a superfluity of hard cheek to assert at this late day that three cents is too low a fare for profitable street car operation. The experience of Glasgow disproves it. So does that of Liverpool. It is disproved by the experience of Toronto. Mayor Johnson has disproved it by actual trial. Even here in Chicago there is a street railway which has proved that even 2½-cent fares yield a profitable return.

We refer to one of the branches of the Calumet Electric street railway system, the branch running from Sixty-third street to Ninety-third, or South Chicago, a distance of nearly four miles. This road has been in the hands of a receiver for several years. The branch in question continues southward from South Chicago to a place called Robey, about four miles farther. Somewhat more than two years ago the destruction of a bridge at Ninety-fifth street cut the branch in two, and the Chicago City Railway Co., a competing line at this point, was requested to allow the Calumet to use its line for the purpose of connecting the severed branch during the rebuilding of the bridge. The request being refused, the receiver of the Calumet road reduced the fare over the northerly section of the severed branch to 2½ cents. Passengers were charged 5 cents, but for this they received a check entitling them to another ride—not a return trip, but a ride either way at any reasonable time. The part of the branch adopting this change was, as already stated, nearly

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