

Pacific Coast "hysterical"—is fully met by the article to which the charge applies. We did not call the Coast hysterical in this matter; we called it an "interested locality," and that is what it certainly is. But the most remarkable part of this remarkable rejoinder of our valued contemporary is its indictment of Chinese immigrants for not assimilating and passing "into the body of our national life." Inasmuch as by our own laws the Chinese are denied all the rights of American citizenship, it hardly lies in our mouth to complain of them for not passing "into the body of our national life." This would be much like the complaints of the Egyptian taskmasters who expected the Jews to make bricks without straw. The Star only confirms our previous impressions that some of the best arguments against Chinese exclusion are made by the "witnesses on the spot," who testify in its favor. Nevertheless we like the San Francisco Star. We like it because it is a courageous Democrat of the democratic variety, even if slightly limited in that respect. We like it, among other things, for the same reason that we like Senator Tillman, of South Carolina. A better democratic-Democrat than Senator Tillman one could hardly wish to meet, until he runs up against the "nigger question." So with the Star. A better democratic paper would be hard to find until it runs up against the Chinese question. These "local questions," as a distinguished and extinguished Democratic candidate for the presidency once described another question of the same general character, are great disturbers of democratic principle.

The advance sheets of the fifteenth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission make interesting reading. One important fact appears quite clearly. It is that the existence of certain kinds of trusts not generally supposed to have any legislative monopoly, is traced to secret contracts with railroads, which do have legislative monopolies. We quote:

The recent investigation of packing-house products showed that rates below published tariff charges had been applied both east and west of Chicago. . . . While the general public probably receives some profit from these lower rates, in the main these sums swell the profits of the packers. These great concerns number only about five or six, and little distinction in the rates appears to have been made between them. The effect is to give them an enormous advantage over smaller competitors located at other points. Already these competitors have mostly ceased to exist. These disclosures afford a pregnant illustration of the manner in which secret rate concessions are tending to build up great trusts and monopolies at the expense of the small independent operator.

This is another illustration of the demonstrable truth that trusts are neither possible under nor an evolution from free competition; but that they depend for existence upon some private monopoly. In this instance the supporting monopoly is private ownership of a public highway.

Daniel D. Healy, warden of the Cook county (Ill.) hospital, deserves special commendation for a thankless interference with medical students in behalf of the impoverished patients at this public hospital. Students had offered indignities to women patients at clinics, and upon learning the fact the warden forbade public surgical operations in cases requiring exposure. He properly declared that the hospital is for the patients, not for the students. A moment's reflection will justify Warden Healy's act. Granted that it is for the general good to have medical students present at surgical operations. What then? Shall county hospital patients be forced to submit to operations in public? Why such patients only? Why not require all persons, of whatever degree of wealth or social standing, who must be operated upon, to submit to the ordeal before medical students? From even the thought of such a law one recoils instinctively. Then why make a law of that kind for patients in the county hospital? Because they are poor.

There is no other answer. It all comes down to this in the end—that the poor who require surgical treatment must submit to an exposure which well-to-do patients escape. This very distinction tends to diminish to medical students the opportunities which of course they ought to have. When public operations are regarded as not only disagreeable in themselves, but also as one of the degrading badges of poverty, no one is disposed to volunteer for the benefit of surgical science. But if they were altogether voluntary, a general disposition, arising from a sense of duty, something in the nature of public spirit, would furnish all the opportunities to students that could be desired. Voluntarily, for the good of their kind, real or supposed, both men and women will submit to much which they seek to evade when it is compulsory. If all clinics were of this voluntary character, students would indulge in no indignities, for they would be invited guests on their good behavior; and poverty would be relieved of at least one of its degrading incidents. Warden Healy has taken a step which will, it is to be hoped, be persisted in by him and followed by his successors and others in like authority.

Advance sheets of consular reports on taxation in New South Wales and New Zealand have been issued by the state department. The most notable feature of the report from New South Wales is a ridiculous argument by the consul, intended to show that the land value tax in vogue there is an indirect tax on improvements, because "in taxing the increased value of the land, the improvements producing the increment are taxed indirectly." As any cross-roads politician could make that absurd argument without prompting, and any intelligent boy could refute it, it was hardly necessary to devote to it the "general observations" of a consular report. The astute consul who is primarily responsible for this report is Orlando H. Baker. He is well supported by Consul

Frank Dillingham, who, in reporting upon taxation in New Zealand, omits all reference to the experiment of local option in local taxation, which has been in operation there for several years, and under the authority of which some 60 municipalities have resorted to the novelty of a single tax on land values for local revenues. Consular reports which don't report are doubtless better than those which report falsely; but when a matter so novel and important is overlooked in such a report, one may be excused for doubting the information which the report seems to supply.

Pursuant to the governor's call (p. 659), the legislature of Colorado met in special session on the 27th. All but one of the objects of the session are only of local and ephemeral interest, and that exception is not specifically distinguished in the call. We refer to the efforts of the speculative real estate interests to cause the repeal of the Bucklin constitutional amendment before the people get a chance to vote upon it. This amendment, if adopted by the people, would empower the voters of any county to stimulate business there, by exempting from taxation for local purposes all investments in productive enterprises and getting local revenues from land value taxes alone. The possibility of an attempt at the special session to gag the popular voice by repealing this measure before the popular vote, set for next fall, has aroused a discussion all over the state which would hardly have arisen had the real estate speculators pursued their original policy of silence; and the probabilities now are not only that the legislature will not vote to repeal the measure, but that it will take no action upon it at all. Still, the repealers are backed by the Denver Real Estate Exchange and some of the strongest financial forces of the state, and no stone will be left unturned—nor bank account either—that may be supposed to have influence with the members of the legislature. A popular vote is to be prevented if possible.

PHASES OF THE IMPERIALISTIC ARGUMENT.

We have invented new doctrines to justify the policy of spoliation. A new and wonderful theory of obligations has suddenly been thrust upon us. It is the man in the street whom this theory is intended to influence. We smashed the fleet of Imperial Spain in the Harbor of Manila, and we became at once endowed—so we are informed—with certain responsibilities to the people of the Philippine Islands. The theory is analogous to this: A child deprived of its natural protector becomes the ward of the state, to whom certain duties and responsibilities are at once owing. Spain was the "natural protector" of the Filipinos; we must protect them in the absence of their cruel step-mother. This we will do if in the meantime we do not exterminate them. But these obligations are all armed with mausers and maxim guns; and they are really ingenious inventions after all. But even under this milder theory of obligations what becomes of the old American faith in the right of peoples to govern themselves; that faith has no place for wardships.

How did the smashing of the Spanish fleet alter our foreign obligations? What do we owe to the Filipinos that we do not owe to the Armenians, for example? The latter, of course, already have a protector, and Turkey is discharging her obligations in a way that is regarded as highly creditable—in those remoter regions where Belzebub records the acts of his earthly agents. But as for our moral obligations, they are the same in Armenia as in the Philippines. The first, however, involves some risk and may therefore be dismissed. But our obligations to the people of the Philippines could have been closed by serving a writ of ejectment on Spain—without the hilariously comical payment of \$20,000,000.

The obligations that we are now assuming are those which some other power must have previously laid down. That power is Spain. To this conclusion we are brought by the acceptance of this theory of obligations. How do you like it? Not that we are not good imitators. Our taxes on the long suffering Filipinos are higher

than Spain's, and we are twice as successful in ridding the islands of their inhabitants; give us time, too, and the "Anglo-Saxon" will demonstrate his superiority as a public plunderer; we have had some experience in the "carpet bag" era of reconstruction. He does nothing on a small scale, this "Anglo-Saxon," and his thefts will be proportionate to his opportunities and his world-girdling arms. When he is through with the Filipinos they will think kindly of Spain.

Organized Protestantism has altered its ethics to suit the changing conditions of time and place. Much of the piety in these days is as brutal and bloodthirsty as Pagan ruffianism. Nothing can exceed the war spirit of many of the clergy—surely not that of the army, which is far less in love with carnage, and infinitely less sordid. Of course there is a prejudice against the introduction of politics in the pulpit, and when murder is suddenly elevated to the dignity of a political principle, the fifth commandment is abrogated by almost unanimous clerical consent. That all questions are at bottom moral questions a few broad minded clerics will admit, but most of them agree that there is no morality save the immorality that is fashionable. If the early Christians had been of this sort, Christ would never have perished on the cross, Paul would never have been summoned before Agrippa, and Peter would have denied his Master to the end. The Christianity of Mars Hill would have seemed as innocuous to the Greeks and Romans of that day as it is to the Romans of this, and it would have occasioned the same boisterous laughter along the docks and quays of Rome, where it first found its lodgment, as most clerical utterances do among the longshoremen of today. It would have been referred to, not as "a dangerous doctrine,"—as Pliny termed it,—but as one very useful to the Roman Senate in its decay; useful to the oppressors of labor, and to the ambitious designs of Tiberius Caesar; and finally Christ and Paul and Peter would have been sent as commissioners into Gaul to advise the foolish barbarians to consent to the benevolent purposes of Roman Assimilation.