democracy a century or more—but they themselves would be irresistible. No government could cope with a suicides' club bent on regicide, so long as one member lived. But there is no such club. The assassination of King Humbert by an Italian peasant is as logical as his death of a plague would have been had he exposed himself to its ravages. He died of a social disease.

We are told that Humbert was loved by his subjects. How does anyone know that? When popular love has to find expression through censored newspapers, in a country where free speech if critical is suppressed, its genuineness may be fairly doubted. But that by the way. The question of affection is wholly aside from the case. Humbert expressed in his person a phase of deadly social disease. Though personally of simple tastes, he lived, nevertheless, in great luxury. His splendid palaces were numerous in Italy. He had a fabulous income. And all his magnificence was maintained from taxes drained out of the ceaseless toil of a peasantry who are seldom above the verge of starvation. The relation between this terrible poverty on the one hand and Humbert's magnificence on the other is not direct. He could not have changed the condition. He was not personally to blame. Few victims of disease of any kind are themselves to blame. It only happens that they are in the path of its movement. So with him. Though no more to blame than any other among the thousands of his kingdom, perhaps less to blame than many of his less conspicuous subjects, Humbert stood out as the great personification of that subtle power of plunder to which the starving peasantry were victims. Just as a dying child at the milkless breast of a famished peasant mother would typify one extreme of this Godless social life, so King Humbert in his magnificent luxury typified the other. And so surely as the thought of that disinherited babe might stir up peasant sympathy to the point of passion for vengeance, just so surely would reflections upon the luxury of the king suggest him as its object. It is disparities like these that generate the social disease of which King Humbert died. As swamps breed malaria, so do such conditions breed assassins. Newspaper hysterics over mythical anarchists' clubs are useless. Worse than useless is it to threaten dire vengeance. It is disease, not crime, with which governments have here to deal. And it can be stamped out only by removing its cause. The indictment for Humbert's death lies against unjust and unnecessary social conditions. It lies against the maladjustments of society which yield luxury to such as him, at the expense of disinheritance and debasing poverty to millions of his subjects.

It must be admitted that the trustees of Wellesley college were in close quarters when the question of accepting a money gift from John D. Rockefeller arose. They were in a sense in the position of Stephen A. Douglas as a candidate for president, of whom a campaign rhymester of the period wrote:

> Our poor little Doug will be sadly affected,
> Whate'er his political lot.
> He'll be S. A. D. if elected;
> He'll be S. A. D. if he's not.

Mr. Rockefeller had been approached for a gift. He replied in substance that he thought a college ought to demonstrate its ability to live within its income before he could assist it to get an income. This was an allusion to a debt, which the alumnae undertook to pay off, upon Mr. Rockefeller's promise to contribute, after the debt should have been paid, $100,000. The debt was paid off and Mr. Rockefeller made his promise good. Then it was that the trustees realized that they would be S. A. D. if they took his gift, and S. A. D. if they refused it. On one hand, to take the gift was to condone the wickedness of the Standard Oil company; on the other, to decline it, was to lose a grip upon the main chance. In this dilemma the trustees did what any well-informed trustees who preferred being S. A. D. with the money to being S. A. D. without it, would do. They called in as an expert on economic morality the distinguished Prof. Jeremiah Whipple Jenks, of Cornell, and made him umpire. Prof. Jenks decided that an individual and a college are different. An individual may be governed in accepting or rejecting gifts, by his personal tastes. But a college is a public institution, maintained for public ends. In a sense it holds its resources in trust for the public. Consequently, it may in honor and credit accept any money from any source. So Wellesley gets Mr. Rockefeller's $100,000.

We are of those who approve Prof. Jenks's decision. It is in our judgment true that a college may with honor and credit—at any rate without dishonor—accept money from any source. If Capt. Kidd had left a legacy to Wellesley, supposing he had foreseen the existence and the needs of that latest Rockefellerian beneficiary, there is no good reason why Wellesley should not accept it. So with the Rockefeller gift. But as there are abundant reasons why Wellesley, in acknowledgment of Kidd's philanthropy, should not turn its professor of moral philosophy into a special pleader for piracy upon the high seas, so there are abundant reasons why, in acknowledgment of Rockefeller's, it should not turn its professor of political economy into an apologist for piracy upon the dry land. In other words, the real question is not whether a college ought or ought not to receive gifts of Rockefeller money. It is whether it ought or ought not to become a grateful advocate of the Rockefeller system of getting money. The Wellesley chair of political economy is now a proper object of surveillance.

J. Pierpont Morgan's plutocratic "Journal of Civilization"—better known as Harper's Weekly—has amended the Declaration of Independence. Instead of repealing the clause about life, liberty and the pur-

Digitized by Google

suit of happiness, as most American plutocrats would like to do, it adds this qualifying phrase: "Under treaty rights." That is truly an ingenious adaptation. We may now read in the venerable charter of our liberties that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and "that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under treaty rights." Mr. Morgan's paper applies the new version to the situation in China. It better fits the situation in the Philippines. The Filipino subjects of Uncle Sam have no rights, according to the imperialists, except treaty rights under a treaty about which they were not consulted and in which no rights are reserved to them. "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under treaty rights" in the Philippines, appears to be a license to pursue, subjugate and kill "little brown men."

And hidden in this amendment to the Declaration of Independence is a menace not only to the "little brown men" of the old east, but to the big white men of our own country. Workingmen who treat the question of imperialism as unimportant may yet realize, possibly after it is too late, that imperialism is a many-headed beast, not half so dangerous to our Asiatic subjects as to ourselves. For a colonial system means a standing army of growing proportions which will not operate in the colonies alone.

In some places imperialist orators themselves openly advocate a large army for home purposes. Among them is Congressman Dolliver, of Iowa, a man high in the counsels of the imperialists, whose nomination at Philadelphia for vice president was prevented only by the superior adroitness of Quay and Platt. Congressman Dolliver threw off all disguise regarding militarism, when he spoke last month at the Chautauqua at Ottawa, Kan. After a fulsome laudation of Grover Cleveland for rushing the regular army into Chicago during the railroad strike of 1894, and an allusion to the St. Louis street car strike in progress as he spoke, Mr. Dolliver said:

> I believe in an army large enough to maintain order not only in Chicago, but also in St. Louis or any other of our great cities.

The ominous meaning of that is plain, notwithstanding Mr. Dolliver's astute interjection about "maintaining order." The worst standing armies in history were for the purpose of "maintaining order." That is what the Russians did in Warsaw—they "maintained order." The object of the great army Mr. Dolliver advocated at Ottawa is not to maintain order in any legitimate sense; it is to be used in the interest and under the direction of great corporations in times of strikes. His words are heralds of militarism. Such an utterance, made before a nonpartisan assemblage of several thousand people in the midst of a great agricultural community, demands the most serious consideration from city workingmen. If militarism is to be advocated upon the country farm, it should at least be discussed in the city workshop.

John T. McCutcheon, of the Chicago Record, whom we have more than once had occasion to mention as one of the best, if not the very best, correspondents in the Philippines, contributes a letter this week to the Record, in which he speaks of the remarkable terror of the Americans by which the Philippine people are possessed. Telling of a trip he made last March with a military detachment to Mindanao, he says that "the coming of the Americans was looked upon as the coming of a dreaded scourge," and compares the terror they feel with that inspired by the Huns and Vandals. Mr. McCutcheon thinks the explanation easy. "The leaders of the insurgents had told frightful stories about the cruelty and bloodthirstiness of the invaders." But that explanation is altogether too easy. Doubtless such stories were told, but such stories would have been ineffectual unless they had had a basis of truth. No terror of Americans could have been excited by stories of that kind in May, June and July, 1898, nor even in August and September, when the Americans appeared as deliverers, and a peaceable and orderly government under the Filipino flag looked to the United States for recognition of its independence. But after Mr. McKinley had proclaimed the destruction of that government in December, 1898; after he had sent a warship to wrest Iloilo from the inhabitants; after the war had begun in February, 1899, and American shot and shell, sweeping away whole villages, had slain Filipinos by the thousands; after an American army had laid the land waste and filled it with mourning and bitterness and hate—after these acts of invasive and destructive war, the people throughout the archipelago were naturally ready to welcome any story of brutality that could be invented against the Americans. At the bottom it is not these stories but the ruthless invasion that excites terror. The terror inspires the stories, and knowledge of the devastation confirms them. It would not be easy to parallel in history this instance of a loving and grateful people wantonly transformed into a terrified and embittered population.

Another imperialistic move has been made by the administration. This time it is the treasury department that acts. The general appraisers of merchandise at the port of New York decide that for all the purposes of the tariff law the territory of Hawaii is a foreign country. Accordingly they impose upon merchandise imported from Hawaii the same tariff duties that would be imposed upon similar merchandise coming from South America. This is the same in principle as if imports to Chicago from Arizona or New Mexico were subjected to the Dingley tariff. The Chicago Chronicle directs attention to the comedy feature of this latest manifestation of imperialism, when it says that—

> it appears that the appraisers have overruled the supreme court and de-

Digitized by Google