

majority prevail?" That is not the question at issue. The right of a majority to rule is the right of the people to manage their own affairs. About that there seems no room for difference of opinion. To hold that this right does not extend to matters outside of the province of government is not a limitation of popular rights any more than to hold as limitation of an individual's right to manage his own affairs, denial of his right to interfere with affairs of others. The best democrats of ante-bellum times refused to obey the fugitive slave law, correctly holding that the right of a black man to his liberty was beyond the just power of government to dispose of. The best democrats of today would undoubtedly defy the same law under similar circumstances. There have been and are laws and local ordinances interfering with freedom of speech or of the press. None know better than advocates of democracy that there is no inconsistency in resisting such legislation.

It may be asked "who shall determine what rights are inalienable and what are proper governmental functions?" Of course there may be difference of opinion as to whether certain rights are inalienable and whether or not certain governmental acts are within its proper powers. There is no human power to determine regarding these, and there should be none. But while there may be room for doubt about some rights and some functions, there are some rights about which there need be no doubt. If the right to life, for instance, is not inalienable, then there can be no inalienable rights at all, and even the right of the majority to rule must be without foundation. The right of a majority to rule rests on the possession by individuals of certain rights, of which the right to life must be the first one.

The Republican asserts that the doctrine of the right of all men to live "has never been accepted anywhere." Even if true, that is no reason why it should not, if properly proven, be accepted now. But it certainly was accepted on one historic occasion, at least. The acceptance by the American Colonies of the Declaration of Independence was surely an acceptance of that doctrine. Upon that doctrine, it was declared, is based the right of governments to exist "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The argument that justified separation from the mother country would have failed to stand the test of reason, had it not been clear that all men have cer-

tain inalienable rights, including the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. S. D.

Municipal Attractions.

If the poor, who play the part of the shuttlecock in the great game of battledore and shuttlecock, ever get far enough away from their environment to look upon their situation from the outside, they must wonder at the motives of those who wield the battledore. Upon the one hand they hear the advice, get out into the country, get away from the city, go back to the land; and upon the other they see efforts made to entertain, instruct and amuse the poor of the city. Not content with parks, museums, zoological gardens, swimming beaches, and the various municipal means of recreation already in use, there have been instituted municipal dances; and it is proposed to add to these, municipal movies. Where will it all end? If we continue adding to the attractions of city life how are we to get anybody to leave the city to go on land? Or how, indeed, are we to keep those already on land from flocking to the city?

If the State really must interest itself in the private affairs of the citizen, and if there is too strong a tendency for people to leave the farm for the city, as so many near-sociologists claim, might it not be better for the State to devote more attention to making country life attractive? It was long ago remarked by investigators that the poverty of spirit, and the lack of social culture, in the average country village was greater than that in city slums; and that there was more call for social settlement work in the rural districts than in the metropolitan. City poverty is spectacular because concentrated; a like number of people thinly settled will show greater need. The very fact of the drift toward the city indicates where the greater attractions lie. S. C.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN NORTH DAKOTA.

Atlantic, Ia., Dec. 11, 1914.

The amendment adopted last month in North Dakota which provides for the Initiative for statutes and for the Referendum, is all that could be hoped for. But for constitutional amendments a 25 per cent petition is required. This was placed there by the prohibition element for the purpose of making it unworkable.

The Constitution of the State forbids the sale of