

this week in Chicago should take to heart. Under the leadership of Roosevelt and Perkins the party urged that evils be forcibly prohibited and regulated, in preference to abolishing them through removal of underlying causes. It disregarded the appeals of such leaders as Amos Pinchot and George L. Record, who urged it to take a more fundamental stand. The result shows its choice to have been as politically inexpedient as it was economically unwise. Possibly no better immediate results would have been obtained had the party advocated a wiser policy. But there would have been more honor in the defeat.



The progressive Republicans of Wisconsin seem to have need of learning the same lesson as the Progressive party. During their period of power they dealt with evils in a superficial manner, attempting to attack them in every way but the fundamental one. On this account results were not proportionate to effort, and conditions were left so as to enable a return of reactionaries to power. This will not be a misfortune, however, should it teach the progressives their great mistake and lead them into advocacy of more fundamental measures in the future.

S. D.



Governor Hunt's Opportunity.

Governor George W. P. Hunt of Arizona is an earnest advocate of the sound doctrine of majority rule. But apparently he makes the mistake of failing to note that the right of the majority to rule extends only to those matters which belong within the province of government. Individuals have certain inalienable rights upon which no popular majority can justly infringe. Among these rights is the right to life. If Governor Hunt will carefully read the Declaration of Independence he will learn that governments exist to protect these rights, not to destroy them. He will see that a governmental order to commit an act which it was organized to prevent does not belong in the same category as an order along the line of proper governmental functions. So when, as happened at the recent election, the voters of Arizona rejected a measure to abolish capital punishment, Governor Hunt should not feel bound for that reason to allow a wholesale execution of condemned persons to take place. The right of these condemned ones to life is not a matter for any ruler to pass upon. It is beyond his just powers, at least as long as public safety may be as effectively guarded by other methods than the putting of individuals to death.

But Governor Hunt is reported to have declared his intention to allow the executions to proceed, although he feels them to be outrageous. His reason is that "the people want it done and should have what they want," whether it justly belongs to them or not. This is not upholding popular government. Quite the contrary. Governor Hunt is letting a chance go by to refute one of the objections to popular government, based on a misconception of proper governmental powers. He should declare that a popular majority has no better right than an absolute despot to infringe on the natural rights of individuals. Such a stand would not only be right, but could be taken, in Arizona at least, without doing violence to unlimited popular government. For Arizona has the Recall, and Governor Hunt could challenge those who would condemn him to put his action to the test of popular approval through this measure. It is scarcely conceivable that Arizona voters, having been made to realize what they voted for on November 3, will not welcome a chance to practically undo their mistake. Governor Hunt has an opportunity such as comes rarely to any individual.

S. D.



Mischievous Philanthropy.

There has been a disposition on the part of some people to condone the accumulation of great wealth by means not strictly ethical because of the benevolent use to which it is put. But philanthropy cannot quite compensate for the lack of justice. It sounds well to name the foundations and bequests that are devoted to various services of society, to helping the weaker brethren, to pensioning aged teachers, to prosecuting scientific research, and to the carrying out of the various functions that have not as yet been taken up by government; yet the very doing of these things by means of philanthropy may defeat the end intended. The Rockefeller foundation and educational fund, for instance, is employing a large number of men to act in conjunction with the United States Agricultural Department. At first thought this might seem to be very desirable, and might be taken as evidence of regard for the rights and needs of the people at large; yet the report is now gaining currency that the thousand or more men who are engaged in this work at the expense of Mr. Rockefeller are not as disinterested as they seem to be. The suspicion is abroad in certain parts of the country that these men are acting in the interests of the oil monopoly, and are by their presence in the Agricultural Depart-

ment bringing the whole work of the Department into question.



It may be recalled that there has been some friction between the government and the farmers over the use of small stills for the distillation of alcohol from the refuse of the farm. The claim is made that instruments are already in existence that will enable the farmer to make a considerable amount of alcohol from vegetable matter on the farm that can be used for no other purpose. But the government claims that the difficulty of controlling the collection of excise duties from these stills is so great that they are not allowed to be used. Just what the real facts of the case are it is difficult at the present time to tell. The Government may be right, and it may be advisable to wait until further improvements have been made. At the same time the claim is made that these stills will make alcohol so cheap that it will seriously cut into the profits of the Standard Oil Company, which means an interference with the income of Mr. Rockefeller; and the deduction is made by certain people that the use of the still is prohibited by the Government at the instance of the Rockefeller employes for the purpose of preserving his income intact.



It may be that there is nothing whatever in this contention; it is not unlikely that the position taken by the Government has been dictated by the wisest consideration of all the factors. And yet from the very circumstances surrounding the relations of a public department with the beneficiaries of a private trust a suspicion has been aroused in the minds of many people, and the whole work of the Department is discredited. This is the more to be regretted for the reason that it is doubtful if any other department of the Government has such opportunities for serving the people. Farming is still our largest single industry, and it is still most lacking, taken as a whole, in up-to-dateness. The Government is doing a great work in helping the farmer, and if the best results are to be obtained there should be the closest harmony and co-operation between the men on the farm and the agents of the Department. If men who owe allegiance to an outside agent are to be taken into the Government service, and questions arise in which there is a conflict of interests between the farmers and that outside agent, it is the most natural thing in the world for suspicions to arise that will handicap the whole work. The United States Government

is not bankrupt; it is able to pay for all the service required by the people. If any private interest wishes to conduct scientific researches, it should do so upon its individual responsibility, and not in the name of the people. We know what havoc has been wrought by a partnership between the Government and private business. Let us not repeat the mistake by setting up a partnership of government and private charity. S. C.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SITUATION IN OREGON.

Portland, Oregon, Nov. 23.

The people of Oregon had before them at the last election 29 measures, of which 11 were submitted by the legislature and 18 through the initiative. Of these, but four passed. Two of the legislature-submitted and two of the initiative measures.

The reasons and the lessons are of interest. The tax measures submitted by the legislature, practically the same as submitted twice before, went down almost two to one. The tax measure submitted by progressive groups (sur-tax and \$1,500 exemption) went down about 2½ to one. The tax measure submitted by the reactionary group went down three to one.



The measures carried were, (1) providing that voters in Oregon must be U. S. citizens, and not merely foreigners having taken out first papers. There has been a good deal of opposition to the old provisions for many years, and at last the legislature submitted the matter. It carried by a vote of 162,159 to 39,675; (2) allowing cities to consolidate, 98,865 to 78,844; (3) prohibition, 137,557 to 99,390; (4) abolishing death penalty, 100,449 to 100,215.

Every measure providing for abolishment of offices was defeated. Every measure creating any office was defeated. Those creating offices receiving the heaviest negative vote. The proposition to create the office of lieutenant-governor went down by 50,005 to 136,540. To create a second state tax commission (one already existing), 34,203 to 136,112. The proportional representation measure was defeated by 59,769 to 133,148, and abolition of state senate by 63,328 to 122,831. The reactionary measure that would practically have restored the old convention system and hamstrung the direct primary was defeated by 25,696 to 152,542.

There were many reasons for the defeat of the progressive measures. First and foremost there was a general idea that the main thing to do was to put them on the ballot. Very little campaigning for any of them was made either before or after filing last July. There was a strong cry from the stand-pat and plutocratic press that there were too many measures on the ballot. The phrase "Vote NO when in doubt," was taken up by the privilege press and echoed by even the somewhat progressive papers until it drove the knife into everything. All that was necessary was to create doubts concerning a progressive measure, circulate some deftly woven