

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-