

The Commoner.

generation, from century to century, although the application of the principles varies from time to time as new questions arise.

To-day, Lincoln's memory is glorified, and yet it is significant that the party that claims him as its own, is now antagonizing every vital principle taught by the martyred president.

That government "should express the highest spirit of justice and liberty," was Mr. Lincoln's idea; government for the advantage of the few at the expense of the many, is the republican notion of today.

Lincoln believed that the Declaration of Independence was written for all men and for all time, and provided the only safe rule for human government. To-day the republican politician has nothing but sneers when the Declaration of Independence is invoked as a safe guide for the solution of present day problems.

Lincoln believed that a people should never "entrust to hands other than their own, the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions." The republican notion of to-day is, that one set of men has the right to give to another set of men only that degree of self-government which in the estimation of the former, the latter is capable of enjoying.

Lincoln had faith that right makes might. The republican notion of to-day is, that might makes right.

What a vast difference between the preaching of Lincoln and the practice of the party that claims Lincoln as its patron saint.

At this time, when the republican party is engaged in policies involving the doctrine that this nation may trample with impunity upon the rights of men, and that our reliance is in becoming a world power it is interesting to recall Lincoln's reference to "the sure logic of history." It was in 1858 that Mr. Lincoln said:

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you are preparing your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of those around you, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you. And, let me tell you, all these things are prepared for you, with the sure logic of history.

There is not a lesson taught by Lincoln, there is not a principle defended by Lincoln, there is not a rule of government proclaimed by Lincoln to be the truth that the republican party is not now arrayed against.

Every policy of the administration violates in practice the lessons which Lincoln taught; and as the wealth of trusts and syndicates increases, as the power of mercenary politicians becomes greater pretense is more and more being cast aside. Some of the foremost leaders of the republican party do not now hesitate to drop the mask entirely and boldly antagonize the truths that Lincoln proclaimed.

A Striking Coincidence.

The Congressional Directory shows that Bertram T. Clayton was elected to the fifty-sixth Congress as a democrat from the Fourth New York District.

The Congressional Record shows that Bertram T. Clayton was one of the four democrats

in the House who voted for the Hull Army Bill. It is strange enough that a man elected to Congress as a democrat should give his support to a bill so undemocratic and so directly opposed to the platform unanimously adopted at Kansas City, but the strangest part of the statement is yet to be made.

The Washington Star reports that a number of Congressmen from New York, mostly republicans, recently called upon the President and urged the appointment of Congressman Bertram T. Clayton to a position in the army with the rank of major. The paper also reports the President as speaking very highly of Mr. Bertram T. Clayton. Now this striking coincidence—his vote on the army bill and his application for a position in the army—suggests several inquiries. Did he vote for the army bill because he intended to apply for an appointment, or did he apply for the appointment because he voted for the army bill, or were the two acts entirely disconnected? Did the republican members recommend him because of his personal qualities or because of political peculiarities? Did the President speak highly of him because he calls himself a democrat or because he voted like a republican?

Gambling.

The Philadelphia papers are discussing with astonishment and indignation the gambling which has recently been discovered among the school children. The evidence shows that a large majority of the children of some of the schools habitually buy chances at what is known as "policy," the amount invested sometimes being as low as two cents. A teacher of one of the schools has been largely instrumental in securing an investigation and the North American charges some of the police officers with protecting the gambling places and ignoring the complaints made. About the same time word comes from Chicago that President Harper, of the Chicago University, made a raid upon some students who were engaged in gaming.

While gambling is probably less common here than in other countries, it is still entirely too common. It is not long since a great lottery establishment required suppression, and even now a great many lottery tickets are sold in the United States, while slot machines, cigar-counter wheels and similar devices give constant testimony to the fact that the mania for games of chance has not been entirely cured. It is difficult to conceive of anything more demoralizing than the gambling habit when it once becomes fixed. In condemning it one need not consider so much those who are driven to despair by losses as those who are encouraged by occasional success. Cases are not infrequent where gambling has led to the use of trust money and to the sacrifice of a life's accumulation, but more pernicious still, if possible, is the adoption of the doctrine that one should try to get something for nothing.

The only sound economic theory upon which society can be built is that each person shall make to society a contribution equal in value to the benefits which he receives; that is the basis of the compact between the individual and society. The same principle applies in all exchange; each party to an honest transaction furnishes an equivalent for that which he receives. People will

not willingly make exchanges unless they think they are receiving equal value, and if one party deceives the other he is guilty of fraud.

Gambling destroys this economic principle and substitutes a system wherein to secure the possibility of large gain one accepts the probability of a small loss. It is difficult, however, to make much headway against small gambling by children while it is considered respectable for grown people to gamble on a large scale.

The same paper which describes the investigation of policy dealing in Philadelphia reported a "cotton corner" in New York. So long as society bows before the successful market speculator, who wins his game with loaded dice, it is going to be hard to impress college students with the immorality of poker or to teach kindergarten school children the wickedness of a two-cent investment in a policy slip.

John Marshall Day.

There seems to have been a disposition on the part of republican orators to make "John Marshall Day" the occasion for doing reverence to his memory as if the republican party could claim a monopoly on him. It was noticeable all over the country that these partisan speakers, after praising Marshall and seeking to make it appear that his history would justify republican policies of to-day, made it a point to assail the memory of Thomas Jefferson.

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, in a speech delivered at Chicago, referred contemptuously to Jefferson and pointed out that Marshall "despised and distrusted" the author of the Declaration of Independence. Senator Lodge sought to extol the virtues of the great chief justice at the expense of the great statesman. There is enough that is creditable in Marshall's history to sustain the good reputation which an orator usually seeks to bestow upon the subject of his oration. So far as these two great Americans are concerned, for the purpose of placing a proper estimate upon their worth, it is not important what the one said or thought of the other.

If comparison between these two men were essential, it would be sufficient for present purposes to say that the lawyers and the students are familiar with John Marshall, while every one is familiar with Thomas Jefferson; that Marshall is admired, while Jefferson is loved. In view of the fact that these republican orators have laid exclusive claim on John Marshall's memory it is significant that they were silent on the one controlling principle that characterized Marshall, the jurist.

A writer who was familiar with the record of the chief justice said:

John Marshall immortalized himself and conferred an incalculable benefit on humanity by making it clear for the first time that the law is higher than the government, and that any mere enactment of government repugnant to fundamental law is void. The principal is not new. For without its operation all power is arbitrary; but in England the struggle has been so long between the arbitrary power of the king on the one hand and the parliament on the other that the supremacy of fundamental law was generally lost sight of except by a few great men—the Chathams and Burkes; who revered law, not merely as the sovereign will of all the people, but as the moral purpose through which the world was created and the omnipotent method by which all good