

the same form as it was in the time of Lincoln, but the same principle is involved. On one side is the common right of humanity, and on the other is the divine right of kings, which does not necessarily mean a monarchy as the people of the Old World understood it, but in our own country is better understood by the claim set forth by Coal Baron Baer that God has designated certain men as his trustees and ordained them to control the wealth and property of the country, and that because of this divinity these men are booted and spurred to ride over the rest of mankind.

Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national constitution and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.—Abraham Lincoln.

**Watch the Primaries.**

The battle between the plutocratic and the democratic elements in the democratic party must be fought out at the primaries. It will not do to leave the matter to the national convention. The delegates to the various conventions—county, state, and national—should be instructed to reaffirm the Kansas City platform. If any one objects to reaffirmation let him be challenged to present a platform embodying his views. Honesty will appeal to honest men and in any crowd the honest men generally outnumber the dishonest ones. Watch the dodger. He is a good man to leave at home when delegates are being selected. If the democratic party is to win the confidence of those who desire reform it must do so by a straightforward course dealing candidly with all the issues before the country. Organize, go to the primaries and instruct. Wall street will control the republican party let the democratic party accept the challenge and make the issue plain. A failure to reaffirm will be equivalent to a return to corporation rule, for those who are willing to abandon any part of the party creed in order to conciliate those who opposed the party will not be courageous enough to make a stand for anything. Sound a man opposed to reaffirmation and you will find that, as a rule, he has no definite position that he is prepared to announce and defend.

Finally I insist that if there is anything that is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions.—Abraham Lincoln.

**Foreshadows Republican Policies.**

The republican leaders have made their answer to the demand that the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law be enforced. The answer does not come in the form of an explanation as to why in its pretended assault upon the trust system the Roosevelt administration has failed to enforce the criminal clause. The republican leaders answer this righteous demand with what is known as the Foraker bill. The Foraker bill does not provide new methods for curbing the greed of the trust magnates, but it actually repeals the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law, and makes other important features of that law inoperative. The Foraker bill is brief, but it is very important. The bill follows:

"To relieve foreign commerce and acts and contracts in reasonable restraint of trade and commerce among the several states from the provisions of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, and the act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, approved July 2, 1890.

"That nothing in the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, or in the act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, approved July 2, 1890, or in any act amendatory of either of said acts, shall hereafter apply to foreign commerce or shall prohibit any act or any contract in restraint of trade or commerce among

the several states, provided that such restraint be reasonable, or shall hereafter authorize imprisonment or forfeiture of property as punishment for any violation of such acts, except for perjury or contempt of court."

Senator Foraker claims that this bill is in line with the suggestions made by Attorney General Knox in his Pittsburg speech. The attorney general does not agree with this claim; and yet while he points out certain defects in the measure, it is noticeable he does not vigorously antagonize it.

The bill has been so generally condemned that it is not likely it will pass at the present session of congress. It cannot be doubted, however, that the Foraker bill has been given by the republican leaders, and accepted by the trust magnates, as an early day promise of what the republican party will do for Wall street in the event that party is given a vote of confidence next November.

The measure will be condemned by many republican papers, and yet it will not be condemned so vigorously but that the same papers may wheel into line when the proper time comes in order to give the measure their cordial approval.

It is significant, also, that the Foraker bill was introduced just at the time when it developed that all semblance of opposition to Mr. Roosevelt in Wall street had been abandoned.

The Foraker bill is one of the most iniquitous measures ever introduced in congress. It is a republican measure and faithfully foreshadows the republican policy.

It is in order that each one of you may have through this free government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance for your industry, enterprise and intelligence that you all may have equal privileges in the race of life, with all its desirable human aspirations, it is for this the struggle should be maintained that we may not lose our birthrights.—Abraham Lincoln.

**"Bartering of Liberty."**

Reference in The Commoner to the article appearing in Frank Leslie's Monthly which article was entitled "The National Lobby at Washington," prompts a reader to direct attention to an interesting article in somewhat the same vein as the article appearing in Leslie's. This particular article appeared as an editorial in an earlier issue of McClure's magazine, and is enclosed to The Commoner together with the comments thereon made by the Wall Street Journal.

The McClure magazine article was entitled "Patriotism," and dealt with questions naturally arising in connection with Miss Tarbell's "History of the Standard Oil Company," and with articles on municipal corruption contributed by Mr. Steffens. In the McClure article it was said:

"We chose the Standard Oil because it is the standard great business concern, and we are laying before the whole country the local disgrace of particular cities because each is the tale of a thousand cities. In these two series is the one great story of a common condition—corruption. . . . We shall proceed with the story of the Standard Oil and of the cities . . . and if we can finally persuade our readers to recognize as traitors some of the great men among us who have succeeded by means of boodling and are exalted because of success we shall have achieved our purpose. At any rate, we shall try it. We propose when we have got well acquainted with them and their methods and excuses to turn from the poor, miserable, petty traitors who sell out their country to the 'respectable' leading men who buy it—from the bribed to the bribers. A briber is a traitor. He may be a captain of industry, he may be a United States senator, he may be a philanthropist. If he has won his fortune by bribery, the art of his success is the undermining of the institutions of his country. He is not an 'example to youth'; he is a corrupter of youth, a corrupter of everything he touches, and everybody he inspires. He is an enemy of the republic. The only force that can stop him is 'Patriotism.'"

Referring to the McClure article, the Wall Street Journal said:

"It is difficult to read these words without a thrill. They may perhaps leave cold the heart of a corporation lawyer who finds in

them merely the expression of envy of some one else's money—Mr. John D. Rockefeller's, for example—but we are much mistaken if they will not strike a responsive chord in the hearts of a majority of those who read them. For they at once enshrine a truth, a terrible truth, an intolerable truth, and breathe the spirit of determination that it shall not ever continue a truth."

Then, having presented other thoughts along this line, the Wall Street Journal continues as follows:

"The spirit of 'commercialism,' of which so much is nowadays heard from ministers, politicians and graduating orators, means nothing at all if it does not mean the setting of money above morals—the bartering of liberty for material prosperity. The lawyer who bribes a legislature for his corporation, the man who steals or 'boodles' a street railway franchise, the man who buys a tariff schedule from a handful of United States senators—all these are traitors to their country, as McClure's Magazine points out, 'just as much as the man who delivers a fort into the enemy's hands. The trouble is that they are not so regarded by everybody. If this is to continue a free country there must be a sound public opinion on this thing.'"

Democrats have frequently been sneered at because they have sometimes employed the term, "placing the dollar above the man." Mr. Lincoln used that expression and Mr. Lincoln was subjected to the jeers of those who were most interested in elevating the dollar. But here we have the Wall Street Journal, a publication that has on several occasions read severe lectures to the financiers of the "street," employing the term "setting money above morals," and interpreting the term as meaning the "bartering of liberty for material prosperity."

For saying the things which the editor of McClure's has said, for saying the things which the editor of the Wall Street Journal has said, democrats have been vigorously denounced by republican orators and republican organs; and yet these things were just as true when they were spoken by democratic orators from ever-stump in the country as they are today when the eyes of magazine editors are beginning to open to the truth.

It is true that every editor who, having his eyes opened, tells his readers the truth with respect to the situation is entitled to credit. But of what avail will these editorial utterances be unless these same editors set themselves resolutely against the candidates whom "the bribers and the traitors" are seeking to install into office?

The Wall Street Journal assesses that the situation is so serious that "if this is to continue a free country there must be sound public opinion on this thing." But of what value will this "sound public opinion" be if the same journals that between election days undertake to cultivate this "sound public opinion," immediately prior to election day urge their readers to support the candidates who have been chosen by "the bribers and the traitors?"

If magazine editors now recognize certain men as "bribers" and "traitors" and then at the approach of election persuade themselves, or permit themselves to be persuaded, because of some imaginary national exigency or upon some fancied issue which they have been made to believe is for the moment more important than other things, to support the candidates of "the bribers and the traitors," may the people expect substantial results from the effort to cultivate this "sound public opinion?"

I desire to preserve this government that it may be administered for all, as it was administered by the men who made it.—Abraham Lincoln.

**Justice Harlan's Warning.**

John M. Harlan, associate justice of the United States supreme court, recently delivered a lecture on constitutional law, before the class of the Columbian University law school. In that address Justice Harlan said:

"Let us hope that this great instrument, which has served so well, will weather the storms which the ambitions of certain men are creating in an effort to make this country a world power."

Newspaper dispatches say that "because of