

time. It would be well if every American citizen could ponder upon these utterances and profit by them. On one occasion he said:

The resources, advantages and powers of the American people are very great, and they have consequently succeeded to equally great responsibilities. It seems to have devolved upon them to test whether a government established on the principles of human freedom can be maintained against an effort to build one upon the exclusive foundation of human bondage.

No statement made by Mr. Lincoln is more appropriate today than his definition of liberty. He said:

The world is in want of a good definition of the word liberty. We all declare ourselves to be for liberty; but we do not all mean the same thing. Some mean that a man can do as he pleases with himself and his property. With others it means that some men can do as they please with other men and other men's labor. Each of these things is called liberty, although they are entirely different. To give an illustration: A shepherd drives a wolf from the throat of his sheep when attacked by him, and the sheep, of course thanks the shepherd for the preservation of his life; but the wolf denounces him as despoiling the wolf of his liberty; especially if it be a black sheep.

On another occasion he declared: "I have never had a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence." On another occasion he rebuked those who, in the discussion of public questions, gave no concern whatever to the rights of men. He said:

Why this deliberate pressing out of view the rights of men and the authority of the people? This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the union, it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of man; to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuits to all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life.

He pleaded for the preservation of the Constitution, declaring: "The people of these United States are the rightful masters of congresses and courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution." On the question of capital and labor, Mr. Lincoln was very explicit. He said:

Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a possible refuge from the power of the people. In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism.

It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions; but there is one point, with its connections not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask brief attention. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with, if not above, labor, in the structure of government. It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that no body labors unless somebody else owning capital, somehow by the use of it, induces him to labor.

Labor is prior to and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the highest consideration. No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty; none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them till all of liberty shall be lost.

In one address, in defending himself from the charge of warring against capital and antagonizing the rich simply because they were rich, Mr. Lincoln said:

I do not believe in law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else. When one starts poor, as most do

in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows that there is no fixed condition of labor for his whole life. I am not ashamed to confess that twenty-five years ago I was a hired laborer, mauling rails, at work on a flat boat—just what might happen to any poor man's son. I want every man to have the chance in which he can better his condition, when he may look forward and hope to be a hired laborer this year and the next, work for himself afterwards, and finally to hire men to work for him. That is the true system.

One statement made by Abraham Lincoln in his famous speech delivered at Alton should be kept before the people by every advocate of popular government. On that occasion, Mr. Lincoln said that there was one issue that would continue in this country, "when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent." He explained:

It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, "You work and toil and earn bread and I'll eat it." No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle.

The "poor tongues" of Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas are silent; but the issue continues, and the American people are face to face with that issue at this time. The common right of humanity is now contesting with the divine right of kings. It is plutocracy against democracy. The few say to the many: "You work and toil and earn bread and I'll eat it." In this shape it comes; and even though Abraham Lincoln had not given us the assurance, intelligent men know that in whatever shape such a doctrine is presented, whether from the mouth of the king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor or from a handful of men, who because of special privileges obtained under the law seek to enslave the masses of the people, it is the same tyrannical principle.

### Enforce the Criminal Clause

The opinion rendered by the United States supreme court in the beef trust case appears to be a complete vindication of the government's claim that the packers have conspired in restraint of trade and have made themselves liable to the terms of the Sherman anti-trust law.

In this case the opinion was delivered by Justice Holmes who several months ago, speaking from the bench, declared that the Sherman anti-trust law was a criminal statute and should be enforced accordingly.

Several weeks ago, Washington correspondents announced that some one high in the confidence of the administration had declared that if the supreme court sustained the government's contention in the beef trust case, criminal proceedings would be instituted. On the day following the supreme court's decision in that case, Washington dispatches said that unless the packers accepted the opinion as the government understood it, the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law would be invoked.

It is to be hoped that this course will be adopted. Long ago, the criminal clause, which is indeed the chief feature of the Sherman anti-trust law, should have been enforced. It is the one feature of that law which the trust magnates greatly fear. The criminal indictment is the one weapon which powerful law breakers dread. Mr. Roosevelt has it in his power to demonstrate his sincerity by invoking the powerful aid of the criminal indictment in his warfare against the trusts. Men of all political parties hope that the president will rise to the emergency. He has everything to gain and nothing to lose by standing fearlessly and stalwartly in defense of public interests and the only way in which the welfare of the many may be protected from the greed of the few is by calling strictly to account men who, in order to fill their pockets with ill-gotten gains, do not hesitate to conspire against the very lives of the people.

The time for experiments has gone by, Mr. President. The time for action is at hand. The people have been permitted to suffer all too long.

They are not only entitled to relief, but they must have relief. It is within your power to protect them and whatever contempt these influential law-breakers may show for injunction proceedings or high-sounding manifestoes, they will be very ready to obey the law—and obey it implicitly—when they are brought face to face with the fact that continued violation of the law means imprisonment.

### A "Special Cable"

The Philadelphia Press of recent date contains the following "special cable:"

London, Jan. 22.—Consuelo, Duchess of Manchester, has just escaped serious illness, having contracted a chill in her left ear while motoring with the queen from Chatsworth to Welbeck. It was feared an abscess was forming, but this was absorbed and she is now convalescing, but is still weak. At Brighton she entertained the king at dinner the night before her return from Chatsworth, but had to leave the bridge table owing to the agonies she suffered.

Just what this special cost is not known, but the readers of the Press ought to appreciate the enterprise of the Press in securing so promptly an account of this international incident. It is possible that some of the Philadelphia women had earache about the same time and many of them doubtless had backache caused by bending over wash tubs or headache from overwork, but their names do not appear in the columns of the Press. Why this discrimination against home industry? Must one go motoring with a queen in Europe to attract attention in this country? Must one entertain a king at dinner in order to secure the right to have earaches in public? What a difference between high bridge and low bridge, even in democratic America.

### A Bad Practice

The Chicago Record-Herald has recently urged the enactment of legislation to prevent the indiscriminate carrying of concealed weapons. The coroner of Cook county, writing to the Record-Herald, says:

It has been my observation that a large percentage of the cases that come to this office in which revolvers figure are the result of irresponsible persons being in possession of weapons of that character, and I have made special efforts the past two years, through the medium of my annual report to the county board, to have the proper authorities enact such legislation as would prevent the indiscriminate sale and carrying of revolvers. If the editorials succeed in stirring the city council to action I am strongly of the opinion that it will go far toward suppressing crime in our city.

The evil referred to cannot be cured entirely by legislation, although remedial legislation is certainly desirable. It is no doubt true that thousands of men who were at one time in the habit of carrying concealed weapons have abandoned the practice and a healthy public sentiment will have great effect in curtailing the practice among thoughtful men. Some provision regulating the sale of pocket pistols might be advantageous. Certainly the Record-Herald, in its laudable effort, is entitled to the support of all good citizens and it would be well if a similar agitation could be made in every section of the country.

### Two Religious Addresses

President Roosevelt and ex-President Cleveland recently delivered religious addresses on the same Sunday—the former at the Lutheran church in Washington, the latter at the Young Men's Christian Association in Philadelphia. President Roosevelt said in the course of his remarks: "It is an important thing for the people of this country to remember their rights, but, it is even a more important thing for them to remember their duties. In the last analysis the work of the statesmen and the soldiers, the work of public men shall go for nothing if it is not based on the spirit of Christianity, that spiritual, that moral foundation without which no country can ever rise to permanent greatness."

Ex-President Cleveland suggested that "a church is too often esteemed successful because men worth knowing, choirs worth hearing and interiors worth seeing are the rewards of attendance," and, again, "It is not worth while to blink at the fact that, without going far from home, we can gain a hint that nations called civilized and