

THE OMAHA BEE

MORNING-EVENING-SUNDAY

THE BEE PUBLISHING CO., Publisher N. B. UPDIKE, President BALLARD DUNN, Editor in Chief JOY M. HACKLER, Business Manager

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS The Associated Press, of which The Bee is a member, is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news published herein. All rights of republication of our special dispatches are also reserved.

The Omaha Bee is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations, the recognized authority on circulation audits, and The Omaha Bee's circulation is regularly audited by their organizations.

Entered as second-class matter May 25, 1905, at Omaha postoffice under act of March 3, 1879.

BEE TELEPHONES Private Branch Exchange. Ask for the Department or Person Wanted. AT lantic 1000

OFFICES Main Office—17th and Farnam Co. Bluffs—16 Scott St. Detroit—Ford Bldg. Chicago—Tribune Bldg. Kansas City—Bryant Bldg. St. Louis—Sya. Trust Bldg. Los Angeles—Higgins Bldg. San Fran.—Hollrock Bldg. Atlanta—Atlanta Trust Bldg.

THE DRIFT TO SLOAN.

With the primary election a bare ten days ahead, the campaign has entered the "sugaring off" stage. Opinions are crystallizing and judgments may now be tentatively formed. It is not wise to undertake to forecast the result of a primary election in Nebraska, save where disparity between opposing candidates is such as to leave no room for doubt. Certain signs, however, justify conclusions that may be borne out in the end.

One of the first of these is that the apathy said to exist in the state is disappearing. Voters, especially republicans, are beginning to take notice of what is going on. There is a likelihood of a gratifying attendance at the polls on both—primary and election day. A heavy vote and a decisive result, no matter how narrow the margin between candidates, is the advance promise of a lively campaign in the fall, and victory for the party of progress and accomplishment.

Another indication is worthy of note. Interest in the contest for the nomination for United States senator is intense. Just now, all over the state there appears to be setting in a heavy drift to Sloan. Republican newspapers, almost without exception, have championed his candidacy, and expressed reasons why voters should favor him. Some of these newspapers in previous campaigns have supported Senator Norris. Mr. Sloan is deeply interested in the things that concern Nebraska. While in congress he did a great deal to forward the welfare of the state. In his campaign so far he has avoided criticism. He has, however, clearly set out what he wants to do as United States senator from Nebraska. His plans are all for the betterment of conditions in the nation at large, but particularly for his home state.

The favorable reaction of republicans to this prospect is evident everywhere throughout the state. Those newspapers that support Sloan contrast the record of his chief opponent, whose 21 years under the dome at Washington have been a disappointment, even to him, according to his own confession. It is evident that what Nebraska wants in Washington are men who can do something for the state and the nation. There appears a definite opposition to those whose time is spent in opposing what others are trying to do who have put themselves in such position as to forfeit the assistance that is needed to get measures through.

Sloan is running as a republican, and will be a republican in Washington. If he should be controlled by a party caucus, it will not be by that of the democrats. Republicans all over the state are taking note of this fact. That is why from every quarter evidence points to the current as setting decidedly in the direction of Sloan. This does not underrate the Norris strength, but he can win only through receiving republican support, and this he appears to have forfeited by his repudiation of republican principles and his opposition to republican policies. He has declared that he belongs to no party. He is asking, just the same, to be nominated by the republicans.

Newspapers throughout the state that have heretofore been for Norris, and that are now for Sloan, as well as influential voters in all sections who have turned from Norris, stress this point. They urge that a man who has no use for the republican party except for the votes he can get by running for office under its banner is not entitled to those votes.

"TAG" IS HOME.

Little "Tag" is at "home" again. That is, it is home for "Tag," who happens to be a bright little boy, only a year and a half old. He does not know that his girl-mother is dead, nor that his father is in prison in another state. Some reason may be found for the hope that he never does find it out.

At the Child Saving Institute the little boy is well looked after. Some day, probably before very long, he will be taken into a home where he will have what a little boy deserves. Tender love will surround him, and he will grow to babyhood and then to manhood under the watchful care of those who will see to it that his life is molded on proper lines. If ever it becomes necessary, he may be given the facts of his mother's sacrifice and her sad ending, perhaps of his father's disgrace, but it will be merciful if this time never comes.

That is one of the most glorious facts connected with modern civilization. Foundlings no longer are condemned in advance to existence under circumstances that almost inevitably drive them to crime. Environment counts for as much as heredity, and, in the case of little "Tag," as an example, it should count for all. What of his father's weakness he may inherit will be overcome by the strength of his mother, and that, encouraged by proper surroundings and training, will lead him to useful manhood.

It is well that we have such institutions as these, and that the world recognizes its obligation to the little ones that are brought into it under unfortunate circumstances. Babies are no longer abandoned, but are cared for, nurtured and properly reared. The world is selfish, probably, but it also has a great heart, and "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

HELIUM FOR FUTURE USES.

President Coolidge has moved again in the direction of public interest. This time for the future. An important discovery made during the war is to be protected. For a long time it had been known that a portion of the natural gas, flowing in connection with certain oil fields, was not 100 per cent combustible. Chemists set about an inquiry, and

discovered that this inert portion of the natural gas was helium. It is one of the most elusive of all substances, not supposed to exist on earth in large quantities, although found in the atmosphere.

Following this discovery, it was learned that sufficient quantities of helium could be secured to inflate balloons. Not all, but some for government use. Its value consists in the fact that it is non-explosive and almost noncombustible. Hydrogen, which has a slightly greater lifting power than helium, is extremely explosive, and must be handled with the greatest care. It is due to this quality of hydrogen that so many accidents have marred the record of balloonists. Helium is regarded as 100 per cent safe. It is an interesting fact that only in the United States is helium found in substantial quantities.

The government has set up a plant in Texas for the manufacture of helium from natural gas emanations, and has been successful in capturing considerable quantities of the element. The Shenandoah holds the larger part of it. The bags in that great dirigible are inflated with helium. Its value was shown in the recent experience of the ship when blown from its moorings in a gale.

President Coolidge has just set apart as a government helium reserve 7,100 acres in a Utah gas field, from which in time a large surplus of the valuable gas will be recovered for government uses. At the same time, acting on a recommendation of the general board of the navy, the president named a commission to ascertain the best method of conserving the oil supply of the nation. These facts will be welcomed for many reasons, not the least of them being that they show the president's attitude toward conservation.

RELIGION, THE HOME AND THE SCHOOL.

A group of religious workers was told last week that the home has failed, and the church has failed, in the work of bringing religion into the lives of children. The younger generation is in danger of growing up godless, unless something is done to get religion into their lives.

We do not question the sincerity of the man who gave utterance to the thought. He is an agent of a cult that seeks to spread religion through the public schools, and he has many followers. In fact, some denominations are devoted to the idea that education is a function of the church, and that religious training should be given alongside of if not made paramount to secular training. What we are inclined to question, however, is the justification of the assertion.

If it be true that the home and the church have failed to bring religious conviction home to the children of the land, then the church is in a serious predicament. That this is hardly true may be gained from reading reports that accredit large gains in membership to the various denominations throughout the country. A recently published census indicated considerable increase in the number of communicants of the different sects or creeds in the United States. In Omaha an investigator reports having added 1,850 to the membership of a single church through an intensive drive.

This does not show any diminution of growth, but a rather healthy advance in the cause of Christianity. Accepting the census and other figures as correct, the conclusion must be that the indictment against the home and the church rests on too narrow a foundation for such a sweeping allegation.

It is desirable, yes, it is the profound necessity, to instill religious understanding into the youthful mind, even at its tenderest age. The thought, however, of taking such teaching into the public schools, where all sects mingle for a single purpose, is repugnant to the theory of the constitution, which forbids the establishment of any religion. The alternative, that of dismissing school for a specified period each week, would for obvious reasons defeat its own object. Freedom to worship God according to the promptings of one's own conscience is among the American's dearest rights, and even the most devout or bigoted would not permit it to be infringed upon. That our people are essentially Christian, but that all other sects prosper in our midst, and that all dwell in harmony, is a bright jewel in our nation's crown of jewels. It must be preserved.

THE GREATER LOVE.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." In a moment of exaltation, stimulated by the presence of others, many a man has risen to the height of heroism, and has jeopardized his life, and frequently lost it, in the effort to save others. Such heroism is noble, as is that of the soldier, who, with his companions, marches into the very jaws of death. Mankind has always revered that quality of courage, and paid high honor to it.

There is the other sort. It was exhibited by the sentry at Pompeii, who was found at his post, eighteen centuries afterward, standing upright, just as he stood while the ashes sifted over him and buried him because he was not relieved from his duty. Something of this courage is shown in those who submit to what is now a very common surgical operation, the transfusion of blood. Surgeons know the risk, which is minimized by greatest care, and yet there is always present an element of danger. The donor in such an operation is truly sacrificing his life for another, in that his blood is being pumped into the veins of the recipient. Sentiment may move some, the need for food others, but the scientific aspect of the operation is always the same.

One of the latest incidents is that of a prize fighter, who gave over a battle to which he was engaged in Philadelphia that he might hasten to New York, where his manager lay dangerously ill. Their veins were connected, and the manager will probably recover because the pugilist donated many ounces of his blood to save a life. It is that sort of heroism that counts, in a fight or elsewhere. In this act the prize fighter has done much to redeem his calling, for he has shown that a heart beats under the surface in the breast even of a professional gladiator.

Dr. Pinto's idea of teaching the policemen health rules is a good one. We hope he gets them worked up to where they will see that all the health laws and rules are enforced.

A garden expert warns against too much cultivation. Idle words, for no one hereabouts is inclined to overdo the hoeing thing.

"T. R." would have grinned if he had read that letter from the president to the attorney general.

We trust the South Dakota republicans will stick to their candidate, and also to the nominee.

At any rate, Mr. Coolidge was gentler than Mr. Wilson was with Lansing.

Listen closely now, and you may hear the sap going up the trees.

Bang! There goes Harry Daugherty.

SUNDAY SIDE UP

Take Comfort, nor forget That Sunrise never failed us yet

THE WORLD WANTS MEN.

This isn't a time for repining, 'tis a time to be daring to do. It isn't the world that's declining; the fact of the case it is you. You think that the world's growing rotter, but in truth it is getting more fair.

The trouble is you have forgotten to lift up and carry your share. While you are complaining and swearing, and sulk by the side of the road, There are men unconspicuously bearing their own and your share of the load.

And if you were but earnestly doing, and wearing a smile on your face, The world in its onward pursuing, would go at a much faster pace.

There are always too many complaining and sulking the hours away, While others their courage retaining are bearing the heat of the day.

It isn't the world backward tracking, as pessimists love to de- 'Tis too many men sadly slacking and trying to gum up the game. The world's growing better and stronger; it's heart is still honest and true:

Why moan and sigh at any longer? It isn't the world, it is you. If you will be true to your duty, and carry your share as you should, You'll find the old world full of beauty, and just over-running with good.

Come out of that mood so despairing; get right with your fellow men and God! There's good in which you should be sharing; flowers blossom where'er feet have trod.

The light's getting brighter and stronger; the world is today at its best. Why sit in despondency longer? Come, tackle your job with a zest.

Brace up and get into the fighting against the forces of wrong. Today hosts of evil be smiting; tomorrow the victory song. God hates the weak coward and quitter; He asks for the best that you can.

So why keep on shedding tears bitter? Brace up and go forth like a man! Just suppose', dearly beloved, that the Carpenter of Nazareth had laid down on His job when He discovered that Judas was a grafter? Just suppose' that George Washington had thrown up the sponge when he discovered that Benedict Arnold was a traitor? Just suppose' that Abraham Lincoln had quit his job when he got his first bumps as a statesman? Just suppose' our boys over there had thrown away their rifles in disgust when they got a hint that a bunch of conscienceless profiteers back home were trading on their heroism?

Pretty fix we'd be in today if that had happened, eh? What are you doing now. Laying down on the job because you have discovered that there are crooks and grafters in public life? Quitting cold? Or are you sitting on your hands and declaring by the living God above you that you are going to step out and do your duty like a real man, and throw the crooks higher'n Gilderoy's kite?

If your pastor were not opposed to unduly emphatic language from his pulpit he'd talk real harshly this bright Lord's day morning. He knows all the words.

If you are a real Christian instead of merely a church member, you are not sulking in your room today. You are out demanding of your brothers and sisters that they come out of their sullen and despondent mood and do their duty. This country needs warriors for peace and righteousness today just as much as it needed warriors for the preservation of democracy seven years ago.

Under which flag? "The Fight is On" is the title of the song we are going to sing this morning. And, after we sing it, with spirit and understanding, you are expected to buckle on your sword and get busy, and keep busy from now until the polls close on April 8.

WILL M. MAUPIN.

Shall Nebraska Accept Radical Dictation?

From the Central City Republican. This is the question the republican voters of Nebraska must answer in their selection of a nominee for United States senator. In the Grand Island Daily Independent of March 10 issue appeared an article entitled, "What Leading Senators Say of Member From Nebraska." The personal endorsements from outside our boundaries appeared the names of William E. Borah, Robert M. La Follette, Henrik Shipstead, B. K. Wheeler, Robert L. Owen, Magnus Johnson, Lynn J. Frazier, Smith W. Brookhart and Arthur Capper. This is the second time within recent years a plea has gone out from Washington in behalf of the republican voters of Nebraska candidates. The result of the first endeavor is now recorded in history. The answer was that of resentment.

Scan again, if you will, the above list of names, representatives of different sections of the country, and you will note it does not include one outstanding republican. It is the personnel of the insurgent group, which proclaims itself independent of party, save the use of the label for election purposes. By what right do they assume to dictate or even suggest to the republican voters of Nebraska whom they shall choose to represent them in the United States senate?

The Republican has for years been a faithful and consistent supporter of Senator George W. Norris, rallying to his standard at times when all his acts did not meet with our approval. We believe him to be a man of integrity and a fearless fighter. We believe he has rendered service to the people of his state. The bitterness of the conflict, however, has so completely alienated him from the members of his own party that he can no longer look to them for support or even endorsement. It is daily becoming more and more apparent he is powerless to secure the enactment of legislation he believes good. Independence in thought and action are powerful assets if they have at heart the strengthening of the organization; they are disastrous if they lead to isolation. Unfortunately Senator Norris has chosen the latter course, and the uniting with the democratic majority, he secured the enactment of two great laws, the measure for the eradication of hog cholera and bovine tuberculosis. He is a man of firm beliefs and rare courage. Linked with these is an equal valued asset, the

ability to work with and command the support and respect of his party organization.

Nebraska cannot afford to take dictation from men of no party, who are steadily losing their strength in their respective states. They first came to the front on a wave of discontent and are destined to recede with it. A program of obstruction, free of construction, cannot long endure. Nebraska republicans have a right to demand a republican senator and we believe will assert it at the polls in April.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

Let the boosters of Omaha stay with the "Union station" question until all the great railroad systems entering Omaha will be converted and surrendered to the edict—"Greater Omaha." B. K. SCHAEFFER.

What of America?

By R. G. PINKHAM.

Can Only Be Answered by Americans.

If any man attempts to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot.—Secretary of the Treasury John A. Dix to the federal agent at New Orleans, January, 1861.

UR survey of the origin, nature and operation of our government must conclude. We have seen the slow and precarious growth of the principle under which the authority of government came to be lodged in the hands of the people. We have seen how our ancestors, more aware than we of the dangers of a governing power not under their control, sought to retain that principle in full vigor and operation. We have seen how, as the recession of those early scenes in our history has dimmed their outlines to our eyes, we have forgotten their lessons and allowed new tyrannies to interfere with the working of that principle.

Experience conveys to Americans of today a lesson that only folly and madness can reject. That lesson is that under the democratic principle the security of government and the preservation of liberty are bound up with the ability and willingness of the people to operate that principle themselves. If they neglect or refuse to direct its operation forces fatal to democracy will direct its operation against the people; for they are just as susceptible of that control as any principle ever devised by oppression for its own use.

These undemocratic forces are active and aggressive in America today. They gain their ends, not by violence and revolution or the destruction of popular forms, for they are sensible that such means would rouse the people to their danger, but by gaining possession, through the indifference of the people, of the political and judicial machinery of government and operating it in their own interests. The domestic enemies of America's free government do not, for example, attack the representative principle; but far more subtly destroy its popular processes by using it to elect their own representatives to office. They do not attempt to abolish trial by jury. Instead, they seek to control the jury system in their own interests. They do not seek to set aside the guarantees of equality in the constitution, but by legislation and interpretation to make inequalities favorable to their own interests, appear to be public measures.

If the American people allow their government thus to be taken out of their hands by these class interests, then the great American experiment in democracy is ended. The democratic form has no guarantee of permanence save in the interest and political activity of the people who live under it. If they allow class interest to rise and assume the sovereign power of war, as it did in Illinois, that ends the sovereignty of the nation. If they allow it to usurp the judicial power, as it did in the same state, that ends trial by jury.

The great interest of man on earth," said Daniel Webster, "is justice. If there is a power in America today that can deny justice to man, that power is the master of this country, and the government and of its people. If there is a power that can, for

its own ends and against the interests of all the people, deny the necessities of life to others by limiting or controlling their production and distribution; if there is a power that can deny the right of man to work; if there is a power that can deny him the right to vote and have his vote counted; that can control his representatives, unmake or destroy the force of his laws or deprive him, in any way, of the benefit of their just and equal operation, then that power, and not the power at Washington, is the government of America.

If American nationality triumphed over the pretensions of the sovereignty of states, shall it surrender to those of class?

If Americans to gain the right to tax themselves defied the power of kings, shall they relinquish it to bosses?

No thoughtful American can contemplate the political and class lawlessness that has been given rein in this country today, and escape the conclusion that its citizenship has ceased to value its liberties. It has abandoned the honorable profession of politics to a venal rabble that has made its name odious. It has surrendered its cities and its states to enemies more destructive of its privileges than ever mating class in form or under the flag of a foreign despot. It has, by default, granted to the worst forms of privilege immunities which Americans of another generation defied the arms of a military empire to take. It has surrendered the principle of representation by abandoning it to the commercial brokers of politics, of equality, by permitting class interests to make their own laws; of justice, by allowing courts to become the citadels of moneyed or political might; of liberty, by giving license to combinations of citizens to harass, oppress and murder other citizens.

What of America? Shall this government live or die?

In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

That third question, through the result of the civil war seemed to settle it in favor of nationalism, still waits the answer of America's citizenship. The great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

What of America? Shall this government live or die? In 1861, President Lincoln said that of three main points in regard to their government the American people had demonstrated but two. One was their ability to establish it and the other their ability to administer it. The third, then to be determined, was whether they could maintain it against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. In 1864 he repeated, that the great test of popular institutions was whether a government not too strong for the liberties of its people could be strong enough to stand when threatened by its people.

Understanding

She wrote of trees and flowers, Of summer and shady bowers; Of winter's cruel, sullen blast, Of the future—of the past.

She wrote of hearts so true, Of true friends—no few; Of children, of everyday life, She wrote of joy—of strife.