

tion comes over the wires as follows:

The cry of "emperor," "czar," and "man-on-horseback" are but extravagant appeals to an instinct which ought to exist and happily does exist among us against submission to unlawful authority, however trifling may be its exercise and however beneficent its despotism. There is a constant tendency to ignore such limitations and condone the transgression of them by public officers, provided the thing done is done with good motives, from a desire to serve the public. Such a process, if general, is most injurious. If continued long enough, it results in an attitude of personal superiority on the part of great officers which is inconsistent with our institutions, a destruction of responsibility and independent judgment on the part of lower officers, and a neglect of the habit of asserting legal rights on the part of the people. The more frequently men who hold great power in office are permitted to overreach the limitations imposed by law upon their powers, the more difficult it becomes to question anything they do, and the people, each one weak in himself and unable to cope with powerful officers, who regard any questioning of their acts as an affront, gradually lose the habit of holding such officers accountable, and ultimately practically surrender the right to hold them accountable. Constant accountability of public officers for strict observance of the limits imposed by law and customary and undoubted assertion of the private right of the citizen to have no power exercised over him except in strict accordance with the letter and the spirit of the law—these are the essential conditions of free government and personal independence.

Had these eminently sound doctrines been observed when the Philippine temptation came we should have a grander history and a higher future; had they been observed in the Chicago strike of 1894, the Colorado usurpation might not threaten republican institutions now.

Before Dr. Gunsaulus made himself guilty of the unpatriotic act of denouncing the fundamental statement of the American Declaration of Independence, to the graduating class of the Armour Institute at Chicago this year, he should have made himself familiar with its doctrine. It is not good form for distinguished educators to trifle with the unripened minds of their students. And Dr.

Gunsaulus ought to learn that it is trifling to assume that the Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men are created equal" in every possible sense in which the term "equality" can be used. What that document does assert is, that in justice "all men are created equal" in their rights under just human laws. Lincoln interpreted this great Fourth of July document truly when he said:

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men, but they did not mean to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say that all men were equal in color, size, intellect, moral development or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what they did consider all men created equal—equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This they said and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society which should be familiar to all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors, everywhere. . . . The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be—as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants; and they meant, when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, that they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

All this is obvious upon any common sense reading of the American Declaration, and it is demonstrated by its context. Do the Gunsauluses deny the truth of its assertion as to equality in that meaning? If they do, why not deny it candidly? If they do not deny it, then why do they pettifog? For it is pettifogging to argue that because men are not created

"equal" as to height and might, or mental and moral temperament, they are therefore not created "equal" as to legal rights, and that the great Declaration of human liberty is as to this, its basic clause, "a glittering generality" or "an interesting falsehood."

In his baccalaureate address President Hadley, of Yale, traced "almost every evil—political, social, or commercial—which constitutes a serious menace to the permanent prosperity of our country, to our tolerant acceptance of selfishness." It is an encouraging sign of the times that a man occupying President Hadley's position recognizes definitely that conditions are "menacing." If it were possible for him, with his wide influence, to denounce the means whereby selfishness becomes a social menace, some of the evil manifestations of selfishness as a social factor would speedily disappear. That the menacing conditions to which President Hadley points are logical and necessary consequences of adequate causes, will not be denied by anyone who believes that this is a universe of law; and no one will find it easy to account for them adequately upon any other theory than that they are the pains of social disease caused by legal privilege. There is consequently but one cure for them, and that is the destruction of legal privilege. Most of the manifestations of selfishness to which President Hadley alludes spring from a sense of that utter helplessness of the individual in the face of narrowing opportunities, from a realization that life is a struggle against overwhelming odds, from a consciousness of complete absence of equality of legal right and opportunity as a heritage of all. They are merely self-defense reduced to its lowest terms. If President Hadley, resisting every impulse of his mind to perpetuate institutions as they are, with all their defects and perversions and oppressive possibilities, and inspired solely by a motive to translate moral truth into terms of economic and