

It was read yesterday. The president's stand was unanimously approved by such of the ministers as were asked for their opinion on the subject. 'President Roosevelt is perfectly right on the subject,' said Jenkin Lloyd Jones, pastor of All Souls' church. 'The time has gone by long ago when dogmatism can count much in the politics of this country. The number of bigots who scratched Mr. Taft's name from their ballots because of his religious convictions would not fill an old-fashioned omnibus. There is no reason why a man's religion should be considered because he is a candidate for office.' 'The president hit the point exactly,' said Rev. Edward A. Kelly, pastor of St. Ann's Roman Catholic church. 'Nobody has the right to question a man's religion in considering him as a candidate for office. When Roosevelt declared that a man's religion was his own personal and individual business he reflected the almost unanimous sentiment of the American people. I am glad he put it so forcibly. One of the strongest reasons for his popularity is that he is a true type of the American citizen. The people appreciate his good sense and fairness all the more now that he has spoken on this subject.' Rabbi T. Schanfarber, recognized head of the orthodox Jews in Chicago, agreed most heartily with President Roosevelt's views. He said that he had preached on the subject within the last few weeks, after his attention had been called to the fact that former Governor David R. Francis of Missouri, at a banquet in St. Louis, had declared that Mr. Taft, as a Unitarian, did not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, and that he was therefore open to suspicion. 'President Roosevelt is right when he says that such arguments are out of accord with the spirit of our constitution,' said Rabbi Schanfarber, 'and that a man's religious views are entirely a matter between him and his Maker. The fact that a man is a Catholic or a Protestant or a Jew ought to have nothing to do with his chances in politics. There have been some very wise statesmen who didn't believe in God at all, and in a country where a pretense is made of a complete separation of church and state I see no reason why an infidel should not become president of the United States, provided his other qualifications are right. None but the bigoted and narrow, who can not see beyond their own creed, will find fault with the views expressed by President Roosevelt.'

NOW COMES a complicated problem: "Is Mr. Taft the twenty-sixth or twenty-seventh president?" A writer in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal, says: "George Washington was the first president of the United States and John Adams was the second. The enumeration ran along without possible complication for a long time. Every man who served as president, whether he served two terms or one, or less than one, was given a numeral. So it ran until Grover Cleveland was elected in 1884. His predecessor, Chester A. Arthur, had been recorded as the twenty-first president, so Mr. Cleveland was put down as the twenty-second president. Mr. Cleveland served only one term, giving way to Benjamin Harrison, who was elected in 1888. Sticking to the original formula Mr. Harrison was recorded as the twenty-third president. Then came an entirely new precedent, but not a new president. After four years in private life Mr. Cleveland was re-elected president in 1892 and resumed the office the following year. Mr. Harrison had been the twenty-third president, so his successor must be the twenty-fourth president. But Mr. Cleveland had already been recorded in history as the twenty-second president. Should he then be written down as the twenty-second, or the twenty-fourth, or the twenty-second and the twenty-fourth? Call him the twenty-second during his second term and you would have the anomaly of the twenty-second president serving after the twenty-third had completed his term. Call him the twenty-fourth, and you would not adequately describe him. Moreover, the twenty-second would then be expunged from the record entirely. Call him the twenty-second and the twenty-fourth, and you would depart from the rule of giving each man a single numeral. If the term rather than the individual should govern, George Washington was the first and second president, and so on down the line. Men who had served only fractional terms would be difficult to describe at all."

EVEN THE Journal writer admits that it is a complicated problem. He adds: "The historian of the International Encyclopedia

solved it by recording Mr. Cleveland as 'the twenty-second and the twenty-fourth president.' Then he went on and listed Mr. McKinley as the twenty-fifth president. That made Mr. Roosevelt the twenty-sixth, and Mr. Taft naturally will be the twenty-seventh. That is the way the enumeration now stands, but it is far from satisfying. Call Mr. Taft the twenty-seventh president, and then call the roll. You will find that Mr. Taft is the twenty-sixth individual to hold that high office. According to the system of enumerating individuals, Mr. Taft clearly will be the twenty-sixth president. But if you call him that, what are you going to do with Mr. Cleveland's place in history? Was he the twenty-second or the twenty-fourth president? If you call him the twenty-fourth, who was the twenty-second? If you call him the twenty-second, how do you justify the fact that the twenty-second president served four years after the twenty-third president had completed his term. Let's see. How old was Ann, anyway?"

HERE IS AN interesting editorial from the Columbia (S. C.) State: "It was to be expected the World would wait that with John A. Johnson as the democratic candidate, Mr. Taft's majority in the electoral college would have been small, indeed." It was to have been expected that the World would say Mr. Bryan is 'weaker than his party,' and point in proof to the fact that the democratic governors were successful in a number of states not giving their electoral votes to Bryan. Such argument may soothe the World for giving no support to Mr. Bryan and for its sporadic, and half-hearted support to democracy, but it must know it is fallacious. There is little or nothing in common between the national and the state contests. Party lines are drawn in the national election in the north; they are not drawn in the state elections. Local questions are absolutely supreme, and if the democrats happen to represent the popular side, as in Ohio, Minnesota and Nebraska, they win. In the state elections, the people have a chance to express themselves with much greater freedom than in the national elections, for the trusts and other predatory concerns take less interest in such contests. Mr. Bryan carried Nebraska, a staunch republican state, but the democratic candidate

larger majority. Our argument is further proved by the World, which, while aligning itself with the national democracy, openly championed the cause of Hughes, republican candidate for governor. Was Bryan 'weaker than his party?' If the World will refer to the election returns it will find that while Taft ran ahead of Roosevelt in the east excepting in Pennsylvania, Bryan cut down the republican majorities in western states as compared with the 1904 election, by the numbers indicated: California 35,000, Colorado 40,000, Idaho 9,000, Illinois 130,000, Indiana 84,000, Iowa 102,000, Kansas 101,000, Michigan 93,000, Minnesota 62,000, Montana 9,000, Nebraska 89,000, Nevada 5,000, North Dakota 28,000, Ohio 205,000, Oregon 20,000, South Dakota 31,000, Utah 19,000, Washington 23,000, West Virginia 21,000, Wisconsin 76,000, Wyoming 6,000, and Pennsylvania, the marked exception in the east, reduced her republican majority by 206,000. A total reduction of Roosevelt's majority in the western states of nearly twelve hundred thousand votes—a million and four hundred thousand with Pennsylvania. Does that indicate that Mr. Bryan is weaker than his party? Judson Harmon, democrat, is elected governor of Ohio. No democrat has ever got that state's electoral votes. Does Harmon strength spell Bryan weakness? It could be contended, with better logic, that Bryan's strength in the west was an asset for the democratic candidates for governors, and enabled them, with the additional popularity of their local issues, to score victories. So long as the beneficiaries of the tariff in the east, press and politicians, all men of the Bryan mold will be weak in the east."

WHAT A DIFFERENCE!

It is now more than a week since the election, and neither President Roosevelt nor Mr. Taft has expressed indignation at the fact that Mr. Rockefeller voted the republican ticket. What a difference there is between "before the election" and "after the election."

If what the mighty hunter does to the African big game is no more than what he has done to the American trusts, the jungles will not run red with blood, although the magazines may run black with ink.

