

THE BIBLE

To the Editor of the Courier-Journal: It is gratifying to many people to read the statements of W. J. Bryan regarding the Bible, as published in your issue of the 5th of May, page 5, and it brought to my mind a quotation from "The Glory of the Cross," by the Rev. A. B. Mackay, as follows:

"At one of the social gatherings of Baron d'Holbach, where the most celebrated infidels of the age were in the habit of assembling, great entertainment was afforded by the witty way in which the pretended absurdities, stupidities and follies of the holy scriptures were descanted upon. The philosopher Diderot, who had taken no part in the conversation, brought it to an abrupt termination by saying, 'Gentlemen, I know no men, either in France or elsewhere, who can speak or write with more talent than you who are here present, and yet, notwithstanding all the evil that has been spoken of this book (de ce diable de livre), and no doubt with reason enough, I defy you, with all your power, to compose a narrative as simple and yet as sublime and touching as the story of the passion and death of Jesus—a narrative which shall produce the same effects and make so strong a sensation, felt so generally by all men and the influence of which shall continue the same after so many ages.'

"So astonished were the company and so touched in their inmost consciousness that a long and awkward silence ensued."

I may add that it has always seemed a thing most significant to me that, though the Jewish people are responsible for the holy scriptures, nothing worthy of being classed with them has ever been written by them since the canon of their sacred writings was closed over 2,000 years ago.

Many will feel grateful to Mr. Bryan for his thoughtful and timely statement. Yours truly,

CHAS. H. MOCKRIDGE,

Rector St. Peter's church, Portland.

FUNCTIONS OF JUDGES

Objecting to the recall of judges as proposed for Arizona and New Mexico, Albert Fink says, in a current number of a magazine:

"The judges are not the servants of the majority. The judges are the servants both of the majority and the minority and must of necessity be independent of each. It is one of the peculiar functions of a judge in a state governed by laws and not by men to protect the minority. Though chosen by the majority, the domination of this majority after election is tyranny. Such a practice can be maintained only by arms, and this power does not always lie in majorities."

Referring to Mr. Fink's article, the Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald prints this admirable answer:

"If Mr. Fink were not a lawyer, and if he did not essay discussion of the subject with the voice of the omniscient, his mistakes would be excusable. But there is no warrant whatever for asserting, as he does, that 'it is one of the peculiar functions of a judge * * * to protect the minority.' That, as the merest tyro knows, is the end served by the constitution. It is the notion that some judges get, that theirs are extraconstitutional functions, causing them to exaggerate property rights and minimize human rights, that has brought home realization of the need of adopting means of defense against them, which would be means of defense of the constitution against perversion of its terms and its spirit. The real enemies of the constitution are not those who advocate the recall for judges, but those judges who bring the courts into contempt by theories of the constitution at variance with the principles of humanitarianism and progress."

A WAIL FROM RICHMOND

The Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, a publication that claims to be a democratic newspaper in the face of its persistent service to special interests, says: "Woodrow Wilson seems to be inclined to flirt a little too freely with the 'head of the party' in Nebraska, for which we are truly sorry—Wilson is such a nice man, so promising, so full of good things, so fit for higher honors than he has yet won that we hate to see him losing his fight before he begins."

If Mr. Wilson can live down the support of the Richmond Times-Dispatch and certain other publications known to be under the control of special interests, he need have no fear of being injured by the fact that he is on good terms with any democrat whose offense is that he

believes the democratic party should be true to its name. The best thing that could happen to Mr. Wilson at this time would be his open repudiation by these publications that are now speaking kindly of him but whose masters mean no good to the democratic party and no service to the American people.

A MUCH NEEDED REFORM

The democratic party will make a great mistake if it loses the opportunity now presented to change the dates for the convening of congress. Under the present law the first regular session does not meet until thirteen months after the election—only eleven months before the next election, and the second session does not convene until after the succeeding election, when many congressmen have been defeated. It is unfortunate that the country should have to wait so long after an election before securing the remedial laws voted for, and still more unfortunate that it should be made the victim of legislation that could not be enacted before the election. The democratic congress should take advantage of its majority to pass a law changing the date of both sessions. The first session should convene March 4, (or, if the date of inauguration is changed, on that day.) This could be the short session. The second session should begin the first of December (when the first session begins now) and should adjourn at least thirty days before the following election. Provision should be made for a third session every four years to count the electoral vote and the president should be empowered to call a special session at any time to provide for emergencies. The change above suggested is imperatively needed. Who will secure the credit of inaugurating the reform? The necessary bill ought to be introduced at once.

KEEP COOL!

It may not be doubted that in his efforts to prevent anything that would bring about complications for the United States in the Mexican conflict, President Taft has the support of Americans generally. The American people do not want war or anything that would result in any sort of a war. It would be well if public men could keep as cool on these war questions as Americans generally are. Certainly President Taft in his peaceable attitude represents public sentiment in America.

The American people are distinctly for peace—peace with Mexico and the Mexicans, peace with Japan, peace with all the world; and finally, for the abolition of war altogether. They will commend heartily the efforts of every man who strives to bring about the realization of this good end.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

When a number of republican "farmers" called upon President Taft to protest against Canadian reciprocity and to threaten the president because of his championship of that reform, Mr. Taft told them bluntly that he would not be influenced by predictions that his course would lose him votes. He said he believed Canadian reciprocity is important for the public interests and he would on that proposition be a standpatter even if he could not stand among the "standpatters."

Congratulations to the president! It is a good sign whenever a public man can show that threats have no terrors for him and that he cannot be swerved from what he conceives to be a righteous position by the promise that his course will result in the loss of votes.

MAYOR GAYNOR'S TESTIMONY

A New York clergyman wrote to several public men asking them why they believed in God. Among the answers received was the following from Mayor Gaynor:

"You ask me 'Why do I believe in the Father God?' Because I simply cannot help it. I have absolute confidence in Him and am willing to submit to whatever He wills in respect to me."

Simple testimony, indeed, but the mayor of New York is big enough to bear witness to the simple faith of a little child when occasion requires, and testimonies of this kind certainly must have far-reaching influence upon young men and young women.

MAKING CONVERTS

The action of Judge Petit in standing between Lorimer and the Illinois investigating committee will make converts to the recall. It will not hurt to deprive such a judge of "independence" such as Judge Petit manifested.

PROGRESSIVE

The Boston Transcript declares that Senator Lodge "belongs with the progressives and not with the regulars." The Transcript adds: "Undoubtedly La Follette and other insurgents are offensive to a man of Mr. Lodge's tastes, and they have not been careful of his feelings. Some of them are hypocrites, for example, on reciprocity, but they are not alone. Moreover, as Dr. Cyrus Bartol used to say, you have done a good deal for a man when you have made a hypocrite of him. These insurgents are voicing popular doctrines, and if there is a chance for republican victory in 1912, they will be the men to bring it about. Mr. Taft has at last found this out. The country is done with the other faction."

Mr. Lodge has had ample opportunity to show where he "belongs," and to men outside of the Transcript office he seems to have made it very clear. It would be strange, indeed, should we find the Massachusetts senator actually lining up with Senator La Follette and other insurgents who are so "offensive" to a man of Mr. Lodge's tastes. It would seem that if Mr. Lodge had within him any of the elements of the progressive, men who wage the good fight La Follette has made would be able to beat down any personal antipathy that might be felt by so aesthetic a gentleman as the Massachusetts senator. It was a matter of common remark during the Roosevelt administration that the president picked his boon companions from the strongest men among the stand-patters and from the weakest men among the progressives. Thus we found him associating intimately with men like Elihu Root and Henry Cabot Lodge, while he was hardly on speaking terms with Robert M. La Follette, and of course it is a matter of record that his attitude toward Bristow drove that gentleman from public service under the Roosevelt administration. This was of course a favor to Mr. Bristow because it won him a senatorship.

The Transcript is right in one particular: The insurgents are voicing popular doctrines, and the revolt is against Aldrichism, which is only another name for Henrycabotlodgeism.

LEGITIMATE ENCOURAGEMENT OF TRADE

The republican party has been trying for years to subsidize steamship lines and the democrats have very properly opposed the plan; and fortunately they have succeeded in defeating the scheme. Now that the democrats have control of the house of representatives they ought to outline their plan for the encouragement of the merchant marine. First, free ships give our ship owners a chance to buy their ships anywhere. We have been protecting a few ship builders at the expense of the country. Second, discriminating duties can be given in favor of goods imported in American bottoms. Third, the government can build transports, to be used for carrying troops in time of war and to be leased in time of peace. In leasing these ships trade routes can be established and provision can be made for training of American seamen. A line could be established between New York and Buenos Ayres, stopping at Porto Rico, Barbadoes and Brazilian ports; another from New York (or some other sea port) to Panama, to be extended to Equador, Peru and Chile, as soon as the canal is opened; another from Galveston, New Orleans and other gulf ports to Panama, to be extended south when the canal is opened; another from Seattle and other Pacific ports to Panama via Mexico and Central America and still another from Panama along the northern coast of South America to Porto Rico and Barbadoes. These lines could, by transferring cargoes at meeting points, give all ports of the United States access to all ports of South America. If we have any battle ships that need exercise they might give up a part of their space to cargo and passengers. There are several ways of encouraging trade without turning the country over to the ship owners, who, under a subsidy policy, would be as clamorous as the protected interests. South and Central America deserve attention and we can encourage our trade in legitimate ways.

WHY?

The republican leaders in congress are making desperate efforts to defeat not only tariff revision as proposed by democrats, but tariff revision as proposed by the president elected as a republican, in the form of Canadian reciprocity. Yet the republican platform of 1908 promised the people tariff revision. Is it possible that republican leaders will yet insist upon hiding behind Senator Lodge's plea that the party did not promise to revise downward?