

hardly spare the Christian virtues out of their own lives, although they are ungrateful enough to deny to Christianity the credit of being the source. But while the Journal editor's feeling toward Christianity is shown by his classing it with the religion of the Buddhist, the derwish and the African worshipper of idols, how can he justify his unfair and labored effort to confuse a belief in Christianity with a belief in a state church. He virtuously protests that this is no more a Christian republic than a Mohammedan republic. Let him be calm; no one is advocating a state religion; no one is invoking state aid for the propagation of any religion or creed. Christians are as much opposed as non-Christians to a union of church and state.

No religious test is applied by our government and none will be applied. The Journal editor says: "This is a republic, recognizing no religion, keeping religion carefully out of public matters, from the lawmaking bodies to the public schools, keeping church and state separate and for that, in the name of the church and the state, God be praised."

To this the Christian says "amen," but what has that to do with the merits of Christianity? Must a Christian deny or conceal his belief in the superiority of Christianity as a religion? Must he purge from the Bible every phrase that asserts the supremacy of Christ in the moral world?

Christians are as loyal to the constitution as non-Christians—as free as non-Christians to "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Mr. Bryan knows this by both experience and observation. He has been a member of the Presbyterian church since he was fourteen. In politics he has never asked to what church a man belonged or whether he belonged to any. He has supported people of all denominations and people not connected with any church. He applies no religious test to a candidate, whether the office to which he aspires is high or low. He recently included in a list of men available for the presidency representatives of Protestants, Catholics and Jews, and there were some in the list of whose religious views he knows nothing. He can not be justly accused of trying to unite the state with any church. The same can be said of Christians generally. When Mr. Bryan was a candidate for president, members of his own church opposed him as freely and as earnestly as he was supported by men who differed from him on religious questions.

When he votes for a Jew he does not ask him to relinquish his belief that his people are a chosen people. When he votes for a Catholic he does not ask him to abandon his faith in his church as the true church. When he votes for a non-church member he does not ask him to accept any creed or to profess belief in any religion; and he does not feel that he is required to abate his interest in Christianity in order to take part in politics.

The Journal editor deprecates religious prejudice and yet his editorial is, in fact, an appeal to prejudice, but he will find few as prejudiced as he shows himself to be, and he can not excuse his prejudice on the ground of "simplicity of heart" or "childish ignorance." The Christian does not feel offended when the Jew denies that Christ is the promised Messiah; and the Jew does not feel offended when the Christian accepts Christ as the fulfillment of prophecy. Each works the harder because he BELIEVES and both Christian and Jew have proven the value of faith.

Christian and Jew admit, and will protect, the right of American citizens to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, or not to worship Him at all, and they have no doubt that non-Christians will be as tolerant and allow Jew and Gentile to cherish such religious views as they please.

Religious belief includes not only the right of the non-Christian to criticize Christianity and Christians, but the right of the Christian to express faith in his religion.

Mr. Bryan believes in God as a creator, preserver and father; he believes in the Bible as the word of God and he believes in Christ as Son of God, Savior and Example. He believes that Christianity is the greatest force in the world for good; he believes that history proves its civilizing power—a power that propagates itself not by force but by example—and he can not be fairly charged with offending adherents of other religions or opponents of all religions, when he states what he believes to be a fact. If he is mistaken as to the fact let the mistake be pointed out and condemned, but no one is justified in accusing him of giving offense to

those holding other religious views or of attempting to convert the government into an agency for the propagation of a religion.

WHARTON BARKER'S TESTIMONY

Following is an Associated Press dispatch: Washington, Nov. 28.—Wharton Barker, a retired banker of Philadelphia, sprung a sensation on the senate committee on interstate commerce today when he alleged that a New York financier told him in 1904, that the financial interests would support Theodore Roosevelt for president "because the latter had made a bargain with them on the railroad question."

Mr. Barker's statement came in the midst of a vigorous attack on the "money trust," in which he alleged also that President Roosevelt had been given the details of the impending panic of 1907 several months before it happened, but took no action to prevent it. He declared that the Aldrich currency plan was the handiwork, not of Former Senator Aldrich, but of Mr. Warburton, of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York, and that a fund of \$1,000,000 had been started to insure its adoption.

"Three or four weeks before the election in 1904," Mr. Barker said, "I was walking down Broadway when I met one of the most distinguished money kings in New York, a man now dead." He said to me:

"We are going to elect Roosevelt."

"I expressed surprise and asked if he had given up the support of Parker. He said yes, that they had frightened Roosevelt so that he had made a bargain with them."

Members of the committee looked somewhat incredulous and Mr. Barker added:

"I wish Mr. Roosevelt were here."

"I wish he were," Senator Townsend said, "it would be interesting."

Mr. Barker said the financial giant, whom he declined to name, told him that "Roosevelt had made a bargain on the railroad question."

Mr. Barker continued:

"He is to holler all he wants to," he told me, "but by and by a railroad bill will be brought in by recommendation of the president cutting off rebates and free passes, which suits us, who own the railroads, permitting the railroads to make pooling arrangements and providing for maximum rates."

The railroad man added, Mr. Barker said, that under the latter authority it would be possible to add from \$300,000,000 to \$400,000,000 to the total freight charges paid by the American public.

"I told him I didn't believe Roosevelt had made any such agreement," Mr. Barker said, "but when the annual message of 1905 went to congress he recommended most of those things. I wrote to President Roosevelt and told him what I heard, and that I had thought the man lied, but now I must believe he had not. It was the only letter of mine Mr. Roosevelt ever failed to answer."

Members of the committee asked Mr. Barker to give the name of the financial man who had told him that Roosevelt was to be elected.

"I can not do it," Mr. Barker said, "but subsequently somebody was alleged to have stolen some correspondence between Mr. Harriman and the president telling of \$250,000 put up for election expenses in the city of New York."

Referring to the panic of 1907, Mr. Barker said a man who was present at a conference at J. P. Morgan's house in May, came to him in Philadelphia and wanted him to use his influence with President Roosevelt to stop a plan that had been mapped out, he alleged, by the financial leaders. The man was a captain in the rough riders, he said, and had used his own influence with the president, but without avail.

"The plan," Mr. Barker said, "contemplated the curtailment of loans, the withdrawal of credit, the putting away of money by those interested where they could get it when they needed it to stop the panic and the enforcement of the various state laws regarding the holding of cash reserves by the banks and trust companies."

Mr. Barker said that in October when the financial upheaval reached its crisis, he urged President Roosevelt to distribute the \$145,000,000 of cash on hand in the treasury among the banks of Chicago, Philadelphia Boston and other large cities.

"He wanted to do it," he said, "but he called in Mr. Knox and Mr. Cortelyou and Mr. Root, and instead of depositing in the outside cities he plunged the whole amount into Wall street. It broke the country, but it saved the gamblers."

The Philadelphia man, whose banking house

at one time was financial agent for the Russian government, declared that those who backed the Aldrich monetary plan had begun a "propaganda" in which it was promised to spend \$1,000,000 to secure the indorsement of the proposed currency legislation.

"Yesterday a banker in Philadelphia started to collect that city's share of the money, \$100,000," he said.

He declared that the "great money oligarchy in New York controlled all lines of finance, industry and transportation and that no legislation designed to break up the trusts would strike at the root of the trouble.

"Few people appreciate how, by control of the money of trust companies, savings banks and national and state banks this money trust has throttled individual enterprise," he said.

He urged a law that would compel national banks to hold their legal reserve in cash instead of having the power to redeposit part of it in the banks of New York.

"Nothing but those immense reserves, varying from \$250,000,000 to \$350,000,000 makes New York the money power it is," Mr. Barker said, insisting that the Aldrich currency plan would strengthen this financial force by enabling the banks to use public credit for their own ends.

Senator Cummins expressed the opinion that the plan did not sanction the use of public credit or place any obligations upon the government. Mr. Barker urged a central bank of the United States to be controlled by directors chosen from arbitrary districts covering the whole country.

"That would take the people out of the clutches of Wall street and put them in possession of their own rights," he said.

William R. Loyall of Richmond, Va., also appeared before the committee and declared the decree to dissolve the American Tobacco company was a "roaring farce." He also asserted that the Sherman anti-trust law, if strictly interpreted, was unconstitutional and needed amendment.

Associated Press dispatch: New York, Nov. 29.—Alton B. Parker, presidential nominee on the democratic ticket in 1904, took issue today with the statements made yesterday by Wharton Barker in so far as to apply to Mr. Barker's intimation that the financial interests ever had intended to support Parker against Theodore Roosevelt.

"Mr. Barker probably did not weigh his words carefully enough," said Mr. Parker when his attention was called to that part of Mr. Barker's testimony before the senate committee in which he said an eminent financier, now dead, had told him the money powers had decided to desert Parker and had made a bargain with Roosevelt.

"There can be no doubt whatever," he said, "that the republican party and the interests which constituted its leaders were always in opposition to the democratic party. But it served their purpose then to get Mr. Roosevelt better trained in leading strings, and to that end they withheld their checks for a time and talked of hostility and undoubtedly spoke occasionally in friendly terms of the opposing candidate."

THE RECALL OF JUDGES

To the Editor of the New York World: Who is doing more to bring about the recall of the judiciary than the judges themselves?

Who that has read the cases of the Oil and Sugar trusts and of the many rich smugglers and food-adulterators does not feel that this issue is being forced upon the people by the prospective victims of it themselves? Who is doing more to make a mockery of our vaunted equality?

I am not clamoring for the recall of the judiciary, but can one do otherwise than think it desirable on reading the Duveen case and many others?—P. A. Neumann, N. Y., Nov. 20.

INVITING SOCIALISM

When trust magnates say that competition can not be restored between big corporations they invite socialism. If the doctrine thus contended for is ever accepted by the public, then the only remaining question will be whether the profits of monopoly shall be enjoyed by a few favored individuals or by the public. The democratic party is opposed to socialism and it therefore stands for a restoration of competition. It may be difficult to "unscramble eggs," as Mr. Morgan suggests, but it is better to separate the members of a trust than to endure either private monopoly or its legitimate offspring—socialism.