

Judicial Sacrosanctity.

As judge-worship in the United States is borrowed from Great Britain, along with her dear love of a lord (the latter for use here only on the strict q. t.), these remarks about British judges by T. P. O'Connor in the Chicago Tribune of June 18, with Winston Churchill's excoriation of British judges for his text, is instructive:

While the Tory papers are raging and some of the more decorous Liberals are silent, and while Mr. Emmott, the Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons, has condemned the language of Winston, and he was the other day silenced by a combination of Mr. Emmott's ruling and the angry shouts of the Tories, there is not the smallest doubt that he has given voice to the pent-up feeling of the masses and of the whole Liberal party. This feeling has been created by the judges themselves, with that strange arrogance which so often besets and entices and finally destroys privileges, impartiality, and fair play. The first offense was committed in the election petitions. Under the old law, whenever a petition was presented against the election of a member to the House of Commons, on any ground, the petition was tried by a committee of the House of Commons. That committee was formed on party lines, and its decisions, as a rule, were influenced largely, if not entirely, by party consideration. If the majority of the committee were Liberal, then a petition against a Liberal was pretty certain to be dismissed; if it were Tory, and the petition was against a Tory, similarly the petition would probably be treated in the same manner. When the suffrage was reduced and the masses of the people were for the first time allowed to have the vote and a share in the government of their country, it was determined that all politics should become more honest than it was in the old days of class ascendancy and wholesale corruption; and as a part of this reform the trial of election petitions was removed from the partisanship of the House of Commons to the supposed impartiality of the judicial bench. It was not long before it was discovered that politics had gone from the frying pan into the fire. For the supposed impartiality of the judicial bench was discovered in many cases to be a pure figment of the imagination. In one respect the judicial bench of England stands supreme in the history of the world. It is in all pecuniary matters absolutely without stain; a suspicion even of pecuniary corruption has never been whispered; I doubt if it has ever been entertained by anybody in the country. But those who know the judges best were the first to laugh at this idyllic picture of them as men entirely liberated from the ordinary class and party prejudices of the rest of mankind. Superstitions, however, die hard, and the faith in the absolute impartiality and the Olympian detachment of the judge from ordinary human weakness persisted for many years. It was not till time after time the judges gave undeniable proof of gross partiality that people here began to revise their estimate.

This bit of British history, in absolute conformity to human nature, should attract American attention just now. It confirms the growing and very

sound American opinion that judge-worship is dangerous to popular liberties when judges make law and plutocrats make judges.

+ +

The Lorimer-fund Treasurership.

While swearing that he was not treasurer of any Hines-Lorimer corruption fund, Edward Tilden discloses bookkeeping habits that would make him ideally competent for treasurerships of that kind.

+ +

Logic, Its Uses and Abuses.

Various versions of Woodrow Wilson's expression of contempt for logic in a speech at Portland having fluttered through the newspapers of the country, we are glad to get from C. E. S. Wood in the Pacific Monthly what is doubtless the literal version. Some one in the audience had interrupted one of Governor Wilson's six Portland speeches at a point where he said he had not yet been able to see the advantage of the Recall for judges. "You are illogical!" the auditor shouted; and Governor Wilson made this instant retort: "Yes; I am. Whenever I am illogical I am pretty sure I am right, for in the complexities of human life the logical man generally is bumping against human nature." Paradoxical as it may seem, this is true. But the reason is that "the logical man" who "is generally bumping against human nature" is not logical; or, if logical, his logic proceeds from false or imperfect premises.

+ +

Whether Governor Wilson was indulging in one of those rhetorical figures that are categorized with long names in the old rhetoric books, we don't know. His allusion to "the complexities of human life," and the paradoxical spirit of his retort, make the retort sound like such a figure; and no one can deny that he was fully within the rights of a public speaker if he intended to startle an auditor into doing some re-thinking, by seeming to be contemptuous only of a certain type of logician. Yet Governor Wilson may be one of those schoolmasters whose thought ripples along the surface so helplessly that when their processes of logic and their observations of human nature conflict they say, "There is no logic!" somewhat (and for this we have Scripture) as when they think that God doesn't work in harness with them, they say "There is no God!" We do not at all incline to believe this of Woodrow Wilson. His thought isn't as superficial as a