

accorded it, so there can be no doubt that if the people could be induced to see the judge in the light merely of an overpaid servant of the modern state, who absorbs an enormous proportion of their earnings, the better would it be for the soul's welfare of the judicial bench itself, as well as for the cause of fairplay. Paradox as it may seem, it is an undoubted truth that no judge can be strictly an honest man. The judge must necessarily be a man of inferior moral calibre. Though it is a thing one would say of no other man or body of men, yet I say unhesitatingly that a judge by the fact of his being a judge proclaims himself a creature on a lower moral level than us ordinary mortals, and this without any assumption of moral superiority above the average on our part. And why? Because the aspiring member of the bar when he accepts a judgeship knows that in so doing he **deliberately pledges himself** to functions which may at any moment compel him to act against his conscience and wrong another man. He **deliberately pledges himself**, that is, to be false to himself. He may any day have to pass sentence on one whom he believes to be innocent. He lays himself under the obligation of administering a law which he may know to be bad on any occasion when called upon, merely because it is a law. He makes this surrender of humanity and honor for what? For filthy lucre and tawdry notoriety. Now, I ask, can we conceive a more abjectly contemptible character than that which acts thus? If we want further proof of the utter degeneracy of moral tissue in such a being, let us examine the sophistries he uses in his defence, and which he endeavors on occasion to force down