

vocating it but by exemplifying the necessity for it, has done more in the same direction by assuming to decitizenize an American citizen because he doesn't vote to suit Judge Hanford. This judge's reported reasons are that the citizen in question votes with a party—the Socialist party—which “has for its main object the complete elimination of property rights in this country,” and that inasmuch as this citizen held those views when he was naturalized, but did not disclose them, he was guilty of fraud in concealing views contrary to the Constitution. Therefore Judge Hanford revokes the judgment of naturalization which another court had given two years ago. It is rather difficult to see enough judicial competency in this extraordinary judge to make it safe to entrust him with the political rights even of a bumblebee. Whatever the Constitution may declare regarding property, or any other subject, that declaration is just as much a part of the Constitution as the clause permitting its amendment, and no more. Every citizen, natural born or naturalized, has a Constitutional right to advocate any amendment to the Constitution, and to vote for it effectively if it comes to vote by due process of law. Doesn't Judge Hanford know that? If then this decitizenized Socialist is in Judge Hanford's opinion unfit for citizenship because he advocates Constitutional amendments derogatory to certain property clauses in that instrument, what about the fitness for judicial power of a judge who virtually decides that the amendatory clauses of the Constitution are unconstitutional?



“LET NO GUILTY MAN ESCAPE.”

This is not a protest against letting guilty men escape from legalized vengeance, which is cruelty by “due process of law.” It is a talk back to men who demand that every guilty person be caught and convicted, and that every one convicted be punished “according to law”; a word to men who demand the pound of flesh, no matter how much blood or whose blood comes with the flesh; to men who deny the difference between justice and social vengeance; to men who make a fetish of “law.”

Such men are of many sorts and creeds. Some are clergymen, who prove by the Old Testament that every man who kills must be killed by society; who argue that men will lose “respect for law” unless the full measure of legalized savagery be meted out to wrong-doers,—and this regardless of the brutalizing effect upon society and the murderous effect upon the families of the wrong-doers. They sometimes tell us it is “the Father's will.”

Which is to say, “man-made law is the Father's will until the law is amended or repealed”; and that is to say—“the Father's will may be amended or repealed by the legislature.” They can prove it, too, if you don't cross-examine them.

Why demand the impossible?

Some of the guilty are not caught. We can't prove it on all that are caught. Some of the caught are hanged, others imprisoned—and then we may learn that they were “caught but not guilty.” They are forced to pay an unjust debt. But we make no restitution.



Here and there in the Old Testament we hear this blood-hungry, wolfish howl, “Let no guilty man escape.” Not in those words, but in words that mean the same thing. If one man knocked out another's eye, the offender was to lose an eye. It was payment in kind, but not in kindness.

Queer mixed ideas those old Hebrews had. They were intensely, savagely religious. They believed in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of—Hebrews. Yet if one Hebrew Brother maliciously cut off the foot of another Hebrew Brother, the Father was supposed to approve of and command payment or vengeance in kind. But common sense tells us that one maimed Brother in the family is more than enough. If half the Hebrew Brothers maliciously deprived the other half of one foot each, the law of vengeance—“the Father's will,” mind you—demanded a population of one-footed men. Can you beat that for absurdity? But it was “law and order,” wasn't it?

Well, if we don't beat that absurdity we tie the score. Recently, when a Milwaukee judge sentenced a man-killer to support the family of his victim, the judgment was so contrary to law and so harmonious with common sense that newspapers printed pictures of the murderer, the judge and the murdered man's wife. It wasn't “law and order”—just order, without law.



After many centuries of cruel experiment that unprofitable and un-Brotherly law of vengeance was still unworkable. Then out of a carpenter's shop came Jesus with the Golden Rule and the “new commandment” that was the Law of Love—and still is. We haven't used it enough to heat its bearings, but it might work if we did use it. We know the law of vengeance won't work.

Nowhere on the social bulletin board did Jesus write, “Let no guilty man escape.” You can't find that anywhere in his teachings, and no “light-of-reason”—logic of a court can fit it into the Law of

Love and make a good job. We can't drive or lead the Law of Vengeance and the Law of Love in harness together. If a law won't work, and can't be worked, it should be repealed. Jesus suggested that the Law of Vengeance be repealed and that the Law of Love be substituted for it. The suggestion is so good that for many centuries some men have quoted it in church. But some highly civilized men have grown into the belief that the church is a sort of penal institution to which the Law of Love must be sentenced for life, to keep it from burglarizing the minds of business saints in their homes and offices. When the Law of Love takes hold of a man and makes him part of itself, you know what happens to that man. A large, very dirty finger of scorn is pointed at him. The dirt on the finger is "muck." The finger belongs to the tribe of muck-makers, who suspend the muck-making operations of that finger to drive what they call a "public enemy" into the wilderness. Don't forget that the other names of muck are: "Private profit from public taxation" and "private profit from vice." Twin brothers.

The dirty finger pulled out of the muck-heap and pointed at men who teach the Law of Love is a busy finger—and a business finger. The Law of Vengeance is one of the props of the "established order," which has several aliases, one of which is "Wholesale Grand Larceny with an Immunity Bath Attachment."

What will the Law of Love do to the "established order"? You remember what happened to the walls of Jericho in Joshua vi, 20, don't you?



If we should awaken tomorrow in an era of "let no guilty man escape" enforced to the letter, how many would be left to do the hanging, the electrocuting and the locking of prison doors? Why aren't more of us honest enough to say with Stefens: "I'm guilty, but haven't been caught"? Because we don't want to be arrested on suspicion, or can't give a good account of ourselves, or haven't fixed up an alibi?

Long ago some blood-hungry men admitted, but didn't say, what all of us would say if we were honest: "I'm guilty, but haven't been caught." It was just outside the walls of Jerusalem, at the Mount of Olives. The Scribes and Pharisees brought to Jesus a woman "taken in adultery." You have read the story. But have you read all of it?

Have you read the part that isn't told? They didn't bring the man, mind you. Was it because he had a "pull," or knew too much about that crowd? Ever think of that?

You have heard ministers preach sermons on that story, haven't you? I have. But did you ever hear a preacher comment on the fact that they didn't bring the man, and try to explain that? I never did. Those old Scribes and Pharisees caught the weaker criminal and let the stronger one escape. He carried his immunity bath with him. Isn't that our way? Anyhow, they brought the woman to Jesus, read the indictment, quoted the law commanding that "such be stoned," and asked Jesus what he thought about it. He didn't answer at first. He wasn't thinking of "let no guilty man escape." Otherwise he would have asked: "Where's the man? Isn't he guilty too? Why didn't you catch him?" When they insisted on an answer to their "let-no-guilty-woman-escape" question, he said: "He that is without sin among you; let him first cast a stone at her."

Did they find a select "not guilty" few for a firing squad? Not in that crowd. The record says, with grim humor: "And they which heard it, being convicted by their own consciences, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last." Every one of them handed in the verdict against himself, "Guilty but not caught." And the record continues, with the same grim humor: "When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, 'Woman, where are those, thine accusers? Hath no man condemned thee?' " No one had condemned her. The jury had discharged itself, and gone home with a bad attack of conscience-ache.

They were hungry for that woman's blood; they wanted the joy of the Manhunt; they were eager to serve God by crushing out a life with stones. But they had forgotten their hands, which looked and smelled of muck. Jesus said in effect, "What's that on your hands?" They looked, saw it wasn't a laundry mark, and sneaked away. As was right, the eldest went first, for these had accumulated more muck on their hands than had the younger ones.

"This stone-throwing business is for the innocent, for those without sin," is the answer they got. And there wasn't a Gridley among them ready to fire. There wasn't a man whose conscience would let him lie long enough to pick up a stone. And when the shamed men went away, leaving against the woman the verdict, "No more guilty than we are," Jesus didn't set aside the verdict, but told the woman to "Go and sin no more."

Honestly, do you think Jesus "encouraged law-breaking" or had "maudlin sympathy for law-breakers"? Do you think he was blowing up the foundations of civilized society? No. He was

practicing what he taught. And some ministers sometimes preach the same thing; and business men, politicians and newspapers sometimes strike that same chord, don't they?

Yes, and what puzzles me is that ministers and super-moral men and newspapers that howl against Executive clemency, and demand the letter of the "Let-no-guilty-man-escape" law, haven't the courage to denounce Jesus for setting aside the death penalty in the case of that woman. They don't even criticize his failure to demand that the uncaught man be caught.



Jesus had shamed those Scribes and Pharisees into "turning a criminal loose upon the community." Wasn't he teaching "disrespect for law"? What if the law wasn't respectable? it was law, wasn't it? Good, wholesome, fiendish, criminal law set aside by the Teacher of morals—and there's not a "law-abiding" minister or editor in Christendom with the courage to denounce His "law-defying" act.

"Thumbs down for all caught criminals—and catch all the uncaught." That's the demand.

But how many of the demanders are willing to spring the gallows-trap, be a penitentiary guard or foreman of a murderous jute room? It's no answer to say that others are appointed to perform those social functions. Are you, no matter who you are, willing to do those things? If you are not, are you ready to admit that you are governed by "maudlin sentiment"? And why demand that some of your fellow servants be compelled or ordered by law to do things you are not willing to do?

If you want the "tooth-and-claw" law enforced, but are unwilling to be the enforcing instrument, then you want some Brother to do dirty work that is revolting to you. And if you are willing to do dirty work that throws the Golden Rule and the Law of Love into the garbage can, do you think you are fit to be a "soldier of the common good" and a fellow servant with conscientious men—not caught, but guilty and sorry for it?

Our social stomach has become too squeamish to have that dirty work done out in the open. We say we hang men for *our* good, and shut them up within stone walls for *their* good. We can prove it, too—before we turn out the gas. But after we turn out the gas and get into bed we know it isn't true. It's hard to lie to yourself when you're in bed in the dark.

We want that dirty work done behind closed doors and stone walls. That's a healthy sign, for it means that we are ashamed of our savagery. The corn on our conscience is big enough to ache,

and after a time it's going to ache worse than did the conscience of the crowd that asked Jesus about stoning that woman.

And then?

We'll quit the degrading business. It not only tortures the "caught," but it brutalizes *us*. It doesn't pay in money or morals.

We are giving men *opportunity to do wrong*, tempting them to do wrong, and then rewarding them—provided they are not caught. Why not tempt them to do right, give them plenty of *opportunity to do right*, and reward them for that, even when we catch them at it? Maybe that will work better than the old way.

The old way has made us all sick, and we've been punishing the sickest. Why not try to heal the sick and prevent further sickness?

W. G. EGGLESTON.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

POLITICAL REVOLUTION IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Pittsburgh, May 12.

The primaries of April 13th last sounded the death knell to Penrose and Guffey as bosses of the Republican and Democratic parties in Pennsylvania. They were crushed so overwhelmingly by an outraged public that it is doubtful if they will ever be of any considerable significance in State political affairs again. Should the direct primary prove to be a failure in every other State in this Union, its service to the people of Pennsylvania in enabling them to overthrow these bipartisan bosses is sufficient compensation for all that has been done to place this weapon in the hands of the people.



Two weeks ago Boies Penrose went to the Republican State convention at Harrisburg, still unable to make himself believe that he would not be sole master of the situation. He summoned to his side the few old leaders who had managed to escape complete annihilation at the primaries, and although they had been masters of the political game they were absolutely powerless to stem the tide of destruction. After floundering around in this fashion for a day or two Penrose came to a full realization of what had really happened at the primaries, and without waiting to even sit in the convention he stole back to Philadelphia before the convention was called to order. For this desertion in the hour of battle he has been scathingly criticised by the few devotees whom he left behind to fight aimlessly and hopelessly.



Guffey, on the other hand, in the Democratic convention last week, remained loyal to the end and went down with colors flying in the camp of his followers. His annihilation was none the less complete, but it can be said to his credit that he did not