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The special legislation which has been obtained in relation to Mr. Gerry's Society, will, when it comes to public notice, occasion more criticism, especially in what rights he claims to exercise in criminal cases, in making arrests and in interfering, if he chooses, with the District Attorney, even in the conduct of criminal trials, where his society has been connected with the charge.

It would have been wiser to have summoned Mr. Stewart before the Commissioner, and to have awaited his return for that purpose. The State Board of Charities, however, can carry on the investigation under the authority of the present law, and the inquiry, as thus far conducted, will be productive of public good.

THE CASE OF DREYFUS.

The most notable recent event, on which the eyes of all the world have been concentrated, is the practical unanimity with which the court of last resort in France has directed a new trial for this officer, so long imprisoned and suffering a punishment, the severity of which is quite unparalleled. The conviction being the result of a military trial in which the honor, so called, of officers of high standing in the French army was involved, the race question, the religious feeling, and the French attachment to the honor of the army, were obstacles in the way of revision of the sentence, which have been well-nigh insurmountable. It is something beyond and beneath all, that has triumphed. It is the eternal principle of justice. The Court of Cassation has demonstrated that the honor of France was at stake, and that it was safe in the hands of its highest judicial tribunal.

The decision of the Court will command the respect of mankind. It will rehabilitate and strengthen confidence in a court which has ignored the clamor of the mob, the danger of internal revolution, the hatred of the Jew, and in the name of justice added new lustre to the ancient glory of France.
State of Connecticut by itself for the popular price of 50 cents a copy and it will form a part of Vol. I, of which it is a part of the 5th Series.

The remaining part of Series 5 of that volume will contain the State of Rhode Island, which will also be published as a separate brochure at the same price. Its publication, which will shortly occur, has been delayed in obtaining portraits of the earlier Judges, of which a large number have been secured.

Series 6 of Vol. I of the same work, will also soon be completed and will contain Minnesota, New Hampshire and Ohio. There has been unavoidable delay in obtaining portraits of the earlier Judges of these States, and the Bar of each of said States are appealed to, to aid the editor in securing portraits of the earlier Judges, of which a complete list will be found in the June and September number of this Journal.

If the Bench or Bar of these States desire to obtain separate brochures of each State, they will be furnished separately on order at the same price—50 cents each copy.

The price of Vol. I, containing the whole six series, can be had for $5 per volume.

FRANCE AND JUSTICE.

It seems to be in vogue to assail France because of the conviction of Capt. Dreyfus and his terrible punishment; and our journals decry France, as if she had turned a deaf ear to the demand that went up from the voice of the world for the release of Dreyfus, suffering for a crime of which all mankind believed him innocent.

It is a grave error to assail France and French Justice, as has been done in America, England and elsewhere.

It was a French Court that set aside the first conviction of Dreyfus, for fraud, perjury and forgery, the proofs of which were furnished by the officials of the Government of France.

It was not France that condemned Dreyfus on the second
trial. It was a military and not a judicial Tribunal. It was the action of a simple Court Martial of lesser and inferior officers, selected by the Generals who were under fire and really on trial themselves, from among those whom they believed they could induce, to shield themselves by his conviction, and this Military Board, on which not one Judge sat, came within a hair’s breadth of refusing to second the wishes of the Generals who selected it, by its verdict.

It is France and the French Government, that instantly restored Dreyfus to liberty, without waiting for the decision of the intermediate appellate Military Tribunal; France that would not rest for a day under such a cloud of obloquy as that finding of the Court Martial involved and engendered.

It was France, the old ally of America, our long-time friend, which loves justice and truth and fair play, whose Government trampled upon the scandalous findings of the Court Martial, defied the mob and rehabilitated the sacred and eternal principles of justice, that has never been stained by the decision of the Highest Judicial Tribunal of France.

Who among us would assail the integrity of the Supreme Court of the United States, or of the American Government by reason of the finding of a military Court Martial, in its action respecting an American officer for violation of the regulations of the military code?

The highest French Court did its duty in reversing the action in the first proceeding, and if it ever comes before that Tribunal again, it will again set its seal of condemnation and reversal on the affair at Rennes.

France is entitled to our praise, not our censure—_Vive la France._

---

**WYOMING STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY.**

The third annual meeting of this body will be held at Laramie, Wyoming, on October 10 and 11, 1899, under the Presidency of R. Harvey Reid, M. D. Surgeon-General of that
and up to three years, with a system of licenses graduated according to sentence, which should be freely exercised.

Should not the thoughtful minds of Great Britain consider whether it would not be worth the trial in the case of youths, of previous good character, who have been convicted of first offences, to hold out to them a ray of hope for a better life, and an opportunity of redemption, on the lines of that splendid experiment made at the Elmira Reformatory, than the future which the present English convict prison gives.

We in America are striving to surround such a youth with influences that will reform and regenerate him and restore him to society and true manhood, and the results show how higher and nobler is this effort than the present English prison system.

DREYFUS AND FRANCE.

The action of the Cour de Cassation, in France, in ordering a new trial on the appeal of Capt. Dreyfus, demonstrates that the highest judicial tribunal of France was safe, and certain, to decide in the interest of justice, and to reverse and set aside the conviction of the first Court Martial on the evidence of forgery, fraud and perjury, which Esterhazy, the suicide of Henry and the confessions of Henry had demonstrated.

It was because the Supreme Tribunal once held that justice was higher than prejudice against the Jew, and that no matter what came of the military chiefs compromised by the revelations of forgery and fraud, the ermine of the French Bench would be unstained by any act that would deny justice to the innocent.

The appeal of Capt. Dreyfus to the Cour de Cassation, was for a new trial before a military commission in the nature of what is known in English speaking countries as a Court Martial.

It should be remembered by those who are assailing the decision of the military officers composing this Court Martial, as if it was the action of a Court of France, that there has not
been one of the Judges of the French Courts connected with this proceeding; that it has been a purely military trial, before officers of the French Army, under the rules and regulations governing military Court Martials in France.

It is as unwise as it is absurd to rail against France, and the Courts and the judiciary of France, or to claim that because these French officers had refused to fasten what they believed to be an ineffaceable stain upon the fair fame of the French Army, and to brand as criminals the Generals high in place who were the real persons on trial; or to imagine or believe, that the French nation and people had gone mad, and let hatred of the Jew and adoration of the Army overcome love of justice and destroy or emasculate the conscience of the French people.

The American and the British press have treated this finding of an inferior Court Martial as if it were a judicial decision of a high French Court of justice—which it is not.

We have no right for one moment to doubt what will be the attitude of the Highest Court of France on the case if it ever reaches that august Tribunal. There was not a Judge or even a lawyer on that board of military men who composed that Court Martial. They were all officers of that Army, in which blind obedience to orders had been ever held to be a cardinal virtue. Each had been trained and drilled to believe and act on the assumption that the honor of the Army was higher than the individual rights of a soldier or an officer, and that the life even of an officer would not for an instant stand in the scale, when danger to the State was in the balance.

When the very Generals whose conduct and action—and who were really on trial—were allowed to state their opinions, wishes and the unfavorable opinions of others, in utter disregard of the rules of evidence as maintained in any Court of Justice in the world, is it not a marvel that two officers could be found of sufficient courage and stamina to vote against the wishes of their Generals; when three votes would have served to quash the proceeding, and when the third voice—really opposed to the conviction—could only be induced to sign
the finding, by complying with his demand, that every member of the Board of Officers should sign a statement of extenuating circumstances, which means very much in France—it has a significance unknown in America or in England and analogous proceedings?

It was only a hair’s breadth by which these generals escaped that annihilation which would have befallen them had the hesitating third officer refused to sign the findings of the Board.

The English press almost with one voice are railing against the decision. What would they say had such a thing occurred in their own country, and it had been a criminal trial, where there was no appeal.

There is, thank God, and the cause of justice and human liberty, an appeal in France. That appeal lies to the higher Military Board and officers, and above all is the Supreme Court of Justice of France, to which an appeal over all lies. The decision of that court in reversing the finding of the first court-martial, despite the whole influence of the generals and of the army, in the face of the mob, and the threatened revolution of those who demanded innocent blood, is an earnest of that eternal principle of justice, which has never yet been sullied or tarnished by their Supreme Court, and which is there as safe as is the liberty of the humblest citizen of France, be he Jew or Gentile, Atheist or Christian, if he be a loyal son of France.

The Investor’s Review of London, Sept. 16, 1899, in commenting upon the finding of the Court Martial, says:

"Nay, even to the unhappy men who form the majority of that Court Martial we might at least accord some measure of pity. Consider their position. They know nothing about law or about the nature and rules of evidence, and they sat there day after day for a month under the eyes of men who were their superiors in the military hierarchy, bullied by these men, threatened by them, and as good as ordered to give a verdict in accordance with their demands. How many of us—let each man ask himself—would have been able to withstand this exhibition of military insolence on the part of superior officers had we been put to the test? Suppose seven colonels and majors and captains of the English army assembled in like conditions, with Lord Wolseley, the Duke of Connaught, Sir Redvers Buller, Sir Evelyn Wood, and a few other general officers in constant secret communication with the members of this Court, who are daily threatened and overawed by them during the hearing of a case.
Could we have found seven men in the British army on whom to rely to give a verdict in accordance with justice and truth and their consciences, regardless of what might happen to them if they disobeyed the generals? We take leave to doubt it."

What would have been the findings of an American Court Martial composed of similar officers of the regular army of the United States, had officers of the highest rank been involved and directly charged with fraud, perjury and the suppression of the truth, as was the case in France, especially when the men accused selected the Court Martial from friendly officers in their own interest and from among their personal friends and subordinate officers?

It is, however, not a case in which the American Government can for one moment interfere.

The Government of France, having furnished the evidence which led to the reversal of the findings of the first Court Martial by the Court of last resort, shows that it would not respect the findings, and instantly pardoned Capt. Dreyfus and set him at liberty.

This was the natural and logical solution of the interference on the part of the Government of France which led to the new trial and the reversal of the findings of the first Court Martial.

The Cour de Cassation of France has always stood as high as any judicial Tribunal in the civilized world. As a whole it has no superior in the world, not only for the maintainance of justice in France, but for its swift action. As a Court it is a model; as an appellate Tribunal it is unique, and in many respects far excels our own in its practical work and operation, especially in the preventive of what are known as "the laws delays."

For the purity of the Court, its absolute fearlessness, it has no superior on the globe.

Whatever may betide France, none have ever doubted the rectitude of the French Bench, and no one at all familiar with France or her history, can for one moment doubt the absolute integrity of the judiciary of France. Of the French Bar it may be said that it is not inferior to that of England in ability,
character or standing, and those who have most carefully analyzed its great and lustrous names, must confess that it would not suffer in contrast with the Bar of our own country.

Capt. Dreyfus is a Frenchman and a French officer. He is not an American citizen, as Mrs. Maybrick is. There our Government has and can rightfully interfere. She, like Dreyfus, is innocent. Her punishment has been ten years of terrible suffering; his five; hers the more severe, the more terrible for her to endure in its physical suffering than was his crimes and terrible as his woes.

Dreyfus can appeal to the highest court in France and his vindication is only a question of time. Mrs. Maybrick, alas, has no appeal. If her case could go before the High Court for Crown cases reserved, or if criminal appeal existed in England as it does in France, she would be at once discharged.

No one need fear that the court of last resort in France will not see that justice is done in the case of Dreyfus. When the case reaches that Supreme Judicial Tribunal, Dreyfus will surely be vindicated.

FIRST CONGRES INTERNATIONAL DE MEDICINE PROFESSIONELLE ET DE DEONTOLOGIE MEDICALE—PARIS, 23–28 JULY, 1900.

The announcement of this Congress addressed to the fellows of the Medico-Legal Society has reached us.
The officers are as follows:
President—S. Lerebonlet, Rue de Sille 44, Paris.
Secretary-General—Jules Glover, Rue du Fauberg-Poissonnier 37.
The address of the Bureau is Masson et Cie, 120 Boulevard, Saint Germaine, Paris, France.
This Congress will have four Sections: M. Andre, of Toul-erne, is the President of the First Section; M. Queirel, of Mar-seilles, of the Second; M. Lacassagne, of Lyon, of the Third, and M. Gross, of Nancy, of the Fourth.
THE DREYFUS CASE.

BY HOWARD ELLIS, ESQ., OF NEW YORK CITY.

A famous English Judge, Chief Justice Willes, said that one of three things made a great lawyer: a miracle, special pleading, or the assizes; either the highest appreciation of the relation of man to government, a man of genius; a clear knowledge of the process of legal thought, a pleader; or an exact perception of the circumstances and incidents of human transactions, the knowledge of the rules of evidence. The office of the lawyer is the ascertainment of moral truth; that condition of facts which exhibits a man in relation to his fellow. To reach this conclusion, and to submit to an adjudication, is the duty of the practitioner.

It is evident that the determining body, the court, must be in a receptive condition of mind to accept and act upon the facts presented to them. All favor, fear or affection must be expelled, that a sound, a sane judgment may be declared. "A sane mind in a sound body" is the first requirement of a judge. Observation will show that great jurists have been distinguished by fine health and temperate minds. In the selection of jurors, men of equable mind are called for the general panel, and in the jury box. The reputable citizen is put upon the panel, and the unprejudiced man is chosen for the jury itself. When the trial body is both judge and jury the highest sense of just conduct must be exercised, a sense of honor. In the application of criminal justice this sense must be acute.

In modern times, this authority is entrusted to the discretion of administrative bodies only, the most notable of

Read at October Session Medico-Legal Society, 1899.
which is the court-martial. That tribunal is chosen from officers of clear faculties and high character, and any departure in the selection, or in their action, arouses universal alarm and condemnation. The consideration of the action of such a body of men interests alike the physician and the lawyer, and is peculiarly a matter for discussion before this society. The operations of the mind must be tested by sane conclusions, by sound determinations; the former the function of the doctor, the latter that of the lawyer. The examination of the trial of Captain Dreyfus, because of the intensity of the public interest, and the unbroken line of criticism (every one participating in it) becomes a fit subject for our consideration.

To say that the procedure in his case has shocked mankind is not enough; it has appalled the nations. The aid of the French Bar, that marvel of ability; the learning of the Academy—the Immortals, and the wise patriotism of the foremost statesmen, were all rejected, while the insolent assertions of military intolerance were not only received but invited. Justice and humanity are the distinct features of civilization; one finding its expression in war, the other the protection of the weak. In a forum comprised by a court-martial the purest administration of human justice should be found. Exact evidence and broad principle only must direct such a body. To assume that any control, within or without, personal prejudice or public passion, may interfere, is intolerable. When force and injustice move together to degrade or destroy, the cry arises: "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless millions mourn."

High and universal condemnation of the Dreyfus court-martial is the judgment of the peoples, and this is the arraignment of a nation. No plea of defense has yet been
heard, neither will it be heard. Confession and contrition alone will "purge the general weal" of France.

In the beginning of our jurisprudence, in the feudal times, the jury was composed of the witnesses, and justice was sharp and swift. Now the refinement of procedure has made prominent the aid of expert testimony. Convenience has become a necessity, with that tyrant's methods. Necessity knows no law, because it cares not to know. But when harsh justice is administered at a tyrant's hand, then the end has come. The court at Rennes, dominated by the feudal spirit which the "Revolution" did not destroy, and animated by wilfulness of opinion, has mixed elements of adjudication, possibly benign when separate, but when combined have produced a force which disrupted justice. England in her most cruel age, France when mercy took her flight, do not show so heartless an act as the outcome of the trial of Alfred Dreyfus. And a court of honor was a divided court. Persecution has exhausted her torments, and her cry of the law is a blasphemy.