

as moral obligation, amendable to a law of its own, a law which, if violated, offers no opportunity for escape. The wrong done may be corrected, though not without loss, and so much of the penalty as shall not have been inflicted may be withheld. It is no avail to deny the fault, no advocate or attorney can be employed to bewilder the judgment that imposes the penalty, no jury can be selected, either on account of its wisdom or its ignorance, to agree or disagree concerning it, no witnesses can be bribed or intimidated to misstate the facts, no question of insanity, emotional or otherwise can be raised. No evidence of general good character will avail, no matter whether the conduct be voluntarily or involuntarily on the part of the offender, or whether he be engaged at the time in conduct as toward other laws creditable or infamous, if he violate the organic law of his own structure, the act is unlawful and unconstitutional as to himself and his posterity, and the punishment is absolutely assured.

In contending for obedience to the law of our organization physically, let me not be understood as holding it paramount to laws which include the regulation of conduct in relation to more enduring interests. The moral law is above the purely physical, but runs concurrently with it so far as the latter reaches, and then goes on with its sanctions into eternity.

There are some well-defined borders between the two codes, though in their antecedents and in their consequence they may largely involve each other. If the moral law commands, "thou shalt not kill," the mandate takes notice only of the person who kills, and is indifferent to the person killed. The physical law, on the contrary, is indifferent to the person killing, and only takes notice of the person killed. The moral law is interested in the moral turpitude of the act—the physical only takes knowledge of bones broken, or lacerated tissues that violate its own requisitions and executes final judgment in death.

When the moral law says "thou shalt not steal," it deals only with the thief, and does not regard the person stolen from. The physical law may or may not take notice of him who has suffered the loss, but if the robbery is such as to cause him to starve, then it does, and under its laws he suffers, perhaps dies. If in the first instance, that of killing, the violation of the natural law was by accident or in self-defense, through ignorance or insanity, it would not in the least miti-