

EDITORIAL

## HANFORD AND M'NAMARA.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**U**NDER charges, and in the midst of an investigation that was going against him with increasing power, Federal Judge Cornelius H. Hanford wired his resignation from the Federal bench to President Taft.

We shall leave the President to bump his head alternately against the alternative of arousing the indignation of the thinking portion of the population by accepting the resignation of a Federal appointee under fire, and thereby allowing the malefactor to escape punishment by impeachment; and the alternative of refusing to accept the malefactor's resignation, and thereby incurring the resentment at the ballot box of the "moral forces" for whom the said malefactor was an instrument, and of whom he was an exponent. We shall leave the President in and to his dilemma. The Hanford resignation suggests matter of vastly greater import.

Judge Hanford had presumed to cancel the citizen papers of Leonard Olsson, a Tacoma, Wash., member of the Socialist Labor Party, simply for being a Socialist. The brazenly illegal act, upon the illegality of which we have amply commented, justified the suspicion that Judge Hanford's act of "patriotism" partook of the nature of the cry of "Stop thief!" The suspicion was promptly and amply confirmed. No sooner had the Congressional Investigating Committee begun its sessions in Seattle, when other charges—charges of peculation in office, not unlike, and perhaps even worse than, the charges upon which another Judge, Archibold, is now under impeachment proceedings at the bar of the Federal Senate—began to flow in torrentially upon the Committee. The charges on the Leonard Olsson case seemed to have unsealed a number of lips, that, before, dared not speak. Under the growing avalanche of these increasingly damaging charges, Judge Hanford resigned, on the ground that the strain upon him was too great.

Identically did John J. McNamara. The strain upon him also was too

great—and he also confessed.

The parallel between Hanford and McNamara is complete—up to a certain point.

Both, during their incumbency, were dynamiting society—the one with legal, the other with civic malfeasance. Both were a menace to the Commonweal—the one under the cloak of the ermine, while actually representing anarchy, the other under the cloak of Unionism, while actually representing the Civic Federationized and Militia-of-Christized A.F. of L. Both, and as an inevitable consequence of the above, were, and surely continue to be, detesters of Socialism as a “danger to patriotism, the family and religion.”

But there the parallel ends.

McNamara, the adoptive child of the House of Republican-Democratic Capitalism, the instant he confesses is “cast out,” so to speak, by his adoptive parents, and denounced as a type of villainy.

Hanford, the legitimate child of the identical House of Republican-Democratic Capitalism, when he confesses, is laid to bed, so to speak, and kindly nursed under the paternal roof-tree.

The member of the Working Class who allows himself to be adopted by the House of Capitalism will be debauched, used as cat's-paw, and, when at the end of his usefulness, thrown to the wolves, in striking contrast with the treatment bestowed by that House upon its legitimates—witness McNamara and Hanford.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded October 2013

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)