

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 12, NO. 22

Lincoln, Nebraska, June 7, 1912

Whole Number 594

Later Returns

A financial publication, devoted to the boosting of the Aldrich currency scheme, has many compliments for Mr. Oscar Underwood and interprets the Alabama democratic platform as being favorable to that (the Aldrich) measure. This financial publication quotes the following editorial from the Atlanta Constitution:

"Mr. Underwood's record during the past session of congress has been very clear-cut on the currency and banking question. He was opposed at the start to the money trust inquiry, not because he did not want an investigation, but because of the shape that had been given to the subject by so-called progressive republicans who apparently had not the remotest conception of banking principles, and who were bitter in their opposition to all existing conditions, as well as to rational methods of reform. Later on, when Bryan democrats were misled into taking up the progressive scheme, Mr. Underwood stood firmly for keeping the investigation out of the hands of the extremists and political schemers and for putting it into the hands of the regularly organized committees, which would be likely to deal with it in a more sincere and effective manner. This attitude caused an immense amount of controversy and denunciation in caucus, but was successful in attaining its object, the final vote being overwhelmingly in favor of the Underwood plan."

But there are later returns. The house of representatives finally retraced its steps and under the pleas of such democrats as Robert L. Henry, adopted the plan whereby a real investigation is to be had. It was not at all to Mr. Underwood's credit that he fought this investigation. It would have been better if he had yielded in the beginning. Some of the men who followed him at first changed their attitude after they had heard from "the old folks at home."

CHANCE FOR JURY REFORM

Judge Charles B. Letton of the Nebraska supreme court recently delivered an opinion in which he condemned what he calls the "barbarities of the common law" resulting in jurymen being shut up until they consent to render a verdict. In this particular case the jury retired about noon Wednesday and reached a verdict Friday morning. The Lincoln News report of the case says: "Some of the jurymen stated in affidavits that they were not allowed to sleep for forty-eight hours and were forced to sleep in a verdict on account of physical exhaustion. Other jurymen signed affidavits declaring that they had a comfortable room, with table, chairs

and writing material and had plenty to eat and drink and that they were not exhausted."

Judge Letton, in condemning the practice generally, said:

"It is high time that the barbarities of the common law should be done away with and that verdicts should be reached as a result of thought and deliberation and not as a result of physical compulsion. There is no more reason for subjecting jurors to confinement in a small room for two nights and a day without opportunity for rest or repose than there would be for subjecting the judge himself or the other officers of the court to like privations.

"The strength of memory and capacity for sound judgment usually found in persons in elderly life, as a number of these jurors were, is apt to be impaired if they are deprived of sleep for forty-eight hours.

"Moreover under such conditions the man who is physically stronger may by force of that very fact prevail over the judgment of his brother juror who may be stronger mentally but physically weaker. We criticize the practice unfavorably in the hope that it may not be repeated, but in this case we are of opinion that the evidence sustains the finding that the verdict was not produced as a result of the exhaustion of the jurors, who make the affidavits."

Judge Letton has offered timely criticism. It would be well if judges and lawyers generally could take up the suggestion made by this Nebraska jurist in order that reformation may be accomplished.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TO BLAME

A woman has hit the nail on the head. Mrs. Harriett Stanton Blatch, speaking in New York City said: "Can nothing halt the vulgar quarrel which goes on day by day between our two leading citizens? Have we forgotten that the one raging combatant is an ex-president, and the other the chief executive of these United States? I am not so narrow-minded, so uninformed, as to hold that men 'are incapable of lasting friendship,' that when ambition steps in between them they will always turn and rend each other, but I do think the love the sex has for a fight has laid hold of our men and led them to form a ring about the combatants instead of stepping in and ending a quarrel which has become a national disgrace.

"And are there no wise men—nay, just men, with common sense in the republican party? Surely the squabble is but a family affair. Every tu quoque reveals only a skeleton in the republican cupboard. What profits it when the ex-president says the chief executive was at a certain cabinet meeting and the latter says he wasn't, when in any case the responsibility each is trying to shift to the other's shoulders is the responsibility of a republican cabinet?"

"Our president says the ex-president wrote a letter and the latter says he didn't. What matters it so long as the policy each tries to blame on the other was a policy of a republican administration? If there be any with brains in these shouting hosts of backers, can they not draw apart and formulate a principle about which the sane men of their party can rally?"

"For the sake of the reputation of men in friendship, for the sake of realities in political life, for the sake of our nation's good name, let this nauseous war of personalities cease!"

FIDELITY

Written in a personal letter to Mr. Bryan:
"A friendless warfare! lingering long
Through weary day and weary year
A wild and many-weaponed throng
Hang on thy front and flank and rear.

Yet nerve thy spirit to the proof,
And blench not at thy chosen lot;
The timid good may stand aloof,
The sage may frown—yet faint thou not.

Nor heed the shaft too surely cast,
The hissing, stinging bolt of scorn;
For with thy side shall dwell, at last,
The victory of endurance born."

What a Pity

The editor of the Wall Street Journal is disconsolate. He supported Mr. Roosevelt for vice president and for president. He told his readers that in doing so he was defending the national honor. Now the Journal editor expresses great regret that Mr. Taft found it necessary to go upon the stump. The Journal editor says:

"Could not Mr. Taft have trusted his fellow countrymen to have protected him, and with him the dignity of his office? Is every public officer obliged to turn from his appointed duties and bandy epithets with any blackguard who chooses to abuse him? Can he in any way help his position by so doing? Must he not necessarily forget that he merged his personality in his great office, and that he at least can afford to despise personal attacks?"

What a pity that the editor of the Wall Street Journal finds it necessary to use such cutting terms in referring to the gentleman whom he once regarded as the chief custodian of the national honor.

AT LAST! AT LAST!!

Mr. Bryan may say with Job "that which I greatly feared has come upon me." Here comes the Washington (D. C.) Herald, actually proposing Mr. Bryan as the republican nominee at Chicago. In a fearfully and wonderfully made editorial, the Herald says:

"There was a time when the great business interests of the country feared Bryan above all other men. Outside of his 16 to 1 free silver coinage theory, the main ground of objection to him was his attacks upon the courts ('government by injunction.') Today Roosevelt has gone so much further against our judicial system, not to speak of his other extreme notions, that the mild protest of Mr. Bryan against government by injunction now seems rather tame. But this very change in estimating the Nebraskan's former objectionable attitude as compared with the man whom he openly charges with stealing all his planks and pushing them to extremes, is a factor that republicans will do well to bear in mind in connection with what might occur at the Chicago convention.

"We hardly believe the people are ready to accept either the Roosevelt or Bryan type, but if the republican voters are confronted by the necessity of selecting a president without reference to party interests, they might be excusable if they preferred Bryan to Roosevelt, because of the lack of consideration which Roosevelt has shown toward his party, which he probably stands ready to bolt unless he is nominated.

"Bryan would start out with one great advantage. For whatever may be his shortcomings, he is regarded as absolutely honest by the great mass of the voters. What we especially mean by this statement is this: What would happen if Roosevelt, on being nominated and elected, should solemnly declare that 'under no circumstances will I accept a fourth nomination?' All would laugh, just laugh!

"People never realized before, as they do now, that Roosevelt is ready to appeal to popular passion, public unrest and discontent. Considerations like these may be leading many republicans to say that, if they were forced to choose between Bryan and Roosevelt as individuals, they would not hesitate to vote for the former."

In spite of the Herald's eloquent pleas, Mr. Bryan persists in his declination. He can not conceive of any situation in which his nomination at Chicago would be permissible.

NOT ALWAYS

In a newspaper interview, Chauncey M. Depew declares that "gall and gab" is all that is necessary to win the presidency. Still the rule did not hold good in Mr. Depew's case.

CONTENTS

WHAT A PITY!

REPUBLICAN PARTY TO BLAME
MR. BRYAN ON "THE LARGER LIFE"
HIGHER BUSINESS ETHICS
BISHOP SCHINER'S POSITION
THE MISSOURI TAX QUESTION
PRACTICAL TARIFF TALKS
MR. BRYAN IN KENTUCKY
WISCONSIN'S VENTURE IN LIFE
INSURANCE
HOME DEPARTMENT
NEWS OF THE WEEK
WASHINGTON NEWS