

**The Norfolk Weekly News-Journal**  
 The News, Established, 1881.  
 The Journal, Established, 1877.  
**THE HUSE PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
 W. N. Huse, President.  
 N. A. Huse, Secretary.  
 Every Friday, by mail per year, \$1.50.  
 Entered at the postoffice at Norfolk, Neb., as second class matter.  
 Telephone: Editorial Department, No. 22. Business Office and Job Rooms, No. 11 1/2.

The news of the disagreement and dismissal of the Thaw jury was spread all over northern Nebraska by Norfolk's daily paper, many hours before it was received in any other way. An extra edition carried the bulletin in The News to people over the entire northern half of Nebraska, this paper scoring a scoop among hundreds of readers between here and Chadron, which is 400 miles west of Norfolk. The same scoop was scored in Norfolk, where an extra was distributed to all News subscribers, on rural routes around Norfolk, east as far as Fremont, northeast as far as South Sioux City, and over the Albion branch. The location of Norfolk, making it possible to thus give to a section hundreds of miles long and hundreds of miles wide the first news all the time—ahead of Omaha, Lincoln or St. Louis—has made The Norfolk Daily News the paper that is read in all this vast field more than all other daily papers combined.

A monument to the late Edward Rosewater has been suggested by the Hastings Tribune. No greater monument could exist to his industry and toll than the Bee building in Omaha and the Omaha Bee itself. This institution was the result of his own effort, however, and a monument erected to his memory by fellow men would bring an added tribute to one of the foremost Nebraskans of his time. As suggested by the Hastings paper, Mr. Rosewater spent his life in fighting for the principles which he deemed to be right. That he originated some thirty years ago and kept persistently at until the time of his death, a campaign along the lines of predominant thought with the public today, is worthy of perpetual notation. During his lifetime many Nebraskans hoped and tried to give him the state's highest political office, and now that he is dead it is not surprising that there should crystallize among those friends a movement to name a monument to perpetuate his name. The idea is a worthy one and one which should meet with hearty endorsement throughout the commonwealth.

**BRYAN HAS FIGHT ON HANDS.**

That Colonel Bryan will meet with some hardy opposition in his own party is evident from the tone of speeches being made here and there by prominent democratic leaders. His government ownership of railroads idea is arousing some clear-cut opposition from former followers, as is shown by the address of Senator Rayner at the Democratic club's banquet in New York the other night.

Senator Rayner declared that the day will never come when the United States will own its railroads. We own enough already, said he. He declared that the scheme in other countries has been a failure politically and commercially; he characterized the idea as a vision and phantom, neither practical nor feasible. And he said that government ownership will not be a part of the democratic national platform in 1908.

It was remarked upon that Mr. Bryan was neither present at this dinner nor did he send regrets. It was hinted that a sub-committee failed to send him an invitation.

The same antagonism to the westerner was shown in Colonel Harvey's speech. In referring to Mr. Bryan he called him the "peerless leader who hobbles like a cripple in the wake of his successful rival, gathering as he goes the few scraps that are left of his own fallacies."

And so from the east there seems to be rising up an opposition to Nebraska's famous son, which promises a merry battle in 1908 to once more test the staying powers of the leader who, after a dramatic night, forced the party to come his idea in platform at the time they nominated Parker.

That Mr. Bryan does not intend to quietly subside before the opposition becomes apparent as days go on. The alleged five million dollar conspiracy which Mr. Roosevelt recently declared had been formed against him would, if democrats became convinced it were backed by truth, probably tend to drive many into the wake of John Temple Graves who declared that democrats ought to nominate Roosevelt in 1908. But Mr. Bryan does not intend that this alleged plot shall remain effective, unless substantiated by proof, in swinging his party from himself. And so the Nebraskan makes light of the plot story by saying, "The president appears unduly excited over the alleged five million dollars raised to prevent his re-election."

The same sentiment among democrats is not confined, apparently, to Mr. Bryan. James Hay, representa-

tive from Virginia, declares the plan of Graves to be "ridiculous and absurd." "It is absurd nonsense," says he. "It is the most absurd thing in politics I have heard, except possibly the story of the \$5,000,000 conspiracy fund."

And so we find in the democratic party a faction favoring government ownership and one bitterly opposing; a faction favoring Bryan and one opposing; a faction anxious to support Roosevelt and one opposing. All of which simmers down to a clear cut battle for and against Bryan supremacy that is just beginning to be waged and which promises a forensic display before the fight is lost or won.

**AMERICAN SENTIMENT SHIFTS.**

There has been a remarkable change of public sentiment with regard to the Thaw case since the day Evelyn Nesbit, pretty in her blue gown, told her sympathy-inspiring story. Had the case ended that day or week acquittal would have resulted and the verdict would have been applauded. But the case ran on for several weeks. The whole case occupied twelve weeks. And in twelve weeks, as has just been proved, American sentiment, powerful when started, can sweep from one extreme to the opposite—from contempt to deep sympathy and back again to contempt.

For a time the country was strong for Thaw. Delmas was a hero. His sarcastic "the learned district attorney," appealed to our sympathy for Harry and Evelyn in their grilling by Jerome.

The polished oratory, the genteel manner of the Californian stood out for a time in heroic contrast to Jerome's steel grey individuality and his cold blooded harshness. For a moment the country almost hissed the district attorney when he grilled the little witness after her confession. But time wore on. Sympathy cooled. Calmer reason pushed romantic "unwritten law" aside. Brain storms lost their attractiveness. Delmas overdid it in painting Thaw's heroism. He plastered on the golden colors too profusely. Jerome followed briefly to point out the counterfeited and the insincere in Delmas' oratory, spread out to entrap jurors' hearts. It reacted on jury and country alike. And the disagreement was no surprise. What would have been, four weeks previous, instant acquittal, turned to seven for conviction. Memory had relinquished the well told words of the actress. In the sifting it was found that White's attentions after Thaw's marriage were not so annoying as the defense might have wished them to appear.

And today the country is regretting that the whole loathsome story must be retold. Thaw's cowardice in allowing a woman to make such a sacrifice for his life or liberty is being condemned; Evelyn's own moral standards are finding their way to the public mind, in spite of her tearful recital. Whether or not her same story, told again after being given such publicity, can have enough weight to cause another disagreement is the question. Another disagreement will be equal to acquittal. But Jerome will have gained an advantage in the fact that no new thrills can be created by a repetition of the story.

In England Delmas' plea has been characterized as "flapdoodle" which could not be tolerated in English courts. "Such forensic oratory is inconceivable in English courts," says the London Standard. If Delmas can produce new testimony showing that White haunted Evelyn after her marriage to Thaw, or that Thaw had reason to believe White would kill him, another disagreement may be expected. But Thaw will have less sympathy at his back in another trial. The cold fact that he killed White will be the prominent feature in the public mind. And with this sentiment there will be resentment that another \$100,000 must be expended by the state for prosecution, against \$200,000 for defense. The realization of cost upon taxpayers will tend to drive sentiment into the side of the people as against the accused.

**"A BRITISH BROWNSVILLE CASE"**

"A British 'Brownsville' Case," is the interesting headline given in this week's Colliers to a story of the disfranchisement of the city of Worcester so far as the present parliament is concerned. The magazine declares that the British House of Commons 'committee an outrage' beside which President Roosevelt's action in the Brownsville case sinks into insignificance. The motive behind the printing of this story by the magazine is not apparent. Perhaps the editors of that weekly would hope to create a prejudice upon the Brownsville investigation so that the verdict, when it finally comes, may be seen in a light unfavorable to the discharged and disgraced colored soldiers. Colliers is unfriendly to Senator Foraker of Ohio, who seeks the presidency and whose primary battle is one against Secretary Taft in Ohio. Senator Foraker succeeded in securing an investigation into the discharge of the colored soldiers of the Twenty-fifth because he

believed they had been unfairly dealt with. Colliers would cast the Brownsville incident into obscurity by means of the British disfranchising shadow, if possible. Exaggerating the importance of the British incident and ironically referring to the Brownsville affair, the magazine has gone out of its way to draw a contrast that would work to the disadvantage of the discharged troops.

The British case involves the temporary disfranchisement of a city in parliamentary representation because it was learned that there were 500 voters in that city who had accepted bribes for their votes, and that less than these 500 votes turned the election. After much debating, parliament determined to disfranchise the city (Worcester it was) for this session because the people of that community had tolerated bribery in the election and because, to put the matter up to the city again would be but to invite defeat for the Liberal party because that party had caused discussion of the matter after the election. Colliers says that this is enormously more arbitrary than was the discharging of three companies of negro soldiers in order to punish the guilty, because it was believed the three companies contained the merest guilty of "shooting up" Brownsville.

But the contrast does not show the American act to have been the one of minor importance. Where in England it was proven that bribery had turned an election, in America there is a doubt expressed by competent sources as to whether or not the three companies of colored soldiers were really guilty as charged. Where in England the whole city loses a representative in parliament for one term, in the American instance the soldiers who were innocent lose their rights to earning livings in the army for all time, to say nothing of the life pensions which those who had been faithful in the service for a quarter of a century, will lose. In England it was shown clearly that not only were there bribes for election, but that the community tolerated the practice and that the corruption had become so general that candidates expected before they went into a campaign that they would be called upon to bribe the several hundred who were known to the public at large. All of these facts were brought out in lengthy debate by parliament in which the defense was represented. And, convinced of the guilt, parliament, acting as a jury, could do nothing more than unseat the member who had bought his election nor could the matter be submitted to Worcester for a new election in fairness to the party which had caused the exposition to be made.

In the real Brownsville case, things were different. According to a report from Washington, where the investigation is being conducted, all of the negroes who have been put on the witness stand have told the same story, though they lacked an opportunity to get together and concoct yarns that would hang together; the officers, all of them white, have without exception declared that they believed the company of discharged soldiers to be innocent of the shooting up of Brownsville; and stories told by Brownsville people, who had protested against the bringing of the Twenty-fifth to that section, have varied as to detail.

It may be proven in the end that the three companies of colored soldiers who were discharged contained the men guilty of shooting up the town. It may not be proven. But the difference between the British case and the English case lies in the fact that in England the charges were proven before disfranchisement was meted out; and the disfranchisement, while a loss to a certain extent which a city will feel for one session of parliament, did not cost any innocent men personal rewards for which they had worked faithfully for twenty-five years, as is possible, it must be admitted, in the American Brownsville case.

The contrast in the two cases, contrary to the Collier insinuation, is not one to the discredit of British methods of seeking justice.

**ATTACKS PRIMARY LAW.**

Is it possible, after all, that Nebraska will not be allowed to spend \$200,000 this summer to nominate candidates for public offices?

The primary election law enacted by the recent legislature because every political party in the state had been pledged to it in advance, rather than wisdom in the plan as viewed by legislators, is not to become effective without a struggle. And the battle to be waged against the primary will emanate from Madison county.

No less a personage than William V. Allen, former United States senator from Nebraska, has called into question the provisions of the law as passed and, declaring that the law is unconstitutional in several respects and that it will not result in the purity of politics that has been claimed for it by enthusiastic advocates, Senator Allen announces that he will seek to test the legality of the act either by injunction or by quo warranto pro-

ceedings before the law is put into effect next fall.

Senator Allen claims that the chief violation of the constitution is found in that section of the law which requires a voter to disclose his party identity. He declares that this infringes upon the Australian ballot principle of secrecy and is to that extent a restriction of suffrage, which, he says, the constitution forbids. He further declares that the expense of holding two elections a year is burdensome to the taxpayers, who complain even on one. And he further attacks the pet of many a "reformer" by declaring that there is as much possibility of corruption under the primary system as where nominations are made in convention, if not more. He says that there is nothing to prevent candidates with money from going out and paying henchmen to see that their supporters are flooded into the polls.

The announcement of Senator Allen's intention to test the primary law will unquestionably create more or less consternation among some of the members of populist, democratic and republican parties alike. The surprise will know no party lines. It will have wide open sway. But the sincerity of Senator Allen's attack, the sincerity of his belief in the unconstitutionality of the primary law and the sincerity of his opinion that corruption will be more possible under the primary law than under the old convention system, can not for a moment be questioned by the most ardent supporters of the new "reform."

The public at large must agree with Senator Allen that the primary law is not without its faults. Senator Allen agrees with the public at large, or that portion of it which pledged every political party in the state to the enactment of the primary law, that there are flaws in the present convention system. But he contends, and not without pointing out concrete reasons, that the primary system offers more opportunity for corruption than is possible today in open convention.

The chief objection which the senator finds in the primary law lies in the requirement that voters declare their party affiliation, thus destroying secrecy of ballot and restricting suffrage. Under the convention system those taking part in the caucuses tacitly declare their party affiliations, though it is true that those who take no active part in nominating candidates, and who merely vote, are allowed secrecy in their ballots. That the objection on this point will appeal to a not inconsiderable element of voters is shown by the fact that there are in every community business men and citizens whose politics are not known, men who may have good reasons for not publicly announcing their party affiliations and who may vote conscientiously, for all that, at the polls.

Nor can it be denied by objectors to this plan of requiring men to state their party sympathies, that the wide open plan, allowing voters to take part in nominating candidates of any parties which notion or conspiracy might determine, indiscriminately, would result in even a worse plight than the present provision.

The Nebraska primary was copied after primaries in states which have not yet satisfactorily worked out their own systems. It is not strange, therefore, that the Nebraska law should lack perfection.

In support of Senator Allen's statement that worse corruption is possible under the primary than in convention, may be cited a primary in Lincoln recently for a city ticket in which, after it was over, great numbers of fraudulent votes are alleged to have been cast. The county attorney was asked and consented to request a grand jury to investigate the corruption.

It has been claimed by many that the primary would tend to wipe out party lines. Nebraska is not ready for the destruction of parties on such short notice. In all of the history of this republic no means of converting good principles into laws has ever been found equal to the political party. There always have and always will be divisions of opinion on public questions. Political parties began with human nature and they have accomplished results in instilling progressive ideas into laws which never could have been done through any other system. Political parties are fundamentally agencies and therefore servants of the people. But that they are needed as a means of concentrating effort upon principles can not be refuted.

This primary question is not one of partisan prejudice in Nebraska. It has been endorsed by all parties in convention. The law was passed with the support of all parties. The fact that fusion secured a favorable clause in the law only more surely attests the sincerity of Senator Allen. Nebraska conscientiously desires the most economical and the purest methods of selecting the ablest men for public office and for carrying into effect the most approved principles of government. For this reason the state will receive the arguments of Senator Allen against the direct primary—the claim that it is unconstitu-

tional, that it offers opportunity for corruption greater than the convention, that it is too much of a burden to taxpayers—with receptive eagerness, hoping to become more genuinely acquainted with its possibilities and its significance, good and bad, through the wholesome discussion which must naturally follow the attack that is promised from Madison county.

**AROUND TOWN.**

Stories of the April snow storm in 1870 are now at a premium.

The Fremont Herald says that people in Fremont with money to burn, won't burn it.

Now what would telephone subscribers do if the new primary should destroy party lines?

School boards confront the proposition that when good teachers become otherwise engaged, vacancies will exist. It is a small matter in a single instance, but the principle, generally applied, will create havoc.

Keep cool. It will soon warm up.

It's the early bud that catches the frost.

Chipped ice is being grown in Norfolk gardens.

Norfolk needs a hot water wagon to thaw out the streets.

Dallas can't expect that railroad extension until winter is over.

"Wet" towns in north Nebraska have been converted into cakes of ice.

The weather man is mixed. It was last year that we ran short of ice.

Trees and bankers and a band minstrel will make it a memorable Arbor day in Norfolk.

They'll have to turn on the hot air if they expect this country to plant trees next Monday.

Even the violets on spring bonnets have withered under this cold breath from the northland.

Something may be done on a gravel road to the Junction as soon as the frost is out of the ground.

A Philadelphia girl has caused consternation in medical circles by three days of continuous dancing. She would make a good card for the Norfolk band minstrel.

Many a Norfolk girl is saying things because she didn't know in advance that John Drew would go through Norfolk. By a little judicious advertising the matinee idol could have played to a good sized gallery while he ate lunch at the Norfolk Junction eating house.

It is said the legislature had no selfish motive in providing for improvements at the insane hospital here.

There is some hope of getting a union depot.

Norfolk refuses to give up a union depot until a union depot isn't built.

Hang the man who mentioned ice cream soda.

It is a coal trust conspiracy, if you want the real truth of the matter.

If you want to know about the new primary law, ask the primary teachers.

The city council has ordered bricks torn out of sidewalks and put in the street.

There are about fifteen Norfolk boys in the same boat, and the boat was stolen.

Some practical jokes would pretty nearly justify brainstorms with fatal endings.

The idea of expecting Madam Strack, in her mysterious way, to locate a pot of gold for a dollar and a half!

It's a good thing Surena, guideless wonder, raced against himself at Battle Creek last summer, before the track was closed. Else he might have had to trot through life recordless as well as guideless.

There is no use denying it, for it always works out: Whenever there is one fire in Norfolk, there are three in a bunch. It has been so clearly demonstrated by a long series of years that Norfolk, after one fire alarm breaks forth upon a silent air, refuses to be surprised at the next two.

Stanton Picket: A railroad coal house that was being moved on a flat car from some point down the line slipped onto the track Monday afternoon near Pilger, delaying traffic until the wrecking train could be sent from Norfolk to clear away the obstruction.

Is there anywhere a woman who never wished that we might eat on wooden plates which could be thrown away as soon as used?

Tuesday was the coldest day Norfolk ever saw, and the mercury got only down to 20 above zero. Such a climate is worth advertising in California.

A Norfolk woman who cleaned house just in time to get it in order for the firemen, is said to feel worse over the

wasted house cleaning than over the fire loss.

The worst of the situation for Madam Strack is the fact that all this notoriety and advertising gained from police court, and telling of her large practice, will go to waste. For the madam, there is reason to believe, will get out of town.

If the main line trains of the Northwestern ran up town those Rosebud Indians never would have gone through here, enroute to New York, without at least seeming interested in the looks of Norfolk. As it was they spent the entire half hour at the Junction in gulping down several gallons of coffee.

Lincoln Star: Dell Akin, of the Atkinson, Neb., Graphic, is a polite and gallant man. Instead of discouraging the efforts of Miss Rosa Hudspeth, who has moved her newspaper plant from Stuart to Atkinson, he says her new paper is a "tribute to the ability of its fair editress and indicates what a woman can do when she wills."

An exchange says: "A Kansas banker wanted a railroad ticket and had only a \$2 bill. It required \$3 to get the ticket. He took the \$2 bill to a pawnshop and pawned it for \$1.50. On his way back to the station he met a friend, to whom he sold the pawn ticket for \$1.50. That gave him \$3. Now, who's out that dollar?"

**ATCHISON GLOBE SIGHTS.**

Sometimes a man can look wise and say nothing without gathering much moss.

While a man is after money he is a hound; after he gets it, he is a rabbit.

One reason some people change their names when they go on the stage, their acting is so bad that they don't want their friends to know who they are.

Getting old feels like having spring fever all the year 'round.

It is bad enough to be a loafer, but it is a disgrace to brag of it.

It is surprising the number of things people "know" on each other.

The fool who escaped the thin ice will now proceed to rock the boat.

You probably expect more of a friend than you are willing to give.

A dog puffs around a lot on a hot day, considering how little it has to do.

We often hear this remark: "The boys in that neighborhood are terrible."

**BUYING RIGHT OF WAY**

Yankton & Southwestern Officials Are Working Near Wausa.

Wausa, Neb., April 17.—Representatives of the Yankton, Norfolk and Gulf railroad are in this vicinity contracting with the farmers for right of way and are meeting with some little difficulty in securing such contracts for the reason that the farmers have been fooled once or twice before on this same proposition and they say that when the railroad managers come with the money in hand they will make contracts with them, and not before.

There are two surveys of the proposed new road, one following almost entirely the old Yankton and Norfolk grade and the other making a new route. The right of way contracts call for right of way on the new routes which would miss Wausa about a mile and a half and would mean a new town or perhaps two, one on each side of Wausa.

Some people here are aroused over this turn of affairs, but the wisecracks of the town are saying that it is all a bluff and that the new road will ask the town for a bonus of several thousand dollars, and if secured will build a depot here.

The general opinion seems to be that if the Hill interests are back of the new road it will be built in the near future.

**STOP TRAIN FOR SICK BOY**

THE "SOULLESS" CORPORATION SHOWS HUMAN TENDENCY.

TENDER CARE FOR NITZ BOY

After Taking Up the Matter by Wire With Officials of the C. St. P., M. & O. Railroad, Sioux City Passenger Made Stop Near Farm.

[From Wednesday's Daily.] A "soulless" corporation stopped a train near Norfolk Wednesday morning for a sick boy's comfort.

Charles Nitz, a boy of some seven years, has been sick for many months past at the home of his father Albert Nitz, five miles from Norfolk near the Minneapolis & Omaha tracks. Operations not having restored the lad's health it was determined to place him under the surgical attention of Dr. Jonas of Omaha.

The rough drive to the nearest station hindering a safe journey to Omaha, the matter was taken up with the officers of the M. & O. Wednesday morning and the Sioux City passenger train stopped near the Nitz farm house while the sick boy was carried to a coach to begin the journey to Omaha.