EDITORIAL

WILSON AS MAN.

By DANIEL DE LEON

On the list of reforms that Woodrow Wilson drew up for New Jersey during his governorship of the State was one affecting the method of electing jurors. The presidential term of the Governor began before this reform could be put through. Since then the Jury Reform bill, embodying the Wilson ideas, has come before the Legislature of New Jersey, where the bill now encounters opposition, to the extent that its passage is in danger. The opposition centers around the agents of ex-Senator James Smith, the unquestionably corrupt, and cynically corrupt, Democratic politician, who long inspired Jersey affairs as Democratic boss, and whom, as such, Woodrow Wilson had to contend with during his campaign for Governor, during his administration as Governor, during his campaign for the presidency, and during the interval, between his election as President and inauguration day.

The essence of Wilson’s jury reform consists in wresting the jury from the clutch of the politicians on the principle that the enforcement of the Corrupt Practices Act and the new election laws is impossible if juries can continue to be packed by political hands.

The bill being in danger, and in danger through the very elements that cynically seek to debauch the State of New Jersey, what does Woodrow Wilson do? What should he do? Woodrow Wilson, tho’ President of the United States, and his hands full with subjects of far broader import, on their face than jury reform bills in a single State, notifies acting Gov. Fielder of his readiness to come to New Jersey and make at least one address in favor of the bill.

One should not need much experience to know that many a friend of the President will be shaking his head in doubt of the wisdom, if not in positive disapproba-
tion of the move. One should not need exceptionally powerful organs of hearing to hear these friends say: “Is it necessary for Wilson to go out of his way to pick up a fight, within his own party, with ex-Senator Jim Smith? Is not such a move a use-
less making of enemies over a trifle? Is it not undignified?”

These timid, near-sighted friends notwithstanding, Woodrow Wilson is RIGHT.

There are “trifles” and “trifles.” A stitch in time saves nine. The more centrally
located an official is, all the more serious may be the consequences of the neglect of
“trifles” upon the policy that he represents. At the same time, the more centrally lo-
cated an official is, all the easier is it for him to shut his eyes to “trifles,” and save
himself the annoyance of a fight. The failure of the jury reform bill in New Jersey is
strained for by elements who are bitterly opposed to Woodrow Wilson as a “mar
plot.” The success of this element in contriving the defeat of the jury bill would be a
blow to the Wilson policies, a blow of the peculiarly damaging nature that it is the
feature of “trifles” only to inflict. At the cost of added annoyance, Woodrow Wilson
“goes out of his way” and “deliberately picks a quarrel within his own party.”

Grounded in social science, the Socialist knows that the Wilson policies are
plasters on a wooden leg. As a watchful observer of men and events, the Socialist
admires manhood, clear-sightedness, and integrity of purpose wherever the encour-
aging sight presents itself. Such a sight Woodrow Wilson is presenting as man.