

EDITORIAL NOTES

By J. D. WATSON

The United States Supreme Court has unanimously upheld the Income Tax law, thus sweeping aside any barrier that would prevent Congress amending the law so as to make it an equitable and just one.

We are running behind in our expense of government, even leaving the War Revenue tax measure in force—without the added millions that the increase in the army and navy will cost us—we are running behind on current expenses just as they are now, and something must be done to either curb expenses, or to raise the money to pay the debts.

It is a certainty that Congress will not curb expenses—it is a certainty that expenses will be increased—so the only remedy is to find some means of raising the revenue without putting any heavier hardships on those who now bear the brunt of the expense of government.

The Supreme Court's decision opens the way to get the extra money without making the common people foot the bill.

Will Congress take advantage of the opportunity?

Let the exemption remain where it is on minimum incomes, but increase the tax on bigger incomes—raise the grade on the percentage of tax levied in proportion to the amount of income, and the tax will readily yield an income to the government of two hundred millions of dollars, or more, whereas now it does not bring in one hundred million.

In this way the one hundred million or more deficit that we see staring us in the face for the next fiscal year would be practically wiped out, and nobody would suffer.

Glance at the market page of your newspaper almost any day, and you will see where some corporation has paid an enormous dividend—it is a common thing to see where this corporation or that corporation is rolling up wealth faster than the directors and officials can count it.

Of course this money is going into somebody's pockets, and these vast fortunes that are being accumulated on account of the war should bear their just burden of the expense of the government that enables the getters of the fortunes to get them.

So rampant is the spirit of prosperity among a certain class that you read where a Steel Trust Magnate's wife gives away Steel Trust shares for premiums at a Bridge party—again you read where an Oil Magnate is offering two million dollars for the controlling interest in the franchise of a baseball club in just one city.

So why not grade the income tax so that these mad spenders may at least pay their proportionate share, instead of lowering the exemption figure.

Instead of making the man who has an income of two thousand pay an income tax, exempt incomes up to three, four, or five thousand, but increase the tax so that the man with an income of one hundred thousand or one million will pay in proportion to his income.

No man, in a lifetime, can legitimately accumulate a property that will pay an income of a million dollars, and a tax of fifty per cent. on incomes of that size would hurt no one.

To some extent, it would only be handing back into the public treasury money that had been stolen from private individuals.

* * * * *

Representative Kitchin, of North Carolina, has served notice on the President that the people will not stand for his proposed tax on gasoline, bank checks, automobiles, etc., to raise the additional revenue that the Preparedness program will call for, and that said

spirators can be tried where any one of them lives. One of these criminal Jews lived in Washington, the other in New York; the Government chose to try both in Washington, and it had the right to do so, because they were both principals in the crime; but the Government did not take either of them to a State where neither of them lived; it did not attempt to try them in Massachusetts or Illinois.

In my case there are no agents, no confederates, no co-conspirators and no conspiracy.

There isn't a word of obscenity in the Frank articles, nor one single line that violates any law.

The attempt to carry me away from the legal venue is not so much for the purpose of a fair trial, as it is to afford an opportunity for the assassin.

I do not accuse Mr. Wallace or any official of the Department with such an intent, but I know very well the murderous purpose of those back of this never-ceasing pursuit of me, and I think it only fair that Mr. Wallace, as well as his superiors, be put upon notice of this fact. It is practically certain that, if I should be taken from here to any one of the Northern venues that you say he contemplates, I would never return to Georgia alive. That is a consideration very well worthy the attention of this Democratic Administration, for the people of the South, at least, would hold it responsible for whatever tragedy might happen from the high-handed proceeding against a Southern man.

Is the whole State of Georgia to be maligned and stripped of legal jurisdiction over its citizens, because of the Frank case?

Was it an unpardonable sin for me to defend our courts and our people, from a deluge of lies and libel?

Is it a crime to publish an honest report of the official record in a case of horrible murder?

Black as that record was, its publication had been made necessary by the infamous methods of William J. Burns and the Haas Finance Committee.

Bad as it was for the Governor of Georgia to virtually retry and acquit his own client, I did not then know that the said Governor actually and personally participated in the management of the case: I CAN PROVE IT NOW.

Am I to be singled out for destruction, and taken from the jurisdiction of Georgia courts, because of my defense of those courts?

Ninety per cent. of the people heartily approved my conduct last summer: are they to be rebuked and punished, vicariously, in my person?

Has the Government any right to say that the ten jurors who voted for my acquittal are less honorable than the two who voted the other way?

Were they twelve rascals or perjurers who acquitted the Naval Stores men?

Were they twelve rascals or perjurers who acquitted the Menace publishers in Missouri?

Were they twelve rascals or perjurers who acquitted those alleged looters of the New Haven Railroad?

When before has a whole State been arraigned as unfit to administer justice, because the Government failed to secure a conviction in one case.

There are thousands of prurient novels coming from the press from year to year: every week the New York papers and magazines publish obscene pictures and stories: such books as Rabelais, the Decameron, the Heptameron, Tom Jones, Roxalana, Madam Bovary, Sappho, Candide, The Bohemians, and scores of other erotic works issue from Northern publishing houses and go through the mails.

The Government itself received by mail, and placed in the Congressional Library the very book out of which I clipped the Latin that caused the Roman Catholic societies to prosecute me.

And the Government itself, at the expense of the tax-payers, published the Tschimsian Texts—a book full of raw obscenity—and the members of Congress sent that book through the mails, all over the land.

Speaker Champ Clark sent me a copy through the mails, under his frank, while I was in Florida.

All these facts being notoriously known, who is it that cannot realize that some special vengeance is aimed at me, by those who care nothing for the purity of the mails, but who are using the tremendous machinery of the central government to silence or crush one man?

Very truly yours,
THOS. E. WATSON.

Read Foreign Missions Exposed, by Thos. E. Watson. Beautifully printed. Profusely illustrated. Price 30 cents. The Jeffersonian Publishing Company, Thomson, Ga.

Read Foreign Missions Exposed, by Thos. E. Watson. Beautifully printed. Profusely illustrated. Price 30 cents. The Jeffersonian Publishing Company, Thomson, Ga.

Reconstruction, when the South was prostrate and bleeding, and when the black Republicans were raging with hatred against the seceding States, nobody ever heard of a proposition to carry ex-Confederate soldiers and civilians into Yankee land for trial.

Even those ex-Confederate soldiers accused of Ku Kluxing and of murdering—not only negroes but white Union soldiers—were tried by the courts of the district in which they lived.

Our older citizens well remember the Columbus case, where several white men of Georgia were indicted for Ku Kluxing and murder: there was no threat to drag them to New Jersey for trial; they were tried in their own county, defended by Alex. H. Stephens, and acquitted.

Does the Government consider the failure of the jury to convict me sufficient evidence upon which to base the charge that all jurors in our State are incapable of jury duty? No Republican President ever hurled such a charge against the State of Georgia: no Republican Administration ever put that stigma upon the South.

Which was it that gave the greater offence to this Democratic Administration: the legal conviction of Leo Frank, or the failure to convict Thos. E. Watson?

The Government made no great outcry when it failed to convict in the Naval Stores case, in Savannah; the Government failed to even follow up the prosecution against the alleged bank-recker of Macon.

Since when, has the notion prevailed with the Department of Justice, that the failure of one jury to convict in one case, degrades, disqualifies and disgraces every possible jury in the State?

This case was already broad enough and sufficiently ominous, because it directly threatens the freedom of the press, which our forefathers held so dear that they said in the Constitution itself, that Congress should never abridge it. Congress has already considerably abridged it; bills are pending to practically destroy it, and each one of these bills is fathered and pushed by a Democratic Congressman.

If the Government now rules that every newspaper in Massachusetts who handles a New York publication is the agent of the publication and a confederate in the commission of alleged crime, when no editor is safe from ruinous prosecution.

New England editors and publishers could be hauled to the Pacific Coast for trial, and vice versa; Southern editors could be transported to Michigan, or vice versa; no matter how unfounded the charges might be which the Government would bring against the publisher, he would simply be ruined by that method of procedure.

President Roosevelt tried that during the last years of his administration, endeavoring to bring Western editors to Washington for trial because the papers were circulated in the District of Columbia. The Western courts refused to surrender the accused editors, holding properly that they were entitled to a trial in the jurisdiction of their residence. If President Roosevelt could not drag Western editors to Washington for trial, how can President Wilson legally do it?

The case is broader even than the question of free press, for it directly involves a personal liberty that is as old as Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence.

Under the construction which Mr. Wallace places upon the law, there isn't a drummer, nor merchant, nor a fertilizer agent, nor insurance agent who would be secure from Northern prosecution. On trumped-up charges of fraud in obtaining credit, of dishonesty in not paying bills, and similar offences, every Southern man who represents, travels for, and buys things from a Northern or Eastern firm or individual, could be dragged out of the State of Georgia and carried to New York, or Chicago or Boston, for trial.

Such a condition of things would be absolutely revolutionary, destructive of that personal security and personal right which Englishmen enjoyed long before the days of Magna Charta.

What will the people of this and other States think of the Georgia delegation, if it silently permits this outrage to be perpetrated upon a Georgian?

What will the people of other States think of the Governor of Georgia, elected in part by my voluntary and unselfish support, if he files no protest against the wrong about to be inflicted upon one of his supporters—and old friend and former colleague?

I again request you to introduce the resolutions demanding an investigation, in order that it may go into the Congressional Record and be read throughout the country.

I also request that you embody this letter in your remarks on the floor, so that the letter may appear in the record. In a case like this, without precedent and without law, the cause of one is the cause of all.

That conspiracy case Mr. Wallace relies on, where one of the criminals operated in Washington, while his confederate operated in Wall Street, has no bearing at all on my case. It takes more than one to make a conspiracy, and all the con-