The proof is almost conclusive that the misgivings of the senators in opposing Chief Justice Hughes' elevation to his present position were entirely unfounded on fact, or intelligent investigation of his previous record. In this connection, one cannot resist the temptation of singling out the "Alabama Peonage Case," where Justice Hughes, in the face of opposition on technical grounds by a man of Justice Holmes' calibre—had the penetration and courage to see through an attempt on the part of unscrupulous employers to enslave negroes for non-payment of debts. He found that the necessary and inevitable effect of the Alabama Statute, even though harmless enough on its face, was to enforce contracts for personal service in liquidation of a debt, contrary to the Thirteenth Amendment of the Constitution. This is merely a sample of the numerous opinions on kindred subjects, where Chief Justice Hughes is indeed in the apt words of the dedication: "A Protector of Human Rights."

There is an ever-present element of human interest permeating the entire work. Its style is clear and lucid, and devoid of all abstract references. It is not merely a chronological tabulation of events, or cut-and-dried cases. A most expert use is made of "connectives" in meaning and sequence, making the book a symmetrical whole. Upon close study one never ceases to wonder how the authors could find their law through a complicated labyrinth and maze of ideas showered upon them by the many cases with which the Supreme Court of the U. S. is confronted yearly. Although the book will prove of great economic, political, and social value and interest to the laymen, as well as to the student of constitutional law.

Reuben A. Gorsky.


The author of this small but interesting volume, formerly a member of the Nebraska Bench, seems to have become disgusted with the injustices resulting from the jury trials, as seen by him in his experiences. It is a plea presented to the public—not to the lawyers—for an abolition of the jury trial.

In his plain, but convincing style, the author goes into the history of the jury trial, explaining that the original jury was selected for its special knowledge of the facts in the case rather than for its lack of knowledge of the same, as is the practice today. The reader is made to realize that the present jury is composed of those, least fitted to try the fact, in so far as anyone acquainted with the case, or the courts, as judges, sheriffs, jailors, etc., who would make excellent jurors, are not eligible. It is a well known fact that the average juror knows little about what is going on before him, but, nevertheless, he determines the fate of the parties to each case.

Unfair practices of lawyers in producing verdicts from jurors are disclosed as well as the evil effects such have as disrespect for courts, efforts to avoid court trials of controversies, belief that lawyers who befuddle juries are the most competent and the like.

In conclusion it is argued that since all reforms of this jury system thus far attempted have been complete failures, the only remaining move is to abolish the jury trial, and to have the judge try the facts as well as the law.

Harry T. O'Connor.