Darrow, Clarence , 1857-1932, dorendent.

Leggle & the State of California,

Plaintiff, vs. Clarence Darrow, defendent.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
LAW LIBRARY

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Googh W. Kyou, Esq. Good Howard Bulding Los Augeles

489325

OCT 26 1978

MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 1912; 10 o'clock A.M.

Defendant in court with counsel.

3

1

2

4

THE COURT. Call the jurors.

(Jury polled; all present.) 5

THE COURT. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Appel are not here. Shall we 6 7 wait a few minutes for them?

MR. DARROW. I don't think it is fair to Mr. Ford to wait. 8

THE COURT. All right; you may proceed, Mr. Ford. 9

ARGUMENT BY W. J. FORD, on behalf of People 10

May it please the court and gentlemen of the 11

Judges ought to remember that their office is 12

jus discere and not jus dare; to interpret law, not to make 13 law or give law. Judges ought to be more learned than 14

witty, more reverend than plausible, more advised than 15

confident. Above all things, integrity is their portion 16 and proper virtue. Above all things, integrity is their 17

portion and proper virtue.

These noble sentiments were penned by one of the most brilliant minds of modern times. Francis Bacon, born in the age of Queen Elizabeth, living during the age

21 of her successor, King James, living in the age of great 22

achievement and noble adventure, in the age of Raleigh and 23 of Smith, in the age of Shakespeare and the great 24

dramatists of Elizabethan era, born in an era of 25 brilliant minds, was the most brilliant mind of all. As a 26 student at the University of Cambridge in England, at the

18

19

early age of 15, he perceived that the entire system of 1 2 scientific inquiry and philosophic discussion was based upon erroneous principles. He formulated a plan of 3 investigation of the natural phenomena of this world which 4 has changed the whole course of modern European thought. 5 Great as a philosopher, great as ascientist, great as a 6 statesman, he was equally great as a lawyer and a jurist. 7 The contemporary of Sir Edward Coke, whose decisions today 8 are scanned with reverence by modern lawyers. the decisions 9 of Francis Bacon stand forth as models of knowledge of 10 legal principles and lucidity of expression. Through his 11 great legal attainments, he rose from a position of com-12 parative obscurity to the proudest place in England's 13 judiciary. He became the Chancellor of the British 14 Empire, the highest office among the judiciary of England. 15 That he fully appreciated the grave responsibilities of 16 that important position is illustrated by the sentiments 17 which he expressed in this essay on Judicature. 18 cerning judges, he said, "Above all things, integrity is 19 their portion and proper virtue." 20 21

And yet Lord Bacon, with his brilliant mind, his noble sentiments, plead guilty to the crime of receiving bribes before the bar of the House of Lords and was deprived of his office. When first accused of receiving money from litigants, like the defendant in this case, when he told Mr. Biddinger, The bolder you do it, the better, " like him

22

23

24

he came forward before the bar of the House of Lords and openly and boldly admitted those things which he thought he could plausibly explain away. But at length he was forced to admit that he was guilty of the charge, and he was deprived of his offices. History is filled with the examples of men like Francis Bacon, men whose minds are brilliant, whose sentiments are noble, but whose practices are ignoble.

Nineteen centuries ago a member of Pilate's Court for-sook the pomps and vanities of a worldly life to follow the fortunes of the humble Nazarine, and to join the com-pany of despised Galileans. So great was his integrity. so great was his honesty, that Christ made him the treas-urer of that little band. So great was his charity that when Mary annointed the feet of her Bod, he could to be warranted liver the not see the extravagance, and he said "Why should not this oil have been sold and the money given to the poor?" withstanding his great reputation for truth, notwithstand-ing his great reputation for honesty, notwithstanding his great reputation for integrity, his apparent love of charity and disdain for the things of this world, he sold his God for thirty pieces of silver.

At the outbreak of the revolutionary war a young captain ar Norwich of militia left his home and joined Washington's army at Cambridge. He had a brilliant mind. He plamed the invasion of Canada. He planned the attacks on Crown Point. He planned these things, and yet sectional jealousy compelled him to give way to others. Notwithstanding, noble and unselfish, he followed those others in the things which he had phanned and did his duty. He was considered one of the bravest soldiers in the American army. Time after time his valor had saved the day in the most vigorous struggles of the revolutionary war. It was his valor, it was his courage, that saved the day for the Americans

at the first battle of Saritoga. And yet the jealousy of others compelled him, time after time, to give way to those of inferior attainments. While he was placed in command of the station at Philadelphia, he was unjustly accused of many crimes. The court martial which sat upon the investigation of those crimes found that he was innocent. His énemies forced a reconsideration of the charges, and he was at length found guilty of several penial offenses and the noble Washington was reluctantly compelled by sentence of that court martial to reprimand him. While in command at West Point, papers were discovered on the person of Major Andre which proved him guilty of and notwithstanding treason, the great reputation for truth, for honesty and integrity, for noble, patriotic and unselfish devotion to duty, the name of Benedict Arnold has become synonymous over the whole civilized world with treachery and treason. History is filled with examples of men of noble character, apparently of great reputation, yet those men have committed crimes. The court will instruct you in this case that you have a right to take into consideration the previous good reputation of this defendant -- and it is just that you should do so. But remember that previous good reputation is no guaranty against the commission of an offense. One of the witnesses in this case haswell expressed it, this man, Lorimer's seat mate,

Billy Mason, one of the numerous politicians who have tesscanned by LALAWLIBRARY

tified in this case, and he said --MR DARROW: I want to take exception to that statement. He wasn't Lorimer's seat mate. MR FORD: Not important. What he said was this, that reputation is what men say about you, not what they think about you. Character is what God Almight, alone knows about you. Remember that, gentlemen, when you come to take up that phase of the case. 

3w

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 What is the chief aim of all civilized government? The preamble of the most admirable of human docu-2 ments, the constitution of the United States, starts off 3 with these words, "We the people of the United States in 4 5 order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility." The very first objects 6 for which the constitution of the United States was framed, 7 the very first objects for which the Union was formed were 8 9 to establish justice and insure domestic tranquility. 10 Our own state constitution, in the very first section says, "All men are by nature free and independent and have certain 11 inalienable rights, which are those of enjoying and defend-12 ing life and liberty, acquiring, possessing and pro-13 tecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety and 14 happiness; " the second provision of our state constitu-15 tion is as follows: "Government is instituted for the pro-16 tection and security and benefit of the people." The 17 chief end and aim of all civilized governments is to 18 maintain the just relations which should exist between 19 the individuals of a commonwealth. 20

Judas Iscariot sold his God; yet Christian theologians believe that his act was necessary in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled. They believe that Christ knew of this treason and could have guarded against it had he so desired. Benedict Arnold would have substituted for government of the people by the people,

government by foreign power. Undesirable as that foreign government might be, yet, after all, it would have served the most important end of government. It would have maintained the relations between the individuals of the commonwealth. It would have dispensed justice man and man.

The act of this defendant in this case, the act of the jury briber, is worse than all of these, for it strikes the very foundation of all government. For without courts of justice to maintain the relations between the individuals of a commonwealth, there is no government, and we might as well, gentlemen of the jury, revert at once to a state of anarchy and let the strongest prevail.

shows that when Mr. Biddinger arrested J. B. McNamara at and Detroit, they were on their way from Detroit to Chicago, that Brice attempted to bribe the officers who had him in custody. Upon their refusal to accept that bribe, he explained, "If you don't take it, Clarence Darrow will get it." What he meant was, if you don't give me my liberty, Clarence Darrow will procure it for me. The defendant says he did not know of the existence of J B McNamara at that time; he did not know that he would ever become an attorney in the case of People vs. J B McNamara. On that matter--

MR . APPEL . Your Honor, whatever McNamara may have said 1 to Mr. Biddinger before Mr. Darrow became attorney in the 2 case, or before showing that it was spoken by Mr. Darrow --3 that was all objected to in the evidence on the ground 4 that it was inadmissible. 5 THE COURT. What is your objection? 6 MR. APPEL. We now, in order to keep up that proposition, 7 we object to having this jury consider that statement or 8 to have it argued to the jury. We would ask your Honor 9 to instruct this jury not to consider it. We are entitled, 10 your Honor, to correct any error committed by this court 11 up to the time that this jury may take this case into 12 their jury room for deliberation. 13 THE COURT. The objection and the assignment of error 14 will be noted ... 15 MR . DARROW . May I just add one word here, that that evidence 16 was admitted solely to show that Biddinger was a competent 17 witness, nothing else, and it should not be used for any-18 thing else. 19 MR. FREDERICKS. If you will just listen to the argument, 20 you will see the application of it. 21

THE COURT. The objection and the assignment of error are noted. Proceed, Mr. Ford.

24

22

23

11

3.

. .

i

1

1

25

40

1 MR FORD: Darrow says that he didn't know of the existence 2 of J. B. McNamara. Darrow says that he didn't know that he would ever become an attorney in this case. And perhaps 3 4 those statements on the part of this defendant are true. 5 But Brice knew Darrow. Brice knew that Darrow had been 6 for years and years attorney for labor in all its struggles. 7 both criminal and civil. Brice knew Darrow, and the exdlamation was perfectly natural upon his part. 8 9 The law provides, gentlemen, that it is the dtty of an 10 attorney to defend a man accused of crime. The law pro-11 vides that it is the attorney's privilege to see that his 12 client, even though his client is guilty, is not convicted 13 except upon legal evidence, and in accordance with the 14 extablished rules of law. But, to the disgrace of our civil-15 azation, many criminal lawyers have enlarged this privilege. 16 They have extended it into an execuse for committing all 17 sorts of chicanery and fraud. He has used it as an excuse 18 for subornation of perjury on the part of witnesses, for 19 the bribery of judges and juries. They have taught by 20 their acts, by their conduct, by their preaching to the criminal classes of this country, that there is no such thing as crime, as the word is generally understood. They 23 have taught the criminal classes of these United States 24 that therears no courts of justice; that courts of justice are merely instituted by society as an instrument for making

reprisals upon them; that there is warfare between society

21

22

25

and them; that the beligerent rights on both sides are equal; and that they have the right to do anything nec-

essary to defeat and obstruct justice; that there is no

difference between the people in jail and those out of jail,

except this, that if you are in jail, it is better if you

1

2

3

4

5

17

18

19

20

21

6 have a smart lawyer like Clarence Darrow. The conduct 7 of these men, their success in accomplishing their pur-8 poses, their use of such tactics --9 MR APPEL: Wait a minute - - wait a minute -- wait a minute. 10 MR FORD: I will stipulate that every remark I make may be 11 deemed excepted to. 12 MR APPEL: You don't need to stipulate anything. We ob-

13 ject to his tealing this jury what some lawyers have taught, 14 or other people have said; and we object to the statement 15 that other people have used such means. 16 THE COURT: The objection and assignment of error will be noted. MR APPEL: We ask your Honor to instruct the jury that they should not consider any statements of that kind, which are not supported by the evidence. THE COURT: The court will instruct the jury --

22 MR APHEL: We shall object every time he does that. 23 THE COURT: The jury is instructed that counsel for the de-24 fense has made an objection that you have heard, and assigns 25 the same as error. It has been noted. Now, the jury is 26 instructed and admonished that if counsel for the People

go beyond the evidence or beyond a rational discussion of the evidence, it is your duty to disregard such statement and give it no consideration. It is perfectly within the province of the jury to determine what has been testified to, and what is a rational deduction from that testimony. At any time the jury wants the testimony read, they may have it. MR FORD: It is your duty, gentlemen of the jury, to use your common sense and apply it to this evidence, and if I fail to do it, disregard my statements. -11 The unfortunate Brice, the poor, deluded Brice, when he placed that bomb of dynamite that hurled twenty unsuspecting souls into eternity, knew that if he were caught, that he could get a smart lawyer, like Clarence Darrow, and he believed that Darrow could free him; and when he was arrested and being cafried from Detroit to Chicago, he said "If you don't take this money Darrow will get it." What difference did it make whether Darrow realized --MR APPEL: Wait a minute. MR FORD: I can't be interrupted this vay. I have been interrupted all along. THE COURT: Make your statement of the exception. MR APPHL: I object to that statement to the jury and assign it as error. It was error to have the testimony admitted, and it is further error to argue it to the jury,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gard that evidence and not to permit counsel to argue it.

THE COURT: The exception and objection have been noted.

and we ask the court now to instruct the jury to disre-

1

2

18

THE COURT: The exception and objection have been noted.

The court declines to instruct the jury upon that matter.

5 MR APPEL: We except to the court not instructing the jury 6 as requested by the defendant, and we assign that as absolute error.

8 THE COURT: The assignment will be noted. Proceed, Mr
9 Ford.

10 MR FORD: It was the example of men like Darrow that caused

11 the poor deluded wretch, J. B. McNamara, to believe
the

12 that he could commit crimes he did with safety to himself.

13 MR APPEL: Your Honor, we protest against any such state-

ment as that, or the insinuation or intimation that Darrow had anything to do, or in any way instructed anyone or instructed J. B. McNamara to commit a crime, there neing no foundation here for any statement of that character.

THE COURT: The assignment will be noted. Proceed, Mr

Ford.

MR APPHL: We ask the court to instruct the jury to disregard that statement.

THE COURT: The court declines to make any such instruction.

MR APPEL: We take exception.

MR FORD Picture in your mind, if you can, gentlemen of the jury, if you can, the agonized faces of the mothers and wives and children, as they stood at the fire-lines on scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 that fateful October morning, vatching that firey furnace at First and Broadway, hoping against hope that their 2 loved ones might be saved from the awful fate that seemed 3 insurmountable at that time Picture, if you can, those poor 4 creatures, hoping against hope, that at least the bodies of 5 their loved ones might be recovered for identification and 6 7 for burial. Picture if you can, the poor father, of a family, caught like a rat in a trap, praying upon his scortched 8 9 knees for the safety of his little children who would be 10 deprived of a father's care during the years they needed his guidance the most. Ah, well, for that poor doomed 11 12 wretch, that he could not lift the curtain from the future 13 and look down the vale of future years and see that the 14 man who had poisoned the mind of poor Brice, would also some day poison the mind of his own little babbling boy, 15 and that same little, pretty, babbling boy would be 16 led into a life of crime and would some day dangle from 17 18 the gallows because, forsooth, someone had taught, there 19 is no such thing as crime, as the word is generally 20 understood. Well, for that father, that he could not 21 see his little innocent baby daughter, lured into a life 22 of infamy and shame by some wretch who believed that there 23 is no such thing as crime. Ah, well and truly may these 24 little helpless children, stretch forth their hands to this defendant and say, "Give, oh, give us back our murder-25

ed father." Ah, well and truly may the widowed mother

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

7294 1 turn to this defendant and say, "Give me back my boy." 2 MR MARROW: Is it the ruling of this court that counsel may 3 say anything? MR. DARROW-4 THE COURT: No, it is not. \( \text{\text{Where is there any foundation}} \) 5 for that argument? 6 MR APPEL: Let us be calm about this. Where is there any 7 foundation, any scintilla of evidence here, that Darrow 8 was responsible for the killing of those human beings at 9 the Times? Who said so? 10 THE COURT: Do you wish to assign it as error? 11 MR APPEL: We ask again, that counsel be admonished that he 12 must not argue that Clarence Darrow had anything to do with 13 this killing or this explosion at the Times. There is no 14 evidence, and we ask your Honor to not permit counsel to 15 argue that unless, your Honor -- I am willing to do that --16 unless your Honor will stretch the time for the defense, and 17 unless we may be permitted to answer. 18 MR FORD: You are stretching it now -- taking a thing that 19 don't belong to you. 20 THE COURT: The court will instruct the jury now. 21 court will give the instruction heretofore given, that if 22 counsel for the People, should go beyond the evidence or 23 beyond a rational discussion of the evidence, it is your 24duty to disregard it. But the court further instructs 25you that it is perfectly within the province of the jury to determine what was testified to, and the rational conclusions

to be drawn therefrom. Proceed with the argument, Mr Ford.

NR FORD: Mr Darrow has testified on the stand here that

for many years he has been engaged in the most important cases
involving labor, both civil and criminal. He testified

that as soon as the McNamara Brothers were arrested, he was importuned by the leaders of labor to take this case. He

said he was getting old and he intended to retire from the practice of law; that he thought a mounger man ought to be chosen for this duty. He said he realized that it was a hard fight. He said that very soon after he went into the case he realized that these defendants were guilty.

MR DARROW: There is no such evidence, Mr Ford. I take exception to that remark.

THE COURT: The exception will be noted, and the jury will
bear in mind the admonition which the court has given.

If any of the jurors want part of the evidence read, it may
be read.

MR FOFD: He realized, gentlemen, above all things that a
long and apparently successful life in his profession, successful reputation in his profession, would be jeopardized

long and apparently successful life in his profession, successful reputation in his profession, would be jeopardized by the lost of this case. He said that it was the last case that he would ever undertake. He realized that its loss would destroy the reputation which he had built up. He felt that he must win the case. Franklin says that in all his conversations with Darrow, Darrow had frequently said that he must win this case.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

It is not necessary that we prove a motive for bribery. It is not necessary that a motive be proved for any crime. That is no part of the crime itself. The question before you is whether the crime was committed. You can con-4 sider the exastence of a motive merely for the purpose of indicating the probability that the defendant committed 6 If there were any doubt in this case, and you 7 crime. needed a motive to confirm your opinion that the defend-8 ant committed the offense of which he stands accused, you 9 have here the most powerful motive, the motive of preserv-10 ing a reputation built up by a life-time struggle for the 11 cause of labor. Mr Darrow knew shortly after his employ-12 ment that these defendants had been indicted by the 13 14 grand jury. There is an exhibit in this case, indictment 15 No.6939, upon which appears the names of the witnesses 16 who had testified before that grand jury, and among those 17 names is the name of Ortic E. McManigal. The defendant, 18 as counsel for the McNamaras, received a copy of that tes-19 timony which was given by those witnesses before the grand 20 jury, and in that testimony is the testimony of Ortic 21 E. McManigal. You remember that Mr Darrow upon the stand 22 quibbled over the question of whether it was possible for George Behm to change the testimony of Ortie E. McManigal. 23 24 He saad he didn't know that Ortic E. McVanigal ever testified 25 anywhere. If he did not remember that Ortic E. McManigal, testified before the grand jury, if he did not remember

1

2

3

5

that he had received a copy of that testimony, he did know

that Ortic McManigad had confessed, that Ortic McManigal was

1

2

26

to be a witness in the trial of the case against J. B.

McNamara. He did know that Ortic McManigal was telling the

truth, because he did know that his clients were guilty.

And what did he do? You, gentlemen of the jury, may have

wondered what a great deal of the evidence in this case

had had to do with the events of the 28th day of November,

1911. It has this to do with it -- before you can fully

understand the occurrences of the 28th of November, you must

know the nature of this case. You must know the relation

11 12 of the defendant to it. You must know the things which 13 the defendant knew at that time, in order that you may 14 truly and really appreciate the circumstances of that day. 15 You must know whether or not the defendant, previous to 16 that time, had been engaged in a scheme or system of crimi-17 nal action, of which incidents of the 28th of November were 18 but a part. 19 Now, what was the very first thing that this defendant 20 did? Now, knowing that Ortic E. McManigal was the main 21 witness for the prosecution, knowing that they relied upon 22 McManigal's testimony, knowing that McManigal's testimony 23 was true, he first got Mrs Emma McManigal, Ortie's wife. 24and brought here to California. For what purpose? To 25

impeach the testimony of Ortie IcManigal, if necessary; to win Ortie over to the defense, if necessary. And there scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

truth, he was endeavoring to frustrate and defeat justice,

influencing Ortic McManigal towithhold true testimony or to

give false testimony, or to impeach his testimony, which

he could not have done in any other manner except by giv-

other purpose or motive was there in bringing Mrs McManigal

here? Any view you take of it, he expected to have a crime

Now, he says that George Behm was a hired nurse, sort of

committed by her, and he was responsible for her acts.

a dry nurse for Mrs McManigal and her two children.

Behm was hired, according to his own story, in order that

be able to devote her time to the cause for which she had

ing false testimony -- all of which are crimes.

and prevent his clients from being punished, not by taking

exception to the competency of their testimony in court,

not by the means which the law permitted, but to do it by

stretching the truth, by stretching the privilege which the

George

law gave him into an excuse for committing crime, for bringing Mrs McManigal to California for the purpose of

Mrs McManigal might more successfully and more effectually

19

21

22

23

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

18

been brought. If the defendant's own story with regard to George Behm is true, he brought George Behm here as acces-

sory to the crime of Mrs McManigal. But he brought George

24 Behm here for other purposes. If George Behm's purpose 25

in being here was merely the innocent purpose of looking after the children, if George Behm did not do or did not

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

before the grand jury? The very questions asked of George Behm before the grand jurywere questions concerning Mr Behm's efforts to have Ortic McManigal change his testi-

mony. Those were the very first questions asked. You

should induce them to cant to prevent him from testifying

hear or did not see anything which could be of value to

before the grand jury for the first time, why was he

story was true. If George Behm's presence was merely

the prosecution, then why, when George Behm was subpoenaed

instructed to refuse to answer questions? They knew that

Ortic McManigal was sane. They knew that Ortic McManigal, s

that of a nurse, what could there be in his knowledge that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 have the contempt proceedings before you in which those 14 questions appear, the questions that were asked before the 15 first grand jury, and those are the questions that Behm was 16 instructed to refuse to answer. The first time he was in-17 structed to answer all questions until these defendants 18 might look into those questions and see what they were, see

19 what the prosecution was driving at. If there was any at-20 tempt on the part of George Behm to intimidate or to influence 21 Ortie McManigal, the People had a right to bring George 22 Behm before the grand jury, and they had a right to have 23 him answer those questions. Any attempt to induce George 24

Behm to withhold that information from the prosecution 25was committing a crime. 26

The prosecution of a criminal is not a var between scanned by LALAWLIBRARY the criminal and the prosecution. It is not one in

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

20

21

22

23

which the beligerent rights are equal. on both sides.

It is one in which the people are entitled to know all the facts in the case. And if anybody is attempting to keep out the facts, the officers of the prosecution would be false to their oath and false to their duty if they did not attempt to prevent such a thing from being carried out: and they had a right to question George Behm, and if George

Behm had been guilty of nothing excepting as a nurse, there would have been no one to instruct him to refuse to tes-The defendant admits that he instructed him to refuse to answer -- that is admitted -- and the evidence shows that he was interrogated in that same matter, in regard to the scheme of bribery in the case of people versus J. B. I c Namara. What happened after the contempt proceedings came on.

13 14 15 16 17 They came into court, and George Behm was instructed to 18 go back before the grand jury and answer those questions. 19 The court held the prosecution had a right to ask them. They went back again the second time with Mr Behm, after Mr Behm had been instructed to answer every one of those questions, they went there the second time in defiance of the court's order, and according to their own story, in-

24 structed him to refuse to answer on the ground that they 25 did not concern the case. 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

They admit

that. They say he was not able to remember the words

words that he could remember were that it did not con-

that were material, relevant and competent, and the only

cern the case, and so he was instructed to go there and say it did not concern the case. Darrow says that Behm was

never instructed to give false answers to any questions.

Do you believe that poor, faithful Behm would have violated the order given to him by Mr. Darrow if he was a man of weak mentality! If he was a man who could not understand

why did they tamper with him at all? You saw Mr. Darrow handling Mr. Behm in this court room, and if there was ever an index to a man's character, it was given here in court when this defendant with his years of training, with his

brilliant mind, with his magnificent personality, toying

with poor Behm onthe stand like a rat in a trap. You saw 16 that poor fellow upon the stand. No wonder Behm should 17 exclaim, "My God, this man has got me into an awful hole." 18 Those were the words that came from him. And he told the 19 truth when he said: "My God, this man has got me into an 20

awful hole." And he did. 21 There is only one conclusion that you can draw 22 from the relations between Darrow and Behm, and Darrow and 23 Mrs. McManigal, and that is at the very beginning he insti-

24tuted a scheme and system of criminal action, and his 25 offenses indicate the existence of that scheme, and the 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

object of that scheme of criminal action was to prevent the due administration of the law. It was not in accordance with his legal rights as a lawyer, but was in accordance with the practice which has become such a disgrace to our civilization that it should not be tolerated, and shall not be tolerated. Let us again turn to Biddinger. You know that Mr. Biddinger was present at the arrest of J. B. McNamara; you know that he took from the person of Mr. McNamara certain keys; you know that those keys fitted vaults and receptacles and rooms where dynamite was stored; you know that was an important bit of evidence. You know from your own common sense that it was necessary to use Mr. Biddinger as a witness in the case against J. B. McNamara. You have heard him testify on the stand as to the attempts to bribe him made by J. B. McNamara, and of the admissions of guilt which were made by J. B. McNamara. You know of the arrest of J. J. McNamara, and that he had taken from the person of J. J. McNamara certain keys which fitted the same vault as the keys that were taken from the person of J. B. McNamara. You know that he had to testify as a witness. You know that he was in the employ of the Burhs operatives who at that time were working for the State of California and the people of Los Angeles County. does the defendant say in regard to that matter? He says: Yes, I tried to get information from Mr. Biddinger. Did he

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not know that if Biddinger accepted his employment that
Biddinger's testimony would naturally be colored in his
favor? Did he not, as a man of common sense, know, that
when he tampered with Biddinger in the slightest degree

Biddinger's testimony, even if he never requested Biddinger not to be too hard on the boys, as Biddinger testifies he did. He knew that as a man of common sense. But he brings another proposition to you, gentlemen, right there, a proposition that I never before heard advanced in a court of law, and that is that the defendant has a right to spy out the secrets of the prosecution because, for sooth, the prosecution has put spies inthe ranks of the criminal classes. For years and years it has been necessary for

pigeons, to send detectives right into the ranks of the criminal classes, in order that they might find out what they intended to do, to frustrate their crimes before they were committed, out to punish them after they were committed.

The object of that system of spies is what? The object is to insure the enforcement of the law. It has been the custom frequently, it is absolutely necessary that some of the real band of conspirators be enticed away from their allegience and made to turn state's evidence, that some degree of leniency or clemency be extended to them, that

some hopes be given to them in order to cause them to turn

state's evidence, or to give information to the authorize

ties as to what their comrades in crime are doing. That is not a nice thing, to employ spies or stool pigeons, but it is necessary, and it is to be judged by the object for which it is done. Now, what does the defendant come here and say? He says: We have a right to do the same thing because the prosecution does. Is his object the same? It is not the means that is objectionable. It is the object for which the thing is done. That is the thing by which it is to be judged. A policeman pursuing a criminal has a right, if necessary, to kill that criminal. Has the criminal, when he is being pursued, the right to turn upon the policeman and kill him? Are the beligerent rights equal on both sides? was the criminal the right to do the same as the officer is trying to do? Are the objects the same? They are not to be judged by the same standard. So when this defendant has the effrontery to stand before you and tell you that he has a right to employ spies to corrupt the agents and employes of the prosecution, you are to judge him by his object. And he had not a right to do it because those on the other side adopted the same means. It is not the means that are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

adopted the same means. It is not the means that are wrong. It is the object that is wrong, and he is to be judged by that object. So, according to his own story, when he sits here and tells you that he employed Biddinger for the purpose of finding out what information the prosecution had, or for the purpose of finding out where the

traitors were in their camp, he has admitted that he was engaged in doing something that he ought not to do, and that your moral sense cannot--gentlemen of the jury, cannot stand for. Mr. Biddinger was an honest man. Mr. Biddinger when he met Mr. Turner, an employe and friend of Clarence Darrow, was requested to meet Darrow. Mr. Biddinger at once knew that Darrow did not want to see him for any good purpose. Mr. Biddinger at once knew that Darrow was trying to corrupt him, Biddinger, but Mr. Biddinger felt that it was his duty--and it was his duty--to see Mr. Darrow, and if Darrow attempted to do anything of that sort, to trap him, and he had a right to trap him. So he met Darrow, and Darrow made his proposition, and Turner made his proposition. "You ought to stand in with Mr. Darrow." Turner says. "I was with him in Idaho, and he spent money like water. " They appealed to the cupidity of Biddinger, but, fortunately for the prosecution in this case, Biddingew was an honest man, and he turned the moneys which he received over to the authorities at once, and made the reports as to what had been doing. Have you any right to refuse to credit the word of Mr. Biddinger? Don't his character, don't his conduct show that he is a man that is worthy of belief? Pon't this defendant's own admissions corroborate Mr. Biddin-And, right there, gentlemen, let me call your attention to another little thing with regard to the Biddinger incident, and that is the character and conduct of this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- defendant himself during Biddinger's testimony. Do you
- defendant himself during Biddinger's testimony. Do you
  remember when Biddinger testified that he had met Mr. Darrow
- at the Hotel Alexandria in this city on August 16th, that he said: "I have here an envelope and a piece of paper," and
- he offered it. Mr. Darrow, mind you, was an attorney in
- this very case. Mr. parrow's lips were not shut. Mr. Darrow has frequently interrupted his own counsel and shown that he
- will not sit silent when they are not doing things the way
- that he thinks they ought to be done in this case, and yet

  when the testimony came in, Mr. Rogers, one of the defendant's
- own counsel, stood up and said: "We admit that the handwriting on that envelope is Mr. Darrow's handwriting, but

we deny that Mr. Darrow gave it to Mr. Biddinger. " Do you

remember that? That was injected at that time for the pur-

- pose of influencing your testimony. And what did the defendant do?
- MR. DARROW. Just a moment.

  MR. FORD. He afterwards admitted that he did give that
- envelope to Mr. Darrow.
- 20 MR . DARROW . Just a moment .

13

- 21 MR. FREDERICKS. He should not interrupt him in the middle 22 of a sentence, your Honor.
- THE COURT. He has the right to assign an error, of course.

  24 MR DAPROW. I did not mean to interrupt in the middle of
- a sentence. I apologize for that. If I am not mistaken, told Mr. Rogers to pass by it, and he comitted it, and

there was no such statement made by Mr. Rogers. You will not find that in the record. THE COURT . Proceed, Mr. Ford. MR . FORD. Right there Mr. parrow told you gentlemen a lie, by his conduct. Do you remember when the little slip of newspaper was introduced and Mr. Biddinger had erroneously testified that he received it in Los Angeles, When, as a matter of fact, he received it in San Francisco, and afterwards corrected his testimony, that Mr. Rogers again arose and said: "We deny that that newspaper clipping is in the handwriting of the defendant in this case," and yet the defendant says he had not any doubt in the world but what he or Biddinger wrote it; he had no doubt but what it was written by one or the other. He knew in his heart that he had written that, and he knew that his conduct before had been a denial of that fact, and he tried to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13 14 15 16 evade, as he has frequently tried to evade. the giving of 17 a direct answer to that question. When requested to write 18 a slip of paper for a sample he refused to do so, but 19 after he saw that the effect of that would be bad, he wrote 20 it. 21

MR . APPEL. We assign that as error, your Honor. 22 MR. FORD. The exhibit is here. And the exhibit shows 23 that the writing that he wrote on the stand was written 24 in an unnatural hand and not written freely. Why? 25 Because he wanted to deceive you, gentlemen of the jury 26

c 1 After Biddinger had testified in chief, and the 2 defendant had a night over which to study his testimony --3 all of the first day he had been denying Biddinger's 4 testimony by his conduct, his counsel had been insinuating 5 that this was a piece of manufactured evidence .-- you heard 6 him repeat time after time: "This is manufactured 7 evidence"--but the next morning the brilliant mind of this 8 defendant conceived the idea that he might explain away 9 his meetings with Biddinger, that he might boldly come in 10 and admit that he had paid him money, and that he had made 11 appointments with him, and that he could explain it away, 12 and so he began to cross-examine Mr. Biddinger along those 13 lines, asking him questions along the lines which he in-14 tended to admit, just the portion which he intended to 15 admit, trying to emphasize by his cross-examination those points which he intended to admit, after he had had a night 16

17 to think it over. Francis Bacon, when he was first accused 18 of receiving money, boldly went into the House of Lords and said he did receive money from litigants, and thought 19 20 he could give a plausible explanation, but he could not; 21 and neither can this defendant, for his acts are not 22 capable of a plausible explanation; you cannot fit a lie 23 to the truth. And his entire story of that transaction

shows that he is lying in regard to Biddinger, and you must,

under the circumstances, believe Biddinger in preference to

24

25

26

Darrow.

THE DOURT. We will take the usual recess at this time. Gentlemen of the jury, bear in mind the admonition. Take a recess for five minutes. (AFTER RECESS. Stipulated jury present.) MR. FORD. Let us take up another instance, the instance of Mrs. Caplan. The defendant tells you, taking the cue from his counsel, Mr. Rogers, that he knew that Mrs. Caplan could never be used in the case of People vs McNamara because that is the law. He did not have any ideas whatever with reference to Mrs. Caplan; no intention to use her himself, no intention to allow the people to use her; no idea that the people would even think of trying to use He admits that the very first code that was made up, the one in which letters were used representing names

her. He admits that the very first code that was made up, the one in which letters were used representing names of individuals, the imperfect code that was used before the first dictionary in this case, the code that was copied by Harrington into that dictionary, he admits that that code may have been made by himself. varrington says it was made by Darrow and handed to him, Harrington, by Darrow, and the very first letter, the letter A, referred to whom?

To Flora Caplan. If they had no interest in her, if they had no intention of using her as a witness, if they had no idea that the people would be so foolish as to try to use her as a witness, how did it come that the very first letter in that code was A, and that A represented the name of Flora Caplah? He said that if he had been consulted by

7310 1 Mr. Johannsen or Mr. Tveitmoe, or any of the friends of Mrs. 2 Caplan, that he would have advised them to do the thing 3 they did, to remove her away from the state of California, because she was being annoyed by Burns detectives. Gentle-4 men, there is no evidence in this case that she was being 5 annoyed by Burns detectives during the year 1911. There is 6 some slight evidence that she was brought down from San 7 Francisco during the grand jury investigation in the 8 latter part of 1910, after the explosion of the Times Build-9 ing, but there is absolutely no evidence that anyone was 10 bothering her in 1911. The facts show that she was con-11 12 Morton, another one of cealed in the woods with their cohorts, there enjoying a vacation; that she was 13 apporached by Miss Hitchock, a woman employed in the 14 District Attorney's office, and subpoenaed, and that 15 immediately after she was subpoenaed, that she was taken 16 to Reno, Navada, and then to the east, and that a telegram 17 was sent from Johannsen to Harrington in which the letter 18 A was used, referring to Flora Caplan . You saw the tele-19

immediately after she was subpoenaed, that she was taken
to Reno, Navada, and then to the east, and that a telegram
was sent from Johannsen to Harrington in which the letter
A was used, referring to Flora Caplan. You saw the telegram in evidence. Johannsen admits that it was the truth,
and whatever Johannsen admits against himself is probably
the truth and that is all; the truth itself.

By whom was Flora Caplan taken east? By
Johannsen, who the defendant in this case said he needed

to have in court, and who must be excluded from the rule

of court because he needed his attistance; Johannsen, who

25

1 had to be put upon the standin the middle of the prose-2cution's case that the ethics of Earl Rogers might be 3 vindicated. By whom was the bill paid? By Mr. Tveitmoe. 4 whom parrow frequently consulted; whom Darrow needed in 5 the court room during the trial of this case in order that 6 he might be able to properly present the case to you, 7 gentlemen of the jury; Tveitmoe, whom they desired to put 8 upon the stand in order that Mr. Earl Rogers's ethics might 9 be vindicated, but he never was put upon the stand, and his 10 ethics, therefore, never were vindicated. These are the 11 men who are participants with the defendant in the defense 12 of the McNamara case. Tveitmoe, at least, is one of the 13 man who did not dare to take the stand because he was im-14 plicated in the Times murder charge, or he was under 15 indictment for transporting nitroglycerine covering the 16 same matters, and therefore did not dare to take the stand; 17 Tveitmoe, to whom a check was subsequently given by this 18 defendant. But I will come to that issue in just a moment. 19 These are the men who took Flora Caplan, and the defendant 20 says that he did not cause it to be done; that he would 21 have advised them to take her east if he had ever been con-22 sulted on that matter. That is one statement that is made, 23 and yet later in the testimony Mr. parrow said that he had 24 talked with wveitmoeand Johannsen about Flora Caplan, and 25 that maybe he did advise them to take her east. I think 26 the circumstances in this case show that they believed that scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

2 knew under the law that she could be introduced as a witness 3 against J B McNamara, whatever the law might have been as 4 to her being compelled to testify against her husband if he 5 had been caught. They knew this fact and they took her

Flora Caplan would be a witness for the state: that they

6 out of the state in order that they might, by that much,

1

7 at least, cripple the prosecution. Was that an act 8 in furtherance of justice, or an act in obstruction of 9 Does it not, in connection with the other 10 incidents in this case, show that this defendant was en-11 gaged in a scheme and system of criminal action to defeat 12 and obstruct justice; that he was conspiring with Johannsen 13 and Tveitmoe and others to do that act? What other conclu-14 sion can you come to in regard to that incident? And then again, with regard to Mr. Diekelman: You heard Mr. Diekelman 15 16 testify upon the stand as to what he knew about J B McNamara. 17 You knew that he had registered him at a hotel in Los 18 Angeles the night before the Times explosion; you knew 19 that he wasa most important witness for the state; you 20 knew that he left the state of his own volition, trying 21

to make his livelihood, /that he kept in constant communi-22 cation with the District Attorney informing him of his where+ 23 abouts. The defendant charges that the Burns detectives 24 were keeping him out of the state in order that the 25 defense could not get him as a witness ontheir side of 26 the case. The only evidence in regard to Burns detectives scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

is the admission that was made here upon the stand that Mr. Bibby had informed Mr. Diekelman--Diekelman testified to that -- that Bibby afterwards told Mr. Diekelman that the men whom he thought were Burns detectives were there on some other case and had nothing to do with him, Diekelman. That is the statement that Bibby made. Whether it be true or not is a different question. But that is the only evidence in the case, that there were any Burns detectives interested in Diekelman at Albuquerque. If they were, you may be sure that they were there for the purpose of protecting him against the defendant in this case, and for the purpose of causing him to return as soon as he would be needed in the case of People vs McNamara. Instead of taking him back to Los Angeles, they took him to Chicago. They paid his fare, they gave him \$100, they bribed him, and they did those things for the purpose of influencing his testimony and of weakening its effect; but they could not influence it when he took the witness stand. know the Burns detectives had to take him away from the defendant and had to bring Diekelman back to California. If they were trying to keep Diekelman out of the state of California, why did they bring him back immediately, as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

soon as they got hold of him? And another thing, Bert Hammerstrom, the defendant's own brother-in-law in this case, was the man that engineered that deal at Albuquerque, and he did not scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

dare to come back to Los Angeles. I think there is a telegram here in evidence to Ed Nockles, instructing Ed Nockles to have Hammerstrom meet Harrington at the Chief Hotel in Salt Lake City. You have seen that telegram, you that he have heard Mr. Harrington's testimony/directed Cooney to

have heard Mr. Harrington's testimony/directed Cooney to
meet Hammerstrom and have Cooney take Hammerstrom back
east, to stay out of California until things blew over.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

You heard Cooney's testimony that he did meet Hammerstrom at Salt Lake City, and that they went back to Indianapolis to see Pappaport, and that he stayed out of the state of California. The defendant in this case says that after that time Hammerstrom returned to Los Angeles and was here. If so, his whereabouts were secret and why wasn't he put upon the stand? Where is he now, if his acts are so uncertain? Why didn't he put him on the stand? Why don't he tell where he is now? He does not dare, because he knows that his brother-in-law would be punished for his crime if the prosecution got hold of him, and he knew that the things which Hammerstrom

MR APPEL: We take an exception to the remark. MR FORD: You may take two of them.

not appear before you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

of error.

MR APPEL: Two of them.

THE COURT: The exception will be noted and the assignment

did do were a crime, and that is the answer why he did

MR APPEL: Counsel says I may take two exceptions.

THE COURT: Counsel should not have made that remark.

MR APPEL: He should be taught some manners first. I ob-

23 ject to the statement of counsel as to what Darrow knows 24 or knew, or any statement that the prosecution would punish

25Mr Hammerstrom, or any statement that Mr Hammerstrom 26 committed any crime whatsoever or at all. Especially because the alleged occurrences, according to the testi-

mony of the prosecution, are alleged to have occurred in New Mexico, over which --

4 MR FREDERICKS: That is correct.

1

12

21

5 MR APPEL: It is not a crime against the laws of the state of California. I will ask your Honor to instruct the jury

that this state could not punish Mr Hammestrom for that crime.

9 THE COURT: The objection of Mr Appel, and the assignment 10 of error, will be noted, and the court declines to give the 11 instruction to the jury.

the instruction.

MR FORB: Mr Darrow said he was employed by the American

Federation of Labor, and that he was paid by the Amer-

MR APPEL: We take an exception to the refusal to give

ican Federation of Labor, and there has been introduced
in evidence in this case the checks which he received from

the American Federation of Labor. You have learned from the evidence in this case that Mr Darrow had three bank accounts in this city, one at the Commercial National

Bank, one at the First National Pank, and one at the Equi-

table Savings Bank. Those checks are all in evidence, and you have looked at the endorsements, and you can see

from each and every one of them that after Mr Darrow came to Los Angeles every check, with the exception of one, was deposited in a Los Angeles bank. That one check --

may I have that check book, Mr Smith -- that one check was 

dated August 23rd. An examination of the checks there will show that Darrow cashed them in Los Angeles within four or 

five days after their date in each case. The check of August 23rd, came to Los Angeles approximately the 27th or 

28th day of August, 1911. 

7318 The defendant admits that he received that check by mail, and that he received it in Los Angeles, and that he probably carried it in his pocket. Why didn't he deposit it in a Los Angeles Bank? He held that check for three or four days, until the first day of September, and gave it to Mr. Tveitmoe in San Francisco. You remember that he admitted that after meeting Biddinger in San Francisco he returned to Los Angeles, and then went back again to San He admitted that he receifed this check Francisco. by mail, put it in his pocket and took it to San Francisco. Why didn't he deposit it in a Los Angeles bank? He says that he intended to give Mr. Tveitmoe \$10,000 to hold in trust for him, Darrow, in order that Tveitmoe might pay certain expenses which were necessary to be paid in San Francisco and yet you see from this letter they claim that Tveitmoe had \$7500 of that money left, three months later. There were pressing debts to be paid in San Francisco, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

26

jury .

- There were pressing debts to be paid in San Francisco, yet, according to their story, \$7500 still remained in San Francisco when Tveitmoe appeared before the grand
- 21 MR1 DARROW. I want to take an exception to that.
  22 MR. APPEL. There is no evidence on that, as I remember.
- 22 MR. APPEL. There is no evidence on that, as I remember.
  23 THE COURT. It is in the province of the jury to tell what
- was testified to. If the jurors want the evidence read, they will say so.

- 2 It is dated August 21st, two days earlier than what I said, 3 and the check came to Los Angeles probably the 24th or 25th
- or 26th day of August. Had been carried by the defendant
- in his pocket from that time until the 1st day of September, 1911, at which time it was cashed in San Francisco by
- ber, 1911, at which time it was cashed in San Francisco by
  Tveitmoe.

  Now, you know and Mr Darrow knew at that time that
- 9 the prosecution had good reason to be on its guard against
  10 Darrow. They knew he was engaged in doing those things
- which no lawyer has a right to do. That he was trying to 
  MR APPEL: We take an exception to that.
- 13 THE COURT: The exception will be noted.
- 14 MR APPEL: As hot a proper comment, not testified to.
- and not facts which were introduced in evidence.
- 16 THE COURT: The exception will be noted. Proceed, Mr Ford.
- 17 MR FORD: They kn ev that Mr Darrow was corrupting every-18 body with whom he came in contact, even as he has corrupted
- some of the most respected citizens of our city, one of whom,

  I am sorry to say, is Lecompte Davis, and I will come to
- 21 that a little later.
- MR APPEL: We certainly take an exception to that as not being in the evidence at all that Mr Darrow ever correct-
- being in the evidence at all, that Mr Darrow ever corrupted anyone.
- 25 THE COURT: Exception will be noted.
  26 MR APPEL: That there is any evidence and we ask now, that

1 if there is such evidence we ought to be -- our atten-2 tion should be called to it, in justice to ourselves, so 3 we can respond to it, if there is anything in the record 4 to show that Mr Darrow corrupted Mr Davis, it ought to be 5 shown. 6 THE COURT: Counsel, I presume, will support his theory in 7 such way as he thinks right. The court will not stop 8 to read the testimony unless the jurors ask for it. The 9 application of counsel for the defendant to have the evi-10 dence called to hisattention is denied. 11 MR FORD: Mr Darrow knew that the District Attorney was 12 using everything, using every means within his power to 13 prevent those very acts; that he Mailed Behm before the 14 grand jury; that he hailed Harrington before the grand 15 jury; that he had detectives everywhere in order to guard 16 against this corruption. He knew, and the District At-17 torney knew, that the corrupt acts of Darrow could not be 18 carried on without money. They knew that the District At-19 torney can search the banks of Los Angeles and find out 20 where money was going, and perhaps be able to trace some 21 of it to the corrupt purposes, and so when they had a 22 corrupt purpose to perform, they did not deposit this 23 check in a Los Angeles bank, but sent it out to some 24 place where the District Attorney might never find it.

In San Francisco -- it might as well have gone to

Chicago, Portland, or any other place; the District Attor

25

- new would not know where to look for it. That was the theory -- that was the reason it was sent to San Francisco.
- 2 theory -- that was the reason it was sent to San Francisco.
- 3 That is the reason that Tweitmoe, instead of depositing
- 4 the check in the bank like an honest man would have done.
- 5 and drawing out checks against it, drew it in large bills
- 6 and put it in a safe deposit vault, according to the state-
- 7 ments that have been produced here --

9 MR FORD: The statement is incorrect; there is no evidence

MR APPEL: Wait a moment, your Honor, we object --

- that he went to a safe deposit vault.

  MR APPEL: There is no evidence here to that effect, and we
- 11 MR APPEL: There is no evidence here to that effect, and we 12 ask the jury be instructed that there is no such evi-
- dence.

  MR FREDERICKS: They are unfair in their interruptions.
- 15 MR APPEL: I ask your Honor where there is any evidence at
- all. We should not be called upon to find it in the short time we have to answer counsel, and we ask your Honor to
- instruct this jury that there is no such evidence.

  THE COURT: The court admonishes the jury as before, that
- they are the sole judges of what the evidence shows.

  21 MR FORD: Can't your Honor admonish them all at once.
- 22 THE COURT: Counsel has a right to make their objections,
- 23 but they should be very briefly made. Proceed, Mr Ford.
- 24 MR FORD: There is no evidence before you gentlemen that
- the money went into a safe deposit vault in San Francisco.

  The evidence of the bank teller is that he drew money in

large bills, and there is evidence before you that some of those bills were thousand-dollar bills. You remember that Mr Rogers jumped the cashier and asked him if he was not talking with me outside, and it came out in the evidence that the only conversation that man had with me was in reference to Tveitmoe's testimony. Tveitmoe had testified before the grand jury that some of the bills which he drew were thousand-dollar bills, and that is the reason they didn't dare put him on the stand; that is the reason they didn'tt dare put him on the stand. Tveitmoe did not have to incriminate himself in regard to any other transactions. When a witness takes the stand he has got to subject himself to cross-examination upon the matters concerning which he testified. When it comes down to any question of incriminating himself, he has the privilege at all times to answer on the grounds that it would incriminate himself, and they knew if Tweitmoe was put upon the stand we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

it would incriminate himself and that would have ended our inquiry upon that matter. The reason they didn't dare put him on the stand, he had drawn it in thousand-dollar bills, one thousand dollar bills being part of the \$4000 in this case. The cashier says it was one hundreds, five hundreds and perhaps some thou sand dollar bills, and Tveitmoe admits that he got some thousand scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

could not examine him about the transportation of nitro-gly-

cerine; he could refuse to testify simply upon the ground

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Now, as I said, the object of that was to prevent the District Attorney from discovering its whereabouts. Mr Harrington tells you out here at Darrow's home, Darrow showed him a roll of money -- I don't know whether it was

money, but it looked like a roll of money, and said, "I have got \$10,000 to reach a couple of jurors with; I got it from Tweitmoe's bank." Is there any corroboration of Parrington on that point? If Harrington didn't say -- if Harrington didn't learn from this defendant that he got it from

Tveitmoe's bank, how did the prosecution know where to look? 11 Out of all of the thousands of banks in the United States, 12 how could the prosecution have known where to look except 13 in Tveitmoe's bank? They knew that Tveitmoe was in San 14 Francisco and that Tveitmoe's bank was in San Francisco, and the defendant must have told Harrington where he got that money or the People would never have found it. If Mr Harrington's lips had remained sealed, that important bit of evidence might never have been discovered; and it might never have been brought before you and the precautions

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 which the defendant took in taking it to another city, or 22 to another city to cash, might have been effectual, and 23 prevented its discovery. Now, there is another point in 24 regard to that \$10,000 check. Mr Davis was asked if he 25 had not told the Assistant District Attorney that he had 26examined Darrow's bank account and knew where the money scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

7324 went, and knew that there was no money that could have gotten to Franklin for bribery of Juror Lockwood. Davis admits that he was asked by the Assistant District Attorney at that time if he knew that Mr Darrow had cashed a \$10,000 check in San Francisco. He replied he did not, and he admitted it upon the stand. If Davis didn't know at that time of that \$10,000 , the defendant was deceiving Davis, consealing from him the fact that Davis -- or concealing from Davis the fact that he had received \$10,000 and was using it for a corrupt purpose. If it was an honest purpose, why should he conceal it from Davis, if he was going to use it for an honest purpose, why should he conceal this \$10,000? Why should Davis come to the District Attorney's office and try to make the District Attorney believe that all the money that had been received was deposited in Los Angeles Banks and could be accounted for? What vas the purpose of Davis there? Either Davis had been deceived or Davis was trying to deceive the District Attorney. Now, with regard to Mr Harrington, as I have already shown, he must have had the conversation, because the prosecution would not have been able to go to Tveitmoe's bank and look for this check in Tveitmoe's bank, if it had not been for that fact. The item was found and Mr Harrington's testimony upon that point was corrobo rated. Proceedings were instituted through Indianapolis grand jury; Frank Morrison was subpoenaed and the checks obtained and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- you have them before you.
- 2

3

7

8

10

23

MR DARROW: I object to the statement of the District

Attorney, that he learned it from Mr Harrington, which is

- not true, or that it was instituted after that. 4
- MR APPEL: He cannot testify. 5
- MR FREDERICKS: That is a correct deduction from the tes-6

ished, and the jury informed that he cannot testify.

- - timony.

  - THE COURT: The objection will be noted.
- MR DARROW: I think counsel -- the jury ought to be admon-9
- MR FREDERICKS: He is not testifying. 11
- 12 MR FORD: I am drawing a conclusion which I know is true
- 13 from the testimony which has been introduced in this case.
- 14 THE COURT: Proceed.
- 15 MR FORD: Mr Harrington was employed by Mr Darrow early in
- 16 the case. Mr Harrington was employed by Mr Darrow because
- 17
- he knew that Harrington could do the things that he. Dar-
- 18
  - row, wanted done. Mr Harrington was placed in charge of
- 19 the evidence on the part of the defense. The defendant has 20
- tried repeatedly throughout this case, to show you that 21 there was some intimacy of relation between Franklin and
- 22 Harrington. Harrington and Franklin denied that they
- 24 other. Franklin was solely and exclusively in charge of

were intimate friends or that they had much to do with each

25 the jury end of it. Harrington was solely and exclusively 26 in charge of the evidence end of it. There was nothing

had not been in Harrington's office more than two or 6 three times, and there is no evidence that Harrington ever 7 did go into Franklin's office, and yet they have tried 8 to show by the evidence of their very employes that Mr Frank

in the business in which they were engaged which would

cause them to come together at all for purposes of consulta-

to do with the other so far as their business was concerned.

Each of them testified that he had not been in -- Franklin

tion. Fach of them reported to Mr Darrow and had nothing

1

2

3

4

5

9

lin and Mr Harrington were frequently seen together in confer-10 ence, yet each witness admitted that there was nothing 11 mysterious in the conferences or their conduct which 12 caused him to report the matter to Mr Darrow. 13 The inference which they desire you to draw was that Mr 14 15 Harrington procured the money from some place and gave it to Mr Franklin. That is a matter that I will return to a

16 17 little later in the argument. I wish to confine myself 18 now to the relations of Harrington alone. 19 When Harrington was arrested in San Francisco upon the 20 contempt proceedings, to whom did he turn at once for as-21 sistance? To Fremont Older, Dafrow's friend, and Darrow's 22 friend in this case. When he came to Los Angeles he at 23

once went to Mr Darrow for Darrow's assistance, and they 24 protected him -- instructed him not to testify, and fought 25 out the contempt proceedings at that time. 26 Now, if Mr Harrington were in the employ of the District scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Attorney or of the National Erector's Association, if he
was being a traitor to his trust, why should the District

3 Attorney waste his good time in pursuing contempt proceedings which were only inconveniencing their own agent in the em-4 ploy of the defense? It is so preposterous as hardly to 5 6 be worthy of discussion; that they would waste their time 7 on that when they had plenty of other people against whom 8 they could institute grand jury proceedings, if they 9 wished to discommode the defense in the McNamara case? 10 Before I leave the Tveitmoe check I want to call your at-11 tention also to a fact that Mr Darrow testified that the

12 District Attorney was always starting something before the 13 grand jury to keep us busy. He was always investigat-14 ing something. That was the reason why that check was 15 taken to San Francisco to be cashed. Mr Harrington, in 16 February of this year, returned to Los Angeles. It is in 17 evidence before you that at that time Mr Harrington lured 18 Mr Darrow, if you please, I use the word lured, to the Hay-19 ward hotel in this city. That there was a dictagraph there, 20 and that Mr Harrington led Mr Darrow into conversations 21 at that point and concerning the transactions in this 22 case. Mr Darrow admits that Harrington accused him, Darrow, 23 of having shown that money. Mr Darrow admits that Har-24 rington at one time said, "Oh, Darrow, Darrow, Darrow, they 25 have got the goods on you." You remember when that quest

tion was asked Mr Darrow, how angrily he flushed. He said,

that statement was made. MR DARROW: I want to except to that as not a statement of

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

4 fact. THE COURT: The exception will be noted. 5

MR FORD: The testimony was, "I don't know and I don't care."

"I don't know and I don't care", and refused to deny that

I said no such thing and there is no such tes-MR DARROW: timony, Mr Ford.

Knowing the attitude of Mr Harrington towards him MR FORD:

Darrow, at that time; knowing that Harrington was making false accusations against him, Barrow, he returned to that

11 hotel time and again; not once or twice, but five or six 12 times and had conversations with Mr Harrington at that 13 14 place. Does he tell you that he was endeavoring to prevent Mr Harrington from giving false testimony; that he was

15 16 trying to pursuade him that he was testifying falsely? 17 He has never told you that; he told you another story entire-18 ly. He told you that Mr Harrington was timid; that he

19 trusted Mr Harrington at that time, and he was afraid that 20 the District Attorney might intimidate Mr Harrington. He 21 believed still, that Harrington was true to him; that is 22 in the testimony of Mr Darrow himself. He believed that Mr 23 Harrington was true to him, after Harrington had said,

24 "Oh, Parrow, Parrow, Darrow, they have got the goods on you." 25 After Harrington had said, "You showed me the money out there 26 on the porch", he believed that Harrington was true to him, scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

but was afraid Harrington might be intimidated by the prosecution. He admits here that when Mr Harrington said he didn't want to perjure himself before the grand jury, that there was only one way left, to refuse to testify. Mr Darrow admits that he went and consulted My Davis about Harrington's right to refuse to testify. Are those the acts of an innocent man? Advising a man who is accusing him of crime? Mr Darrow admits that Harrington made these charges. Darrow said, yes, he said them, and I denied them. He admits that he made those charges, and yet, he goes and consults Mr Davis in order that they might find some way for Harrington to refuse to testify, and he is going tack there and consulting him again, because he is afraid Harrington might be intimidated. It is not in evidence in this case that Mr parrington has done anything wrong in his employment by Mr Darrow, unless he had done something wrong he could not be intimidated and Mr Darrow knew it. Why didn't Mr Darrow produce the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

25

14 15 16 17 18 19 wrong act of Harrington here upon the stand? Mind you, I 20 am not arguing that Mr Harrington never did anything wrong. 21 I am not holding any brief for any witness in this case; 22 all I care about is whether the witness upon the stand

23 spoke the truth. If he didn't speak the truth in every 24 particular, in what particulars did he hold the truth?

26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 I don't hold that Mr. Harrington's character is the character 2 of a lovely man. I don't claim that he is any model for 3 you or I or anybody else to follow. I make no such claim, 4 but I do claim that he has spoken the truth upon the 5 stand, and that if he ever did do anything wrong the 6 def endant knew it and didn't dare to ask him about it. That is the case here. That is the relation of Mr. parring-7 8 ton to this case. If Harrington did anything wrong the 9 defendant is guilty himself in this case, and did not dare 10 to ask him about it. 11 Under the court's ruling we could not introduce 12 the dictagraph testimony without giving the defendant a 13 copy of it. That might seem unfait to you. It would be 14 where the rights on both sides are equal, but the rights 15 of a criminal and the rights of the state are not equal, and 16 the people of the state are not required to give to the 17 defendant their ammunition, in order that the defendant 18 may guardagainst it. They are not to say to the defendant, 19 "Now, you must not tell an untrue story without having 20 all the facts that we have." The defendant had a right, 21 according to their view of the case, to manufacture a per-22 jured defense and in the manufacture of that perjured/ 23 he is entitled to know what means the district attorney has 24 of making up that perjured defense.

MR. APPEL. That is getting awful personal as far as 1 am

25

26

MR . DARROW - I object -- .

- concerned. I object to that, we have any purpose--
- 1 2 MR . FORD. I haven t any reference to you. I don't know
- whether you disclaim to know the facts. 3 4 THE COURT. Counsel says he had no application to you at
- 5 all.
- MR. DARROW. I object to it. I also object to his 6
- 7 statement that they had no right to introduce the dicta-8 graph because they had a right to introduce it in rebuttal 9 and didn't. 1 object to it. 10
- MR . FREDERICKS. That is absolutely unfair to take up our time. The court ought not to allow them to do it. 11 12 THE COURT 1 am going to allow them to indicate the 13 objection in the record as briefly and quickly as possible
- 14 and no further . 15 MR . DARROW. I never tried to consume time anywhere in this
- 16 case, am 1 think it is the duty of the court in 17 case counsel is right to tell it to the jury. Now, this
- 18 counsel told the jury they couldn't introduce the dicta-19 graph because it would give me a chance to know what was 20 in it, so I could testify. They could have introduced it
- 21 in rebuttal. I object to the statement. THE COURT. The objection will be noted. The court 22
- 23 declines to instruct the jury on the subject. 24 MR APPEL. Exception. MR . FORD. We are convinced by the conduct of the defend-25
- 26 ant-coming back to the evidence in this case, that is what scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

he would do; he would try to make up a perjured story to

fit the facts if they had any of our evidence. MR. APPEL. We take an exception to that remark.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

22

23

25

26

THE COURT . The exception will be noted . Proceed, Mr Ford.

4 5 MR . FORD. In addition to that we desire to hold that 6 ammunition back. We have another admission from the 7

def endant to serve our purpose in this case. We have sufficient to show you that he, Harrington, had the goods on this defendant, and the defendant knew it, and that was why he returned back again and again and again, and again and again, five or six times to Mr. Harrington, trying

to keep Harrington from testifying. Now, here is another thing. The defendant shifts from one base to another in his defense. He said that Mr. parrington was trying to extort money from him.

16 You know the dictagraph was there . You know that Harrington 17 was aware of its presence in that room. Does it sound 18 reasonable to you that Mr. Harrington would try to commit 19 extortion when he was trying to trap Mr. Darrow? Weald that

he a reasonable thing for Mr. Harrington to do? Whatever he may be; whatever his relations may be to this case, he is certainly no fool. He is a lawyer, and no man with the slightest knowledge of law would absolutely nullify 24 the effect of the dictagraph by trying to extort money

from this defendant, and there is another lie nailed by the

defendant's own admissions and conduct in this case upon the scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

6 guarded by his attorneys by objection after objection in 7 the admission of testimony from the defendant's own lips. 8 A man perfectly able to protect himself, and then they 9 say that/trying to trick him, trying to trick this witness,

who practiced law before I was born. Tried to trick him;

a man perfectly able to protect himself, to ask protection

stand. These are the things that come from the lips of

the defendant himself, as wary as he may be, as skillful

as he may be, as brilliant as he may be, as learned in the

law as he may be, he got upon this stand and dodged every

question, gave evasieve answers, taking the time to think,

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

20

against being tricked.

13 MR. DARROW. I object to that as not a statement of fact. 14 THE COURT. The objection will be noted. Mr. Ford will pro-15 ceed. 16 MR. FORD. Now, knowing these things, haven t we the key 17 to the situation that arose on the 28th day of November, 18 1911, when Franklin was arrested in the very act of bribery; 19

when Franklin was caught giving money to Lockwood? Wouldn't

you say at once that Franklin must have got that money from

21 the defendant in this very case? Wouldn't your 22 as men of common sense, at once lead you to the conclu-23 sion, knowing the facts as you now do, wouldn't your common 24 sense at once convince you that Darrow must have given the 25 money to Franklin? All that remains to be determined now 26 is whether or not there is sufficient legal evidence in this

case to corrupt Mr. Franklin upon that point. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr. Golding, on your examination as a juror on voir dire, you said you had no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of this defendant. The only opinion that you had

in regard to any transaction was in regard to the transaction that occurred at Third and Los Angeles street. You

said you had perhaps a slight suspiciion that it might be a firame up. knowing that the circumstances might appeal to you in that matter, that it might raise such a suspicion at

that time, knowing that if you heard all of the facts in

this case you would see that it was not a frame up, we made no objection to your remaining upon the jury, and I want to go into the circumstances of that case at this time to show you that that was not a frameup, at least on the part

of Bert Franklin. If there was a frameup on the part of any body there were only two men who claimed that in all

this world. There were only two men who knew the circum-

was the District Attorney.

said, "Well, I want to think it over, take it under advise-

stances of that frameup; one was Lockwood and the other

You remember the evidence in this case, that Mr. Lockwood was first approached by Mr. Franklin on the 14th day of November. You remember that at that time Lockwood

ment;" and that later he saw him inthe city, and that somewhere about the middle of November the facts concerning the matter were communicated to the District Attorney; that Lock-

25 wood had turned it down; told Franklin he didn't want any-26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

thing to do with it; had turned it down and then went to the District Attorney. Mr. Lockwood said to the District Attorney, "Franklin has attempted to bribe me. I have turned him down. He is my friend but I have turned him down. Now, he is my friend and may return to meagain and renew the offer, but there is one thing there Franklin told me that there was another man upon that jury whom I knew better than he did, a member of the G.A.R." Mr. Bain, and Mr. Bain had been sworn in upon that jury. Counsel tried to show that Mr. Lockwood had betrayed a friend. The circumstances in this case show that Mr. Lockwood had turned the offer down, but that Mr. Lockwood being the honest man he 13 is, realized that he owed a duty to the state far greater 14 than that which he owed to a freend. Mr. Lockwood himself 15 had fought during the Civil War. He wears that same G.A.R. 16 button and had fought for his country, felt that he still 17 owed another duty to his country, and he communicated the 18 facts to the District Attorney, because there was one man 19 in that jury box who had been bribed . 20 Mr. Lockwood's face is stamped with the impress 21 of truth and honesty by God Almight himself. He has lived 22 in this community for many many years. He has occupied 23 official positions in this community, and not one word has 24 been breathed against his character for truth, honesty and 25 integrity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

26

The Court will instruct you that a witness must scanned by LALAWLIBRARY.

the crime of perjury; You cannot do it. You have got to

choose between Mr. Lockwood upon the stand and this defendant, The name of Mr. Lockwood did not appear upon any venires until movember 25th. Day after day, every two or three days, a venire would be drawn, 50 names more would come out of the box, and the name of Lockwood was/among them until November 25th. on November 25th the District Attorney imagined that this was the day, Saturday night; this was the time that Franklin would return to Lockwood, if he

ever did return, and so the District Attorney sent his men out, his detectives out onthe night of November 25th to surround Lockwood's house and gather the evidence of Franklin's crime, if he showed up.

1 Now, if Franklin were acting in common with Mr Bockwood, if there was any community of interest between Franklin and Lockwood would the District Attorney have out there that evening in vain for Franklin to show up? Franklin didn't show up. Franklin didn't have the money, 5 and Franklin didn't come out that night to Lockwood's house, and the District Attorney's men waited in vain. 8 Weren't they doing a foolish act if the District Attorney 9 and Mr Lockwood were conspiring together with Mr Franklin 10 to entrap the defendant? Weren't they doing a foolish 11 act vaiting out there in the dark for that man to show up? 12 Next day Mr Franklin came out on Sunday to see Mr Lock-13 wood, and there was not a single, solitary soul from the 14 Pisfrict Attorney's office present to corroborate that fact. 15 Poes that look like a frame-up on the part of Mr Lockwood 16 pr the District Attorney on that point when they didn't 17 have a single man there to corroborate Franklin's testi-18 mony? And does it prove to your mind that Franklin came

20 know they were trying to trap him at that time? 21 Franklin, on Monday, tried to get the money from Mr Dar-22 row, and he didn't get it. Darrow kept putting him off 23 until noon, and then again until evening, and that evening 24 he told him he couldn't get the money out of the vault, becaus

19 unknown and unsuspected tothem, and that Franklin didn't

25 the vault had closed; they would have to vait until the 26 hext morning at half past 8. How did Franklin know that Job Harriman would go to the vault the next morning at half past 9, as Harriman himself has admitted upondbthewubrary

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

- 1 stand? Could Franklin draw aside the veil that was 2 stretched over the acts of the next day and know that Har-3 riman was going to the vault on Tuesday morning at half past 4 8? Mr Franklin had made the appointment to deliver the 5 sum of money to Mr Lockwood on the Monday night. The Dis-6 trict Attomney had gone out with Mr Lockwood to his home, and they had made arrangements so Franklin would have 8 to come out to Lockwood's house at night. They surrounded the house that night with their detectives, and they wait-10 ed for Franklin to come with the money. If Lockwood or the 11 District Attorney were parties, or either of them were 12 parties to any frame-up on the part of Franklin, why did 13 they stay out there in the dark that night, listening to the 14 conversation between Lockwood and Franklin? Waiting in vain for Franklin to deliver the money? What did the men 16 who were out there think? They thought Lockwood was string-17 ing them; that probably he got the money and was keeping it, 18 but he didn't get it. He didn't have it. Franklin hadn't 19 got it from Darrow, so they couldn't deliver the money
- 21 night and that money had been delivered on Monday night, 22 you would never have had a suspicion it was a frame-up, 23 but yet the way in which the bribery did ofcur was a far 24cleverer scheme than to pay it out at Lockwood's house 25 that night in the dark, because in the dark and at night 26 the very fact that Franklin came to the prospective jurors'

there that night. If this had occurred out there that

house would seem a suspicious circumstance in itself: it would be easy to station men around there and capture him

1

7

8

9

10

11

20

3 at that time. They expected to do it, but they couldn't do

it. Next day Mr Bockwood had to come to court. Mr Franklin 4 couldn't get the money until half past 8, and Lockwood had 5

to be in court at 9 o'clock; the order called for it. 6

And so they made an appointment with Mr Franklin that he should meet White at quarter to 9; that White should immed-

iately go down to Third and Los Angeles street and deliver the money to Lockwood, and White should hold the balance of the money as stakeholder.

12 Supposing Lockwood was true to Franklin and false to his 13 country? Supposing Lockwood had been willing to accept 14 this money? Lockwood was the man who had lived for many

15 years in this community, a man of whom the District At-16 torney would have no suspicion; a man who could have gone 17 into that jury box just as easily as Mr Bain did; for the 18 same reason that he had led a long, honest life, and was 19 above suspicion.

Supposing that Franklin and Lockwood had been seen at 21 Third and Los Angeles streets? They were old friends. 22 Lockwood could say, "Yes, I met Mr Franklin that morning

23 as I was coming up to court; shook hands; passed the time 24 of day and valked on. " Who would have doubted his state-25 ment? But Franklin didn't even take that chance. He sent

26 another man, Mr White, of whom nobody would have any sus-

- picion. Franklin was more or less known to the people of
  this community as connected with the defense in this case,
  and he might arouse suspicion of some passer-by; some passerby might recognize him and report to the District Attorney
  that they were together. He didn't even take that chance.
  He sent White to meet Lockwood. Lockwood, you remember,
- He sent White to meet Lockwood. Lockwood, you remember, tried to get Franklin to meet him over here at the Federal Building, and Franklin said, "No, I am too well known around there." Franklin had formerly been a deputy marshal.
- Too many people would know him near the Federal Building, and he didn't want to take that chance. He said, "You meet
- 12 me down at Third and Los Angeles street;"
  13

a place that is convenient to the Higgins Building, where

he expected to get the money. He said, "Meet me at

3

s 1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

4 lin told White that the vaults were closed and they would

5

not be opened until half past eight, and he couldn't get

half past eight," the night before. He told White--Frank-

the money. The same night, Monday night, he told Lockwood

that the vaults were closed and he couldn't get the money

until half past eight the next morning, and so made the

appointments they were to meet in point of time after half

past eight. Franklin is corroborated in that point by the

fact that the vault did open at half past eight. Job

Harriman did go to the vault at half past eight. Job

warriman says it; Hawley says it; Russell is brought in

a check--or paid a note on the 29th, when they had money

that day in the bank was probably his rake off, his share

use it. We know that all the appointments were made after

it, had looked into the future, and had learned from the

future that warriman was going to go to the bank at half

and that Harriman was going to come to the office again.

Franklin says he saw Harriman at the office that morning

half past eight. We know that Franklin, if he was planning

past eight that morning and draw some money out of his vault

for holding the money for Darrow until he was ready to

enough in the bank that day.

to explain away that circumstance by saying that they paid

That \$500 that was put to Job Harriman's account

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

7342 Harriman says he came to the office that morning 1 immediately after half past eight, the same as Franklin, 2 but denies that he saw Franklin; denies that he saw Darrow. 3 Denies that he brought the money, and Franklin went imme-4 diately from that building, went down and met White. 5 Now, the watchman has been put on the stand. 6 That watchman denied Franklin was there that morning but he 7 says he was there between 7 and 8 o'clock that morning--8 MR . DARROW . At 7 o'clock . 9 MR. FORD. That he was there around 7 o'clock, the earlier 10 11 the better it suits by argument. Put it at 7 orclock if you desire. I wanted to be fair and put it a little 12 later. Shoeber said it was about 7 o'clock. Have they 13 made any accounting for the time that elapsed between 14 7 o'clock and half past eight? Whyre was Bert Franklin? 15 16 Did they interrogate him? Eid they bring forward a 17 single witness from their willing cohorts from Venice, that would swear that he saw Bert Franklin between 7 and half 18

past eight delock that morning? How do they account for that 19 20 fact, if he didn t get the money from a mysterious stranger early in the morning, that he made his appointment so late 21

22 as 9 o'clock, and Mr. Lockwood should be in court as a juror? THE COURT. It is 12 o'clock, Mr. Ford. We will take the 23

24 noon recess. 25 (Jury admonished. Recess until 2 P.M.)

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

AFTERNOON SESSION. August 12, 1912: 2 PM.

Defendant in court with counsel.

1

16

18

26

2 3

4 THE COURT. All the parties are present. You may proceed, 5 gentlemen.

6 MR. FORD. I have hurried through the events that occurred

7 on the morning of November 28th at Third and Los Angeles

8 streets. As the way the thing worked out, I believe that 9 it was the cleverest possible manner in which a bribe

10 could be given. You remember that prior to that date the

11 District Attorney knew that there was one man on that jury 12 who had been bribed, Robert Bain. Remember that the

13 District Attorney knew that Darrow was the man who was 14 responsible for the bribing. The only evidence that

15 he had as to either of these events was hearsay.

prosecution could be had; Bain could not be removed from

17 the box; the attempted bribery of Lockwood by Franklin

rested solely upon the word of Lockwood against Franklin.

19 Remember that up to that time we must presume that Franklin's 20 reputation was good, and there is not one scintila of

Franklin's

21 evidence here that/reputation was bad, and it was not. 22 It was the word of Franklin against Lockwood, and Lockwood

23 against Franklin. The proof that Mr. Bain had been bribed

24 rested solely upon Franklin, upon the declaration of 25 Franklin to Lockwood that there was another man on the

jury, a member of the G.A.R. "whom you know well."

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

testimony against Darrow was solely this. Franklin had said to Lockwood, "I will see Darrow and try to find some 2 way to make it safe." When the money was passed from Mr. 3 White to Mr. Lockwood, no man had seen Franklin pass the 4 money to White. Up to that point there was no additional 5 evidence gathered against Franklin, /until White had been 6 arrested there was no direct and positive evidence that the 7 money had come from Franklin to White. But White was 8 arrested; White came through and testified, and that link 9 was furnished. Mr. Franklin was down there in that vicinity, 10 watching his money. He was ted to see that White would pass 11 the money to Lockwood, as had been agreed upon. Mr Darrow 12 was down in that vicinity watching Franklin and the money. 13 While Mr. Franklin was there on Third street he saw Jim 14 Campbell, an attache of the District Attorney's office, pass 15 by. He did not apparently attach any great deal of import-16 ance to that event. But when he saw George Home stimaking 17 around the corner, he did attach some importance to that 18 event. He hurried down to meet Lockwood and said, "Come, 19 let's get away from here; let's walk up the street," 20 and allowed White to drop behind and get away if he could 21 take the cue. But White did not take the cue and did not 22 get away, and was compelled to confess. After they had 23 24 gone up the street a little ways around the corner, Franklin began to realize that his friend Lockwood had 25 betrayed him, and he immediately began to think of some way 26

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRAI

He made up his mind to charge Lockwood with having solic-2 ited a bribe, and to turn Lockwood over to the first

policeman he met. That is what he says, and his testimony upon that point is corroborated out of the lips of the defendant's own witnesses in this case, because Davis says

defendant's own witnesses in this case, because Davis says that he reported to Darrow that Franklin was innocent, that Lockwood was attempting to solicit a bribe, and that

that Lockwood was attempting to solicit a bribe, and that Franklin intended to turn Lockwood over to a policeman.

I don't believe Mr Davis' testimony upon that point is true. I believe Davis knew better than that. But some

such plan was entertained by Franklin, and it was commu-

nicated to Davis. Davis knew that Franklin's desire to do this thing was merely a subterfuge, to get ahead of Lockwood, to turn the tables upon Lockwood, and that was all there was to it.

In a few days after that event -- I have forgotten now

whether it was the next day, the 29th, or whether it was on the 1st of December -- at any rate, Mrs Bain came to the District Attorney's office and told her story and an information was filed against Franklin on the Bain charge, and when Bain testified and Mrs Bain testified

and White testified and Lockwood testified, and Franklin
was down in that vicinity trying to save the day, to hurry
Lockwood and Bain away from the scene, they had a case against
Franklin, Franklin knew at that time that he was done for.

If there was any frame-up in this case, it was a frame-up scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

on the part of Lockwood and the District Attorney to catch Franklin, and they caught him, they had a right to trap

him, they had a right to do the things they did; and they

Now, gentlemen, what defense is put up against those

circumstances? They charge that Franklin was acting in

collusion with Lockwood. You heard Franklin testify upon

the stand. You know how bitter the feeling is that Mr

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

did catch him.

9 10 Lockwood testified at the preliminary examination; he said "Franklin told me he would see Clarence Darrow and 11 12 find some way to make it safe." Franklin realized that 13

Franklin showed toward Mr Lockwood. You remember what was an indiscrete thing for him to say. He was angry, he didn't like Lockwood anyway. He went up to a newspaper man and he said, "If Lockwood says that I said that, he is a damned liar." Those are the terms he used. Here on the stand you saw how he showed his animosity against Lockwood. There was no community of interest between those two men. Franklin admits that he made that statement to the reporters at the preliminary examination, and he says upon the witness stand that that was true. And still sore against Lockwood, he denied that Lockwood told the truth with regard to that particular expression.

He denied it upon this very stand here. Evidently those two men were not friends, never have been acting in collusion at any time for the purpose of hurting the McNamaras scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

or for any other purpose.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

Gompers.

There is not a scintilla of evidence in this case that Mr Lockwood was acting in collusion with Harring-No such claims have ever been made by evidence or otherwise. And, in regard to the character of Mr Lockwood, you must realize that Mr Lodkwood is an honest man, and that he has told you what did occur between him and the District Attorney, and that nothing occurred between him and any other person, except the District Attorney. Was there any collusion between Farrington and Franklin? Franklin was never told by Darrow where the money came from. You remember Harrington asked Mr Darrow down at the dictagraph conversation, he asked him this question, "Did you ever tell Franklin about showing me this money?" or something in substance like that, and Darrow replied, "Never in Christ's world did I." Darrow had never told

- Franklin where the money came from, and Franklin never 17 testified upon the stand that Darrow had so told him. 18
- MR DARROW: Your Honor, I want to object and take an excep-19 20 tion. Franklin said that I stated I got it from Sam
- 22 THE COURT: Let the exception be noted.
- 23 MR FORD: Darrow never told Franklin he had got the money
- 24 from Tveitmoe's bank in San Francisco. If Franklin
- and Harrington were acting in collusion, if they were 25 framing up something by which they could get Mr Darrow. 26

1 how does it come that Franklin did not corroborate Har-2 rington on that point here on the stand? How easy it 3 would have been to frame up testimony to say, "Mr Darrow 4 told me he had got the money from San Francisco", or some-5 thing like that. But he didn't say it. The testimony of 6 Mr Franklin and the testimony of Mr Harrington cover 7 entirely different fields, and cover it in a perfectly 8 natural vay that must convince you that they are telling 9 the truth. 10 Now, another thing. If Mr Franklin were in a plot to 11 destroy the defendants, the McNamaras, in that case, or 12 to injure this defendant, how does it come that for weeks, 13 day after day, up until the 18th day of January, the time 14 that he confessed to me in this case, up until that day, 15 he had time after time and place after place, according to 16 the defendant's own witnesses in this case, he had said 17 that "Darrow never ave me any money. Darrow never 18 gave me a cent. Darrow is innocent of this charge."? 19 The defendants have attempted to impeach Franklin 20

by saying that he made statements of that character. Mr Franklin admits upon the stand that up to that date, up to that time, he was protecting Darrow, and that he did make statements along that line, although he had denied saying the precise things that were attributed to him, but he did admit he was protecting Darrow. If Franklin were in a plot to ruin Darrow, why did he protect him at that

26

21

22

23

24

The defendant himself has called your attention to the fact that for weeks after the arrest of Franklin the District Attorney had said, "We have no evidence against Darrow on that charge." Neither did they. They never had any evidence upon which he could be indicted or tried

time?

in this case until the 29th day of January, the date on which the indictments were returned by the grand jury. It took us weeks of patient investigation to gather this material together, in order that he might be indicted for the crime that he had committed, and prosecuted here in The first absolute, necessary thing to do this court.

was to make Bert Franklin come through, before the case would be sufficient or complete to present it to you. 

I do not mean to say that this case rests upon the testilc1 mony of Bert Franklin alone. It does not. But Franklin's 2 testimony furnishes an explanation of all the circumstan-3 ces in this case, and there is no other explanation pos-4 sible -- all the circumstances of this case except the story 5 told by Bert Franklin, through Bert Franklin here upon the 6 stand day after day, cross-examined by the most skillful 7 cross-examiners that this fair city can produce. You saw 8 him remain there unshaken in any essential detail of his 9 testimony; he told all the circumstances of each day with 10 a particularity of detail that would absolutely defy 11 fabrication. No man could make up such a story upon the 12 stand here and fit it with the circumstances as they have 13 fit in this case; no man could have defied the cross-14 examination which he stood on this stand. The court will 15 instruct you that the testimony of an accomplice ought 16 to be viewed with distrust. The ordinary rule is that a 17 Witness is presumed to speak the truth, and you must 18 rely upon the testimony of that witness unless there is 19 20 something in his attitude, his relation to the case, his manner of testifying, or the probability of his story 21 which destroys that presumption. That same distrust may 22 23 be repelled by the fact that he has told a story that is extremely probable, by a consideration of its relation 24 to the case, and all the circumstances in the case, by the 25 fact that he has been corroborated in detail after detail, 26

as Franklin has in this case, and as I shall show you before I conclude. That being the case, that distrust should have been absolutely removed, and you have a right to believe that Bert Franklin has told the truth upon the stand in every essential detail, as I am sure that you must as men of ability, and your duty as jurors is to satisfy your reason as men. What you believe as men beyond a reasonable doubt you must also believe as jurors beyond a reasonable doubt.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

While I am upon the subject of Franklin, you remember that he testified he had met Mr. Darrow and Mr. Davis in the his office onthe 14th day of January, and there had discussed some proposition to deceive the District Attorney, If Franklin were acting in collusion with the District Attorney, or with some interest inimical to the defense in this case, how was it that on the 14th day of January he plotted in that office to deceive the District Attorney? How was it that he actually attempted to deceive the District Attorney and was laughed at at the very inherent improbability of his story? How was it that he invented some mysterious stranger whose name he did not know in order to exonerate Mr. parrow in this case, if he were in a plot to

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 ruin Mr. parrow, if he were in a plot to procure the convic-23 24 tion of the defendants in the McNamara cases? How was it that he attempted to deceive them upon those dates? Can 25 26 you explain it in any manner except this, that he was trying scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

to protect Mr. Darrow, and that he was loyal to Mr. Darrow up 1 2 to that time? They have attempted to show that the story that was concocted to deceive the District Attorney was 3 really the truth, and Ithey have produced Shoeber upon the 4 stand with his mysterious stranger. You will remember that 5 Mr. Shoeber testified before the grand jury; that he 6 admitted receiving Mr. Franklin up in the office, he thought 7 it was Tuesday morning, but after consideration he guessed 8 it was on Monday morning, and you have had here produced 9 upon the stand Mr Mayer who testified to the identical 10 circumstances testified to by Shoeber, and it must show, 11 if Mayer tells the truth, that Mayer was the man who 12 13 Shoeber saw, and that he waw him on Monday. A great deal of cross-examination was directed against Mr. Mayer because 14 of the fact that he refreshed his recollection as to dates 15 in various manners, but there is one thing that remains 16 in Mayer's testimony, and upon which he needs no recollec-17 tion at all, and that is that he had worked on saturday 18 night and Sunday, and had reported to Mr. Franklin on Monday 19 morning prior to the pleas of guilty, and prior to the arrest 20 of Bert Franklin, and from the other circumstances in this 21 case you know that the Saturday night referred to was the 22 25th day of November, the Sunday referred to was the 26th 23 day of November, and the Monday referred to was the 27th 24 day of November, and there can be no possible doubt in 25your mind that it must have been Monday the 27th day of 26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 November that Shoeber saw Mr. Mayer there, and saw Mr. 2 Franklin there. Mayer answers the description given by 3 Shoeber, although Shoeber, one of the lieutenants of the 4 defense--private solider of the defense--refused in court 5 to identify him. 6 Mr. Mayer went up there Monday morning to get his 7 money, and he went over afterwards to the office and gave 8 Mrs. Franklin a receipt. She does not remember just when 9 the receipt was given, but she said it was not made up for 01the purposes of this case, it was made in the ordinary 11 course of business and was intended to show the date on which 12 that sum was paid to Mayer by Mr. Franklin, and it absolutely 13 fixes the date in this case. Mrs. Franklin has never been 14 accused of any crime; Mrs. Franklin testified on this 15 stand 'sat after her husband had received immunity auto-16 matically--Mrs. Bert Franklin could not be prosecuted; 17 Mrs. Franklin was not guilty of any crime. What motive 18 was there for Mrs. Franklin to falsify in this case? Another 19 thing: You remember that it was the influence of Mrs. 20 Franklin that made Bert Franklin come through to the Dis-21 trict Attorney in this case. You remember that according 22 to Franklin's own testimony, Mr. Darrow and Mr. Davis were 23 willing to pay his fine and give him a sum of money until 24 he could rehabilitate himself, but when he went home to his 25 wife and told her the circumstances of it, like the true 26 woman that she was, she said: Bert, you can take your

medicine if you want to, you can do what you think right as a man; if you believe that you ought to plead guilty and let Darrow go, she said, you can do so, but I will not take one dollar of that corrupt money. And it was her influence that caused him finally to come through and tell the truth to the District Attorney. Just a word, in passing, about the inherent probability of the story which he had told. Mr. Franklin, if he had been approached by a stranger, knowing that the District Attorney was always starting something to keep the defense busy, knowing that the District Attorney was watching their every move, would at once suspect a trap on the part of the District Attorney. Would he take money from a man he did not know? If an offer of that sort was made, what would he do? Why, common sense tells you that he would at once report the circumstances to this defendant and receive his advice in the matter. And if he received it from some stranger, it would not be until after he had consulted with Mr. Darrow and knew it was all right so to do. And if he got it from some third party, and Mr. parrow told him to do it, and Mr. parrow aided and abetted and adised him and encouraged him to do it, then Mr. Darrow would be guilty whether he personally gave the money to Franklin or not. And there Would be absolutely no necessity of Franklin claiming he got the money from Mr. parrow personally. There is absolute-

ly, motive whatever for Mr. Franklin to falsify upon the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

stand and say he got it personally from Mr. parrow if he got it from somebody else, because if he did get it from somebody else he certainly consulted this man before he took it. He never got it from an unknown stranger.

The defence in this case have shifted about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

26

The defense in this case have shifted about from one base to another. One of the jurors in this case made an innocent inquiry about the political situation in this case. Knowing that all the defenses, they had submitted were unsatisfactory, they reade a immediately jumped at the bait. They immediately tried to instil into your minds the possibility that Bert Franklin had acted for the political adversaries of Job Harriman, and this was the result of a political frameup in thiscity. Let us see what are the circumstances in this case. Mr. Franklin has told upon the stand that Job Harriman -that they had to wait for Job Harriman to go to the vault at half past eight. He testified that Job Harriman came into the office, saw Mr. Franklin, went into the adjoining room, and that Mr. Parrow came out and immediate/handed

arrest of Franklin, up to the day of the pleas of guilty,
you remember up until the very hour that the votes were
counted in this city, that it was by no means certain that
the socialists would not win out in this city. A vigorous

Franklin \$4,000 and he left.

the socialists would not win out in this city. A vigorous campaign was being waged by them at that time. Was the

story as told by Franklin upon the stand here ever made

You remember that after the

0							
9							
10	4						
11	, and the second				×		
12							. ,
13							
14		a.					
15	n N						
16	v						
17		S - 17					
18							
19							
- 1							
20							**
21							
22	1			*			
23							
24							
25			*				1
26							1
				*		scanned l	y LALAWLIBRARY
	1						

public during tha vigorous campaign?

What better campaign material could there possibly have been than to spring the story that Franklin has told upon the stand at that time? If there ever was a necessity for manufacturing that story, it would have been then, not now. There is no campaign on at the present time. Mr Job Harriman is not a candidate for office. Job Harriman . the man most vitally interested, says here upon the stand, he says he never heard the circumstances as told by Franklin here upon the stand, he never heard it from the lips of anybody inimical to the defense in this case, inimical to the Socialists in this city, he never heard it from the lips of anybody until he heard it from my lips in the office of the District Attorney three months afterwards, when he was called before the grand jury. That was the first time he had ever heard his name mixed up by anybody. Franklin had kept still all of the time. Isn't that the very best evidence that it was not a political frame-If the situation was framed for political purposes, why would Franklin come on here and manufacture it at this time? It is not necessary to consider Harriman guilty in this case. Mr Darrow, for purposes of his own, may have deceived Mr Franklin about Harriman. Darrow may have wanted to make Franklin believe that Harriman was interested for some reason, and he held off until Harriman came to the office and handed the money to Franklin at that time. It does not add anything to the strength of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the testimony here by implicating Mr Harriman. It is possible to reconcile the testimony about Harriman in this case with the theory of innocence, as far as Harriman is concerned. It does not affect this case in any way, shape or form, so far as the guilt of this defend-Mind you, I am not arguing that Harant is concerned. riman is innocent. I believe he is guilty. I believe the circumstances in this case -- I do not know whether they are sufficient to charge him as an accomplice in this case, but I believe, from the evidence in this case, he is an accomplice in this case, but I am trying to show you at this time that there is absolutely no motive today, as far as the purposes of this case are concerned, for mixing up the name of Job Harriman. And why does Franklin do it, if it is not true? The only answer is that it is part of the details of what occurred at that time, and that With regard to this transaction Mr Franklin has told you everything with the same multipliticy of detail that he. has told you everything else: If it had any effect at all its only effect at this time could be to weaken the testimony of Mr Franklin, because Mr Franklin would well know, and the District Attorney in this case would well know that it only furnishes an opportunity for another Witness to come on the stand and contradict Franklin. But the thing was true. We had to furnish them the opportunity to let them contradict it if they desired. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 If it was a frame-up, the persons who were framing it 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

would have cut that out. Because they as lawyers

would know that a circumstance of that sort only furnished an opportunity for another witness to deny portions of Franklin's story.

The circumstances of Harriman, then, were not made public. There is a motive for it now. Is Franklin telling the truth in that regard? Is he? Or was he the tool of any political combination? I don't think I ought to waste your time further on that subject.

Now, there is another hypothesis: was Mr Franklin the

agent of the prosecution in this case? Mr Franklin went to Mr Bain and offered to give him \$400 and promised to pay him \$3600 more, and he sat in that very chair right there in tack. Was the bribe to convicthe Mc-Namaras? No, he was told to acquit them, and he wasn't going to get the money unless he did acquit. The \$3600 additional. Mr Franklin went to Mr Smith out here at Covina and offered him \$4000 to sit as a juror in this case: to convict the McNamaras? Mr Smith testified that the \$4000 was conditioned upon this fact, that he should vote for a verdict of not guilty in the case of People vs. J. B. McNamaras Mr Franklin went down to Third street and saw Guy Yonkin, took him into a saloon next

door and offered to give him \$4000 if he would sit as a

jury in the case of people vs. McNamara, and that was

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

conditioned upon one thing, that Yonkin should refuse to convict and should vote not guilty in the case of People vs. McNamara. Mr Franklin went out to John Underwood, who is now dead, and offered him a bribe, and Underwood mid. "He was my friend, and he couldn't hurt the prosecution." The offered to him was for the purpose of voting not guilty. Mr Franklin went out to Krueger at The Palms and offered him \$4000 to vote not guilty. Mr Franklin went to Lockwood and offered him \$4000, and you have have had the money here, to vote not guilty. Why, isn't that the most remarkable thing you ever heard of in all your life to convict a defendant, to go and bribe a juror to vote not guilty, and promise them money if they would vote not guilty. Can it be possible

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

that any person interested in the conviction of the Mc-Namaras would ever bribe them to vote against convicting them? As Mr Appel would say, a fifteen-year-old boy would know better than that. Now, Mr Franklin furnished another opportunity for contradiction upon this stand. He said when he went

down and saw Mr Kreuger that Kreuger had told him that Frank Fowler had been to see him. Frank Fowler, the railroad detective. Frank Fowler, whom the defense in this case had characterized as one of our most eminent members of the bar. Frank Fowler, whom, to use one of Mr Rogers' Vernon arena terms -- Frank Fowler, concerning

- MR. FORD. He came in here-
- 3

1 BB

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- MR. APPEL. We take an exception and object to the remarks 4

might be avoided by counsel.

I believe to be the plain--

- - of counsel that Mr. Rogers here or any one connected with the
  - 5

THE COURT.

- THE COURT . Wait a minute.

MR . FORD. courts are sometimes deceived.

defense ever buffaloed this court or buncoed this court.

MR · APPEL · 1 think it is a reflection upon the court ·

THE COURT . 7 think, however, it is a formal expression that

MR . FORD . Your Honor, I cannot avoid my duty to say what

THE COURT. It is the form of the expression, Mr. Ford.

Fowler give as to his visit to Mr. Krueger down there?

MR. FORD -- facts in this case. What explanation did Mr.

By the way, Mr. Krueger was an unwilling witness. The testi-

mony was dragged reluctantly from his lips upon the stand .

MR. Krugger was a man who had been prosecuted by the Dis-

trict Attorney and had no love for the District Attorney.

Mr · Krueger was not anxious to aid the District Attorney in

upon the floor, each match symbolizing a thousand dollars;

sented to Mr. Krueger the same identical proposition that had

four thousand dollars. How did it come that Fowler pre-

any way, shape or form. Mr. Krugger told Franklinthat

Fowler had come to his place and laid out four matches

The exception will be noted. Prodeed, Mr. Ford.

1

2

7

8

9

MR . DAPROW . We want to take an exception .

MR- FORD. The only inference that can be drawn--3

MR. DARROW. We take an exception to that. Krueger said 4

each match represented a dollar or ten dollars; he didn't 5 6 say each match represented a thousand dollars; said he

didn't know.

THE COURT. The objection and exception will be entered. Proceed, Mr. Ford.

MR . FORD. Mr. Krueger was an unwilling witness. He was 10

not going to aid anybody. He had to admit to the four 11

matches proposition, and he understood at that time well

12 that those four matches symbolized \$4,000, and perhaps 13

would have accepted it in this case. I don't want you 14 gentlemen to believe that we admire the character of Mr. 15

16 Krueger. All we are interested in is the truth of his statement, and we believe the truth was forced out of him; 17

that is all I care about Krueger. 18

How did Fowler happen to go down there? He 19 admits he saw Krueger down there on the 7th day of September 20

21 He said he was interested ina witness in the case of the radiroad; he was interested in a witness by the 22

23 name of Harrison; he didn't know his initials; he used to live at Santa Monica. He moved out to the Palms. He 24

inquired of some man down there if he didn't know him; he 25 26 had seen parris. He went to the billiard hall and asked

a man if he didn't know anything about thim. Never heard of him. Fowler then went over to Krueger's and thought perhaps Krueger might know something about him. He couldn't give you any details whatever about this man Harris. Krueger said the man might have lived there, if he did he moved away. I call to your attention also another very significant fact, that was this: When Mr. Krueger was upon the stand he was not asked if Fowler hadn't come to see him in regard to this man Harris. No foundation was ever laid for impeaching Krueger by Fowler's testimony. Probably in their hearts they recognized they could not impeach a yellow dog upon Fowler's testimony, and for that reason did not lay the foundation, and the only reason they produced Fowler in this court was they were afraid his appearance would not be sufficient. They called your attention, gentlemen of the jury, to the fact he was not under subpoena then, and he should be put upon the stand, so finally they did put him upon the stand. Gentlemen, if you had a case would you hire this eminent lawyer of the bar, Mr. Fowler, to handle your business for you? Would you trust him? If not, don't trust his testimony. wealthywow, there is another point inthis case. Whatever interests were about bribing these jurors or hired Mr. Franklin to bribe them, were not throwing their money away. \$4000 is not a sum that people, no matter how a lithey

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

are

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

throw away lightly. If they paid each

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

don't throw away lightly. This money if given to a man remain on the jury. How did they ever expect to retain

must have been given with some expectation that he would that man upon the jury unless the facts were told to Mr.

Darrow? Bain was a man whose interests were not particularly in favor of the defendant. Lockwood was a man whose opinions were not particularly in favor of the defendant or the McNamaras. An examination in court of either of these men might bring forth the fact that they were hostile to the prosecution, and so they had to guard against that. They had to figure an examination in some way that would retain the bribed persons upon the jury . How

could Franklin or any other person behind him ever expect to retain this man unless the facts were communicated to Mr. Darrow in order that Mr. Darrow could act accordingly? Do you suppose they went out blindly bribing everybody and taking chances on Darrow retaining them, or do you suppose, like sensible men, they told Darrow the circumstances in order that Darrow might make their money go where it would

21 do the most good and the best for them. 22 Now, this Christian anarchist, Lincoln Steffens 23 took the stand and testified that he had first broached the 24 proposition of letting J.B. plead guilty and stopping all 25 other prosecutions. That he first took up the subject 26

with Mr. parrow on April 20th, Monday morning at breakfast.

That they had labored all that week until Saturday night

trying to get the authorities to accept that situation.

Mr. Steffens says that the District Attorney at all times

insisted on both men pleading guilty. He says that on Thursday, Friday or Saturday night, he would not be particular, but he knew it was before Sunday the 26th, that the National Erectors Association and the interests in the east would not consent to a plea of guilty unless both men plead

guilty, yet they were trying to act with the District Attorney to prevent the prosecution of both men and get him to accept a plea of guilty on the part of one man—

THE REPORTER. You said April, Mr. Ford.

MR. FORD. I meant November. Is it possible that the District Attorney or the Mational Erectors Association would interfere with a plea of guilty by framing up something on Mr. Darrow at that time?

on Mr. Darrow at that time?

Mind you, the testimony of Lincoln Steffens shows that the National Erectors Association or the interests in the east, who were interested in the prosecution of the McNamaras, that those people knew prior to the end of the week, or Sunday, November 26th, that there was a chance for both—a chance for at least J B McNamara to plead guilty.

week, or Sunday, November 26th, that there was a chance for both—a chance for at least J B McNamara to plead guil. The world at large wished to know the facts; the world at large would never be convinced of the facts if these men had been sent to the gallows by reason of a jury verdict.

Wany millions of people in the United States would have felt that the evidence, however strong, was a frameup, and that these men were innocent, and it was desirable above all things that they admit their guilt; that they confess their guilt. Thatwas the thing that most of the world, who were interested in the prosecution: that was the thing that they were most vitally interested in, to convince the rest of the world that these men were guilty, and after the defendants themselves admitted it, is it likely that under those circumstances they would frame up a job on Darrow? Darrow was a criminal lawyer. Darrow had been a fighter all his life. You have seen his powers here in court; If they framed up a proposition against Darrow wouldn't they know that Darrow would fight all the harder? Wouldn't they know that any crime of that sort would prevent the very thing that they wanted, a plea of guilty. As a matter of fact, gentlemen, the people in the east had; absolutely nothing whatever to do with the question of the plea of guilty or otherwise. That was a matter that was handled by the District Attorney of this city regardless of any outside influence, as will appear from the testimony of Lincoln Steffens himself. Mp. APPEL. We object to the statement of the gentleman here, that no interests nor no people inthe east had any interest in the matter, and they had nothing to do with the question of their allowing or rejecting the plea of guilty,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on theground it is contrary to the evidence, and there 2 is no testimony to the contrary, and I object to the 3 gentleman testifying to those facts before the jury while 4 not under oath. 5 MR. FREDERICKS. That is a deduction drawn from the evidence. 6 THE COURT. I don't want any argument on the subject. 7 I don't want to hear from you Mr. Fredericks. The objection 8 will be noted and the jury will bear in mind their admoni-9 tion and instruction in regard to their being the judges of 10 what was testified to. Proceed, Mr. Ford. 11 MR . FORD . Now, what is the next step, according to the 12 testimony of Lincoln Steffens? The man who believes that 13 men should not be prosecuted for mere murder. You heard 14 him say that on the stand. The man who believes that they 15 should go free because they were guilty only of social 16 crime. What did he say was the next step in the case, if 17 you can trust his testimony? He says that on Sunday, the 18 defendants were seen by him self and Mr. Darrow and a dead 19 man, Judge McNutt. If Judge McNutt were alive they where 20 would not testify that he was a pafty to the proceedings 21 on Sunday, but he is dead, and so they can make any asser-

1

22

23

24

25

26

being an inference that Judge McNutt, if he were alive,
would have been a witness to a fact contradicting the claims
of the defense, that he was present on Sunday, one of the

MR . APPEL. Wait a moment -- we object to that statement as

tions they please with regard to him.

meetings referred to in the testimony for the defense.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

testified to.

The Court. The objection will be noted. Proceed, Mr. Ford.

MR . FORD. Mr. Steffens says that on Sunday they saw J J McNamara and J B McNamara. That they talked to each one separately, and each one was willing to plead guilty pro-

vided the other was saved, according to his own testimony, on Sunday, J J was willing to plead guilty only on the condition that J Bshould be saved. MR. APPEL. We object to that on the ground that that

is not the evidence and is contrary to the evidence. MR. DARROW. Said his life should be safed. THE COURT. The objection will be noted. The jury will

bear in mind that they are the judges of what the witnesses

MR. APPEL. We object to his misstatement of the facts. THE COURT. The objection is noted.

MR FORD. The defense have an opportunity in this case to

17 18 argue the facts in this case. If they deny that there is 19 a transcript to support any facts concerning which I have 20 argued, let them make them when they argueto you, and my 21 chief, Captain Fredericks, will read you from the trans-22 cript, when he closes, the exact testimony on that point. 23 I must hurry through; I haven't time to take up the refer-24 ences. Let them deny each time and we will make a note 25 and it will be given to you on the closing from the transcript 26 itself.

7371 1 At any rate, both were willing to plead guilty. 2 J B--there can't be any contradiction about this--at one 3 time, the first time Steffens talked to them, each one 4 was talked to separately, each was willing to plead guilty 5 if the other could be saved. Each wanted to save his brother 6 and save the cause of union labor. How J J could save 7 the cause of union labor by pleading guilty himself I don't 8 know. He was an official. Certainly a plea of guilty on 9 his part could not save union labor, but that is in the 10 testimony of Steffens. The point I am driving at, however, 11 is an entirely different one. Mr. Steffens says that on 12 Monday they sent Mr. Davis, Captain Fradericks's friend, 13 to see Captain Fredericks and see what he would do on that 14 day, and that the District Attorney told Mr. pavis and Mr. Davis reported back to Mr. Darrow that he was willing, on wonday, toaccept a plea of guilty from both defendants; he was willing that J B should take a life sentence and that he was willing/should take a sentence, say, of 10 years. Mr. Steffens says that the District Attorney hadagreed to that on Saturday, that being a week before, because somehowthey had discussed that very proposition on

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 Sunday November 26th. It had crept into the discussion 23 somehow. He didn't remember how, but the proposition was 24 that the district attorney was willing to let J J take a 25 term, say, of 10 years, and to let J B take life. 26 MR. Davis and Mr. Darrow, according to

testimony, called on the District Attorney again on

Wednesday, and the District Attorney told them on Wednesday

he was willing to let both defendants plead guilty, to let

J J plead guilty and take 10 years, say, or something like

that, and to let J B plead guilty and take life.

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

16

17

18

19

6 They had to furnish some excuse there. Steffens 7 realized and the defendants realized that there must be 8 some other condition made which would account for the 9 necessity of having a conference on Thanksgiving Day. That

was the fact that stared them in the face, the fact that they had conferred all day long with J B McNamara, then

12 so in order to get J B to confess and so they had to invent 13 a condition and they said that on Wednesday the District 14 Attorney insisted on both men pleading guilty at once, at 15 the same time, and that made it very hard for them to

account for the necessity of arguing all day on Thanksgiving day. But the point is this, gentlemen: The District Attorney, during the week preceding Sunday, knew that Bain

had been bribed; he knew that Franklin had been bribed. 20On Monday he knew that Lockwood had been approached by 21 Franklin and he knew that on Monday night, and later it was 22

postponed until Tuesday, but at that time he thought that 23 on Monday night Bert Franklin would go out with some money 24 to give it to Mr. Lockwood. He knew that a crime was about 25 to be committed and yet he was willing, in the interests of 26 justice, in the interest of ending the expense of litiga-

1 tion involved inthe McNamara trial, he was willing that the crime contemplated by pert Franklin should never be sommitted, and that meant that Bert Franklin could never be prosecuted. On Monday he was willing that that should be done. That is the defendant's own testimony. There was nothing, absolutely nothing to prevent the defendants on 8 Monday from putting in their plea of guilty, if they desired to so do,, and remember, Mr. Steffens says Darrow the week 10 before had insisted that there must be secrecy; there must 11 be haste; we must do this hurriedly or there is something 12 liable to go wrong, yet on Monday, after this had been 13 consented to, Captain Fredericks, after Davis had made his 14 last appeal, and his direct appeal to the very man with 15 whom he had to deal, had been turned down, and after they 16 realized there was no way to get anything, they realized 17 J J should plead guilty, and according to their own testi-18 mony they were willing to plead guilty, both of them, 19 although there was urgent need for haste, 20 they didn't do it. Davis never went back, to Fredericks 21 that day and said "We will accept your terms." 22 Here is the District Attorney on one side, 23 willing to forego the chance of capturing Franklin; willing 24 that a crime, even though it was committed, should go un-25 punished, and yet they have the effrontery to stand here 26 before you and to say that the District Attorney or

C

2

3

4

5

6

person in the prosecution who had the same knowledge that the District Attorney had, who, if they had any interest, would certainly not be throwing any stones inthe way of the District Attorney, who would certainly not interfere with the success of the negotiations for the plea of guilty. yet they have the effrontery to say that somebody else put up a job to get Darrow, when they were perfectly willing, the authorities were perfectly willing to prevent even Franklin from getting himself in the snaare, in the interest of the people of this county, that the expensive litigation might be stopped, there could be a frameup by someone; something that is not true; something that this. defendant knows is not true, something, that Darrow, the fighter, Darrow the gladiator of the court, would fight all the harder; the man who knew the District Attorney always started something to keep us busy. Is that explanation plausible on the part of the defense, and is there any reason for their making statements of that sort, or are they trying to deceive you? Are they slipping from one base to another to deceive you? If they are, gentlemen, you should not trust them. You should be guided by your common sonse and the evidence in this case. You should not be speculating for some evidence upon which you might acquit him. Now, here is another thing. Bert Franklin on the 27th day of November this year, by plea of guilty, announced to the world that he had gone over to the prosecution.

At that time the prosecution in open court asked the court to be lenient with Franklin; announced to the world 5hat Franklinwas to be a witness for the prosecution. There was no longer any necessity of concealing the connection between Franklin and the District Attorney, if there was any, and yet the District Attorney insisted on Franklin pleading guilty, and placing the stigma of jury bribing upon himself forever, placing this disgrace upon his family. Do you imagine for one instant that if Bert Franklin was in a frameup with the prosecution that he would have allowed this stigma to be placed upon his name? It is true that he was dealt with leniently. It is true that he got more than he would have deserved otherwise. It is true that he plead guilty to a crime which he committed, and knowing that it was wrong and being himself over the age of 21, he went into it with his eyes open and I can say no word by way of defense of Franklin's act in this matter, although Franklin was dealt with leniently in order that justice might be accomplished in this case; in order that/ man who corrupted Franklin, in order that the man who corrupted others, in order that the man whose life and conduct and teachings were luring men whom he never knew into evil ways, in order that that man might be punished. MR. DARROW. Wait a moment. I will take an exception to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

the language just used by Mr. Ford.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

THE COURT. Yes, sir, the exception will be noted, proceed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. FORD. The District Attorney and the judge realizing the importance of this present litigation, dealt leniently

with Franklin, but the fact remains that the stigma will always be upon his name. Do you think, Franklin was the tool of the prosecution in this case, that if Franklin was merely acting as a spy to trap Mr. parrow, that if Franklin want in for the purpose of getting defendant that he would allow this stigma to be placed upon his name?

Now, gentlemen, if Mr. Franklin was the agent of interests hostile to Mr. parrow, why was it that way late in February they resorted to the imperfect device of the dictagraph, which, imperfect as it may have been, never theless something of which this defendant has been fearfully afraid, and which hasserved its purpose to indicate the guilt of this defendant.

If Mr. Franklin or Mr. Harrington or anybody elae

was in the prosecution's pay to get this defendant, why could they not have managed to have witnesses present to the transactions that had occurred away earlier in the game at the very time these things were being done? Wouldn't they, if they were clearing up anything, had witnesses who saw Mr. Franklin going into the building -- the Higgins Building, wouldn't they have had witnesses who saw Mr. Darrow

going into the Higgins Building? Wouldn,t they have had

witnesses so they could have corroborated Franklin as to these things? Wouldnot they have had witnesses so situated that they could have seen Franklin pass the money to White?

Wouldn't they have had a world of testimony that we have not inthis case? Certainly, if people were framing up some thing and spedning thousands of dollars in that frame up, throwing money around and promising money to everybody. wouldn't they have hired men who would be present in an

advantageous position, and who could testify in this case, and yet are not here? Isn't the very absence of such witnesses the best proof that there was no frame up?

1 Under these circumstances isn't it reasonable to sup 2 pose that this was the motive that actuated Franklin? 3 That Franklin saw there was no possible loop-hole for him 4 to escape, and that he was going to be convicted, that 5 there was no chance for him whatever. Davis had been 6 sent, according to Franklin's testimony, to the District 7 Attorney, and they had asked the District Attorney to let 8 Franklin plead guilty, and to let him pay a fine of \$5000. 9 and go free, and say nothing about it, stop all matters. 10 Mr Davis himself admits that he dod go to the District 11 Attorney's office. Mr Davis corroborates Franklin upon 12 that point, that he didgo to the District Attorney's 13 office, and says that he was representing Franklin at that 14 time. Mr Davis says that awayback in the beginning he 15 knew that Franklin was innocent, and yet he wants Frank-16 lin to plead guilty. Knowing he was innocent, he wanted 17 him to plead guilty; that he had represented to Darrow 18 that Franklin was innocent, and yet he admits he went to 19 the District Attorney's office and tried to get a plea of 20 guilty accepted upon certain conditions. Do you believe 21 that Mr Davis would permit an innocent client of his to 22 plead guilty? Do you believe that Davis is that kind of 23 a lawyer?

Franklin has been abundantly corroborated in every detail. There is every detail of corroboration as to what occurred in those few days prior to the 14th day of

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

January. Franklin realized he was up against it.

1

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

He had heard Darrow say, when Franklin told him that the

District Attorney would never accept this wild-eyed

story about this unknown man, he had heard Darrow say, 4 "If you are going to tell him about me, tell him about Job

5 6

Harriman, too." He went home and told his wife, and told her about the circumstances. He consulted his friend,

8 an attorney, George Adams, and upon Adams' advice and upon 9 his wife's advice, but principally upon his wife's advice.

he determined to tell the truth to the District Attorney. There was abundant evidence in this case to lead the District Attorney to believe Franklin would not tell the

truth and unless he told it was Glazance Darrow. Another thing. Franklin knew that the moment he took

his place upon this stand, the moment he started to testify upon this subject he would receive immunity. Franklin knew that he could not be prosecuted for any matters concerning which he gave testimony. Franklin knew that the only prosecution possible after the first words had passed his lips, that the only thing for which he could be prosecuted, would be for perjury in giving false testimony thereupon the stand. Franklin is shrewd enough, Franklin is sharp enough, and these defendants were advising

him. Darrow and Davis. the undoubtedly knew that the 25 moment he was sworn, he would be immune from any punish-26 ment upon that subject; he knew that then he could tell scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

the whole truth with absolute impunity; that he could not be prosecuted excepting he perjured himself. Therefore, when Franklin had started to give his testimony. started out to admit that he had paid Lockwood \$4000. he was there to tell you any story he pleased about where he got the money, excepting that if he told you a falsehood, if he perjured himself, he was liable to prosecution on an offense which would still be punishable by a greater punishment than the one which he had received. He knew that the moment he started he was immune from punishment, and yet he went on and told you the truth. told you that Darrow was guilty. He said here upon the stand -- and I believed him -- that he was absolutely neutral; that Darrow had been his friend. He said here, "I always considered Darrow my friend, and I say so yet to his face. He has always treated me right." There is only one thing here, gentlemen, only one conclusion, and that is that Franklin was acting for Darrow, that the only reason he had for bribing these men was for the \$1000 he got in each case. \$5000 were laid aside for each juror -- \$4000 for the juror and \$1000

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Now, what answer do they saive to the facts in this case? They produce one of the defendant's employes. Mr Wolfe. They have Mr Wolfe, a Socialist of the Darrow

for Franklin. That was the only motive he had for act-

ing in this case -- no other conclusion is possible.

type. Wolfe takes the stand and says that he came down that morning, that he had been with Mr Darrow on that morning. Mr Wolfe says that he knows he came down that morning, because that was his custom to come down at 8 o'clock; that is, to leave on the 8 o'clock car, and to arrive here at 8:30. Let He remembers that specifically, because that was his custom. Later on, when he was cornered, and he saw that custom was not going to be enough. he could remember positively, and he made the direct positive statement that he was there at 8 o'clock, and remembered distinctly that it was 8 o'clock. He remembered then as to a transaction of that day. Conductors, one of whom was an admirer of Wolfe, a Socialist and an admirer of Wolfe, take the stand. They don't even know what they are called here for -- they think it is something about an accident, but they take the stand and testify that Wolfe was what is known among street car men as a late traveler, that he always came on later cars, and the man who ran on the 8 o'clock car said that Wolfe took his car only about once in a week. Yet Wolfe tries to deceive you, gentlemen of the jury, to make you believe that story and tells you that it was his custom to come down on the eight o'clock car. He forgot that he was a candidate for the council at that time, he forgot that he was probably known, that he was known to most of the people who ride in on those cars. He forgot that they had seen his picscanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ture, forgot that they would be able to identify him, that they would remember him. He forgot that he was one of these distinguished sort of fellows, that he was a candidate for office, and that they remembered him. Mr Wolfe testifies on the stand that he spent half an hour. nearly, in talking with Mr Darrow about the political They talked about the alliance between the situation. Good Government people and the liquor interests, just the same as Hawley and Harriman were talking, over the same situation a few blocks away in the political headquarters. All of them talking over the situation of the alliance of the Good Government people and the liquor interests. It is in the testimony that there was this remarkable coincidence, that these people in both places were conversing about the alliance between the liquor interests and the Good Government people. Nowhere in Wolfe's testimony does he give you his ideas on that subject, and the probability was he didn't talk with Al Levy following the same process of reasoning that Mr Hawley adopted to come to the same conclusion, that there was an alliance between the Good Government people and the liquor people, because he had never heard it from either side, so he concluded it must be true. Do you believe the story of Wolfe, under those circum-

stances? There is another point involved, and I will come

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

to that in just a moment. I vant to talk about Hawley's

testimony first. Hawley testifies that he saw Job Harriman at 8:30 in the morning coming out of the vault of the German-American Savings Bank at Fourth and Spring streets. Harriman testifies he was down there at They talked three or four minutes on the corner of Fourth and Spring. That would make it about 8:40. Hawley says that Harriman walked down Fourth street towards the headquarters there. Mr parriman says he got in his machine and went to his office. At any rate, we know he was in his office, from the testimony of Franklin, and from the testimony of Mr Russell. Hawley says that at 8:40 he started out to his own office across the street. and figuring the time which would be necessary for him to walk across the street, wait for the elevator, and get up to his room, he was there about 8:45. He said he had a conversation the night before with Al Levy, that there was an alliance between the Good Government forces and the liquor people, that he found it out from the Tribune editorial. Now, do you want me to read that editorial again to you? I don't think you do, hat I will read it if any juror desires me to do so. But there is not a single reference in that editorial that bears the construction that he put upon it, not a single reference, and Wolfe said he did not have a conversation with them the night before. But, be that as it may, if he had been to me 15 minutes with this important news, he walks over to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Socialist headquarters to get Mr Harriman and discuss it with them: it took him 5 or 10 minutes to get there; 5 minutes; assuming that he got there in 5 minutes. That made it 5 minutes past 9 when he arrived at the Socialist headquarters. What happened there? The doorkeeper told him that he would go and see if Mr Harriman was in. He returned and said Mr Harriman was engaged in a conference, and that he would have to wait. And he said he sat down and waited 10 or 15 minutes. That made it 10 or 15 minutes past 9 before he saw Harriman. They then discussed it. Wolfe says they discussed it 5 minutes. That made it 9:20. And then they discussed the liquor question and the alliance, the very question that Wolfe and Darrow were discussing down at the other place, and Harriman said: You ought to see Mr Darrow about that; Mr Darrow is from Chicago and will probably know something about the political situation in Los Angeles. Mr Darrow is engaged in the trial of an important case, which will probably consume much of his time, and he will probably be able to explain it. That a is 9:20. So he walks back to his office, another 5 minutes. 9:25 he is back to his office, and he picks up a phone and phones to Darrow at 9:25. Remember that Franklin was arrested on the street at 9 o'clock, and Darrow, according to his own testimony was in court a few minutes after they started to impanel the jury, a few minutes past 9, and Wolfe says

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Darrow left the office before 9 o'clock. Who is a liar?

Are these witnesses who told about the reputation of Mr 2 Hawley upon the stand, when they said it was bad for 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

truth, honesty ar integrity -- are they lying, or is Haw-

ley lying? Remember there is another thing in that very

incident of that telephone conversation: Franklin says

that Darrow had picked up the phone and telephoned to some

place, presumably headquarters -- that was not testified

to -- but they felt right there that they must not let Darrow be in communication with the socialist headquarters

because that would, in a measure, corroborate Franklin's testimony, and for that reason, Hawley went back to his office. They did not want to corroborate Franklin. That

is the reason that they we had Hawley go back to gain his office instead of that place under an appointment.

There is another thing. Farly in this case, time after time, the defendant realized that when he went down there to watch his money, to watch Bert Franklin, as Bert Franklin was watching White, he realized that the circumstance of his being down there was something indicating guilt, that in connection with the other circumstances of his case, was damning against him, and he had to give an explanation. Now, he is an attorney in this case.

You have heard him interrupt his counsel time after time. 25 and yet you heard him charge in the beginning, time after 26 time, that somebody from the District Attorney's office.

in order to ruin Darrow, had had him come down there by a telephone call, and that was reiterated time and again, up until the 9th of July. MR DARROW: I object to that and tak e an exception. Nobody ever said that at any time. MR FORD: You remember whether Mr Rogers said that in the presence of this defendant in this court or not. That somebody from the District Attorney's office had lured Mr Darrow down there in order that they might create a circumstances, in order that they might manufacture evidence against this defendant, and yet, this defendant knew that Mr Hawley was coming on the stand to testify that he was the man who had telephoned, and he knew -- or, ought to have known that he was going to explain his presence by being upon the street near 9 o'clock, he was going down there to hold a conference about the liquor question, the alliance of the liquor people with the Good Government people, towards 9 o'clock in the morning, when it was his business to be in court. He always in court when the jury was being selected, and as soon as Franklin was arrested he started back to court because it was time that he be in court. The incident of Franklin's arrest did not affect him in the slightest degree; it did not change his purposes at all. He just simply went back to court because it was his business to be in court.

The incident of Franklin's arrest,

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

did not

occupy a moment of time. If that was of no importance to Mr Darrow, why didn't he go on to Socialist headquarters.

If the proposition of being in court that morning at 9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

 $\cdot 13$ 

14

15

16

17

18

25

26

If the proposition of being in court that morning at 9 o'clock was the most important business that he had, why did he tell his anonymous telephone correspondent that he would be down there and meet job parriman and the anoynmous belephone correspondent? That was almost half past 9. Wolfe says. Why didn't he come straight up here to court? Another thing, Mr Darrow says that when he saw Franklin arrested by Mr Browne, that he knew who Mr Browne was; he knew he was an attache of the District Attorney's office, knew he was employed by the District Attorney as a detective: he knew that the District Attorney was always starting something before the grand jury; he did not know that Franklin had committed any crime, and did not know why Browne had arrested Franklin; all he knew was that Browne said: don't speak to him. Bert Franklin says that the defendant whispered to him: "Look out:" Bert, they are onto you, or something like

19 "Look out;" Bert, they are onto you, or something like
20 that. He did not remember just exactly what it was, but
21 he thought it was: Bert, they are onto you. The defend22 ant denies that he said a word. The defendant admits that
23 Browne said; don't speak to him; don't speak to his
24 employe, the chief investigator. And this trained lawyer,

this trained fighter, this man who had for years and years

been in every celebrated case in which labor was involved,

been in bad fights, fighting all his life, not knowing of anything wrong that Mr Franklin had done, knowing that Bert Franklin was his chief employe, calmly-- or, tamely, rather, submits to the order of a mere attache of the District Attorney's office. If he were innocent, if he really believed the District Attorney was always starting something "to keep us busy", if he really did not know of any reason why Franklin should be arrested. would he be stunned? Would surprise be the word to use? Gentlemen, you know right there that if Darrow was the innocent man that he claims he was, that when he saw his employe, Bert Franklin, arrested, he would have walked up to Browne and said, what are you doing with this man? What sort of chinanigans are you trying again? Is this some more of your grand jury tactics? He would have never let him go. He would have said right there: what is this man arrested for? Ah, he wanted time to think it over. He knew that his presence down there was a guilty circumstance. He knew he had been caught with the goods on, and he wanted time to reply, just as he took it on the witness stand right here oncross-examination. some questions to which he could have given a direct answer -- there were no catch questions; there were no tricks: simply straight inquiries about the facts in this case -- and yet, when he wanted time all the time to figure out his answer. And so here he wanted time to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think about the situation, and he tamely submitted to Browne's command. Then what did he do? As soon as he had recovered from this stunning blow, as soon as he had redovered his equinimity, did he rush after Browne and find out what the trouble was? You remember when we came to that point he was talking about the importance of his being in court that morning. He thought that was a matter of some importance to the District Attorney, and he thought the District Attorney was belittling the importance of him being in court, and so when the question was asked him: was your meeting with Browne near the Hall of Records pu rely accidental? he said, it was purely accidental. He was on his way to court, and had no interest in Franklin. He did not rush after him to find out what was the matter. He was on his way to court. Yet he said the conversation that did occur was substantially true as related by Browne. What was that conversation? Mr Darrow, with all his cleverness, slipped a cog here. Browne says that Darrow -- volume 22, page 1661, saw him on Franklin street between Spring and New High, and he said: My God, Browne, what is all of this? I turned to him and said, bribery. He said, isn't there anything that can be done? This is terrible." "Isn't there anything that can be done?"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Knowing that Browne was an agent of the District Attorney, knowing that the District Attorney was starting

something always just "to keep us busy", he immediately accepts the word of Brownethat this is true, and he said. "My God, this is terrible." "Isn't there anything that can be done?" If he were an honest man, if he did not know that Franklin was guilty of this crime. if he was not the man who had given the money and led him into this trouble, is that what he would have said? Is that what the trained lawyer, who has fought here day after day in this count, would have said at that time? He would have said: what are you trying to do here? This is some more of your grand jury stunts, and would have used language that I cannot, probably, repeat in the presence of this audience. And Brown replied: I don't know of anything that can be done. You will have to see Captain Fredericks. So he said: isn't there anything you can do. I said: I cannot do anything. Darrow then said: if I had known this was going to happen, I would never have allowed it to have been done. weak explanation, a weak admission right there that Franklin was probably guilty, but he wanted to deny that he had any connection with it, and he did notwant to say too much about it, and so he says: "I would never have allowed it to be done." Then occurs the most significant thing. Browne said: Darrow, you ought to have had better sense than to hire a man like this to do that work. Did Dafrow then deny that he had hired Franklin to do scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

that work? Do they say: I never hired him to commit 1 2 bribery: I never hired him to commit crime? What are you insinuating against me? You notice how quick he 3 4 is here to take us up on any insinuations. Did he then, 5 when he did not have time to think, when his conscience 6 Was hurting him, when fear was uppermost in his heart, when 7 he was guilty; did he then stand up as an honest man and 8 say: what do you mean? I never hired Franklin to do any-9 thing like that. No, this is his reply: he realizes then 10 that Browne was charging him, Darrow, with having hired 11 Franklin to do this work, and his only statement was in 12 reply: this is terrible. Browne said: you ought to know 13 Franklin; and he said Franklin came to me very highly 14. recommended by Mr McCormick and others. Browne said: 15 Mr Darrow, I don't know what I can do. And Darrow re-16 plied: my God, Browne, this is terrible. You do the best 17 you can do for us and I will take care of you. parrow 18 says that conversation is all right, and that is sub-19 stantially true as given by Browne at that time, and the 20 only thing he could think of after Browne had said: you 21 ought to have better sense than to hire a man like Frank-22 lin to do this kind of work -- the only thing he could 23 think of was: Browne, can't you please do something 24 for us and I will take care of you. Trying to corrupt 25 Browne right there, as he had done with everybody else 26 with whom he came in contact, to solicit their help and

appealing to their sense of cupidity, promising to do something, that he would take ca re of him.

THE COURT: We will take the afternoon recess at this

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

time, Mr Ford. Gentlemen, bear in mind the usual admo-Take a recess for 15 minutes.

THE COURT: (After recess.) You may proceed, Mr Ford.

MR FORE: Mr Darrow knew when he was talking around that Franklin had always been faithful to him. Mr Darrow knew

that Franklin's every report upon jurors was correct, from the standpoint of the defense in that case. He has not

brought forward one untrue report. Mr Darrow knew that Franklin had bribed Bain, and that Eain was upon the jury. Mr Darrow knew that he had given a check on the 6th of

15 money to Mrs Bain. 16 MR DARROW: I want to take an exception to that -- to the

October to Franklin, that Franklin had paid \$500 of that

17 statement that the check was given on the 6th.of October. MR FREDERICKS: That is the testimony of Franklin.

18 19 MR FORD: Darrowin had dated the check the 4th of october. 20 Darrow knew on Friday, the 6th of October, when he actually 21 did give the check, that Franklin would need some money 22 the next day to pay the invesigators who were in his em-23 ploy, and it was probably not convenient for him to go 24 to the vault where he had the money that he had got down 25 from San Francisco, or perhaps it had not yet been brought 26 At any rate, it was not convenient to get it, and

he felt that the \$1000 check would cover the \$500 payment, and he gave him the check, but with the crookedness of evil minds he decided to date it the 4th of Octob-It may have been dated accidently the 4th of October. but my belief is he dated it purposely the 4th of October, in order to cast some discredit upon the testimony of Franklin should it ever come to light that the sum of \$500 was going to Bain on the 6th of October. Franklin would not have carried that check for two days. Franklin did not expect to be trapped with it. If Franklin. from the evidence in this case, had received that check on the 4th of October, he would have gone and cashed it on the 4th of October. That is his testimony, and there is no reason for Franklin lying upon that point. But here is the point, gentlemen. Mr Franklin testified that the day before the check was given, that he had talked with Darrow, which would be the 6th of October, about Bain, that it was about time to go out and see Bain; and the defendant, having procured the check, and noticing that it was dated the 4th of october, produces it here to show that the money was paid before the conversation was had with Bert Franklin about Bain. When he picked up that check, why, he remembered that he dated it a day prior to his conversation about Bain, that he had dated it two days before the 6th of October, and a day before the conversation about Bain, and so he produces it here

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here with the intent to deceive you. But you know that

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Franklin was not paying out his own money to Mrs Bain

or to Mr. Bain. Franklin was in that business solely

for the money that was in it, he was not paying out money 4 from his own pocket. He was not using this money for 5 this purpose unless he had been directed so to do by Dar-6 row. 7

Now, Parrow said that after he met Browne it was important that he should go to the jury room, and he got there a few minutes after the court had started in on the jury; that it was very important that he should be there all the time, he started in to do the work he had always been doing, on that day. Mr Darrow knew that the District Attorney was always bringing something before the grand jury; that the District Attorney was always doing something to hinder him: the transfer Mr Darrow knew that his agent and employe in the jury business. Mr Franklin, had been charged with bribery. Now, what did he do when he

went to the court room? What would an honest lawyer have done? An honest lawyer would have said, "Your Honor, I desire that the jury be excused in order that I may  $\operatorname{pr} \leftarrow$ sent to your Honor something that has just transpired. Our chief detective has been arrested by the District Attorney on a charge of bribery. I don't know whether that charge be true or not, but this I do know, that if it is true, that the attorneys for the defense have had nothing to do scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

with it, and we don't want our case, the case of the People of the State of California Versus McNamara be prejudiced in any manner by these tactics. We demand an immediate investigation of these charges, and if these charges are true, we desire to be purged of them, in order that our clients' interest may not suffer. If, on the other hand, your Honor, if these charges are not true, we want the District Attorney cited into court for contempt of court. This is but one of a series of acts of the District Attorney which have been happening concerning us throughout this case. He has brought Behm before the grand jury, he has brought Harrington before the grand jury. Now, he charges our chief investigator with bribery. We desire that all those charges be investigated at once." Did he do that? No, he calmly slipped the word to Davis to go over to the jail and see Franklin. He quietly wrote out a check to Davis for bail money. He wanted to conceal his own connection with it. When the reporters

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

visited him, he didn't have the courage to say anything to them. He said, "I will have to think it over," and he didn't give them any statement of the affair until 6 o'clock that night. MR APPEL: We object to that and take exception to that remark. There is no evidence --MR DARROW: I said I didn't remember when the reporters

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 spoke to me first.

THE COURT: Counsel has a right to his exception. He has

3 taken it.

2

5

6

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

25

26

4 MR APPEL: We take exception and assign the conduct of the

District Attorney in making that statement, not justi-

fied by the evidence, as error.

7 THE COURT: The objection is noted.

8 MR FORD: Mr Darrow was guilty. Th

MR FORD: Mr Darrow was guilty. That is the reason he did not act as an honest lawyer would act. Mr Davis

did see the District Attorney on Tuesday, the same day,

about the noon hour, perhaps a little later, and wanted

the charge to be filed in order that he might put up bail

money. He didn't go to the District Attorney and say,

"Fred, you know you and I have been friends for years.

You know me and you can talk with me. I will tell you that Bert Franklin is not guilty of this offense. We

would not allow a thing of that sort to be done. There is no motive for it being done. You know we have agreed to let these men plead guilty, and J.B. is willing to

20 plead guilty if we l et them, and I don't think you

have got the goods on J.J. McNamara, and we won't let J. J. McNamara plead guilty. There is no reason why

we should bribe the jury, why Franklin should bribe

the jury, why Franklin should bribe

wrong, or else you have allowed somebody to frame up something on you." No, he said, "When are you going to

- file the complaint, and how much bail are you going to ask?" He went back to Darrow and got the money and put it up.
- 4 Again, Mrs Franklin telephoned to Darrow. She got him personally on the phone. She knew her husband had 5
- been working for this defendant. She was Bert Frank-6 lin's dearest and nearest friend, his wife, and she immed-
- 9 band. I want to see him right away."

1

2

3

7

8

25

- MR DARROW: That isn't what she said at all. 10
- MR FORD: Words in substance to that effect. "I want to 11 12 see him right away. I want to get him out of jail."

iately phoned to Mr Darrow, and she says, "I want my hus-

- Darrow says, "Go over to Gage's office. Go over to 13
- 14 Gage's office." Mr Dagrow was proposing to depend Bert Franklin. Mr Darrow says, "Meet me at Gage's office." 15
- 16 Mr Darrow says upon the stand that he didn't hire Gage
- 17 for that purpose, and he qualified it in a way. Gage 18 vas hired for some purpose -- I don't know what it was.
- 19 unless for some event like this, in the event of some
- 20 proposition like this. At any rate, he said, "Go to 21 Gage's office." And then Joe Scott says to Mrs Franklin.
- 22 as soon as he met her, he says, "Mrs Franklin, Gage is
- 23 an old-fashioned lawyer; you must speak to him personally. 24 It is all right. It is all right, but you must retain
- him personally." Davis on the way from the jail says, 26 "Mrs Franklin, Gage is an old-fashioned lawyer. You must

retain him personally. It is all right." She had been

directed to go there by this defendant. She knew that this

defendant was employing Gage, and that he would be responsible for the employment of Gage; but they wanted to

conceal the fact that Mr Darrow had hired Gage. They

wanted to make it appear that Mrs Franklin hired Gage.

They wanted to protect this defendant in every way, shape or form from any connection with Franklin.

Why? Because his guilty conscience feared to let one little circumstance be added to the great mass of circumstances already existing in this case. He was a coward. He was afraid of himself. The man who could stand up and fight for others, when he had no personal interest in it, the man who could show his bravery in battles for others, was cowed by his own guilt, and he did not dare -- he did not know how to act like an honest man would act under

such circumstances. He wanted to conceal every little iota, every little scintilla of evidence that would tend to connect him with Franklin.

They come forward with a new defense in this court.

After all other defenses have falled down, they bring forward a new defense, -- state of mind, and lack of motive. How much credit is testimony of that kind worth? You know the motive which has been shown here. You know the admissions which he makes are strong evidence against him. Why should not evidence of his own acts and declara-

tions in his own favor, be entitled to weight? There
is a reason, gentlemen. There is a reason why they
and the
should not be, reason is that it is so easy to manufacture testimony of that character.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Suppose 1 conceive a grudge against a man, and I intend to murder that man, to kill him. I have been offended, and I desire to have my revenge. How easy it is for me to go out and tell everybody how much I admire that man, what great friends we are, what a debt of gratitude toward him I feel; and then slip up in the dark some night and kill him. If I am suspected of having done that act. why. I can bring Tom and Dick and Harry to whom I have expressed my feelings, and produce it as showing my state of I can show by these witnesses, who will be honest, and disinterested people, that I have made these declarations about how I loved that man and why it is impossible for me to have had any motive to kill him. Testimony of that sort is not credible. How, here is another eason --MR APPEL: Wait a minute. We object to his saying to the jury that he could introduce any such evidence as evidence to show lack of motive. We object to his saying that he could do such a thing as that, that the court would permit such evidence as that, there not being any such evidence indicated by a see him in his argument as having

been admitted here in this case.

THE COURT: The objection will be noted. Proceed.

7400 MR FORD: Here is another point. The very man whom I desire to injure, the very man whose life I desire to take, will be disarmed by these expressions on my part. He would not be on his guard against me. It may be that the disagreement we have had is unknown to any person but ourselves. It may be that my malice towards him is unknown even to him. But my protestations of good feeling towards him will completely disarm him, and will enable me to approach him where I can commit the deed without detection. The circumstances in this case show that the District Attorney had good reason to suspect Mr Darrow. Mr Darrow knew that the District Attorney was on the job all the time, and was watching every move that Mr Darrow was doing.

1

2

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr Darrow knew that on the 19th day of September, his employe, Mr Harrington, had been cited before the grand jury, there to be interrogated concerning his conduct in this very case. MR DARROW: Knew that Mr Behm had been cited before the grand jury. Mr Darrow knew that the District Attorney was vatching his every move. And then when Lincoln Steffens said, "I believe that we can get up a plead of guilty for J. B. McNamara, and allow him to escape with his life, "Darrow didn't think much of the proposition, but he thought "well, here is a pretty good scheme. I will just dally with the District Attorney, and I will make him

25 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY believe these men are going to plead guilty, and he will be disarmed by that, think we are throwing up the sponge, and we are ready to accept his terms. He won't watch us so close. We can slip something over on him while he is not looking. But in the event that we are detected, we can then show a lack of motive, and we can introduce that in our favor."

could jump at such a conclusion, and how he could work that to his advantage. If there is anything that is whown in this case, which you have learned about this defendant, it is that he is infinitely fertile in resource.

I don't say that is the fact, but I want to show you

just how a keen, fertile brain like that of Mr Darrow's

Now, Mr Steffens says that on Saturday, the District Attorney told him he would accept a plea from both persons and that on Saturday they intended to have both J.B. and J. J. McNamara plead guilty. Mr Darrow says he kept away from Franklin at noon, and didn't see him until Saturday night about the investigation of the jury, because he saw no necessity of working on the jurors or investigating jurors -- that they intended to let the McNamaras plead guilty. Is that statement borne out by the facts of Saturday night. When he did see Franklin, did he say, "Franklin, I know you are short-handed, but do the best you can with the men you have on hand. He said, "Go and

get Russell, have him come down and go through that list

canned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 I will send Cooney or Fitzpatrick. " He did send Cooney 2 and Fitzpatrick. He says to Cooney. "You go and see Bert 3 Franklin, and have Russell telephone to those jurors who 4 are marked unfavorable. Warn them that the sheriff is 5 coming to summons them for jury duty, so that they may 6 evade it. " Right then and there he directed Cooney to 7 commit another crime. miss 8 MR ROGERS: That is absolutely a statement of the evidence. 9 There isn't an iota of testimony of any kind, as counsel 10 well knows, that was a mr Darrow said anything of the 11 kind. There is not an iota of testimony to that effect. 12 THE COURT: The objection is noted. You may proceed. 13 MR FORD: Mr Cooney so testified. 14 MR ROGERS: Mr Cooney did not so testify. 15 MR FREDERICKS: Cooney testified that Darrow said there 16 were some men on the jury --17 THE COURT: I will not hear argument. The exception has 18 been taken, and has been noted. 19 MR FORD: I don't remember the exact expressions that were 20 used by Cooney, but you can remember the effect of it. 21 You remember that he did go to Franklin, and that he 22 and Fitzpatrick did go out and warn the jurors who were 23 on the list, and that jurors came into court and told 24you that they were warned, and you know that thing was 25 done, and you know that those men were sent to Franklin

by Darrow. Darrow says, "We wanted to conceal from Frank-

7403 lin the fact that the McNamaras intended to plead guilty-didn't vant too many people to know it. There was need of haste and secrecy." But he sent these other men -he didn't see Franklin, but he sent men directed to commit another crime while these negotiations were pending. I have already told you briefly what Lincoln Steffens said about Sunday . Now, I have shown you that in my opinion these things did not occur on Sunday. My opinion is that they went and discussed the project with the boys. Darrow said he never discussed it until Sunday. Lincoln Steffens said they never discussed it with the boys until Sunday. They didn't know what the attitude of these boys would be until Sunday. MR DARROW: I said it was discussed the latter part of the week -- Friday. Saturday. Steffens said we discussed it all the time. MR ORD: Mr Ste ffens says in another place in the testimony. "I did talkprivately with J. J. on Friday, and on Saturday I talked with J.J. but not J.B. At any rate. Steffens says on Sunday we talked with them separately, Darrow and I and the dead man. Steffens says that Davis didn't know anything about it until Monday. They wanted Davis to be decreved. Davis knew that J.J. was willing to plead guilty, but they concealed to him the

fact that J.J. was willing to plead guilty. "We wanted

him to go to the District Attorney, and make his appeal,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

and he went to the District Attorney.

1

2

3

4

5

7

25

26

MR APPEL: We take exception to that as being a mis-

statement of the facts.

THE COURT: The objection will be noted.

MR APPEL: Absolute mistatement of the facts, and assign

that conduct in making that statement to the jury as 6

absolute misconduct, and assign it as error.

THE COURT: Objection noted. Proceed.

8

The fact is, gentlemen, this is my deduction MR FORD: 9

from the evidence now, that J.B. was the one with whom they 10 had talked; that they did not desire to do anything even 11

on that until they had heard from Gompers. They telegraph-12

ed Gompers on the 22nd, on Wednesday, they did not get any 13 reply at all until Friday, when Mr Darrow said he got a 14

telegram from Nockels, the telegram has been introduced 15 here in evidence by Mr Darrow, telling him that he was com-16

ing. Nockels didn't get here until Monday night. Darrow 17 didn't see him until Taasday night. I don't believe they 18

intended to do a single thing with regard to J.B.McNamara 19 20 until they had had a chance to confer with the people who Were paying their fees. By that as it may, Mr Davis was 21

sent to the District Attorney, they were turned down cold 22 23

on Monday. The District Attorney said both of them had 24 to plead guilty.

Gentlemen, both of them would not plead guilty. J J at that time was not willing to plead guilty. Parrow kept putting Franklin off that day waiting to hear what Davis's report would be from the District Attorney. They kept up until they came to the conclusion that they could not accept the District Attorney's offer, and then Darrow says to Fraklin: I will give you the money but the vaults are closed, and Franklin was put off until the next morning. That explaines the delay. You want to know why Franklin did not get the money in the first place from Darrow on Monday. It was because Darrow was afraid that Land Franklin might convince the District Attorney that he should take a plea of guilty from J B alone, and he was the one they were trying to safe. When on Monday night he found that he could not get those terms, he decided to invest \$500. He did not take a chance on \$4,000. \$500 was all Lockwood was to get, and the rest was to be held by Captain White, and if a plea of guilty was obtained that \$3500 would be saved. They were only risking \$500 on that occasion. At any rate, Franklin was put off until the next morning at 8:30. Job Harriman did go to the vault and Job Harriman did come back from the vault to the office in the Higgins Building, and Franklin did appear upon the street in a few minutes afterwards and give the money to White, and Lockwood was bribed with that money. Now, what happened? On Wednesday, parrow and

1.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

.14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Davis went up to the office of the District Attorney. They 1 were told that time that the arrest of Franklin would not 2 affect the negotiations; that his stand would be the same 3 then as it always had been; that he was perfectly willing 4 to let the negotiations go through on the same terms. They 5 said, All right, we will have to see the boys about it. 6 They knew then that there was no chance to do anything with 7 8 the District Attorney; they knew on Monday that there was no chance to do anything with the District Attorney, that 9 they would have to come to his terms, but the arrest of Frank-10 lin had changed the situation. Mr. Darrow, fearful in his 11 heart that the Franklin bribery would be investigated to the 12 bitter end--as it was the duty of the District Attorney to 13 do--hoped that the pleas of guilty would stop further pro-14 secution; that the District Attorney might become inoculated 15 with the virus of this new Christianity that Lincoln 16 Steffens was spreadling about, and that he would stop the 17 prosecution of crimes where they were mere social crimes; 18 that he would end the matter, and that Darrow might escape. 19 Darrow was a traitor to his clients. Darrow knew that he 20 had to do something to end the District Attorney's activi-21 ties, and he sacrificed J J McNamara in order to save him-22 self. Darrow says that the evidence in Indianapolis would 23 absolutely of no value in this case. He did not 24 believe in the McNamara case it could be introduced in 25 evidence. Then how in the name of all that is legal did he 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

ever expect the District Attorney to convict J J McNamara?

1

2

3

What chance was there for the District Attorney to convict

J J McNamara unless that evidence could be produced from the

4 east? He knew there was absolutely no chance to do it.

2c5 He knew that he had a fighting chance for J J McNamara.

6 The District Attorney conceded that he had a fighting

7 chance for J J McNamara when he allowed the sentence of .

8 J J to be made less than that of J B, notwithstanding the

9 fact that J J McNamara was the real brins of the com\_bina
10 tion, the District Attorney allowed a smaller punishment

to be inflicted upon J J. And why? Because the evidence
was not as strong against J J as it was against J B;
because there was a chance for J J, and this defendant
knew it—this defendant knew there was a chance for J J,
and this defendant never sacrificed J J until it became
necessary in order to save himself. This defendant, after
he had seen the District Attorney on Wednesday, after he
and Davis had both seen the District Attorney together,
this defendant did not know what his clients were going to

16 17 18 19 J J had not consented to plead guilty, and he knew that 20 the only chance left for him was to argue the matter out 21 on Thanksgiving day, to put it up to them, and they did 22 spend the whole of Thanksgiving day in that behalf. And the 23 only excuse they furnished for laboring all that day is 24 that the District Attorney had insisted that both pleading 25 guilty together. If pleas were to be accepted by the 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

District Attorney at all, wouldn't it be natural for both to plead at the same time? Would it be likely that anything would be said about it? Did they say to the District Attorney: Look here, we are willing to let both of these men plead together, but we cannot do it together, because J B wont plead guilty unless J J is acquitted. We are going to sacrifice, we are going to deceive our client J B McNamara. It is the duty of an attorney to defend his client. It is the duty of an attorney to defend that client until the client pleads guilty of his own volition, or is convicted by a jury of his peers, and yet this defendant stands here and says to you, by way of excuse on this charge, that he was willing to deceive his client, J.B.; that he was going to deceive/and by false promises also plead guilty. That is what he said he was going to do

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

20

21

22

23

24

25

14 him to believe that he was saving his brother, make him 15 plead guilty, and then afterwards fool him and let J J 16 17 in this case. He was going to deceive J B McNamara. 18 19

1 What kind of a man do you think he is if he is speaking the 2 truth in that behalf, that he was goingto deceive J B 3 McNamara. The fact is, gentlemen of the jury, that J J 4 McNamara represented the cause of union labor. J J Mc-5 Namara represented the interests that were paying Mr. Darrow. 6 J J McNamara was not going to plead guilty if Mr. Darrow could 7 help it, because the evidence was not sufficient to convict 8 him in his opinion. 9 The Indianapolis evidence could not be used here 10 at all. On Wednesday afternoon Mr. Darrow did not believe 11 that J J would plead guilty. On Wednesday afternoon he did 12 not believe that union labor would ever consent to the pleas 13 of guilty. On Wednesday afternoon he was doubtful if the 14 Judge would accede to the pleas of guilty, or adopt the 15 District Attorney's recommendation in the matter. And what 16 did he do? He was so extremely doubtful of that matter 17 that he sent a telegram to Rappaport to use all means to keep 18 out that Indiana evidence. Rappaport had telegraphed, 19 "May I spend \$1,000 to regain Indianapolis evidence." Let 20 me have those telegrams, Mr. Smith, please. Then, Mr. parrow 21 sent a telegram at 6:22 P.M. that evening--at 6:22 that 22 telegram went over the counter of the telegraph office and 23 was sent to Rappaport, "May spend thousand dollars for 24 evidence. " And on the following Friday, just as soon as 25 the pleas of guilty were entered, Mr. Darrow telegraphed to 26 Rappaport, "Do not spend that thousand dollars." He wasn't

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

7410 any longer interested in that evidence, as soon as his clients plead guilty. He told you he was anxious to save money; that they needed money. People were coming down upon them for money, and yet here is \$7500 in Tveitmoe's bank three months later that has not been used, hard up as they are, and as much as they needed money. \$7500 they claim--MR . APPEL . We take an exception to that statement on the ground that there is no evidence upon which to base that statement here inthe record. THE COURT. The exception will be noted. Proceed, Mr. Ford. MR . APPEL. And assign the conduct of the District Attorney as misconduct. THE COURT. The assignment is also noted. MR . FORD. I beg the court's pardon, I have torn this telegram in handling it. THE COURT The clerk will paste it together as soon as he gets it back. MR. FORD. At 3 o'clock is the clock mark on this telegram of December 1st, showing the hour it was received in that office and says, "Do not spend thousand dollars." You 22 remember that Mr. Darrow had admitted onthe stand that he 23 sent a telegram to Rappaport, had directed that the tele-24 gram be sent to him December 1st, in which he said, "Do 25 not spend that thousand dollars." He said there was no 26

necessity of spending it, that they had attempted bto prevent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

the Indianapolis evidence from coming out here sometime before. He didn't remember that it was only two days before he had sent a telegram. "Spend the thousand dollars." He thought the time seemed longer than that. He thought he thad ordered that money to be sent before Franklin had been arrested. He didn't see just exactly the point that the prosecution was trying to establish at that time. He admitted that he stopped it at that time because they had no further use for it out here, and thaty didn't care what become of it. Later on he furnished another excuse. At that time he did not remember that he had sent a code telegram on the 29th of November to Rappaport, after Franklin's arrest, and he did not know that we had worked out that code, were able to interpret his telegrams, he made that admission, and it was only when driven into a corner and when he found out that the telegram had been sent to Rappaport on the 29th that he figured up his other excuse, that we were short of money. were is the mark on the telegram of the 29th, "Receiver NW 6:22 P.M. Los Angeles, Cal." After he had seen Captain wredericks, he couldn't be sure that the terms agreed upon by him and Captain Fredericks would be carried out, and why? There was another factor in the situa+ tion all the time. On Sunday, Monday, Tuesday/and on

Thursday and on Friday there was another factor that had

to be consulted in this case, and that was his Honor upon the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 bench, Judge Pordwell. Lincoln Steffens said that he had 2 a talk with Judge Bordwell; Judge Bordwell says he is a 3 liar. You have, in deciding the negotiations of these 4 times, to decide by your verdit which man committed perjury 5 on the stand, Judge Bordwell or Lincoln Steffens. 6 MR. DARROW. I want to take an exception. Lincoln Steffens 7 says he never had any conversation with Judge Bordwell. 8 MR. FORD. Judge Pordwell denied the conversation as 9 related upon the stand and you have got to decide, but the 10 fact remains that it is the Judge who imposes the punish-11 ment. The District Attorney can make a recommendation, as 12 he frequently does. The District Attorney can dicker, if he 13 likes, with the attorneys for the defendant, but the judge 14 will not do that; but when the District Attorney is 15 handling criminal cases and connsel for the defendant come 16 to the District Attorney and say, I will let my client plead 17 guilty if he can get off so and so. The District Attorney 18 says, I will recommend so and so. He says, Will you sound 19 the judge out to see how he is dispsed on the matter, whe-20 ther there is any probability your recommendation will be 21carried/ whether the judge will believe it is the wise 22 thing or not, and so when the final day occurred that the 23 MCNamaras should plead guilty, it was arranged between the 24 defendants in the McNamara case, that is, the attorneys and 25 the District Attorney, that the case should go over 26 until 2 o'clock, and meanwhile the District Attorney should

They could not bargain with the judge, the 4 District Attorney could not bargain with the judge. They 5 had just simply to take their chances. The District Attorney 6 did his part. The District Attorney saw from the attitude 7 of the judge that the recommendation would have to be more 8 than 10 years; that the judge would probably not afollow 9 10 years and probably take chances on 15, which, in his 10 judgment, afterwards proved to be correct, and J J was 11 sentenced to 15 years and J B for life. 12 They were not sure until Friday morning, after 13 the District Attorney had seen Judge Bordwell, that their 14 agreement could be carried out. Those steps had never 15 been taken before, and they had never had any assurance 16 that this case would be ended, and there was always a chance 17 that the case would go on, and that chance existed on Sunday 18 and existed on Monday before the arrest of Franklin just as 19 well as it did after the arrest of Franklin. 20

try to sound out the judge and see what pfobability there

was of his following the District Attorney's recommendation

1

2

3

21

22

23

in the matter.

in company with Mr. Davis, had seen the District Attorney
on Wednesday, and the Estrict Attorney had said he would
be willing to do that if they could get their clients to
accept it. Do you believe they were lying to the District

lin he was always doubtful if the case could be settled,

and yet Mr. pavis testified that they had -- that he, Darrow

Mr. Darrow says that after the arrest of Frank-

Attorney then or do you believe they are lying now? That

is the point for you to decide in this case. By the

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

22

23

24

25

26

way of passing, Mr. Steffens, do you remember that Mr. Steffens 3 said that he did not think the McNamaras ought to be punished; 4 5

that they had committed a social crime. He makes a distinction between a social crime and other crimes, between 6 mere murder, as he called it, and other things that people 7 do. Mr. Steffens admitted upon the stand that the bribery 8

committed in defense of a person who was guilty of a social crime was of itself a social crime. It was tantamount to admitting that he didn, t think that Darrow ought to be punished in this case. Mr. Steffens thought Darrow was guilty when he went to see parry Chandler. He admits that he told Harry Chandler the prosecution ought to stop including

14 that of Bert Franklin and Mr. parrow. He said that Mr. Darrow 15 had told him not to mention that fact. He says that Mr. Darrov 16 THE COURT. Wait, let's have the exception. 17 MR . DARROW. I want to take an exception to the statement 18 that Mr. Steffens said he thought I was guilty. He said 19 nothing to that effect. He expressly said in answer to one 20 of the jurors' differently from that . 21

MR. FORD. - didn't make the statement that Steffens said that. I said Steffens thought. Steffens didn't say what he thought. MR . DARROW. I take an exception to his statement.

THE COURT. The exception is noted. Proceed, Mr. Ford. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

MR. FORD. What Steffens says I would not place any Darrow was guilty. Steffens thought Darrow was guilty and he maid to Mr. parrow, "You ought to make this a condition that the prosecution of Franklin and the investigation of your connection with it, that those things ought to be stopped as well as all these other transaction," and he says Mr. parrow said, "Oh, if I am -- " Mr. parrow was astounded that he should be connected with the offense in any way, shape or form. Mr. Darrow said, "If that is the point they are making, if they are making any point about that, I owe a duty to my client, and in answer to some juror's question said he acted like an innocent man, and yet in spite of the fact that he thought he acted like an innocent man, in spite of the fact that Darrow had nothing to fear, he went to Harry Chandler and asked Harry Chandler to intercede with the District Attorney to stop any possible prosecution of Mr. Darrow, and to stop the prosecution that 18 was then instituted against Mr. Franklin. 19 MR. DARROW. I want to object to that statement because he 20 never directed him to stop any prosecution against him. 21 THE COURT. The objection is noted. Proceed, Mr. Ford. 22 MR. FORD. He didnit think Mr. parrow ought to be prosecuted 23 for bribery, be thought if briberty was committed in the 24 sense of a social crime, entertaining that attitude in 25 regard to briberty, don t you think that Mr. Steffens would 26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

believe that it would be all right to commit a little perjury in this case to prevent Darrow from being punished for bribery in that case of bribery he wasn't trying to prevent the punishment for mere murder in the Times case? Do you think he would make any distinction between the three crimes? Do you think he would hesistate to lie on this stand? Don't his attitude towards the circumstances show that he did lie? A meeting was called for Wednesdary night of influential business men in this community that they by their influence might back up the District Attorney in whatever they would do, and Steffens went to that meeting and begged that they let J J off, to use their influence with the District Attorney to let J J off, and they would not do it. On Wednesday, the 29th, and that meeting was called after Franklin's arrest. If they wanted to bring this influence to bear onthe District Attorney, why didn, t they call that meeting Monday night? only had to sit down to the telephone and do as they had done on Wednesday morning and telephone and ask a few people to meet in Meyer Lissner's office; they could have done that on Monday as well as Wednesday . Gentlemen of the jury, they had no intention on Wednesday of concluding this matter. They had no expectation it could be concluded. They had no expectation it could be concluded; they had no desire, no intention to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

let J J plead guilty. On Wednesday night they tried to scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

get these business men to use their influence with the District Attorney to let J J loose and they worked all day long Thanksgiving Day, in order to arrange these pleas of guilty. Lack of motive? If the defendant had worked up himself these self-serving declarations they would not be

himself these self-serving declarations they would not be worth that as a piece of evidence, but the fact is, out of their own mouths they have been damned, because they have manufactured evidence on the stand here with the intention to deceive you and that is not the only piece of evidence they have manufactured.

Mr. Pirotte, Mr. Watt and Mr. Stineman of Venice,

friends of Sargeant Cavanaugh, the adherent of this concurring,
defendant; Sargeant Cavanaugh, whom Harrington testified
as follows:

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Harrington said: I had a talk with Sergeant Cavanaugh

about your guilt, and we both agreed you were guilty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

The defendant put some impeaching questions to Mr Harrington about a conversation that had been held between Mr

Cavanaugh and Mr Harrington. Mr Harrington says: we talked this over in the presence of Mrs Cavanaugh and we all

agreed that you were guilty. Cavanaugh agreed that you were guilty. Did they dare put Cavanaugh upon the stand to deny that charge?

MR APPIL: Just a moment. 11 MR FORD: Did they dare put Mrs Cavanaugh --12 MR APPEL: I object to these discussions, the agreement or

13 opinion testified to by Mr Harrington, on the ground that 14 it is hearsay, incompetent, irrelevant, should not have 15 been allowed by the court, and does not tend to prove any 16 fact against this defendant, and we have drawn an instruc-

tion, your Honor --18 THE COURT: Objection overruled. Mr Ford, proceed. 19 MR APPEL: We will assign both the conduct of the court 20 in sustaining the objection, and also the conduct of the 21 District Attorney in discussing a piece of evidence which

22 has no standing in any court of justice, as evidence against 23 the defendant --24 THE COURT: The assignment is noted. The District Attor-25 ney may proceed. 26 MR FORD: Mr Parotte, Cavanaugh's underling, Mr Watt

Mr Steineman, all of them admitted that they were meeting Franklin for the purpose of talking Franklin into making some admissions, concerning Darrow; that they were there, and here Franklin says that he was never going to be punished, and that there never was any time when he was really going to be punished for the commission of the crime on the 28th of November. And all the time he was a confederate of Mr Lockwood's, that Mr Darrow was innocent, that Mr Darrow had never given him any money; and, remember, every one of these conversations occurred in March. Remember that on February the 27th Franklin had plead guilty, the whole world knew -- or at least, the whole of this community knew that Franklin was going to be a witness against Darrow in this case. Remember that Franklin still had one charge pending against him, for which he did not acquire immunity until he got onto this stand. Remember that Franklin, under those circumstances, according to their testimony, goes down to Venice and makes statements of that character. Franklin said that he realized that they were detectives; he thought they were trying to pump him, and that he said: well, we won't discuss the case. That was what Franklin said he told these people. Yet they have manufactured statements entirely at varience. Which is the most reasonable story to believe? Franklin, according to his story.

that he did not want to discuss the case with them or their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

statements about Franklin exonerating Darrow? Franklin hired to spot Darrow and ruin him; and here exonerating They said Franklin knew all the time he knew he him. vas not going to be punished, he was a confederate of Lockwood's and yet Franklin was punished. It is true he did not pay any fine; it is true he is mas not put in jail, but he got the stigma of jury-briber placed upon his name. I am not defending Franklin's acts; Franklin's acts are not worthy of commendation in doing what he did. They are worthy of the severest condemnation. He admits it himself. He says: I was over 21. He does not blame this defendant. Franklin admits he did it for the money there was in it. He has no animosity towards Darrow, or anybody. He certainly would not go down to Venice to Darrow's friends and make statements like these that are credited to him. This case reeks with perjury, this case reeks with rottenness and crime as presented to yougentlemen, by this cery defendant. It will be the duty of the District Attorney to investigate every angle of this case as he did the McNamara case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Attorney to ingestigate every angle of this case as he did the McNamara case.

MR APPHL: We certainly protest against any threats here against us or against this defendant, that it will be the duty of the District Attorney to investigate this case.

We ask for some protection here, your Honor. We have been threatened enough, and threats have not intimidated scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

us to this extent, but we ask at this time that should not be here openly and persistently stated. THE COURT: The court will admonish the District Attorney that he should not make any threats against the parties conducting this case. MR FORD: In order that I might present all the facts to you, gentlemen of the jury, which seem to bear out and which do bear out, beyond all reasonable doubt, this defendant's guilt. I have purposely refrained from citing the authorities and the evidence in the transcript. If I have varied, your memory will show you in what I have varied, and I believe you will find no substantial But if the defendant believes I have stated variance. that which is not the evidence, they will have the opportunity to argue that matter and call your attention to it, and the closing argument that will be presented in this case will cite you to the page of the transcript, and it will be read to you wherever they charge we have departed from the facts. We will be charged with over-zeal in this case; we will be charged with being unfair. But, gentlemen of the jury, we have, as officers of the law. presented to you, as it is our sworn duty to do, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

You are sitting here in the most important and the

about this matter that can aid you in arriving at a verdict,

evidence and the facts in this case in the best manner

that we knew how to. We have given you all that we know

most sacred position that you will ever occupy during your whole lives, so far as your relations to the government are concerned. You are occupying the most sacred position for the government is itself instituted. You are to pass in your judgment upon one of the most henous of crimes, the crime of corrupting the very tribunal of which you are now a part. Witnesses may be bribed, and there is a chan ce on cross-examination to show the improbability of their story, the falsity of their statements, but it is in vain that evidence is produced, it is absolutely folly to produce evidence before a jury whose ears have been stopped by gold. If you find the defendant guilty in this case, if you are convinced from the evidence in this case that the defendant is guilty, you will remember that you are not punishing him. You will remember that you are not deciding what shall be done with him if he is guilty of this charge. Whatever results come to him, that will be because of his own acts and not yours. You are simply to decide the one question: is he guilty or is he not guilty? You are not to pass upon the question as to whether he is to be punished or not. I would not care to sit in his Honor's place and tear this man from his faithful wife. I would not desire to have that duty to perform, but if I did I would have to fortify myself with the thought that way back East isits an aged mother whose sons are now occupying cells in San Quentin because of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

.14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conduct of men like this man. I would have to fortify
myself with the thought that the orphans -MR DARROW: Just a moment. I think it is an outrage, and
there is no possible excuse for the court to let it go by.
What is there in this testimony that will justify that
statement?
THE COURT: Counsel has a very broad latitude indrawing
his conclusions.
MR DARROW: No such latitude as that. I want to object
to the statement as not being founded on any revidence
at all in this action, and utterly untrue and venemous
and malicious and not warranted in a court of justice.

MR DARROW: I take an exception to the ruling.

MR FORD: I would have to fortify myself with the thoughts

wr Ford, proceed.

mothers who have been deprived of their families in that
terrible catastrophy on October 1st, before I would be
able to deny that mercy to the defendant which the law does
allow to be extended to the defendant in some cases.

But, gentlemen, neither you nor I have that duty to per-

of the fatherless children and the widowed wives and aged

THE COURT: The objection will be noted in therecord.

form. We are here simply and solely to decide the evidence and the facts in this case. You will be false to
your trust if for a moment you allow any other sentiment
to guide you except that of the facts in this case. You

scanned by LALAWHIBRARY

will be false to your trust if you sit back and say: I do not know what God Almighty alone can know. I am not able to say beyond all possible doubt that this defendant is guilty -- you will be false to your trust if you try to do that.

It is your duty to remember that thuman justice can only be dispensed by human means. You will remember that you have to rely upon the evidence which it is possible for human beings to produce. You will have to remember that it is your duty to examine the evidence, and if, as reasoning men, you are convinced of the defendant's guilt, you should find him guilty. The question is: Are you convinced beyond a reasonable doubt. You have not the right to indulge in vague and idle fancies, to speculate on what might have occurred, or what might not, to speculate on what evidence it might be possible to intro-You are to be guided by the evidence that is actually in the case, and determine from that whether or not this defendant is guilty, and if you are morally certain, if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt, if you are satisfied in this case to the same degree that would satisfy you in the most important concerns of your own life, if the dvidence in this case produces a satisfaction in your mind upon which you would be willing to act in matters of vital interest to you, remember that is all that can ever be produced in a court of law; that mathemathical demonstration is not possible; that we have to rely upon the moral certainty of the situation, and if we are morally certain, as you must be morally certain, of this def endant's guilt, it will be your duty to find him guilty as charged. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 There are two counts in this indictment. One 2 of them charges that the defendant in this case caused a bribe to given to Lockwood, and that Lockwood was a juror. 3 and that Lockwood was about to have brought before him for 4 5 decision the case of People vs McNamara. The second count 6 differs from the first in that it does not say that Lockwood was a juror, but says that he was drawn as a juror, 8 and there was a case pending before the court. A man is 9 a juror as lere soon as his name is upon the list. The 10 list of jurors is made out once in each year. You were 11 jurors before you came into this court, because your name 12 was upon the jury list. You were not trial jurors, you 13 had not been drawn inthis particular case, you were not 14 actively in service, you had not been impaneled to try 15 this case, but, nevertheless, you were jurors. The question 16 will then present itself: Was the McNamara case about to 17 come before Mr. Lockwood for decision. You may have 18 doubts about that matter. You may conclude that he was 19 not summoned and therefore that the wase was not about to 20 come Te him for decision. If you are in that frame of 21 mind it will be your duty to go to the second count and see 22 if that satisfies your mind, I am not going to argue the 23 first count at this time. I will leave that to Mr. 24 Fredericks in closing. But, as to the second count of this 25indictment, there can be absolutely no possible doubt, 26 because Mr. Lockwood's name was drawn as a juror,

case of the People vs McNamara was pending, and it is absolutely immaterial whether he had been summoned or the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

case was ever likely to come before him for decision. Gentlemen, you have served a long time, an unusual length of time in this case. You have been kept from your homes for nearly three months. You have been kept under unusual conditions because of the very nature of this charge, as a protection to yourself as well as to You are about to deliberate upon a mass of the state. evidence that has taken nearly three months to introduce. Do your duty carefully and calmly and deliberately, as I know you will. I know that there is no man upon this jury who will obstinately cling to one opinion, but that each man will reason with his fellow jurors, and while he will, if he believes the defendant is guilty, stick to that opinion unless he is reasonably convinced otherwise, or if he believes the defendant is innocent, stick to that

opinion unless he is reasonably convinced otherwise, still youwill not obstinately cling to your opinions but will patiently and carefully weigh all the evidence, listen to the reasons of each other, and try to arrive at a verdict in this case. I thank you for your attention. MR. APPEL. Before you finish -- just a moment. The Dis-

trict Attorney just told the jury that they were kept locked by reason of the nature of this case. We would like to know right now -- and as protection for themselves + we would like to know right now, and ask this gentleman

whether your Honor didn't make the order -- or whether your

Honor informed him when you made the order, or when you

made up your mind that this jury should be locked up, for fear that anyone should bribe them, or whether it

was made for their protection. What right has he got to make that statement, your Honor. What right has he got to insinuate to this jury that we or any one else would undertake to bribe them. MR . FREDERICKS. That is not a question that counsel has

any right to propound. MR . APPEL. I ask him, on what does he base that statement, your Honor? Your Honor sees it is not fair to any one in this case. THE COURT. The Court ordered the jury to be handled as they were, because the law provided for it.

MR. APPEL. We ask your Honor to correct that statement of the District Attorney. THE COURT. The court has stated the facts. The District Attorney, however, is entitled to draw any conclusions from the facts he desires.

MR. APPEL. Is he entitled to draw that conclusion from your Honor's order? MR. FREDERICKS. I do not think we should engage in any controversy such as is now going on. Mr. Ford has made his argument and sat down.

24 25 26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

judicial to the rights of thisdefendant, and as unheard of in the history of jurisprudence.

MR . APPEL. I assign the statement of the District

Attorney as maliciously false, and as tending to cause

imputations upon this defendant, and we assign the conduct

of the court in not saying manfully to this jury that there

is no evidence upon which to base that statement, as pre-

THE COURT. The assignment will be noted in the record.

MR. APPEL. Your Honor, owing to the misstatements made

here, to which we have taken exceptions, we will be forced

THE COURT. Do you want the court to convene at 9 o'clock?

MR. APPEL. Your Honor, I have no time--your Honor has

THE COURT. 1 think a fair presentation can be had in the

MR . APPEL. We take an exception to the limiting of our

time allotted to you. But you/have the extra hour tomorrow

first to answer those misstatements by reading the evidence.

The court will now adjourn until tomorrow morning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

26

morning .

curtailed our time here—and we ask your Honor not only to adjourn until 9 o'clock, but to extend the time of argument to both sides in this case that a fair presentation may be

given, an equal show to both sides.

23 argument. - here.
24 THE COURT. The exception is noted.
25 MP APPEL To the disable to the second second

at 9 o'clock A.M.)

MR. APPEL. To the disadvantage of the defendant.

(Whereupon, after the usual admonition of the jury an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, August 13, 1913

2 P.M.

- 2 Defendant in court with counsel.
- 3 THE COURT. The parties are all present. You may proceed.
- Captain Fredericks. 4
- CLOSING ARGUMENT OF THE PROSECUTION. 5
- MR. FREDERICKS. May it please the Court and gentlemen of
- 6

1

10

11

12

13

14

24

25

26

- 7 the jury: 8
- I know you are all glad to see us starting down the home 9
  - stretch and getting nearly through. When I asked you, or when you said at the beginning of
  - this trial that you would not permit the oratory or personal
  - appeal of the defendant to influence your verdict, you did
  - not mean and I did not mean that your hearts would not be touched, and that perhaps a tear would not dim your eye
- when you were confronted with the unfortunate predicament 15 16 in which the defendant finds himself.
- We are all human, and Clarence Darrow is very human. 17 Mr. Rogers warned you that I would read from the testimony 18
- partly, and that I might not quote it correctly or all of 19 it. He, however, did not warn you to beware of any oratory 20
- on my part. You have heard all the oratory that you will 21
- 22 hear in this trial.
- When I said that I did not expect that you would be unmoved 23
  - himself by the sorrow, and it is sorrow, of his position, I expected that like true American citizens, you would

by the unfortunate predicament in which the defendant finds

7832 1 write your verdict, even though you would have to wipe a 2 tear drop from your eye, and you would write it according 3 to your best judgment. I believe I can show you, if you are 4 not already convinced, that the unfortunate and unhappy posi-5 tion in which this defendant now finds himself, is the 6 result of the philosophy of life which he has expounded to 7 you here as his philosophy, and the philosophy of life which 8 you have seen belongs to him in this testimony. No man 9 ever suffered punishment without sorrow, yet that does not 10 mean he is not guilty. Clarence Darrow told you yesterday 11 that while he had some notions in regard to the advisability 12 of those McNamaras escaping publishment for the crime they 13 had committed, that he would have walked from the east to 14 the west in his bare feet to have prevented the commission 15 of that crime. 16 gentlemen, that is not the way to prevent the commission 17 of that crime and other similar crimes. That would be 18 idle, sentimental and useless. The experience of the 19 ages has taught us, yea, the handiwork of God Almighty 20teaches us the way to prevent wrong and crime is by punish-21 ment. Punishment. Oh, perhaps our hearts were moved at 22 his position, but let me show you another position, let 23 me take you down to old Bob Bain's house, let me show you 24suffering there. Let me take you, perchance, out to the little kitchen around the cook stove, where Bob Bain and 25his wife sit of an evening alone.

5 on their part. Let me take you down to the lodge meet-6 ing, perchance, that this little woman spoke of -- and I 7 take it from her manner and her talk that those little 8 things mean much to her, to get up in the meeting and say 9 a few words and express her ideas -- let me take you there 10 and show you that little woman, if she has the face at all 11 to go to the meeting. Disgrace -- suffering -- ruin. 12 Why, my friends, gentlement of the jury, it is not the 13 bayonets or the bullets of outside foes that this coun-14 try need fear. Bob Bain, when he beat his little red 15 drum at Shiloh and Gettysberg and the other battles of the 16 civil war, was not afraid of that kind of an enemy, and 17 he did not succomb to that kind of attack. And you can 18 well imagine the proud soldier boy as he marched up Pennsyl 19 Vania avenue at the close of that great struggle, proud 20 of his manhood, proud of the fact that he had not been 21 afraid, proud of the fact that he had come back from bat-22 And through all the years that that 23 of human honesty has been building since then -- 71 years of through

age. I believe he said he was-4/ all those years he has

not been a fraid, and, perchance, he has not been vanquish-

ed and he has not fallen. But it remains, it remains for

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Let me take you down to the Post meeting of the G.A.R.,

you Bob Brain sitting off in the corner. If any of his

comrades care to speak to him, it is a matter of charity

where Bob Pain used to beat his drum with pride, and show

1

2

3

4

24

25

the enemy of society that has come upon us in these latter days, to tackle the old soldier. Oh, God, if they had only taken his life! What would it be -- he is nearly through.

Now, I say to you, my friends, that the man who tears

down that temple by tempting that poor old fellow beyond his ability to resist, that the intelligence and the man who does that is the worst enemy of society, is the enemy which at all odds must be put down, must be punished, and jury-bribing must forever remain a dangerous calling.

Mr Steffens thought I was hard-hearted, thought I was

hard-hearted, and it was no use to appeal to me. 14

years I have served this county in the capacity that I now

do, and I do not believe that I am hard-hearted. I believe

that my heart is just as tender today as any woman's,

when it comes to the suffering of my fellow man. But,

mark you, it does not extend to the maudin sympathy which

protects the enemy of society, but it extends to the man

or the woman who have not yet done wrong. Ah, wouldn't

it be a grand thing if you could take hold of Bob Bain and

his wife and turn back the hands of time for a year, and

their

give them / honesty and / reputation again! Wouldn't

it be a grand thing, if you could do that?

Well, there are other Bob Exins that may come in the years to come, and I say to you that the man who sternly punishes crime is the charitable man, is the merciful man,

for he saves the ones who are now happy, he saves him from misery. And if you don't think it is misery, just try to imagine. I have seen misery in my time, but I never saw, and you will never see, any greater mistery than the misery of a soul scourged, convicted before the public, and their good name taken from them, as was done in this case.

Oh, they were of age -- it is true -- they were of age,

and they should have known better. I do not ameliorate the condition at all.

5.

Let me give you another fact. Suppose, as an illustra-1 C 2 tion, that throughout a year in the United States there had

3 been over one hundred buildings and bridges blown up by 4 dynamite, and in all that time no one had been caught and

5 punished; and suppose during that time a man or men were 6 caught and were punished for that crime -- and I do not mean 7 an eye for an eye, a life for a life and a tooth for a tooth 8 exactly; punishment should be meted out with mercy. 9 But, suppose they are exposed and punished, and suppose 10 that in the year following there have been no buildings blown 11

12

13

14

15

16

up, there has been no occasion where men have been blown into eternity without an instants notice. Who is the merciful man, the man who, by the strict enforcement of the law puts the fear of God into the hearts of the people, who would do that kind of a thing, and thus save the lives of hundreds of men in the next year, or a man who comes with he would turn a murderer, a dynamiter loose on parole or pardon; that he would forgive him and let him go? Why, gentlemen, about how long would it be after J B Brice, or

maudling sympathy, with tears of pathos and tells you that 17 18 19 20 21 J B McNamara would be pardoned from the think the Peniten-22 tiary before there would be another building blown up? 23 I don't know and you don't know, but human experience tells you what the answer would be. So I say to you, when 24 I ask you to stand by the state, to stand by what I believe 25 to be the right, I am not cruel but I am merciful. And you 26

Granted; granted. Did you ever see a club swung at the

dog and see the dog, in blind and unthinking rage, turn

that wields the club, knowing that there are other clubs,

and bite the club? That is the dog. But the intelligence

of organized society reaches for the hand and the intelligence

there are many of them, and they may be wielded time and time

again by that same intelligence. I have no apology or ex-

none whatever. But shall we stop there? You know--and I

do not need to argue it to you--you know that Franklin was

bribing that jury for any fun, for any amusement or for any

not using his own money. You know that Franklin was not

judgment or tare that he had as to their verdict. Who

gentlemen of the jury, don't you think that the part of

was Franklin? Simply a hired man. Then, my friends, and

wisdom, that the part of cool, calm, sober judgment, dictates

to you and to me that, if possible, we must punish the man

who was back of Franklin, at least to the same extent that

Franklin has been punished?

cuses or pardons or forgivenesses for Franklin's act;

say then Franklin is the dog who should be crucified. Franklin is the wretch who should be made to suffer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Why soak the puny pawn? Why disgrace a Franklin? Why make a felon of him and let the man back of him go? Why not, perhaps, be a little lenient on Franklin? Why not be a little easy on Franklin? Why not be a little merciful to Franklin and through him endeavor to right the whole wrong? Gentlemen, if I am ever able to continue making a living it must be in this fashion, practicing law. I don't want to go up against the power of money when I place my cases before juries. You may be litigants and you don't want to go up against the power of money -- the corrupt use of money if you are litigants. Do you intend to make jury bribing a safe industry? I take it not. Now, then, when we know that Franklin has bribed a juryman, and we know that Franklin didn't use his own money, and I am not going to waste any time talking to you about anyone associated with the prosecution being interested in Franklin. We have evidence here of his bribing and trying to bribe six men. Six. Always to vote against us. Franklin said he was my friend. Well, so be it; so be it. But he was not a good enough friend that he would not try to bribe a jury against me. Now, shall we go back of Franklin or shall we stop? What is the wise thing to do? You know and I know that Franklin didn't use his own money. You know and I know that the intelligence that was back of Franklin came from the defense, for he was working for the defense

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of justice demands that the whole thing should be probed to the bottom, if possible, and all things are not possible

what are we going to do? Where are we going to look?

Suppose that we have made up our minds that the interests

and every one of his acts were for the defense.

Franklin the money.

Now, let us look. Someone connected with the defense, certainly. That circle can be drawn. Someone who was going to see these jurors as they came into the box to pass on them in court and determine whether to accept them or not. For what folly it would be to have Franklin to be

out in an independent way paying out money to Fain, for

instance, and not knowing that Eain was going to be able to pass and get on the jury, so we have got to eliminate everyone else and come down to the point that it must have been someone, some one of theattorneys in the case. And who? Let us look. Who was the head? We would maturally look there. They say that we wanted Clarence Darrow; I say that we want the scalp of no man. Why, how much better it would have been for us if we could have found some little fellow without the ability to turn and fight like a tiger, and put the battle that he has put up. We have troubles enough, don't worry. We are not looking for anything to be thrust upon us. The District Attorney's office

of this great county has to grind the grist that comes

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

through day by day, week by week and year by year, and it don't have any time to go out in the highways and byways and take up cases to satisfy the grudges of any man, and why wish to tear down this beautiful temple? What value is there in it? No, my friends, gentlemen of the jury, we have simply followed the trail, that is all, and that trail we have laid before you to the best of our abality, that is all, and when I am through I am passing the responsibility over to you. I may not be as eloquent and I may not be as keen a lawyer as those on the other side, but whatever humble qualities I have I have given to this case my best through and with the idea that I might assist in doing justice -no more -- no less. Why, gentlemen, can you conceive a soul so base that would endeavor to fasten a crime upon an innocent man simply to satisfy the lust of anyone? And who wants Clarence Darrow? He says the Mational Frectors! Association wants him. I don't know whether they do or whether they don't. I don't care. I am not working for the Mational Erectors' Association. They have gotten in a lot of loose truck and trash here about telegrams to the National Erectors Association, and they have argued to you as though I was sending telegrams back and forth with the National Erectors Association. There isn't one scintilla of evidence to that effect. Mr Steffens said

that Mr Gibbon told him that Mr Chandler had got a letter

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or a telegram from the Mational Erectors Association, and that they would not consent to one of these men going free.

Butt the evidence is that whatever this was--and I doubt

very much whether there was anything -- it came on Friday

of the week before Thanksgiving that on Tuesday they had

gotten their first information from me, and it was the same

then that it always was -- there were cases against two men

and two men must plead guilty. Mr. Darrow would have you

the friend of organized labor. Gentlemen, 1 claim to you

believe that he is being persecuted because he has been

that this evidence and the statements of the defendant

here show that he has not been the friend to organized

labor, the true friend. I claim that this evidence shows

and his statements show here that I myself am a better

friend to organized labor, to that portion of it at least

that believes in the law, than Clarence Darrow, with his

maudlin sympathy for murders and dynamiters. Who is the

friend to your boy when he goes down the street and back

into a little nookery where he can buy cigarettes, where

he can sit and chew tobacco and hear nasty stories -- the

man who furnishes him the opportunity, the man who en-

courages him, the man who at least excuses him, or the

friend of the family who comes along and sees the boy, and

takes him out and spanks him and puts him where he belongs?

As I said in the beginning, gentlemen, no man can claim

to be the friend of any organization or any society or any

sect or any set unless he encourages them by his precepts,

by his acts and by his works, in observance of methe laws of

lw 1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Who is the friend?

2 before, not in vengeance, not in wrath--unless he assists

society, and unless he assists in punishing -- as I said

1

12

13

14

15

3 in punishing the wrongdoer.
4 Now, gentlemen, I want to go back a moment. We were

looking now for the man who gave Franklin the money. I had attempted in my discussion of this with you to show you that that must have been some one of the attorneys for the

that that must have been some one of the attorneys for the defense. Suppose, now, without a word from Franklin, you find out that one of those attorneys back on the 5th day of June in Chicago tried to corrupt a state's witness, Biddinger, by offering him money. Suppose that you find

that one of those attorneys a week later sent a man by the name of Behm, an Uncle of Ortic McManigal, out here to California to get Ortic McManigal to change the confession which he had already given, and come over onto the side of the defense. Suppose you found that one of those attorneys

the defense. Suppose you found that one of those attorneys had been instrumental and privy to an arrangement to get Flora Caplan, an important witness for the state, three days after she was served with a subpoena, out in a devious and dark way over the mountains out of the state. Suppose you had been shown that a witness by the name of Diekelman,

one of the king pins, perhaps, an identification witness
of Brice and the handwriting on the night before the
dynamite had been exploded, was induced to leave his place
at Albuquerque, where he was staying, and to go east to
Chicago by the instrumentality of one of the attorneys.
Suppose you had found out that one of the attorneys was the

7842 man who had received and was receiving at least \$200,000 practically all of the money that was being raised in this case, and paying all the bills, hiring all the lawyers, detectives, and so forth. That one of these attorneys was the paymaster. Suppose he was also the chief attorney and head counsel and the director. Suppose you found that one of the checks for \$10,000 had been given to a friend of his, an associate, whom they have referred to here as being implicated in this same affair in San Francisco, out of the they were large bills. Suppose that you found out that this same attorney had felt out one of his trusted agents, one of his trusted lieutenants, found out whether he would engaged in the bribery business by suggesting to him one night that he had some money to reach some jurors with; suppose you had found out that this same man Franklin had

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 usual order of affairs, and that when the bills were received 11 12 13 14 15 suppose you had found out that another juror had been bribed 16 17 gone to five or six different men, whose names were on the 18 19 list, and tried to get them to accept a bribe; suppose 20 you found out that one man actually had gotten onto the jury 21 and received moneyl with this same man being the chief counsel 22 in the case; suppose you had found out without one word 23 of testimony from Franklin -- and we have it here in this con-24 dition, if you wish to look at it in that way -- that this large sum of \$4,000 had been put up, part of it--\$3500 of it 25 put up, and \$500 of it actually passed in Los Angeles 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

counsel of the defense, had gone to his vault that morning,
and then gone up to the office of that head counsel;
suppose that transaction at the vault had been just a few
minutes before the transaction down below; suppose you
had found out that of all the thousands of men who might
have crossed the street at the time Franklin was arrested,

this same one head counsel happened to be the one who was

there; and so I might go on; suppose you had all those

things, without one word from Franklin, without one

syllable from Franklin, where would you look for the

on the morning of the 28th of November; suppose you had

found out that Job Harriman, one of the associates and

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Franklin with the money? Why, gentlemen, it is so plain that, unless you will convict on this evidence, in my judgment, you have made jury bribing absolutely safe for all time. How are you going to get more than the one who received the money, the man through whose hands it passed, the man who gave the money, the vault open on the morning a few minutes before it was passed, by a man who goes up to the meeting place testified to by the accomplice? In addition to all this, in addition to the occurrences on the

28th, what do you ever expect could be found against a man

asking you to make any guesses at all. I believe that this

Now, I am not asking you to make any guesses. I am not

who wanted to bribe a jury?

jury briber? Where would you look for the man that furnished

are concerned, that is all we are concerned with. Mr. Darrow has held up, in his telling and pathetic way, the gray walls of the penitentiary. You and I have nothing to do with that; absolutely nothing to do with that. It is my pusiness to place this testimony before you. It is your business to weigh it with the testimony put in by the other side, and determine whether you think Clarence Darrow is guilty or not, and so state by your verdict, and if there is any mercy coming, if there are any considerations

evidence is so clear, so convincing, so satisfying, that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

23

24

25

26

coming, those will be and can be attended to at the proper 13 time by the court. We have got nothing to do whether he is 14 to be put on probation, pays a fine or goes to the peni-15 tentiary. That is not our affair. You have got burdens 16 enough of your own to carry without toying to carry the burdens 17 for the court. 18 Now, gentlemen, I am going through this testimony with 19 you. I am going through it carefully. We have been a 20 long time here. I am going to take my time to it. I am 21 going to reach much of it, and I am going to read it fairly. 22 There was a stack of this that you and I could not read

through in three weeks if I were to attempt to read it all

to you. That would be impossible.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1

2

3

4

26

me by my judgment.

believe to be the duty of a District Attorney. You have 5 heard a good deal about Mr Ford in the argument that I have 6 read during the evenings. Gentlemen, I have not time to 7 pass out bouquets and you have not time to listen to them. 8 But I would call to your attention that the one man who has 9 kept his poise through all this trial, who has not lost his 10 head and been fined for contempt of court, who has always been the courteous gentleman, although the persistent advocate, is that same man, Joe Ford. And I would call your attention to the matchless arguments which he has presented here to this court, and I want to say to you that

And I want now again to call your attention to what I

11 12 13 14 15 I believe one of the best things that I ever did in of-16 fice, was insecuring the services of Joe Ford. Out yonder 17 18 on the lawn there stands a monument to a man who earned that right by his ability and his integrity here in Los 19 Angeles County, and I want to prophesy to you, gentlemen, 20 21 that the time will come when they will put another one on

22 the other side to this same brilliant mind, this same court 23 ous gentleman, Joe Ford. And it will be given in true re-24 ward for his merit. 25 Why. Mr Rogers -- Joe Ford referred in his argument to

some witnessesthat he said were perjurers, and Mr Rogers

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

came in prancing and champing at the bit, roaring and tearing and kicking, and charging that Joe Ford, for insinuat-

1

2

12

17

18

25

26

ing for a moment that anyone would commit perjury in this 3 case, where he was chief counsel. Why, please your heart, 4 at the time the rottennest ones of these witnesses were on 5 the stand, if my memory serves me right, Mr Rogers was not 6 7 in the court room at all. Let me tell you a little story. There were four men on 8 a street car. One of them, when he got on the car looked 9 at his watch to see what time it was. When he got about 10 11 to his destination, he reached for his watch, and it was gone. He saw a policeman outside and he called a police-

man. He said. "I had a vatch when I came in here. It 13 is gone. There has been nobody here but these three men; 14 one of them has stolen it." And one of the three jumped 15 up at once and said. "You are a liar; you are a liar; you 16

are a liar.", and the man said to the officer, "Search

that man." He did, and he found his watch and a stick-pin

19 that he had not missed. 20 Gentlemen of the jury, nobody is accusing anybody any more than they have to, and certainly we are not accusing

21 22 counsel of anything. Mr Rogers also informed you that Mr 23 Darrow had made a great bargain when he got these two murder 24 ers off so lightly, neither one of them being hanged at

least once, when they had murdered twenty men. I suppose

the inference was that if Mr Rogers had been retained in scanned by LALAWLIBRARY the prosecution until the time of trial came, that both

would have been hanged, at least once. Why, gentlemen of

the jury, if Mr Rogers had been retained in the prosecu-

left in the exchequer to buy a clothesline to hang a

tion until that day, there wouldn't have been enough money

pass that by with Mr Appel's goat and the baby's trousers.

Now, gentlemen, so much for that, and we will

vashing on.

He says Franklin only approached honest men. How does

he know?

He says we are prosecuting him because he has always stood for labor. Gentlemen, we are prosecuting him because he is the center of this corruption, and this evidence shows it. That is why, and only why. If there is any laboring man that labors any harder than I do, I want to see the inside of his hands. I want to see the time when he goes to work in the morning and when he quits at night. I want to know of I am not a laboring man, and if I have any sympathies they are sympathies with the man who toils. But they are not a maudlin kind of sympathy. Why, I remember an attorney in one of these kind of cases said to me one time, he said, "I think we all work too hard." He says. "I believe the time is coming when no

man will have to work over three hours a day." "Oh", I said, "Old Man, why work so long?" I am not one of the kind that believes in handing out any maudlin sympathy

to the laboring man. He don't need it, and he don't want it. All that he needs is that the accursed leaches that

have fastened themselves on the institution shall be stripped off, and the men themselves go on clear-eyed and

clear-brained to their destiny.

Mr Darrow is also jump ed on because he is a poor man.

Oh, I don't know -- I don't know whether he is a poor man or not. I never heard of anybody getting this sort of an

785**f** array of counsel without having some of the wherewithal to scatter around them. Maybe they are only getting two and a half a day -- I don't know. Eut if he has to pay them anything. I am sorry for him -- not because they haven't earned it, but because he gets no advantage in the end, whether he is convicted or acquitted. The central figure in the labor world, because he came here to defend the McNamaras. Now, gentlemen, I am not saying these things roughly, and I don't want you to think I am. I haven't an unkind thought for this defendant. I vant to see him punished, but there is no gloating about it, and there is no joy in it. I haven't the sligh test doubt that any lawyer capable of handling that case in the United States would have been tickled to death to have taken it for the same fee that Mr Darrow got, and I don't know what it was, and I don't care. I haven't the slightest doubt but what any lawyer capable of handling the cases that he has handled for labor, as he calls it, would have been tickled to death to have taken those cases that he took for the fee there was in it and theadvertising, which brings other business, and I don't know whether he is entitled to any great credit for his position in that re-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

gard or not, and you don't know. This talk about the District Attorney's office wanting him and not wanting Franklin to tell on any Los Angeles man, is all nonsense. Have you seen LeCompte Davis sheltscanned by LALAWLIBRARY

ered or protected or spared here in the cross-examination

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

or in the examinations and producion of testimony? Have you seen Job Harriman spared? We haven't said much about Joe Scott, it is true, but you know Joe Scott didn't know

that these men were going to plead guilty, or were even thinking about it, as Lincoln Steffens or Davis -- I have forgotten which -- said, until Thanksgiving day; so I don't imagine that Joe knew a great deal about it, although he

does put up quite a fine front. I wonder if Joe Scott was in this case because of his great love for labor? I wonder if LeCompte Davis was in it because of his great love for labor. Shucks -- nonsense! They were in it for their fee, to buy shoes and stockings and clothes and meals. And there is nothing dishonorable about that, and there is no cricitism intended about it. It was a

good job. It was a good case for any lawyer who had desired to take it and could handle it, from a financial standpoint.

1 I want to tell you, gentlemen, that you have listened to 2 one of the most marvelous addresses, orations or pleas, 3 whichever you wish to call it, ever delivered in any court 4 room, when you listened to Mr. Darrow. Plausible, eloquent, 5 his 35 years of training back of it, his terrific and 6 tremendous interest in it made it indeed a wonderful plea. 7 But that, my gentlemen, only reflects the ability of the 8 man and has mighty little to do with his guilt or innocence. 9 If you were to pay attention to that, it would mean that a 10 man of his ability could commit crime all at his pleasure, 11 and he could not be conficted for it. If you were to per-12 mit that to weigh in your judgment, then the bigger the 13 rascal, the brainer the criminal, the surer he would be 14 in his position. But you know and I know, and history 15 teaches us that brainy men have gone wrong; that the wisest 16 criminals have committed the most foolish blunders, and 17 I am going to show you now by this testimony that this man, 18 this defendant's predicament now is the result of his 19 beliefs and the principles that he has in him. c 20 He says to you that he would have walked from the east to 21 the west in his bare feet if he could have stopped this 22 crime. Now, gentlemen, I am going to show you by his own 23 words that he would have done nothing of the kind, because 24 he knows that the only way to stop these crimes is to 25 punish them, if he is in his right mind. He knows it and 26 And when he said he would have stopped it and you know it. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

- yet sail in the same breath he would not have punished it,
- 2 I argue to you that he would not have stopped it, for it
- means the same thing. No, no. It is all wrong, 3
- 4 gentlemen; it is all wrong. Lincoln Steffens called this 5 a social crime -- called the McNamara murders a social crime.
- This defendant said there was no hate in the mind of Brice, 6
- no desire to take life. It is in evidence in this case that 7
- he told Biddinger that he wished that Chandler had been there 8 that night and he would have blown him so high that he rever 9

would have come down again. No hate! Why, gentlemen,

MR. APPEL. No, there is no such evidence as that. It may

- 11 that is full of hate.
- MR . DARROW . W. Just a moment . 12

1

10

15

- MR. FREDERICKS. Your point is that it was put in for another 13 14 purpose.
- be possible, but we have no such recollection. 16
- MR. DARROW. There isn't any such evidence. 17
- MR . APPEL. Furthermore, that your Honor stated that you 18
- admitted it for a particular purpose only. 19
- MR. FREDERICKS. Well, it is in there. If I do not get it 20
- today I will get it tomorrow. It is there all right. And 21
- I do not intend intentionally to tell you anything is in 22 testimony if it is not, and counsel is at liberty and you
- are at liberty to call my attention at any time if you 24
- think I have made a misstatement of the evidence because 25 unless we can agree on what that is we cannot go very far, 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

and this will probably be your last opportunity to refresh your mind as to what the evidence is.

3 No hate 1 I tell you, the people who do that sort of

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

thing are filled with hate--filled with hate! And there

is no power under God's Heaven that will prevent them from

giving vent to their hatred except fear of punishment.

Why, that is the logic of the world. Stick your hand in

the fire, disobey the laws of nature and you are punished;

9 disobey the laws of nature in the matters of diet, inthe

matter of eating, and you are punished; disobey the laws
of nature in any one of a thousand ways that I could name

12 to you and nature punishes you. Disobey the laws of your

13 country, and society punishes you. It must. There cannot

be any slipshod way. But Lincoln Steffens thought that a man like Brice could come up to a confession post somewhere

and make a confession to some God, to some idea, that he

17 had blown up the Times and killed these twenty men, and then

go on his way and blow up another one and make another confession, and kill twenty more and make another confession.

Now, gentlemen, I am going to start on the discussion of this testimony.

As I said before, I am going to try to be fair. I do not want anything but what is right. I do not want you to go

out and make a mistake. Do not do it. Let me give you a little notion of my idea of the District Attorney. A

District Attorney once had a murder case against a poor

scanned by LALAWEIBRARY

Mexican, a cholo as they are called, and it was a strong case against him. He had been identified as being on the scene of a murder, and he was held to answer and taken over to the jail, and two women had identified him, and it seemed as though -- it was a brutal affair -- it seemedas though he was on his way to the gallows. He hadn't a dollar in the world, not a cent, not a sou, not a friend, but the court appointed a lawyer to go and interview him and defend him. 

The lawyer went; he could talk his language. And he came back to the District Attorney and he said: old man.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

14

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

you have made a mistake there. I do not believe that man 3 is guilty. Well, the District Attorney looked at the eyi-4

dence, and he says: it looks pretty straight. But the attorney said: this man tells me he was down in New Mexico

on the night this murder was committed; that he was a tramp, tramping the streets, tramping a railroad there, an unnamed, unnumbered and unidentified tramp. Oh, it

sounded like a fairy tale; sounded like the old yarn over 10 again. But the lawyer who knew his language said: it 11 sounds true to me. I have got no money. I cannot send down 12 there. So the District Attorney sent a stenographer over, 13

and, through an interpreter, they took his statement and

he told them that on this certain night when the murder was 15 committed here in Los Angeles he was down in a little sta-16 tion in New Mexico, and he remembered that a tool-house 17 had been broken open and he and another man had been taken 18 19

up by the section boss and the constable for breaking into the tool-house. Well, the District Attorney took one of his detectives and got him a scrip book and gave him \$100 and told him to go down there; we will just chance \$100 on In about ten days the operative came back with the skin all padled off his nose, and his cheek bones, and he brought back a big, red-headed section foreman with him, and he said: yes, there was a man down there; there was a

section-house broken open, and we took two Mexicans and locked them up over night; and it was broken open at that

time. I don't know who they were. I have not seen them since. We took him over to the jail and stood up a lot of

Mexicans in a line, and he said: why, there is the man.

And the man was turned loose. That has always been my in

And the man was turned loose. That has always been my idea and my ideal of the duty of the District Attorney. It is true that it is in human nature when we take one side of a case, to become, perhaps, a little unfair and a little

biased, if the struggle is fierce, and the counsel on the other side are able, but so far as lies within my power, that is my idea of the duty of the District Attorney.

And it was whith that idea in mind, of assisting you to

up this testimony, and I am going to start right back in Chicago, and I am going to show you day by day, just what happened. I am going to show you how the insiduous and skillful hand of this defendant entered into the brib-

come to a correct conclusion, that I am going to take

ing business from the beginning. I am going to show you that bribery is in his nature -- not unkindly. I am going to show you that bribery and the ideas of power of money, that money could buy anything, is in his nature. I am go-

ing to show you by this testimony that those are the ideas and ideals of this man, and I am going to try to do it fairly. Money! Money! Money! That, he had the notion that there was no integrity or virtue that could

(After recess.)

MR FREDERICKS: Just before court adjourned, counsel thought that I had made a mistake in the testimony. The

testimony that I was quoting at that time will be found in volume 42, page 3281. It is the testimony of Guy Biddin-6 ger, when he was relating what occurred when he was bringing

ger, when he was relating what occurred when he was bringing Brice and McManigal from Detroit to Chicago. It is as follows: "After we had set upon \$30,000 as the price to let

him (Brice) go, he got very friendly and told me that the only thing he ever regretted out in Los Angeles, he didn't blow up that son-of-a-bitch Chandler. He wished he blew him so high they didn't find a piece of him. I asked him

have time. He went to a telephone booth and looked in the book to get his address, and couldn't find it. Had to get out of town too quick."

how it was they didn't get Chandler. He said he didn't

This is the man that Mr Darrow hopes some day will be pardoned or paroled; Brice. Those are his hopes; those are his ambitions. That is the kind of a man Mr Darrow wants turned loose on the community, because of this maudling sympathy that he has expressed to you.

I might call attention again to the idea there of the

power of money. The power of money even in the mind of Brice, offering this man \$50,000 if they would let him go.

Now, I want to talk to you a little about this man Bid

dinger, that they discussed this witness that came on the stand. Biddinger, they say, I believe it developed on his cross-examination, had been a saloon-keeper in Chicago in his early days, or at least, had had some connection with a saloon. Be that as it may. I suppose one connection with a saloon is about the same as another. And I don't know that that is exactly an indication that the man is not honest. My experience in life has taught me that there are more honest men behind the bar than there are in front of it; that the fellows, as a rule, who stand behind the bar with their white apron on and handing out poison to the rest of humanity, see the evid effects of vice, and are more apt to be honest fellows than the fellows who habit ually frequent the other side of the bar. I saw habitually frequent the other side of the bar. At any rate, I think they are about an average; just about an average. So let us start with that. Is Biddinger honest? Well, he has been a sergeant of police in Chicago for about ten years. At present he is on a leave of absence and in the employ of W. J. Burns. Now, who is W. J. Burns? Mr Rogers was going to eat him alive when he took the witnews stand.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22

23

24

25

26

He changed his mind-he didn't do it.

2 Who is W. J. Burns? You know lawyers have a way in 3 trying a case of speaking sneeringly and referring in a 4 slurring way to a witness day in and day out until the 5 jury and everybody else almost feels that that witness must 6 be a bad fellow. But who is W. J. Burns? I suppose it is 7 permissible to refer to history, to well known events, and 8 I want to tell you that in my humble judgment William J. 9 Burns has done more for the cause of civic righteousness 10 and civic decency and civic honesty in America in the last 11 ten years than any other one man. Now, that is my opinion 12 of William J. Burns. Men who are continually after criminals 13 get rocks thrown at them, get mud thrown at them, until 14 sometimes we look at the mud and think that is the man. 15 But I would like to know what William J. Burns ever did, 16 in your minds as candid men, that did not indicate he 17 was a highminded, honest, honorable man, pursuing the line 18 of work that he seems so well cut out for. I think he has 19 his faults, like all the rest of us, but they are not the 20 faults of dishonesty and they are not the faults of crooked-21 ness, or anything of that kind. So much for Burns.

Biddinger. Burns wouldn't pick a man unless he thought he was an honest man. Now, the fact that nothing ever came of this offer of \$30,000 shows that the men who were there on the train were honest men, for if they had been dishonest how easy it would have been to have had an accidental escape, scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 and gotten at least some of that money. Here is where we 2 learn about who McManigal was, and discussing this evidence 3 you must know to a certain extent who McManigal was. McManigal was arrested in Detroit in May of 1911 with this 4 5 man J B Brice, that is, J B M dNamara. They were arrested 6 together, and as appears from this testimony, McManigal 7 gave upthe career that he had been living and turned states evidence and made a confession. Counsel says that he was 8 given the third degree. Counsel is drawing on his imagina-9 10 tion in that regard. He knows nothing about it, and I don't know a great deal about it, and there has been nothing brought 11 12 on here, but I do not believe that he was given any more. 13 third degree than a man's own conscience presents to him when he finds he is brought up against a terrible tragedy 14 in life, such as capture for dynamiting. But, be that as 15 it may, he makes his confession. That stands as one of 16 the facts, but just what that confession was is not in 17 evidence, and, of course, for that reason I cannot go into 18 19 it in detail. But you can draw a conclusion from what is in evidence here, that is, the testimony of Biddinger about 20 the several score of explosions in the east around about 21 this time, and a gathering of the registers of the hotels 22 of various cities, and using that as evidence, from that 23 you would be entitled to conclude that McManigal was mixed 24 up in all of those t lings, that his confession covered 25 them. 26

Now, let's see. I am going to pass over the trip on the train. Just a little talk here from Brice about money again.

scanned by LALAWLIBRAR

"After we had been en route an hour or two, McNamara said to me", said Biddinger, "'Why, you haven't got me for blowing up any safe; you have got me for that job out in Los Angeles. Further on he says, "Do you want to make a little money?" I said. "I always want to make a little money. How much have you got?" He said: "I will give you \$2000 to let me go." So it went on up to \$30,000. You remember in 8 the testimony it was told how it was to be done. 9 Just in passing, and before I come to Biddinger again, 10 I have a little note about John R. Harrington. Who was 11 John R. Harrington? You know they have thrown so much 12 mud and so many rocks at John R. Harrington -- and he has 13 done somethings, as the testimony shows here, that proba-14 bly you or I would not care to do. We would no t care 15 to go and live in a man's house, and then tell on him. 16 I don't think I would , and I don't think you would. 17 But that is a matter of ethics and not a matter of honesty. 18 And I don't know whether a man's duty to the state is not 19 greater than his duty to his friend. I don't know but 20 what a man's duty to the state is at least as great --21 that is, his duty to reveal any criminal act that he knows--22 is at least as great as his duty to conceal the criminal 23 acts of his friend, even though he is under his roof. I 24 think probably, in 'strict ethics, he should have gotten 25 out from under his roof, so far as that is concerned. 26 But, at any rate, Harrington was a lawyer, or claim agent

1

2

3

4

5

6

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

in Chicago, for 15 or 16 years, and he had known Darrow there for that time, and he was employed by Mr Darrow on the 27th day of April, employed and chosen and selected. After 15 or 16 years of acquaintance. John Harrington was selected by Mr Darrow as his investigator of evidence. Now. if they want to muddy these fellows up to any great extent -- you know they are mostly their men. Harrington was their man; Franklin vas their man; Old George Behm was their man; Cooney was their man; Fitzpatrick was their man; this old fellow Mayer was their man. I might name others, and I will as I go along. I am going to pick out these gentlemen, and I want more to discuss those than anything else. Now, you know Darrow came out to Los Angeles late in May, and as the record shows was associated in the prosecution of the case of the people vs. McNamara, as chief counsel. At that time the counsel was Rappaport, and I wish you would remember that name; Pappaport of Indianapolis, Scott, Davis, Harriman and Darrow. At that time Franklin first met Darrow, about the 1st of June. Now, let us go back to Chicago with Mr Darrow, where he met Biddinger, the man whom they say is not worthy of belief, and who is not honest. Now, if Biddinger hadn't been honest, you can see by this testimony, by the testimony even of Mr Darrow himself, what he could have made.

Probably \$500 at any rate, if he had not been an honest

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

officer. There is no doubt about that. So when a man puts aside the opportunity to make a big bunch of money like that and to make it easy, secretly, and get away

with it, what does that mean? 

What does it mean in life? It means that that man is honest; it means that he is honest simply because he wants to be honest, simply because honesty is his being and in his being. That is what it means. They have talked about Malcomb McLaren here. Old Mac is not very good to look at. maybe. He is not as handsome as some fellows, but he is one of God Almighty's noblest works, an honest man. How do I know he is an honest man? Gentlemen, every man who went through that fight with me in the District Attorney's office, with the shower of gold going around there, that I shall tell you about and show you, and come through that fight still my friend, still with access to the District Attorney's office, to go and come as he would, that man does not need to be proven an honest man. If Biddinger was worth \$5,000, what would Malcomb McLaren have been worth to Darrow if Malcomb McLaren had wanted to peddle his information, with the access that he has been shown here to have had to my office? I want to say to you gentlemen. McLaren has not been an issue; he has not been a witness, but I want to say and I want to say it so it will be remembered, that Malcomb McLaren has endeared himself to me by the traits of sterling honesty and integrity, by ties that will never be severed if I can help it, and if the time should ever come, as it did come that time, that I have to choose a companion to go out among a howling mob and fight for my life, when I know when I feel his back against my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that I would choose would be old McLaren. But, gentlemen, I have learned in the past year what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

common honesty is worth, as I never knew before, and I am going to talk more about that to you. An honest man. Honest men. It don't buy much. I suppose McLaren doesn't get very big wages. I don't remember what we paid for him, but he gets a wage that I would rather have than all the gold between heaven an earth, if the streets were paved 10 with it. He gets a wage that comes from in here (the heart), 11 that can enable him when he hears a knock at the door at the de 12 dead hour of night, jerk it open and say, "Who is there?"

13 And he is not afraid it is the sheriff. He gets the wage 14 of independence; the wage of the knowledge of honesty. 15 There is no bigger coward on earth than a crook. I don't 16 care what people say about me so much, if the wrong they 17 say my heart tells me is untrue. I can go home and go 18 to bed and sleep at night and get up and go to work inthe

19 morning, if the accusations are untrue, and get fat on it. 20 That is my little tribute to honesty. 21 There has been lots in this case that has not been honest 22 and it hasn't all been on one side or the other. I am

23 going to discuss this evidence as I see it, as I would talk 24 it over with you over the back yard fence, and give to it 25

the amount of weight that I think his testimony entitles 26 him, and say to you that this man Biddinger is honest. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY I say to you that a man who would turn an offer like that and go at once and report to his boss wont lie when he takes the witness stand. Why, a naturally honest man would undoubtedly tell the truth, unless he had some termific object to the contrary, and what object has Biddinger to lie? When he says that Darrow's bargain with him was not only to deliver him information about the crooked men in Darrow's own camp, but was to deliver to him the physical evidence that was going to be used to convict the McNamaras. That is what Biddinger says, and I believe when he says it that he is telling the truth. Why shouldn't he? What

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

and is interested in the rewards that are out for the apprehension of the other people who were involved in the Times

Dynamiting case, but that has got nothing to do with this
case and I hope to Heaven if there are any rewards out,
that he gets one of them. In fact, I would like to see

is it to him? He has shown himself to be honest, why

should he not tell the truth? He has gone; this is only

a case too him. It is true they say that he was interested

Now, let me give you his testimony. Biddinger states he met William Turner, a friend of Darrow's. Mr. Darrow said yesterday that he didn't remember whether Turner brought

everybody who has done honest work get some reward.

yesterday that he didn't remember whether Turner brought
Biddinger to Darrow or not. He may have. "Well, go

right--where did you go after you talked to Turner?"

This was in Chicago on the 5th of June. I am going back

and I want you gentlemen to remember this, and offed it age to get and said and said

tedious remember that we have been a long time at this and there is only one way we can solve this problem, and that is solve it by the testimony. If you get tired and find your head, as mine gets sometimes, is tired and you want to let up a while, say so and we will quit and we will take a recess, and don't hesitate to do it, because I know I have sat often and listened to a talk until after my head gets full and then they can go on for an hour and I don't get any more of it, and I suppose other people are the same.

So I want to call your attention to this testimony of

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Biddinger. "Now. Turner takes him in to the private room 2

in this hotel that was near Darrow's office, and 3

Turner says, 'I am going to leave you two men alone to 4

get together and talk things over', and Turner left the 5

room," and Biddinger further says, "Well, Mr Darrow asked 6

7 me what I knew" -- you will notice I am skipping the

questions -- "asked me what I knew about the case. I told 8

him a little of J.B. McNamaras' conversation", referring 9 to the conversation on the train. "He asked me if I had 10 made an affidavit to it, and I said, no, I hadn't." Well, 11

he said, "I wish you would forget it." He said, "For get 12 as much as you can. Don't do the boys any harm." He said, 13

"I am going down to Indianapolis tomorrow to see the boys

and get some money, and I will take care of you."

Remember that expression of Darrow's, "I will take care of you". Eack in Chicago on the 5th day of June, and here in Los Angeles given to Sam Browne on the 28th day of November -- "I will take care of you." It seems to permeate this man's mind and this man's moral nature, that men could be handled like chattels or someone would take

"I said, 'What do you mean by take care of me. He said, 'How would 5000 do.' I said, 'No, it is not mough,' and he said, 'You want to come to help me and I will

25 26 give you 5000, and I said, Well, I will see about it.

care of them, if somebody would buy them.

We were in the room about 15 minutes."

1

2

8

11

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

26

What does he do? He goes and reports that at once to

3 his chief -- not to William J. Burns, for William J.

4

Burns was in Europe, he didn't see Eurns for sometime

5 afterwards, but he went to the head of the agency in

6 Chicago. Now, did Darrow say at that time, "Youvant to

7 forget it? Have you made an affidavit to it? You want

to forget it?" Here is a witness, mark you, gentle-

9 man, this man Biddinger was a witness, an important wit-

10 ness, one of the ones who had made the arrest, one of

the ones who had come through on the train, one of the 12 ones who had heard the conversation, a police officer.

13 "Youvant to forget it." Gentlemen, you have heard so much 14

of crime and criminal talk here that it may be that athink 15 like that does not impress you. It may be that "vice is

a monster of so frightful a mein, that to be hated, needs

but to be seen, but seen too oft, familiar with her face, 18 we first endure, then pity, then -- forget about it!

19 But that is a crime, gentlemen -- to induce a witness, to 20

attempt to induce a witness to withhold or forget -- it is the same think -- true testimony.

Crime No.1.

Now. Mr Darrow is a capable, an able man. He knows that. He knows what that means. We have only one way of arriving at facts, and that is by witnesses, and if the integ-

rity of witnesses and jurymen can be town down, what have

Biddinger met him again in his office, and here is what occurred. It was about the same time, a few days after

the conversation in the Union Restaurant in Chicago. Turner was there, this man Turner, "Turner started in tell me how liberal Mr Darrow was with everybody in Idaho." Money -- money -- money!

1 Mand it was to my interest to go in with Darrow and help 2 him win this case. Now, Mr. Biddinger said", and so 3 forth. "So Turner told me that I was making a great mis-4 take not to be friendly with Darrow, not to do everything 5 I could for him; that he was the most liberal man inthe 6 world; that he gave one man up there in Idaho \$15,000 and 7 another \$10,000, and threw the money away like it was water 8 up around Idaho; I was making a great mistake by not 9 joining with him. And so I told him I would take the matter 10 under consideration." 11 So Turner starts in and tries to shake the money bags 12 this man Biddinger. Turner tells him, in order to induce 13 him, about the money, the ten or fifteen thousand dollars 14 that had been poured but to one man alone up in Idaho. 15 What does ten or fifteen thousand dollars mean to a poor 16 devil who is a samgeant of police, and if he has been for 17 ten or fifteen years, I expect he would be for ten years 18 more, and, to guess at it, a salary of about \$150 a month. 19 It means a home, it means a ranch, it means a beautiful 20 picture of quite a good deal of ease; it means temptation --21 temptation. Ah, gent'emen, I have always thought that that 22 part of the Saviour's prayer which said, "Lead me not into 23 temptation, " was the mightiest part of it. Lead me not 24 into temptation. And here we have this high minded man 25 tempting--tempting--even to put his construction on it--26 tempting; shaking the money at him, \$10,000 or \$15,000.

C

That Biddinger testifies was said in the presence of Mr.

Darrow. Why should Biddinger lie? What was his object?

What does he care? Weigh it. Is it true? Did Darrow

what does he care? Weigh it. Is it true? Did Darrow
say it? Ah, when you come to see all the rest of this

1

2

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

you will see now that it does not stand on one nor two nor ten men's word, but the same thread goes through it all;

money! Money! -- Money! Money! Money! The
friend of the laboring man, the friend of the labor

unions. Money! Money! Why, as I said, I will show you that this defendant is believes that money can do anything. Twice in Chicago, then, he committed a

crime, in these conversations with Biddinger, and I will

come again to Biddinger here in Los Angeles. But, let us

on the 18th day of June, along about a couple of weeks after that, he commits another crime in Chicago, of the same nature, with the same lack of moral sense, with the same lack of moral ideas, with the same idea that the courts were simply shambling places.

George Behm. Mr. Clerk, will you let me have the letter

that George Behm got from Darrow, please? Now, he has charged Behm. You nor I would place very much credit in George Behm's word, if it stood absolutely alone. He would have to tell us about what we thought the truth was or we would doubt it. You see, I am not defending George Behm.

Although there must be some good in George Behm; a

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

railroad engineer for years, running a railroad train, a passenger train, I believe, a responsible position, a man of some little means, with a little farm, a man who must

necessarily be of some ability.

But in view of the fact that he has admitted that he has sworn so many different ways, it is necessary that we should disregard any part of his testimony which does not match up with our ideas and with the rest of the case, and with our ideas of probability and possibility.

Now, if it were not for this letter written by Clarence Darrow on October 19 to George Behm in regard to this matter, George's testimony might need a much more careful scrutiny, but with this letter we have about everything that we want out of George Behm's testimony. The letter is a confirmation of the agreement of employment of

Behm to come to California, an agreement to pay him his expenses and the wages of his man, and all that sort of thing. He closes with: "I have full confidence in you, and that under no circumstances would I let you lose anything." Closes with the statement of confidence that Darrow has, as late as October, long after the Behm incident had passedinto history; had full confidence in Behm. Did he have confidence in Behm or was he afraid that if Behm got sore at him he could tell something which would damage him? Which was it? I do not care which. Either he did have confidence in him or else he was afraid to let him get away from him and he wanted to mollicoddle him into believing that he had confidence in him. Now, Behm, as I told you before, was the uncle -- I don't know whether it appears here as the favorite uncle, or whether

7879 any favorite uncle -- but, at any rate, the uncle of Ortie McManigal. You remember who Ortie McManigal was, and is, over here in the county jail. I am going to talk about him after a while Behm is sent for and goes to Darrow's office on the 18th day of June in Chicago -- not to his office, but to his house -- on Sunday, and there are present there Behm, Harrington, Mrs McManigal and Old Man McManigal, as I understand it, the father of Ortic McManigal. He is not here, so it makes no difference. Mrs McManigal has not been here, so you have not heard her testimony. But we have the testimony of Harrington and Behm, and the testimony of the defendant himself, and it does not differ a great deal. The most skillful man in the world -- and this defendant comes about as mar to that as anyone -endeavoring to avoid a dangerous circumstance in testimony, would not deny the whole conversation, would admit right up to the danger point, and then skip it, and thus, he would not contradict any more than it was absolutely necessary, and would not be contradicted any more than was absolutely necessary. Now, here is what Harrington testifies to -- and I am going to talk to you more after a while about Harrington. This is the conversation: Mr Darrow first asked Behm if he was a labor man and associated with unions. Behm said he was. He then asked him if his sympathies were with the unions and Behm, answered they were. He then asked him if he influence scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with Ortic McManigal. He said he did." "Influence with

Ortie McManigal." Influence, mind you. You remember Ortie McManigal was the witness whose name was on

the McNamara indictment, but turned states evidence. He was the man, as I will show you, that they felt had to get and they surely did try to get him. To do what? To swear falsely, to commit perjury. Do you suppose that Mr Darrow

ever had any doubt in his mind that Ortie McManigal's con-And don't you know that Mr Darrow knew fession was true? that the testimony or confession of Ortic McManigal was the God Almiahty's truth, and when he tried to get him to change that testimony, he was trying to get him to commit perjury?

"I was going to ask Behm, as Harrington swears, if he

had any influence with McManigal. Behm said he did.

Plw

. 2

Darrow asked Behm if he was willing to come out to Los

Angeles and interview McManigal and try and get him over
to the side of the defense."

That sounds like an innocent statement, to get a man to change sides. Change sides in a case, change sides in religion, change sides in society, anything of that

kind doesn't amount to much. But when you ask a witness to change sides, you ask him to commit perjury.

"Behm said he would be glad to go but he wasn't in financial condition to do so. Darrow said he would take care of that, that he would pay his expenses and look after a man to husband his farm while he was away, so Behm said under those conditions he would be in position to go at the end of the following week. Darrow stated there that

if McManigal should testify against the McNamaras that it would bring disgrace on him and his children and his family and his friends, and he told Behm that he could tell Mc Manigal that he would see he was well taken care of after

That is a direct sending of a bribe through Behm to McManigal, if it is true.

he got out, and that he would get a position in Chicago."

Now, we find that when Behm got here that is about the stuff that he handed to McManigal, according to his sworn testimony, and surely he would not swear to it if it

wasnit so. For, why should he? Why would he swear that he had committed this crime if he had not? Why would you say, "Yes, I stole a man's purse," when you didn't.

"So Mr. Darrow gives Behm \$100." Money again. Behm was

to start the following week, the following Sunday--that was practically the substance, and so forth.

Now, then, George Behm says he received a telegram at Portage, and he went up there, and he got there, and here is his testimony in regard to that event:

"Q--State, Mr. Behm, whether or not you had heard through public rumor and the public press and general noteriety that Ortic McManigal had made a comfession of the offenses with

which he was joinlty charged with the McNamaras, state

whether or not you had heard that and understood that at

So it was generally understood then at that time that
McManigal had made a confession, and Darrow knew what he had

said, and Behm says this:

"Mr. Darrow asked me if I was a union man. I told him I
was. He asked me what order I belonged to. I told him I

belonged to the Engineer's and the Fireman's both, and he wanted to know how it was that I could belong to both orders. I told him that I had belonged to the Engineers before the convention at Milwaukee, etc. " x x x x "He asked me if I would be willing to go out there and see What I could do with my nephew in regard to changing his testimony,

as he says, 'you have already read of the trouble that he is in. Q--Well, go ahead. A Well, I told him that I couldn't hardly leave home. I had to put in my crop that I had at home and he said 'Well,' he says, 'how long

would it take you to put in your crop?" That is true, that part of it Mr. Darrow admits -- "and he gave me \$100."

Darrow said, "George, do all you can with Offie out there to get him to come across. Well, I said, I can't do any

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

more than to go to him and tell him what you have told me.

what you will do for him, and we passed down the hall." On cross-examination, or on further examination, at any rate, he said. "Darrow told me at that meeting there that

if he, McManigal, came across, he would get to be a free man, that he would come back here to Chicago and he would see that he had a good job back here and that he would not be climbing around on buildings any more to make a

Ortie McManigal to refuse to testify for the state when they came to trial with the McNamaras? If it is, who was getting him to do it? Certainly it vas. Now, Mr Darrow, as I remember his testimony admits

living." Is that a bribe? Is that an inducement to get

practically all that except the incriminating part, and he says that he sent George Behm out here and paid him all that money in order that George Behm might take care of Mrs McManigal, and yet George Behm didn't come to California with Mrs McManigal at all, as the testimony shows. When George Behm got ready to come here to Los Angeles,

he went to Chicago and Mrs McManigal had already left with 23 Sadie McGuire, as her nurse and companion, and Behm came 24 alone; came alone, and not with Mrs McManigal. What 25 then, did he fome for? Here wehave the acknowledgment of 26 Mr Darrow that he was going to and had paid him. What did scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

10 or confession that he had given, and falsify in favor of 11 the McNamaras. Is that a crime? Yes, most assuredly it is 12 a crime to induce a witness to give false testimony, and

to be false to the truth, and go back on the testimony

he come for? Darrow says he came to help to be with Mrs

McManigal, yet we find Mrs McManigal here with a nurse

from Chicago by the name of Sadie McGuire, and we find

that Behm didn't come with her. Why, he same here for

but the one purpose it was claimed he came here, to cajole,

to coax to plead, to bribe, to beg, to induce, to threaten,

to force or do anything that the ingenuity of the devilish

mind could devise to get McManigal to be false to the state

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

does such a crime eminate from the brain of the high-minded man? Does it? And I am going to nail that thing down in this testimony before I finish with it, and show that

there is no doubt about what Behm was brought here for and who brought him. Why, Mr Darrow says that all he wanted was to find out what McManigal -- what the truth was from McManigal. Well, goodness gracious! There is his own client who could have told him what the truth was about what McManigal had testified to or had stated. Why did he have to go and get Behm to find out what the truth was from McManigal? Oh, no. no. The further proceedings

along that line show that the state had to fight every

step of the way against just this kind of damnable chicanery; just this kind of criminal action; fight for their very scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

going to commit perjury or be taken away from them, and this is only one little step. I noticed counsel most skillfully handled all the facts in this case. He took up the chain, link by link, and as he picked up a link he said to you, "Why, gentlemen, you would not convict a man No, of course you would not. Of course you on that." would not. And then they pick up another link and they say -- and they get your attention all grafted onto that one link, and they say, "You would not convict a man on that." Of course you would not. And they pick up another link and they go all through with it, and when they have got through they have shown you that you would not convict a man on any one of those links. Of course you would not, but put them all together. Put them all

lives, fight for what? Fight for the integrity of the

chance at unbribed witnesses; fight for a chance at un-

courts: fight for a chance at a square trial; fight for a

bribed jurors: fight for a chance for witnesses who are not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fore he left. Now, we will take up the criminal trail in California. Who does this man Behm go to when he comes to California? Does he go to Mrs McHanigal? He goes right to Darrow's office. "I came all alone from Chicago to Los Angeles, no one came with me." And he says, "When I

Now, I am going to transfer the scene to California.

Two times with Biddinger; in Chicago and one with Behm be-

together; that is what we must do.

I had anything in my grip, and I told him I had nothing more than my wearing apparel," and so forth. That is

got to Los Angeles -- Q -- Where did you go? A -- Well,

1

2

3

4

referring to Mr Darrow's office. I will go back.

"Q -- And then did you see Mr Darrow again before you

left the East? A -- I did not. Q -- And when you left on

the following Saturday, did anyone go with you? A -- No

sir. Q -- Was anyone with you on that trip? A -- No sir.

Q -- And then you got to Mr Darrow's office in the Higgins

Building on this evening on which you arrived there. State

whether or not you saw Mr Darrow? A -- I did. Q -- Do you

remember, then, of any talk with him that evening? A Noth-

11 12 13 14 ing in particular, only he says, 'You got her here all right. I says yes. And I asked him then about 15 what was in the valise." That is Behm's testimony. 16 Here is what Harrington says about the arrival of Behm 17 in Los Angeles. "A -- After you came to Los Angeles state 18 whether or not Mr Behm came here and you met him? A -- I 19 20 did. Q -- State whether or not Mr Darrow was in Los 21 Angeles at the time Mr Behm came here? A -- Yes sir.

Q -- Where did you have your office with reference to
Darrow's office," and so forth. "In the Higgins Building,"
and so forth. And then follows a conversation: "At the
time Behm came to Los Angeles had you any conversation with
Behm? A -- I had. Q -- Where was that first conversation

1 and who was present? A -- Mr Behm and myself and Darrow. Q -- What was the conversation? A -- It was with 2 3 reference to Behm calling at the county jail to see McManigal 4 Q -- About how many days after Behm had gotten her e was it? 5 A -- Within a few days, two or three days. Mr Darrow told 6 Behm to go to the county jail and see McManigal and to do 7 what he could to get him to come over to the side of the de-8 fense." That is the testimony of Harrington. Behm says. 9 "Q -- When was the next time after that first night that you m et Mr Darrow? " And he says, "It was the next or 10 11 the following morning at his office. Q -- Did you have 12 a conversation," and so forth. "Yes, he had a few words 13 about it. He asked me if I thought I could do anything with 14 him. I told him the only way I could do was to go over, 15 under his instructions, told him what he would do for him 16 and try to get him to come across. Q -- And who was pre-17 sent during that conversation, if anybody? A -- There 18 was nobody in the room when we had this talk. Q -- Then 19 state whether or not you saw Ortie McManigal?" and so forth. 20 Now, I am going to pass over this, or rather, I am going 21 to make a pause right here and call your attention to another 22 branch of the work that was going on at this same time, so 23 that we may take everything right along with us as we go. 24 This was June 29th, when Franklin next met Darrow in the 25 office of Job Harriman, and Darrow engaged Franklin at that

time to investigate the members of the grand jury in

9 10

wanted him to do and Franklin went to work on it.

fectly legitimate and proper; no complaint to make about

it, showing that the legitimate work was going on at the

same time but that underneath it all, this devilish, diabol-

ical attempt to defeat the laws and prevent the punishment

of guilty criminals was going on underneath, by the same

Parrow told him he wanted Franklin -- what he

session.

man and the same thing.

he had committed this crime with McManigal in the jail if he

had not. Now, mind you, if he had not. Assume that Behm only

25

went inthere and talked about the family affairs and talked about old times, and did not try to persuade him to swear falsely -- assume that. Can you figure any power in Heaven or earth that would induce him, Behm, to attempt to tell a lie and say that he was there committing a crime? Why should he? No, it is an admission against himself, is an admission against his interest. It is an admission that hurts him and that he would not make if he did not know that we knew it was true. Now, isn't that fair logic? If there is anything unfair about it I would like to know it. If Behm went in there--I will go over it again--and only talked about innocent things, no power on earth would ever have induced Behm to perjure himself here by saying that he had committed a crime there, if he had not. So we have got to believe that when Behm says he committed a crime there in trying to induce McManigal to change his testimony, that it is the truth. So surrounded and so understood, we have a right to dis-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

jail, and rely upon it, as long as he does not try to selfserve, as long as he does not try to avoid, as long as
he does not deny his wrong act.

This is the first meeting: "Well, we shook hands and
sat down at the table there, and we got to talking over
matters and I asked him how he expected to get out of this
trouble, and he told me he did not expect to get out of it;

cuss now the testimony of Behm as to what occurred in that

he was in it and in it right. He told me that he was guilty 1 of the deeds that were charged against him, and he was 2 caught right, and he was glad he was catched. He said 3 I am better off in here than I am out on the street", and 4 so forth. "And I asked him if he would allow me to talk 5 to him and give him a little advice that I thought I could 6 7 give him, and sort of strung him out, and so forth." So he goes on inthat conversation, and I will not go into 8 that ina great deal of detail; because I am going to take 9 up the next one; except down here, before he went out, he 10 says; "Now, I says, Ortie, it is going to be an awful dis-11 grace on you and your family, and your folks back home, if 12 you stick with this testimony that you have already given . 13 He said: I cannot help it. Uncle George, I have got to tell 14 the truth. I said: Darrow hassent me over here to see 15 you to get you to come across. He told me that if you 16 would allow him to come in here and have a talk with you that 17 he will make you a free man from all this trouble and all 18 that sort of stuff, and he will get you clear." Then 19 Behm says that he goes back and reports this to Darrow, and 20 he savs: "I have told McManigal; have done all I could. 21 I have talked to him and told him what you will do for him 22 if he will come across with his testimony and change it; 23 that they have nothing on him at all, only his testi-24

Did Behm think that up? "I told him that, I said,

mony ."

25

26.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

dont make any difference what he has already told; that could be changed. He did not need to swear to that. He 

could swear it was a falsehood. Well, we then kind of quit talking"--that is, Behm and Darrow--"kind of quit talking and walked out into the other room into Harriman's office, and Darrow followed him out there and then he said: "George, when you go back the next time you spring this on You tell him if he ever comes out of this case they will indict him back in Chicago of a murder trial." Spring 

that on him and see if he will come agross.

26.

Now, let's take the next visit. So he goes back the 1 next day, and he has another talk with this nephew. Now, 2 gentlemen, I want you to picture, if you can, the situa-3 tion over there at the county jail. Ortic McManigal, 4 the confessed dynamiter, tsick of his life of crime, 5 no doubt, resolved that at whatever cost he would tell 6 the truth; he would rid his soul; he would get right. 7 Shut up in jail behind the bars, justly so, but with a 8 9 firm resolution in his mind that he was going to do right. Gentlemen, I am a firm believer in the principle that the 10

right will triumph. That has been my motto through life. 11 12 I suppose I got it from Presbyterian ansestors, but I be-13 lieve that right will triumph, and that the right cannot be 14 defeated by chicanery or by the most glowing and dazzling 15 ability of any man or set of men. I believe that the simple 16 justice and the simple right is just as large and well-17 developed in the mind of a man who is not brilliant as it 18 is in a brilliant mind, and often more so. And here was 19 this poor devil, with his eye of hope fixed on the star 20 of right. All in God's world he had to cling to was the 21 little ray that shone, the ray of the star of right.

22

23

24

25

26

of the

Perhaps not a man of much education. Ah, gentlemen, I have learned some things in the last year about humanity. I have learned of the sterling integrity that is in the breasts of some poor and lowly, and of the damnable trickery that is in the minds and the hearts of some of the brilliant scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

the corner of his cage by his uncle, sent there, as this letter shows, on the pay of Clarence Darrow, backed up in

of our land. And here was this poor devil, caged up like

a rat in a trap, with no hope, except what might come to

him from the knowledge of having done right, backed up in

1

2

3

6

7

8

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

letter shows, on the pay of Clarence Darrow, backed up in a corner and talked to like this.

"So I was put into a room here, and he was fetched out of his cell into the room where I was. We shook hands together, and I got I my temper worked up a little about the

9 vay he was acting, so I began on him and I says. \*Ortie.\* 10 I says. You may think you are right, but you ain't. You 11 ain't got your abrains on the right side of your head." 12 I says. You want to get them in the fore part of your 13 head, and now do business for us. Now, ' I says, 'come 14 across and get on the side of the people that has helped 15 you along to where you were as a laboring man, the wages 16 that you have gained during the time that you have belong-17

you will never be a free man. I tried to show him and picture to him how well he could come across and go back on the words he had already sworn to before the court, and Mr Darrow would take care of him and make him a free man. That is mostly my conversation. "

Add that to the talk of the previous day about how Darrow would take him back into Chicago and how Darrow would

make him a big man, and get him a good job where he wouldn't

ed to these unions,' and I told him, I says, 'If you don't

bow down and do this damnable thing." God in Heaven,
gentlemen: And this devil from hell goes back and reports
to Darrow. Do you think that Darrow didn't know what he

was doing? Do you think that he was doing this, this

igno rant engineer, on his own hook? Darrow, as this let-

who sent him home -- Darrow, to whose offices he was going

every day -- do you think that Darrow didn't know? Ah,

tle boy, his little boy, that, so far as this testimony

shows, he has not seen yet, and he walks down the street

in view of that caged man, that man who had made up his

mind to do right, that man who had made up his mind to

take his stand on the side of decency and government, that

God, if there could be anything more -- he takes his lit-

ter shows, brought him here. Darrow, who paid him -- Darrow

have to climb the high buildings again. Go to hell

search its bottomless pit and bring forth the devil that

knows the most of torture and bring him up, horns, tail,

pitchfork and all, and let him get Ortie McManigal, the

ner and say, "If you don't come across, oh, if you don't

come across, if you don't swear to a lie, if you don't

get free. But oh, if you do, ah, take him up into the

repudiate all the decency that there is in your soul,

poor soul that wants to do right, let him back him in a cor-

why, we will get you on a murder charge, and you will never

high places and show him all the cities of the world, and

say. "All these and more will I give you if you will but

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7897

their hands against society; but the minute they turn and get on the right side, the torture. That is the man we are talking about. I am sorry that I got too much in earnest, for it doesn't do any good; it doesn't help you; it

is not logical. But that is the man we are talking about.

That is the kind of a man we are talking about, the man

yes, he wants to help them as long as they with arms in

dog loves its whelp -- he takes that child and comes down

on the street, and McManigal, "Oh, George, bring the boy

God! And then he comes here to you and asks for mercy.

What mercy? What mercy? Ah, gentlemen, gentlemen, there

is a God in Heaven. There is an idea of decency and right-

there were no other just cause for the punishment of this

man than even his only permitting of this fellow Behm to

go there with his damnable torture, then I say to you, he

Ah, this man of humanity; this man of sorrow; this man

who believes so in his fellow man, he wants to help them --

should be made to feel that there is a God in Israel.

eousness in the breasts of the American people. And if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

up -- bring the boy up. "

that believes that you and I and every man in God's Christen dom, as I believe this testimony shows, has got his price, or his weakness, that he can be pulled here and there and made to do what is wrong.

Gentlemen, I stand for a clean and decent and fair adscanned by LALAWLIBRARY

ministration of the law. I ask for nothing more.

Mrs Caplan. They said we would not want Mrs Caplan.

They said we could not have used her. They said she had 

been hounded around by the Burns' men up in San Francisco--

and what kind of testimony did you get that idea from? 

It was the testimony of Johannsen, the fellow that took her out of the state, the fellow that, when he got her across

the border line, sent a telegram back -- to whom? under Heaven would you report to? would you send your tele-

gram to, after you had accomplished an act? Why, to the one that sent you to do it.

They say that we could not use Mrs Caplan. Well, we differ, and we had her subpoensed and three days, two days, one day, I think, after she was subpoenaed -- mark you, not before she was subpoenaed, not a month afterwards, not a month before,

but immediately after she is subpoenaed by the state, out

in the night, down through the hills and the hollows and the valleys, and out through the mountains and along the river,

she goes in an automobile, secretly and clandestinely. Why didn't she take the train, if her trip was a fair one, if she wanted to dodge Burns's men? Let me say to you that

the evidence that the Burns, were bothering her is so small that I am justified in telling you that it is all rot. She was down in the mountains with her friend, down in the mountains near San Jose with her friend, when the subpoena

is served on her. Wark you, we can't serve a subpoena until after a case is set for trial, and as the record here shows but a few days before that the Toase had been set for trial, and immediately, post haste goes an agent of the state to subpoena Mrs. Caplan. They say we couldn't use They say they have got an instruction that a wife that instruction. It doesn't apply in this case and has

16 cannot testify against her husband. I have no quarrel with 17 18 nothing to do with this. I don't know whether the instruction 19 Abe given or not--I don't care, except that it would 20 encumber the record. We were trying Brice; 21 McNamara. We were not trying her husband. There/many 22 things that she could have sworn to about Brice, even if she 23

were the wife of Caphan -- and you have no absolute knowledge of that fact. But assuming that she was his wife,

25 26

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

7900 She was not Brice's wife. Now, who took her away? took her away, and why and why? Here was a case that had been pending for several months in which she might be considered as a witness. Immediately after she is subpoenaed as a witness, bang! They grab her, and away she goes. Why? Why, for the same reason they tried to get Biddinger; for the same reason they tried to get McManigal; for the same reason they took Diekelman out of the way, and I will come to that later. And when Johannsen crosses the line into Nevada, he sends a telegram, there is no dispute about it. On the first or second of August he sent a telegram To who? To the man who had charge of the evidence for Darrow, John R Harrington. Harrington is probably trying to put his best foot forward when he says he didn't know anything about it, but they knew mighty well that parrington would report that to Darrow as soon as he got back. The telegram came in code that Darrow had arranged, and the first word in that prearranged code is "Flora Caplan." The letter for Flora was "A", and the telegram was a congratulatory telegram: "Florais fine; all on train." Just as soon as they got over the line. Why didn't they send

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

26

it back at some station where they stopped over night? 22 Why didn't they send it back at Sacramento? Why didn't they 23 send it back where they stayed over night before they got to 24 Reno? Well, they waited until they got across the line and 25 then comes back a message, and then to who? Back to the confidential agent of Clarence Darrow. Why, I am not claiming that the hands of all of these agents of his were clean.

The hands cannot be clean when the head is foul, but it is

The hands cannot be clean when the head is foul, but it is the head we are tracing it up to now, and so another of the state's witnesses is gotten. They had been working on McManigam--off goes Mrs. Caplan. You remember what a farce and folderol and foolishness there habout this man

McManigan--off goes Mrs. Caplan. You remember what a was farce and folderol and foolishness there about this man Tveitmoe and Johannsen, and how he denied--and how Mr. Rogers goes out and couldn't be in the court room because

Tveitmoe and Johannsen, and how he denied—and how MroRogers goes out and couldnot be in the court room because
his ethics and all that stuff couldnot stand for it;
because it would hurt his ethical soul to see this man
Johannsen testify on his side, because he didnot like Johannsen; had been examining Johannsen before in another
capacity, and had been interested in another capacity, and
all that sort of rot, so they forced us against our objection to interrupt our case in order that Tveitmoe and
Johannsen might be put on the stand to tell about taking
Flora Caplan away.

Johannsen might be put on the stand to tell about flora Caplan away.

19
20

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 Well, I am a modest man, and I do not claim any particulc 2 lar credit, but we were loaded for Johannsen, and when we 3 got through with Johannsen they had had about enough of that 4 incident, and they quit, and then -- Ah, gentlemen, that 5 looked bad -- that looked bad . They had made their big blare 6 of trumpets here, and they were going to put those two 7 men on to explain the high and mighty purposes of Tveitmoe 8 and Johannsen. How did they climb out of the hole? 9 The way to keep the other fellow from hitting you is to hit 10 him just as hard as you can. The wanto keep you gentlemen 11 of the jury from thinking much about why Tveitmoe was not 12 put on the stand is to raise a big hallabaloo about why we 13 didnit put him on the stand and to explain to you all 14 this, that and the other, that he was indicted, and all 15 that . Well, well, let it go for what it is worth. , don't 16 care. All we wanted out of Johannsen we got, and that 17 was the telegram, a confirmation of the telegram. As soon 18 as he got across the line he reported to Darrow. If they 19 had put Tveitmoe on we would have gotten something out of 20 him that would have looked a whole lot different, I imagine, 21 from his grand jury testimony, about where the rest of that 22 \$10,000 was. You know they read a part of his grand jury testimony given some months before about the \$10,000, but 23 24 we would have liked to have crossexamined Mr. Tveitmoe a 25little bit about that \$10,000 and asked him where it was 26 now.

1 MR. APPEL. We assign the statement of the District Attorney, 2 that if we had put Mr. Tweitmoe on the stand he would have got 3 a statement against us or prejudicial to us, and different 4 from the testimony given before the grand jury, and ask the 5 court now to instruct the jury to pay no attention to such 6 a statement as that, as there is no evidence here upon which 7 he can base that statement. On the contrary, we demanded 8 of them the testimony that he gave before the grand jury, 9 for the purpose--10 MR . FREDERICKS. I object to the court making any such 11 instruction, because I am deducing this conclusion from 12 facts already in evidence, and I am not making a statement 13 or deduction except from the facts inevidence. 14 THE COURT. The assignment is noted and the jury is instructed 15 that they are to disregard any testimony that counsel for 16 the People imagines might have been developed from the 17 lips of Mr. Tweitmoe had he gone onthe stand. 18 MR . FORD. Do I understand your Honor's instruction to be 19 that we cannot draw conclusions from that? 20 THE COURT. It is directed in reference to the statement 21 by the District Attorney that he imagines that had Mr. 22 Tveitmoe taken the stand such testimony would have been 23 produced, as a conclusion not warranted from any evidence 24 in this case. 25 MR . FREDERICKS  $^{\circ}$  I do not agree with the court in that at  $_{\parallel}$ 

all. I think that is an absolute restriction that is im-

proper, but it is the court's ruling and I will take it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

14

19

24

25

26

And, gentlemen of the jury, then remember that Tveitmoe did not testify about anything here before you, pure and spotless, and we still, gentlemen, would like to know where that \$10,000 is that Tveitmoe has. We still would like to know, if it was intended to be used as Mr. Darrow says, to pay some of the expenses of the investigation, or the

defense that Mr. Tweitmoe had been to inthe past-we would like to know why in the name of Heaven he got big bills to do it with. Wewould like to know why some of those bills,

at any rate, were thousand dollar bills, and I will show

you there is evidence of that the banker said they were.

13

14 If, as Mr. parrow says, the \$10,000 was to be given to Mr.

Tveitmoe to pay for expenses--which, believe me, Rogers says

he had put Tveitmoe to--1 have often wondered why God

Almighty had to be on earth while Rogers was around, but

17 l suppose the Lord likes to take a holiday once in a while,
18 and so Rogers was toddled in as a deputy runner of the

universe. But these bills-these bills, these thousand dollar bills and five hundred dollar bills, just like the

according to Mr. Darrow, went for the purpose of paying
little debts, accumulated and to accumulate, by Mr. Tveitmoe.

ones that you saw here taken from Franklin, these bills,

Much of the defense was going on in San Francisco. They needed money to meet the defense in San Francisco. There were bills to be run; automobiles to be paid for, probably,

- and witnesses to be seen, and their wages paid to them while they were away from their work, and all those little
- things needed to be attended to. So they get some thousand dollar bills and some five hundred dollar bills, and they 4
- take them away. Do they put them down in a callar, down 5 in a vault, or did Darrow bring them back to Los Angeles 6
- with him, as he told John Harrington? Why, that confirms 7
- John Harrington absolutely. 8 MR . APPEL. We challenge the District Attorney to show

1

2

3

9

12

18

where Harrington swore that there was a thousand dollar 10 bill in that. 11

MR . FREDERICKS · I will show you . I will guarantee to show

- you. 13 MR APPEL. Show it now. 14
- MR. FORD. I do not think counsel has a right to challenge 15 counsel --16
- MR . FREDERICKS. Oh, let him challenge me. 17
  - MR. APPEL. It is a misstatement, and I will assign it as
- I will give him the page of that witness who 19
- said time and time again that he did not think that there 20 w as a thousand dollar bill in it, and that he told the 21
- District Attorney outside when he testified that there 22
- was not. 23
- THE COURT. The error has been assigned. 24
- MR. FREDERICKS That is not so. 25 assignment THE COURT. 26 The/ is in the record . The District

1 Attorney may proceed. 2 MR. FREDERICKS. There will be time in the morning to get 3 that, just as we got the other a while ago. I wont take 4 up your time now. I will get it for you in the morning. 5 I find one place here inthe testimony of Mr. Hunt, page 2630 6 that Hunt says, "Check Number 30 for \$10,000 was paid to 7 him by Cleveland Dam, with a request for large bills. The 8 check was deposited and went through." That is one of them. 9 I am not going to stop for it now. Targe bills, so we 10 do not have a quarrel about that; large bills. My memory 11 is that he said thousand dollar bills. I will bring it in 12 the morning. If it was only \$500, all right; but large 13 \$500--1 am sure he said that. Now, let's see: 14 That is the money, gentlemen, that Franklin got. There is 15 no doubt inthe world about it. The explanation about it, 16 gentlemen, is so absurd that it shows that, at any rate, they 17 have not told the truth about the explanation, because if 18 that was intended to be used for that purpose, for the 19 purpose which Mr. Darrow says he gave it to him, why did he 20 get large bills? Tveitmoe had a bank account. He paid 21 for the automobile that took wrs. Caplan over the hills, 22 with a check, as the testimony shows. So there was an expense 23

of running a witness out of the country, one of the expenses

that Tveitmoe was put to by the def ense.

24

25

26

Paid by Tveitmoe, and if they had any others that were any more crooked than that, so that they didn't dare give

anything that was any more crooked than this getting this witness, under subpoena, out of the state, and they were willing to chance a check on that. No, no, gentlemen, that is all nonsense. That money came down here with

checks for them. I wonder what they were. If they had

that is all nonsense. That money came down here with Clarence Darrow, and it could not-MR APPEL: We are very sorry to interrupt the District

Attorney, but, please, Mr Fredericks, I don't like to interrupt you, but, your Honor, the Caplan matter was the last days of July and the first days of August.

MR FREDERICKS: I understand all that.

14 MR APPEL: The \$10,000 check -15 MR FREDERICKS: Was after that.
16 MR APPEL: September 2nd.

1

2

3

8

9

MR APPEL: September 2nd.

MR FREDERICKS: It was after that. There is no question about that. That is not the point I am making at all.

The point I am making is this: that if he was willing,
why did he put this in a safety deposit box or the cellar
or somewhere else, instead of depositing it in the bank and
drawing checks on it when he wanted to use it, if it was

to be used for legitimate purposes, and I say -
MR APPEL: I again say, your Honor, there is no evidence

he put it in a cellar or safety deposit box.

MR FREDERICKS: He took it away from him, and I believe

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

3 MR APPEL: No sir. I have a right -- your Honor, there isn't a bit of evidence here where Mr Tveitmoe put that 4 5 money in a safety deposit box. We asked them to produce

you are trying to interrupt me just simply to break up my

1

2

11

13

14

15

16

17

argument.

6 the testimony or to put Tveitmoe on the stand and they 7 didn't dare to. 8 THE COURT: You have assigned your error, Mr Appel. 9 MR APPEL: He cannot point his finger at me and say that

10 I am doing this for an improper purpose, and I begged his pardon, and I asked him to pardon me for having to inter-12 rupt him. MR FREDERICKS: All right.

MR APPEL: He must not assign to me any trickery, your Honor. I didn't want to do it. I wanted to treat him with respect. MR FREDERICKS: Do it, then.

18 MR APPEL: I did ask you to pardon me, and I am very 19 sorry to have to interrupt him. 20 THE COURT: Gentlemen --21 MR APPEL: I say, your Honor, I assign his statement as 22 unjustified by the evidence here, that Mr Tveitmoe put any 23 money anywhere.

24 THE COURT: The assignment is noted in the record. 25 MR APPEL: They don't dare to produce the testimony. 26 THE COURT: Just a moment. I am going to instruct the

told him that he got it and got it from Tveitmoe's bank. 6 7 No evidence that it came down with Clarence Darrow? That is the evidence, and I draw the conclusion that it never 8 9 did get into any safety deposit box. I am not claiming it did, but I would naturally be the only thing they could 10 11 claim that did happen to it, if Darrow didn't get it, 12 and I am remirded that they did claim that in their chinand-13 gan about trying to get some testimony given by Tveitmoe 14 before the grand jury here in evidence. It was such a 15 palpable attempt to evade the putting on of the witness 16 that I didn't pay much attention to it, and I don't care

much about it, but there was something of that kind brought

is instructed that if counsel for the People go beyond

Clarence Darrow! John Harrington says Clarence Darrow

MR FREDERICKS: There is no evidence that it came down with

the evidence, they are to disregard it.

1

2

3

4

5

17

18

19

20

21 THE COURT: The assignment is noted.

22 MR FREDERICKS: I remark it does hurt.

23 MR APHEL: I again assign that as error and misconduct on

out before you. So much for the \$10,000 that seems to

When you talk about 10,000 --

MR APPHL: We assign that as error.

- 23 MR APHEL: I again assign that as error and misconduct on his part.
- 25 THE COURT: The assignment is noted. The District Attorney will proceed.

(Jury admonished. Recess until August 16, 1912, at 10 A.M.)

1

3

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

20

21

22

26

Defendant in court with counsel. Jury called: All pre-Argument resumed. sent.

THE COURT. You may proceed. Mr. Fredericks.

MR. FREDERICKS. Gentlemen, I am going to try to grind

through this grist just as judiciously as I can. I want

to ask you -- I hardly think I need to ask you, but I want

to ask you, however, to weigh carefully this testimony in regard to other offenses. In my judgment it is very

10 important. I want you to weigh each instance as it goes 11 along, and to make up your mind as to whether you think 12

my position or the position of the witnesses for the state 13 are true. Whether you think the defendant did those 14 things, as we go along, because if you don't, when it comes

to the end, you will not have made up your mind on each

16 one of those things and you will have to make a run and 17 a jump at it, and that is the reason why I have taken

18 these things one at a time, trying to digest each one and 19 make up our minds on that and pass.

It is important for you to know that when the 28th day of November came, that the defendant in this case was a man who had a plan and a custom of doing this sort of thing.

It is important for you to know that, and you don't want 23 to guess at it, and you want to know that, and you want to 24 be sure of it, because as I told you in the beginning, 25

there is no use of talking to intelligent men about anybody

else having been interested in trying to bribe this jury. except some of the attorneys who were in court actually passing on the question of whether the man was going to sit or not. It is utter folly to assume for one moment that any one else could have been wasting their good money, not knowing whether, finally, when the man that was bought, came into the jury box, whether the defendants' attorneys, not knowing anything about the arrangement, should throw him out. That is utter folly. That is against all reason. So I say to you the matter narrows itself down to some one of those attorneys who must have been handling the money. And as I told you in the beginning they said that the prosecution had intimated that if there was any local attorneys Franklin needn't turn them up. Gentlemen, I don't believe anything of the kind, and this evidence here does not show anything of the kind, and. as I go on and discuss this evidence and try to discuss it fairly, you will see that we are not shielding any one of the attorneys in this city. They have told you that Mr. Davis is a friend or was a friend of mine, and I tell you that if he is or if he was my own brother, in my judgment it would make not one particle of difference, except that it might make my heart more sad and my duty more onerous, and that is all, and that is exactly the way you would look at it as jurors, with your oath and your sworn duty to the state.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

I claim no monument to my virtue in that regard, for I claim that every honest citizen would look at the thing in just that way .

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 Now, as I said in the beginning. I am going to try and 2 discuss these witnesses and their testimony fairly. I don't think that all the witnesses who have appeared on the 3 other side of this case have sworn falsely, and I am not 4 sure that all of the witnesses who have appeared on our side 5 of the case have told all the truth. I am going to try to 6 7 look each one square in the face and slough off what does 8 not appear to be right and leave what appears to be true. 9 I don't think that all these newspaper boys who came here 10 and swore to statements that they said Franklin had made 11 at the time that he. Franklin, was in the toils in defense 12 of Parrow. I don't think those men committed wilful perjury. 13 I don't think any of them did. Neither do I think that 14 Mr Franklin committed wilful perjury when he said he didn't 15 say those things. As to whether he said them or whether 16 he did not say them, is a matter of very little importance. 17 As a matter of fact, if I were building a case I would pre-18 fer that Franklin had said those things, that Franklin had 19 admitted that he said those things at those times. 20 that is just the attitude that his whole conduct shows 21 he was taking, the attitude of standing between Darrow and 22 the law, the attitude of protecting the man that gave him 23 the money. That was the attitude that he was taking. His 24 whole course was filled with that. And what folly it 25 would be for us to permit him to deny it and deny that he 26 said these things, when, as a matter of fact, his whole

conduct showed that that was his attitude and the whole case is built on the idea that that was his attitude.

1

2

3

26

But I believe that Franklin believes that he did not say those things to the newspaper men, and I think that

4 say those things to the newspaper men, and I think that 5 the newspaper men believe that he did, and I think that 6 Franklin, in that technical way of answering that he has, 7 led them to believe that he was saying them, when probably 8 he felt that he was not saying them. But it makes no dif-9 ference one way or the other. I think it is true that if 10 he had said anything on the subject at that time he would 11 have said that Darrow had nothing to do with it. 12 Now, I do think that this testimony shows beyond a doubt that those Venice witnesses were perjurers and were not

13 14 telling the truth. You notice how skillfully they are 15 tucked away -- I wonder if I can find them -- in among 16 the newspaper men. Here is one of them here. Here is 17 a newspaper man. Here is another one away up here, and 18 here is another man, and I don't know wheth the other 19 one is, but he is tucked away somewhere. The three of 20 them are not put together. They were not put on the stand 21 together, either. The idea was to mix them in, those 22

men who made the statement impeaching Franklin at another
time, at a time when Franklin had plead guilty, at a time
when Franklin had been before the grand jury, at a time
when Franklin had confessed. That is a different propo-

sition altogether. That is an entirely different story,

not attempt to judge him. We all know Silver Dick. Silver Dick said that Franklin said he was going to win that case, and that there was an angle to it that the attorneys didn't know anything about. And so there was.

and I do not believe they spoke the truth. As to whether

What did the attorneys know about what he was doing? 1 No, no one of them knew, in my judgment, even what he was 2 trying to do, except Darrow, and Darrow did not know the 3 details of it. He did not tell Darrow every street corner 4 that he turned, and every angle that he twisted; he did 5 6 not tell Darrow all these things. He was out doing this job, and Darrow was furnishing the money, and he was fur-7 nishing the brains and ingenuity, and taking a part of the 8 risk. But I do not believe, and I have thought a long time 9 over this, gentlemen, you can well be assured, as to whether 10 Davis knew about this or not. And I am a going to refer 11 to that later. But you can well be assured that I have 12 thought of it and thought of it long and carefully, and 13 that I would not charge my fellow man with the commission 14 or the knowledge of a crime unless I have good grounds to 15 base it on. I would be just as careful of the man I suspect, 16 unless I felt I knew, as I would be of the man against whom 17 I have no suspicion. But I will talk about Mr. Davis later. 18 I think that Mr. Wolfe was simply a cry of Wolfe, Wolfe, 19 when there was no Wolffe. That is all there is to it. 20 And that this other man, this man whose reputation was not 21 strong enough here in the city to make a very great im-22 pression on the citizenship, I take it. We are limited to 23 three witnesses that his reputation was bad--bad--bad!--24 Hawley was his name, and I will talk about him later. I do 25 not think he told the truth. I do not think Wolfe told

the truth, and I do not think these three fellows at Venice told the truth.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Now, we will come to a discussion of the testimony of the defendant himself. I have always maintained, and I maintain now, that the testimony of a defendant in his own behalf helps the jury mighty little, for this reason: If he intended to plead guilty, if he intended to admit his crime, he would not be on trial; he would have plead guilty. But if he intends to deny his crime and fight, and try to beat the case, his testimony is going to be just the same, whether he is guilty or whether he is innocent, for if he is innocent he is going to say I did not do it, isn't he, and if he is guilty he is going to say, I did not do it? Whether he is guilty or whether he is guilty, he is going to say the same thing, I did not do it. And if he is wise and skill ful and has had years of experience, he is going to say that I did not do it. whether he did it or whether he did not, in such a skilful way that you cannot look back of his eyes and tell whether he is telling the truth or not. I know there are people who claim they can look at a man's face and tell whether he is telling the truth or not. I have been looking in men's faces for years and trying to determine that question, and perhaps in 7 out of 10 you can make a fair guess. But in the other three you cannot tell anything about it -- you cannot tell anything about it. They can look just as innocent when they are guilty. Take a woman like Mrs. Bain or a man like old Bob Bain, and set him down

and catechize him or her for a while, you could probably 

see how their mind was working. Take a man like Clarence 

Darrow, and set him down and catechize him for a while, you couldn't tell, if he wanted to deceive you, whether he 

was doing it or not. That is simply a matter of skill and experience. Now, as I said before, I want to ask you to pay close attention to these other crimes, to these evidences 

of other crimes, so that you will feel when we have gone through with them that they are proven. We talked to you about Behm, George Behm yesterday.

1 About his actions here with McManigal, about what he was 2 trying to get McManigal to do and why and who brought him 3 I made an incident out of that and then went on to 4 San Francisco and took up the Caplan matter. You remember 5 the testimony shows that Harrington had been up there dur-6 ing the time that Behm was down here with McNanigal in 7 jail. 8 Now, I am going tack here and I am trying to take these 9 things chronologically so you will see, week by week 10 and month by month theterfificbattle at the state was being 11 put up against here. Now, I am going back to the incident of 12 Behm before the grand jury, and I want to discuss that a little while. I am not going to take up your time with 13 14 reading the questions that were asked him. You remember he 15 was brought before the grand jury -- I am using a copy 16 here, but it will be found to be correct with that intro-17 duced in evidence. 18 The 31st day of July was the day he was brought before 19 the grand jury. Why? Now, the state is not a suppine 20 and a weak and powerless thing. It is organized to fight 21 the battles of society. It is organized for the purpose 22 of protecting society against crime and criminals, and 23 to do so it has proper and legitimate weapons put into its 24 hands for that purpose, and the grand jury is one of them. 25 Now, it is fair to assume that after the three or four at-26 tempts that Behm had made on McManigal, that after Behm

1 had valked by the jail there and McManigal had shaken the

2 bars of his cell at the sight of seeing him walking down the

street with his boy that he wanted to see, it is well that
you can imagine, that you can conclude, rather, that Mc-

Manigal had told the state all these things; that McManigal had told the state officers of what was being done, and it

6 had told the state officers of what was being done, and it 7 is fair that you could conclude that no man under God's

8 Heaven was caldulated to withstand forever such tempta9 tions, such importunity as that, and it is well that you

could assume that the state was then compelled to act and
to act in a proper manner through its proper officers,
the grand jury, and bring this man Behm before the grand jur
to account for what he had been doing, and to stop it, and

so Behm is brought before the grand jury.

14

15

16

17

18

26

Now, if Behm had been brought out here by the defendant, as he says, for the sole purpose of being a nurse or the care-taker of Mrs McManigal, and if his visits to the county jail had only been the courteous visit of an uncle to a newhew, there would have been no reason under Heaven

to a nephew, there would have been no reason under Heaven
why Behm should not have answered the grand jury's every
question, would there? "Yes, I went over and talked to
McManigal. Yes. We talked about the old home folks. Yes,
we talked about the old days, and how we used to pitch hay
and all that sort of thing. Yes, we talked about the
friends and relatives and told the whole thing." No

reason in the world, but what does he do? As this record

shows you, that has been introduced here, when he is 1 haled before that grand jury he refused to answer as to 2 what he had been doing over there with wcManigal. He re-3 fused to answer as to who brought him out here. He refused 4 to answer as to why he was brought out here. He refused 5 to answer all questions. Why, gentlemen, that at once 6 brands him as having done just exactly what his testimony 7 now shows he did do. Trying to induce Ortic McManigal to 8 commit perjury, but the teeth are not all gone out of the 9 weapons of the state, so he is cited for contempt of 10 court to compel him to answer these lawful and proper 11 questions, and then he is up against it. Then, he has 12 got to talk. 13 Now, gentlemen. I claim that no honest man in an honest 14 transaction need fear to talk about that transaction to 15 the grand jury at any time. I am not afraid of the grand 16 jury; you are not a fraid of the grand jury. Let them bring 17 you before the grand jury. Let them bring me before the 18 grand jury and ask me what I did on such a day and ask me 19 20 what you did on such a day and such a day and such a day. 21 You have no fear; your actions have been honest, and if you can refresh your memory you will tell them; why not? 22 23 But he would not tell them what he had been doing over there 24 with wcManigal. He would not tell them who brought him 25 out here. So the list of questions are put in an affidavit

and served on him, which he takes, and he is ordered to come

into court and answer those questions or show cause why he should not. 

7924 1 And then he is up against it. Then he has got to frame some-2 thing. I am not going into all the ramifications of this 3 question. You remember there was a big book of them. But 4 the salient part of it is this. He denied, when he was 5 next brought before the grand jury and compelled to answer, 6 he denied that he had tried to induce McManigal to change 7 his testimony and to come over onto the side of the defense. He denied that he had tried to get McManigal to commit

8 9 perjury. Why, then, does he now come here and admit that 10 he did try to get him to commit perjury, unless that is the 11 If it is true that he did not try to get McManigal truth? 12 to commit perjury, if that is what happened, if that is the 13 truth, why would he not stick to it? Why should he not stay with it? Why should he stultify his soul by coming

14 15 in and admitting to you and admitting to the world that he 16 committed perjury, if he did not? 17 Now, as to who got him to commit that perjury, the defendant 18 says that if he is guilty of that then LeCompte Davis is 19 also guilty of it. Well, so mote it he. He says so. 20 I say that he is guilty of it, and if the defendant says 21 if he is guilty of it LeCompte Davis is also guilty of it, 22that is a matter that will be or can be and should be and 23 probably has been--1 don't know, attended to, or will be 24 attended to; at any rate, it is not before the court now, 25 and it is not before you now. Le Compte Davis certainly 26 has not been spared exposure in this matter, and if there scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 is technical evidence sufficient to bring about the arrest 2 and the prosecution of LeCompte Davis for that offense, then 3. that should be done. But it is not being done now. That 4 is not what we are discussing now. It is a very subtle 5 and easy thing for one man in the toils to say, "Well, there 6 is another fellow who did the same thing, and you can't 7 punish me. I ddd it-yes, and he did it, but if you are not 8 going to punish him you can't punish me." Well, we are 9 not trying even Darrow for that crime. We are simply showing 10 it as one of the criminal acts which he committed in this 11 long conspiracy to defeat justice. 12 So much for the grand jury episode here with Behm. And 13 then Behm goes back. Behm goes back. After the grand 14 jury got through with Behm he thought it was about time to 15 quit that sort of thing, and Behm goes back to railroading. 16 He goes back. And after he has been back a long time he 17 tries to get his money, what he claims is his due, out of 18 the defendant for bringing him here, and he says the defendant 19 doesn; t give it to him. He says the defendant holds it out 20 on him. We can't go into that matter and thresh that 21 out. Behm has as good a right to believe that Darrow did 22 not pay him enough as Darrow has to say that he did pay him 23 enough. At any rate, Darrow wrote him this letter, dated

october 19th: "Mr. Harrington handed me your letter, and I

do not understand how you can get at your result. You are

24

25

26

right in saying that we figured on \$451, which should cover scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

etc." And then he ends up: "Of course, you know that

know how hard up we are, etc."

month or so after.

you came, and gave you \$251 when you left, and sent you \$100].

I have full confidence in you and that under no circumstances

would I letyou lose anything that was your due. You also

After Behm had been before that grand jury and had

you think he went back and told Darrow what he had said to

the grand jury? Maybe he didn't--maybe he didn't. But, as

reasonable men, as reasonable men, don't you suppose he went

back and told Darrow that he had denied/all, and that Darrow

denied to them what he was doing with McManigal, don't

writes him and says: "You have my full confidence," a

Now, there was a lagal and a proper side to this Roc-1 tor Jekyl and Mr Hide game. Let us see about this time 2 what was being done out in the open, as it were. It was 3 not really in the open, but proper and legitimate. 4 On August 9, which was about this time. Franklin at 5 Darrow's office is employed by Darrow to investigate mem-6 bers of the trial jury. You remember he had been employed 7 less than a month before to investigate the members of the 8 grand jury, which was then in session. Darrow said he 9 wanted to find out the apparent, age, religion, national-10 ity, feeling toward union labor, opinion in regard to the 11 Times explosion, guilt of the McNamaras, financial condi-12 tion, and so forth, of each one of the 1600 or 1700 names 13 in the jury box. Now, I am not making any particular quar-14 rel with him for that. That was out in the open. That 15 vas not specially improper, and I make no claim that it 16 That is what Franklin was hired to do, mind you, and 17 he was hired to do it by Darrow, and he was paid by Dar-18 row, and he reported to Darrow and to others, but he re-1920 ported to Darrow. That is a big job, the investigation of 1600 men. It means, as you have seen by testimony here, 21 22 the going out and finding out by asking a man's neighbor whether he is infavor of union labor, or whether he has 2324 ever said anything against Union labor; it means finding 25 out whether he had an opinion as to how the Times was blown up, and all that. One man could probably run around 26

see more. But probably he would be able to see less.

So you see it is a big job to see 1500 men. That being on the 9th of August, and the trial opening on the 11th or

1

11

12

12th of October, that was a big job. Franklin undertook
the job and went to work at it. That is the job that
brings Franklin in touch with the jury. In that job he
looksover the list day by day and week by week, and he
scans them, and he finds out the ones that he knows among
them, and so Franklin was employed and working in that

field and so far as this testimony shows, and so far as

I will claim, working honestly and committing no crime

Now, let us have another little instance. Let us
drop back. Let us have another little instance that
happens in August. Let us see if there was a week went
by that this man was not committing some crime in this
case -- that this defendant was not committing some crime
in this case in order to defeat justice.

case -- that this man was not committing some crime in this
case -- that this defendant was not committing some crime
in this case in order to defeat justice.

Biddinger comes to California. Biddinger, the man whom
this testimony shows, if it shows anything under God's
Heaven, the man whom this testimony shows to be an honest
man -- Biddinger comes to California and meets Darrow, and
he had talked with him tack in Chicago; he meets him
down in the Alexandria hotel, whether by his appointment
or Darrow's I don't remember, and it makes no difference,

"Q -- Now, when you met Mr Darrow here in Los Angeles 3 4 on the 15th of August, what time of the day was it you met him first? A -- About 8 o'clock in the morning. Q -- At 5 6 the time you met him here in the Alexandria, who was pre-7 sent? A -- Just Mr Darrow and myself. He wanted to know 8 what evidence we had against the McNamaras, and where the 9 evidence was kept, and whether I had been able to get hold 10 of any evidence for him." 11 Get hold of any evidence. What do you mean by evidence?

so far as I know. What transpired? Let Biddinger tell

1

2

21

it.

12 Why, you mean the thingsthat are admitted in evidence. 13 That was asked him afterwards. The things that weread-14 mitted in evidence, the books, clocks and the keys, and all 15 that sort of thing. That is called evidence. 16 "I told him that I had the keys that I had taken off of 17 J. J. McNamara when I searched him at police headquarters 18 in Indianapolis; they were the same duplicates of keys 19 McNamara had when he had been arrested in Detroit." 20 That is Brice. "He says, 'That is a damned strong piece

22 I said, 'I have already got hold of it. I have hold of 23 27 or 28 hotel registers. I have one register where J.J. 24 McNamara signed for his brother, as J. B. Brice, at a road-25 house outside of Indianapolis at a dinner, and J.J.McNamaras 26own hand writing. He said, 'Can you get hold of that?' scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

of evidence against him. I wish you could get hold of that!

says, 'yes.' He asked me how I would get possession of 1 or get hold of it and I said I was the only one Mr Burns 2 would trust, and he was going to send me out. He wanted 3 to know if I could not a rrange for a couple of his boys to 4 hit me on the head when I got on the train and take it 5 away from me.. I said, 'I will see. I will let you know 6 when I am going out with the evidence. He said, I 7 will bring up some money tomorrow.' I said, 'All right, 8 how much will you bring?' And he says, 'I will bring 9 down \$1000. So we parted and made an appointment to 10 meet at 8 o'clock." 11 Now, is Biddinger manufacturing that? Let us look it 12 square in the face. Let us not sidetrack it, let us not 13 dodge it. Is Biddinger manufacturing that, or did Darrow 14 say it? Were those keys damned important evidence? Was 15 that register showing the two McNamaras registered togeth er 16 one of them under the name of Brice, the name that he had 17 committed this crime under -- was that important evidence? 18 And did Darrow want it? And did he want to destroy it, 19 or get it away from the prosecution? Biddinger says he 20 did. Biddinger swears he did. Now, why? Why would not 21 Biddinger go on about his business back in Chicago, or 22 wherever it may be, and attend to his business and live his 23 life, and all that sort of thing, and not come out here, 24 away to California and swear to a lie? What for? What in-25 ducement? If you haven't seen that Biddinger is an hon-26

2 Do you suppose it would take any stretch of the imagina-3 tion for you to imagine that the prosecution prized those 4

stance. Darrow wanted to get possession of those things.

1

22

23

24

25

26

things? Why, not for our gain; nothing to us as men, but 5 as officers of the state, don't you know how much they 6 meant to us? Don't you know how much they meant to him if 7 we did not have them? He says right there in that connec-8 tion. "I will bring you down some money tomorrow." 9 that was getting awfully close -- that was getting awfully 10

good. He promised \$1000. But the next day, being care-11 ful, and not stingy, but just careful, he brings him down 12 \$500 and tries that on him. Now, Biddinger did not have 13 to tell anybody, did he, about this conversation with Dar-14 row? Biddinger did not ever have to fill his end of the 15 bargain. Couldn't Biddinger -- I will leave it to you --16 17 couldn't Biddinger have taken that 500, good, hard dollars and slipped it down in his vest pocket and gone on working 18 for Burns, gone on working for the prosecution, said noth-19 20 ing about it and told Darrow, "Well, I cannot do it; they 21 are watching me too close", or something; "I cannot do it",

and keep that \$500? \$500 is good: \$500 is worth \$500 and \$500 feels good if it is honest, in the pocket in any man. And if this fellow had wanted to be dishonest, if there was one yellow streak in him anywhere, if there was one crooked hair in his head, he would have kept that scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

and Darrow cross-examines him after that, after Darrow had
given him the \$500 and Eiddinger starts in to swearing about
the conversation with the McNamaras and about the keys,
and all that sort of stuff.

or anybody else, and he would have kept that same \$200 that

he got up there, and he would string this man Darrow along

a little further, because Dafrow could never have told it.

Darrow could never have told it. Darrow would have to kept

it to himself. And, mark you. Biddinger would not have

and given him testimony. And suppose -- ah, suppose Mr

Biddinger comes and takes the stand in the McNamara case

betrayed the state, either. Biddinger could have gone on

you \$500? What is the matter with you? " Or would Darrow
have done the other thing? No, No. That 500 or \$700 was
Biddinger's to have and to hold and to keep, if he wanted to

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

be just the least bit shady. He could have had it without intentionally violating the law, perhaps, if he had not intended to deliver the goods to this defendant, and yet

Why. Darrow would have stood there taking in anything he

said. Darrow would not dare get up and say, "Didn't I give

Biddinger would not be just a little bit shady. I want to tell you, my friend, there is in the human soul and the human heart a prevailing influence of honesty in most of us, nearly all of us, and we wont do these things. I know some people cannot understand that. They cannot understand that.

is not honest is to show
They think that all they have got to show that a man, that he

had a chance to steal. Well, there is many a chance to steal that comes that nobody knows anything about. There is many a chance to be crooked that comes that nobody knows anything about, and a man don't ask any credit for turning it down.

Why, you turn it down because it is in your nature to turn it down. You turn it down because you are built that way.

You turn it down because God Almighty made you in his own image, in knowledge, righteousness and truth, and you have not departed from it. That is why you turn it down, and that is why Biddinger turned it down, and when Biddinger turned that down he wrote across the sky, where every man could see it for all time, his record and his reputation and

7934 1 his character for honesty, and I say to you when Biddinger 2 comes here and states to you that this man wanted/to give 3 him, the defendant, these important pieces of evidence, and 4 that he was trying to buy them, that he committed a crime, 5 one of these series of crimes that shows the character of the 6 man; that shows that he believes that every man has his 7 price.

8 MR . ROGERS. Just a moment. I trust I am right in saying 9 that your Honor will instruct the jury that all evidence 10 of so-called other offenses, if so they may be denominated, 11 are not allowed to go before this jury to show the character 12 of the defendant.

MR . FREDERICKS. That is correct, I understand the point.

14 MR. ROGERS. And I think counsel ought not to argue that it 15 does show his character. 16 THE COURT. Captain Fredericks says he understands the point 17 MR. FREDERICKS. Counsel is correct, that is the law. That

13

18 is the purpose of it, the purpose of introducing this evidence 19 is to show that this defendant was engaged in a system, and 20 that this is a part of the system, not, of course, to show 21 his character, that can be only shown by calling witnesses 22 and say what is his reputation, is it good or bad? It is 23 Why? But you get my idea just the same. You get the 24 idea just the same. The man who would do this with Biddinger this is a link; this is a part; this is the power of 2526 Money that he was using systematically. This shows that

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

the core of the idea, and all, and it shows it so plain that
you don't need Franklin to tell you when he is caught down
there on the street with \$4,000 by the bribing a jury man, it
shows it so plain that this is another step in this system,
that you don't need Franklin to tell you that Darrow is the

his system was born of the blood, that all men had their

price. This shows the system existed; this shows the plan,

1

2

26

man that did that. Why, you know it just as well as you

know a link in the chain, when you have seen a dozen other

links all along the line-
MR · ROGERS · Rardon me, but as his statement is a reiteration

of his former statement, that you could deduce from the fact
a man, perchance, might have committed other offenses, he
is likely to have committed another one. I don't think a
man could draw any other conclusion from his statements.
He has just told me he knows what the law is, and I think he
ought not to argue that, as the court has just said he would

18 instruct the jury they cannot draw that deduction. 19 MR. FREDERICKS. Now, counsel cannot make an argument. If he 20 wants to take an exception, take it. 21 THE COURT. Do you wish to take an exception? 22 MR . ROGERS. Yes, I do note an exception. I call your 23 Honor's attention to the fact that your Honor has an in-24 struction of which I have just spoken. 25THE COURT. Yes, sir; under Captain Fredericks' avowal, if

he has made any statement, it is an inadvertence, and the

- 1 jury are instructed to disregard it.
- 2 MR . FREDERICKS . I am now talking inside of those instruc-
- 3 tions that you are going to read. The court will instruct
- 4 you as to the purposes of the introduction of the evidence
- 5 of other crimes. Well, the court doesn't need to imstruct
- 6 you in that; your good sense will tell you what the pur-
- 7 pose is, and what it is and what it means.
- 8 Now, then, do you see any system, do you see any similarity
- 9 do you see anything in the Biddinger incident that looks
- 10 like all the other incidents? Step by step we will go along
- 11 until, I say to you, when, we are through, you would think a 12
- man was an insane man, you would think Franklin was an 13 insane man or a liar, you would not believe him for a
- 14 minute, if you tried to put this job off on any one else.
- 15 Now, so much for that. is Biddinger an honest man?
- 16
- Was Darrow trying to bribe him? Oh, the power of memory is 17
- a weak thread. It wont stand the weight of very many 18 green backs hung on it. How easy it is to forget just what
- 19 the conversation was, if your forgettor is plastered over
- 20 with hundred dollar bills! How easy it is to forget!
- 21 I wonder, if Biddinger had been what Darrow thoughthe was,
- 22 I wonder where the state would have gotten off when they put
- 23 dependence in Biddinger? I wonder what his testimony would 24 have looked like after he had through the mill with Darrow
- for a month or so. I wonder what it would have looked like. 26 Why, they say to you that old Bob Bain said he didn,t intend-

8 with every piece of testimony that the prosecution put in. 9 He would pick the flaw in it. And with every piece of 10 testimony that the defense put in he would have glossed it 11 over and made it look good and swallowed it. And when he 12 got through Bob Bain, if the defendant himself, McNamara, 13 had taken the stand, and admitted his guilt, old Bob would 14 have still thought he was lying and that there was some 15 trick about it. It is like some people nowadays, they 16 have said that they don't believe the McNamaras blew up 17 the Times -- they think it was blown up by gas -- even after they 18 have plead guilty. You could no more have made a witness 19 out of Biddimer under those circumstances than you could 20 have made an honest juror out of Bain under those circum-21 stances. That is why we must have men when they take their 22place in the box who have no predilections, /no opinions, 23 whose minds are fair, who have no prejudice, whose minds 24 are unbiased, who are not trying to pick a hole here or 25 fill a hole there, but who will patiently look at all the 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

that if the evidence showed that the defendant was guilty

money. Do you suppose that any prosecution under Heaven

would have seen a doubt? Why, he would have started into

that investigation with the idea of picking a flaw, a fault,

those circumstances? Don't you think that old Bob

he was going to find him guilty even though he did take the

could ever have made Bob Bainthink the defendant guilty under

1

2

3

4

5

6

7938 1 evidence that comes in and weigh it without prejudice, 2 without feeling and without fear. 3 I made some reference yesterday to the \$10,000 episode 4 and Mr. Appel did not quite agree with me on what the testimony 5 was -- and that is not to be wondered at. Now, he was right, 6 and I was right. He was wrong and I was wrong; but I 7 think that between the two of us he was a little more right 8 than I was about the \$10,000. I am going to make this 9 admission, because I must quote this testimony right to 10 you. My memory is only the memory of a man, and while I 11 think I have a good memory for testimony, a remarkably good 12 memory for testimony for some reason or other, still I may

memory for testimony for some reason or other, still I may

not get it right. Now, I thought there was something in

here about that thousand dollar bill, and I will tell you

what it was. Here is what it was. It was a question

asked of Mr. Ledeme, the cashier. It will be found in the

transcript, Volume 33, page 2652. "Q--What kind of money?

A--In large bills. That is, bills of fifties, hundreds,

five hundreds, to the best of my recollection. There may have

been thousands, but I wouldn't be certain."

21

22

23

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Tweitmoe had asked him to reemburse him for money that he had already expended, and Darrow says, "I told him I couldn't do it at that time, that I hadn't the money, but

I would do what I could when the money came in to war-

There is the testimony -- "There may have been thousands

but I wouldn't be certain." I knew I had the impression;

of thousands. Now. Fr parrow attempts to make an innocent

transaction of this; but, oh, what a sorry attempt it is

even for such an able man as he is. I will tell you.

gentlemen, when you start in to manufacture something to

fit in with the truth, you have got a job cut out for you

timony of Mr Darrow in that regard. Mr Darrow said that

that takes an able man to fill. Now, you remember the tes-

rant it. I was in San Francisco and gave him one of these checks for \$10,000. He asked me to give it to him on the money he had expended."

Further along he says: "I told him" -- Tveitmoe -- "that he could take this and it could be used for the purposes of this case" -- that is, the McNamara case -- "whatever investigation was needed there, or expense of witnesses was needed there, or if we had to maintain witnesses preceding the trial and during the trial, and that if I could get any more he should have it, etc".

That is the purpose which Mr Darrow says he gave this

money to Tveitmoe for. Let's see what Mr Hunt says. Mr

Hunt was one of the bankers. Hunt says: "Check No.30, scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

A -- At my window. Mr Hunt came to my window and Mr

Tveitmoe handed me this check and asked me if I had

So it is undisputed that this man Tveitmoe was re-

Mr Ledeone says, "Q -- At what place did you meet him?

bills. "

\$10,000 in big bills."

state my testimony in full.

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

21

22

23

24

25

26

questing big bills. And he says, "Ledeone says, ' I paid 11 him in large bills, that is, bills of fifties, hundreds, 12 five-hundreds' to the best of my recollection. There may 13 have been thousands, but I wouldn't be certain." 14

are talking about just now, we will say five-hundreds. Now, 17 what good would five-hundreds, a bunch of five-hundreds, be 18 to Tveitmoe, under the circumstances shown here in the tes-19 timony of the defendant? 20MR DARROW: May I interrupt you a moment? You didn't

the thousands." So, for the purposes of this that we

Big bills! Now, he says, "I wouldn't be certain of

MR FREDERICKS: I don't have to state it in full. I read what I wanted. I stated it fairly. MR DARROW: Oh, no. MR FREDERICKS: yes, I did. You make your objection.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

MR APPEL: The testimony of the cashi er was that there was

fifties and hundreds and five-hundreds and there may have

been thousands, but he wouldn't be certain. 3

MR FREDERICKS: That is what I read. 4

MR APPEL: The testimony of Mr Darrow should be fully 5

stated, or substantially in full. I don't wish to inter-

MR DARROW: I take an exception to that.

MR DARROW: I vant him to add the further statement which

he will find right there, that if there was any left he

could apply it on what he had already expended himself.

MR FREDERICKS: That is what I read -- that is all there

is. You can take your exception, and I don't believe it

MR FREDERICKS: I do not think the objection is made in

good faith, because it does not differ materially from

what I said. It is just exactly what I have said. It

does not add to and does not detract one iota from what

going to do with five-hundreds in the settling of his

I have said. There may have been thousands. There were

five-hundreds, and I want to say to you, what was Tveitmoe

little bills there for witnesses and one thing and another?

rupt counsel, but it is an important point, and your Honor will be kind enough to pardon us for the interruption.

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

is in good faith.

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Gentlemen, that is the money that we have got right

here in court, if there is any dependence in human testimony

or human judgment, and when Ledemes said. "There may have

been thousands, there was at least one thousand, and that

one thousand is the one thousand that the clerk has got in his envelope right now. Why, gentlemen, how do you suppose -- stretch your imagination a while now and use your judgment, and how do you suppose the District Attorney knew where to go to find

that this defendant had cashed a check for \$10,000 and that bills had been taken out for it? How do you suppose, with all the thousands of banks that there are in the United States and up and down this coast are accessible to the

to go to find that fact? Why, to start out without some knowledge would be just exactly like looking for a needle in a hay stack. is it not a fair argument to say to you

defendant in this case? How do you suppose we knew where

that you should remember what John Harrington said when he 18 said, "I told the prosecution just about Christmas time that 19 Darrow told me he got this money out of Tveitmoe's bank." 20 MR. APPEL. We take exception to that. There is no 21

evidence that John Harrington ever said he told the prosecution that.

THE COURT. The objection will be noted. The jury will remember the testimony. I think, Captain, Fredericks,

this is a good time for the morning recess. scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

25 26

22

23

1

C

- 3 THE COURT. You may proceed. Captain Fredericks.
- 4 MR. FREDERICKS. Just at recess I had stated that the

- 5 e vidence here shows that John Harrington about Christmas

- 6 time told for the first time the prosecution about Darrow's
- 7 having told him that he got this money, \$10,000. I think
- it was, from Tveitmoe's bank in San Francisco. Counsel for 8
- the defense said that that was not the evidence. I say that 9
- it is the evidence, and you will remember. You will remem-10
- ber that Harrington testified that after he had finished 11
- 12 his work for Darrow and quit and started back to Chicago] that he was stopped in Albuquerque by a United States grand
- 13 jury subpoena and brought back here, and he says that when he 14
- was brought back here that time is the time when he told 15
- that Darrow had told him about getting the money from 16 Tveitmoe's bank in San Francisco. Now, then, the very fact
- 17
- that we are able to go to that bank and find such a check and 18 find that cash had been taken out, doesn't that show that 19
- when John warrington tells you that Darrow tried to feel 20
- him out on this proposition, and told him he had \$10,000 21
- from Tveitmoe's bank, doesn't that show that John Harrington 22
- told the truth? Why, just as plain as reason; just as 23 clear as the crystal sunlight. It shows that John R 24 Harrington, what little he did know about that, told it,
- 25 and what he told was the truth. It is in evidence here 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

that these checks were gotten by the Indianapolis grand jury

2 by having this man Morrison, who issued the checks, brought 3 from washington City to Indianapolis, and there he was 4

made to turn over these checks and this check book to the United States grand jury at Indianapolis, and that is the

5 6 way it came here.

1

14

17

21

7 MR. DARROW. I object to that statement, your Honor. There 8 is no such evidence. 9 MR . FREDERICKS . That is the evidence. Take your exception 10 and let it go at that.

11 MR . DARROW. There is no evidence in this case to that effect 12 It was from John Harrington's statement --13 THE COURT. You object to the statement and assign it as

error, do you? 15 MR . DARROW. Yes. 16 MR . FREDERICKS · I object to counsel being permitted to make

an argument at this time. He has had three days. 18 THE COURT. There will be no argument. 19 MR · FREDERICKS · That is argument, your Honor, and I do not 20 want to be interrupted this way. They have had three daysd.

22 the interruption. 23 MR . DARROW That is what I was trying to do. 24 MR. FREDERICKS. Then let them quit this matter of arguing.

If they wish to corredt me on any point, I gladly welcome

25 I say to you that it is a conclusion that any reasonable 26 man would draw, that when John warrington says in evidence

here, told this prosecution that Darrow had told him where this money came from, that it is a matter—and it is also in evidence that this man Morrison was brought before the grand jury at Indianapolis—it is a matter of fair deduction that it was done at the request of the District Attorney's office here to get possession of that check. That is not a statement of testimony; that is a deduction from testimony, and it is a fair and reasonable one.

I say to you that this testimony shows that there is no way on God's green earth that we could have found out what bank to look in. Why, that check, when it came into the hands of the authorities in Indianapolis, looked just like

hands of the authorities in Indianapolis, looked just like any other check. It was a check for \$10,000. We would have been running all over the earth. No, gentlemen, it shows that John Harrington spoke the truth, and that John warrington gave an honest statement, and it shows that John Harrington, whatever may have been his faults or ethics, whatever may have been his timidity of manner and cowardice, as counsel says, whatever it may have been, it shows that John Harrington has got some honesty in his carcass. It shows that John Harrington will not be a party to jury bribing.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

That is what it shows. It shows that John Harrington will not protect a man in bribing a jury, even though he has eater and slept under his roof. And I maintain, gentlemen, that that is nothing against John Harrington. I maintain that it is the duty which a man owes to the state to reveal. Why, if John Harrington had wanted to lie about this, if John Harrington had wanted to tell a lie, if he had wanted to implicate this defendant wrongfully and untruthfully, don't you believe he would have had a do zen different statements out of him? Don't you believe he would have had them every day in the year? Don't you believe he would have come down here with two statements, incriminating statements, one way tack in September and another on the morning of the 28th. Don't you believe he would have come in here and had Darrow say, "yes, I gave Franklin that money"? Don't you believe he would have come in here if he had been untruthful, if he had wanted to soak Darrow, don't you believe he would have told a lie that would have stung harder than the ones he told? Why, gentlemen, the very smooth and the very decency, the very lack of roughness, the very lack of an attempt to hurt in his t estimony shows that what there is of it is the truth, and I don't care what they may say about John Harrington. Mr Darrow says he was a coward. In wonder if he lærned that Marrington was a coward when Harrington was arrested on contempt of court and brought up here on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

charge of temponing with a without T wondon if them Ham

1

2

3

4

charge of tampering with a witness? I wonder if then Harrington refused to go on with the job? I wonder if then

that occurred? I wonder if that is how and why Mr Darrow says Mr Harrington is a coward?

Well, gentlemen, some people may say it is sowardice to refuse to violate the laws of the state, and others may give other reasons for a man refusing to violate the laws of the state, and I am not going to say that a man who does not goout and commit a crime is a coward, and that is

the only reason why men fommit crime, not in a thousand years.

Now, I want to talk to you about Dickelman. In re-

Now, I want to talk to you about Dickelman. In re-13 gard to other offenses, and you may use them and you may 14 consider them. The court will instruct you that testi-15 mony has been introduced by the prosecution, which it is 16 claimed to show the commission of other criminal acts. 17 or offenses by the defendant, similar to those charged in 18 the indictment. I charge you that this evidence as to the 19 commission of other offenses by the defendant was admitted 20 for the sole purpose of proving guilty intent, motive, guilty

21 knowledge, scheme or system of criminal action or design or
22 plan on the part of the defendant. And it is to be consider23 ed by you for that purpose.
24 MR DARROW: I want to take an exception to reading an in-

struction to the jury.

THE COURT: The exception will be noted. Let me have the

instruction.

1

2

3

4

16

17

22

MR FREDERICKS: That is just my copy. I am through with it.

THE COURT: The exception will be noted.

5 MR FREDERICKS: Now, then, how are you going to consider 6 these other offenses? Oh, the defense would like to dis-7 abuse your minds altogether of the idea of these other 8 offenses. The defense would like to have you forget about 9 these other offenses, but, gentlemen, you cannot forget about 10 them. They are part and parcel off this great case. They 11 show the system, thedesign, the intent, the guilty knowledge

12 of this defendant. 13 Now, let's take Dickelman matter. They say that in 14 this case if Darrow is guilty, then LeCompte Davis is 15 guilty, but let us see. I hold no brief for LeCompte Davis

and I shall not spare him, neither shall I unjustly accuse

him. Let us see. Whose brother-in-law went to Albuquer-

No. But if it

18 que? Davis'? No. When Dickelman is taken out of Albuquer-19 que and back to Chicago, to whose office is he taken? 20 Davis'? No. Whose friends does he meet back there? 21

Nockels and Hammerssrom. Davis'?

would show for one instant that LeCompte Davis had done not for one moment, not for one instant. Why should I?

23 the criminal acts in this matter I would not shield him, 24 25 I think more of my own peace of mind, of my own knowledge of 26 an honest attempt to do my duty. I think more of my own

at nights, than I do of the friendship of anybody, for I
have got to live with myself, and if I take a canker in my
conscience and try to carry it around with me, it will

composure, and the fact that I can go home and sleep

conscience and try to carry it around with me, it will
drive me to misery sooner or later. Put it on that selfish ground, if youvant. It is a selfish ground, but I
will not sheild any man in the commission of crime, no mat-

Dickelman. You remember Dickelman as he came on the stand here. Not a very strong-looking fellow. A hotel clerk. Testifies that he was the hotel clerk in the Baltimore hotel here in Los Angeles

Baltimore hotel here in Los Angeles
13

ter what I think of him. Why should I.

the Times was blown up, who identified the signature of the 2 man who was taken over to jail here when J B McNamara 3 was arrested, and asked whether that was the man, and they 4 say he didn't identify him. I say he did. Here is what 5 he said: "Q State whether or not -- " quoting from volume 6 20, page 1576: "Q State Whether or not you informed the 7 District Attorney after you had seen J B McNamara over in the 8 county jail, that he was the same man whom you had seen 9 on the night or the day previous to the Times explosion 10 at the Hotel Baltimore here in Los Angeles? A Why. I 11 identified him almost as positively as I could under the 12 circumstances." And again over on transcript 21, 1572, 13 he said: "I told him, (Hammerstrom) it certainly looked 14 like the man." That was Hammerstrom back in Chicago. 15 Now, gentlemen, a case is not built up by one Witness. 16 This man identifies the signature. This man said, I 17 believe, practically -- I believe this McNamara is the man. 18 Now, suppose -- suppose that he was the only link that we 19 had to connect McNamara with his presence here in Los 20 Angeles? Suppose that signature down there on the hotel 21 register was the only thing to connect McNamara, the man 22 we had in jail, and show he was in Los Angeles when the 23 Times was blown up? What is this little hotel clerk worth? 24 Now, gentlemen, the state cannot keep a hotel and keep 25 witnesses from June until away along in the fall. 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

who registered a man by the name of J B Brice on the night

38

must go along about their business and earn their living. and as soon as the case is set they were put under subpoena, but the testimony in this case shows that before this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

26

case was set and before Diekelman could be put under subpoent he had been taken out of the state. Not surreptitiously, not trying to get away from us. He testified that he was

communicating right along with the District Attorney and telling him where he was, and that he was agreeing that

he would be here, and all that sort of thing. Now, gentlemen, if Biddinger was worth \$500 or \$5000 to parrow, what do you think little Diekelman was worth to him? Do you think that it was not a pretty good thing that little Diekelman should be left alone; that little

Diekelman should be in a position where he could not be How did we know how much temptation little Diekeltempted? man could stand?

22 25 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY And finally he goes to Albuquerque, and they say here that

a Burns man appeared in Albuquerque. They say he was there on another matter. They say they found out afterwards

he was there on a smuggling business. That is the tes-4 timony. But assume that he was there, as they would have 5

1

2

3

6

7

8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

you assume -- assume he was there watching this little witness, keeping his eye on him, why, Dickelman says he never knew he was a Furns man, he never knew he was watching him, he never knew anything about his connections or his

9 intentions. That is what Dickelman says in his testimony. 10 Now, you have got little Dickelman down in Albuquerque--11 the man above all men -- why, gentlemen, what was he worth 12 to them, if they were willing to do those things? And 13 remember, it is but fair to assume that in September, 14 when the Dickelman matter came along, the prosecution knew

tion knew of the Biddinger matter, that the prosecution knew of Mrs Caplan's flight, and assume then, if you will, that the prosecution must have been on their guard, and that the prosecution must have known of the dangerous position it was in with regard to this witness. Now, Dickel-

man goes down there, and Mr Darrow says that he wanted

to send down there and interview Dickelman to find out

of the Beim matter, George Behm matter, that the prosecu-

whether Brice was the man that as down at the hotel. 24 Ah, he says that Hammerstromuas to find out whether 25 Brice was the man that was down at the hotel. 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

- here in the county jail, Brice vas Darrow's client.
- 1 2 It seems to me it would have been a much shorter route
- 3 for Mr Darrow to have asked Brice whether he was really
- 4 down there or not. Ah, no, that is not what they wanted.
- 5 Let me show you how this testimony reads.
- 6 Well, Dickelman didn't understand it all, and yet
- 7 the little fellow appears to be honest, appeared to feel 8 that there was something wrong about it, although he did
- 9 want to take the bait, although he did take the bait to a
- 10 certain extent, although he did go to Chicago and not 11 here to Los Angeles, where the case was ontrial, not in
- 13 Ah, gentlemen, what was the action of the prosecution? 14 George Home testified that he went back to Chicago and

12

Chicago.

- 15 that he brought Dickelman back, not to Kansas City, not to 16 Pittsburg, not to New York, but he brought him back to
- 17 Los Angeles County, where the prosecution wanted him.
- 18 And Let me tell you, you can well imagine that it was a
- 19 pretty good piece of work for Mr Home under the circumstance: 20
- without a subpoena, to get Dickelman back, and it shows 21 that Dickelman had wakened up to the situation that he
- 22 vas in back there in Chicago. They were putting men 23
- around him, in rooms around him, he says, to keep people 24 from bothering him. Ah, Mr Dickelman, you are lucky --
- 25 you are a lucky dog -- that you came back to Los Angeles 26 to testify! scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

to locate you, and we finally got word where you were through your mother up in San Francisco. So he told me that I was practically on their side of the case, and that I was really their witness, and if I hadn't been subpecnaed

You know these people don't come right out and hit you on the head with a club. They are nice and delicate and gentle, and they simply slide you over on their side.

And there is a big restaurant in Chicago that needs a

that I would never be wanted by the state --

manager;

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

6 here, old man; we don,t want you to testify with the other 7 fellows. We will give you a job. Come on with us." 8 No they have got to coash him along, smooth him along, 9 get him along, but get him. With all thy getting, get him. 10 "Because I was not their witness, so I told him I didn't 11 know about that. I told him I promised to appear there, and 12 promised Mr. Fredericks that I would be there, and they said 13 they wanted me, and he asked me if I had been subpoenaed, and 14 7 said No, at the time, and he said, well, they will never 15 call you. I will have towait and see. And he says, I under 16 stand from your folks that you intend going to Chicago 17 shortly, and so he asked me how I would like to take the 18 trip. And so he goes on. Itptakes time to read it all. 19 I thought I would read it to you. Let me give you a little

restaurant business, just as an indication of the methods

Restaurants in Chicago. I said Yes. He said, 'Well, I

think Mr. Darrow is interested in that, ' and he said, 'How

would you like to be assistant manager in that? I said it

would be pretty nice, but I did not think I could hold it

"He said, Hammerstrom, he asked me if I knew the Rectors

of this high minded defendant.

and Darrow has lots of influence with the unions and the

restaurants there, and you would just be the man to be the

manager of that big restaurant, Mr. Diekelman. You are our

Of course, you cannot go at a stranget and say, "Come

witness, Mr. Diekelman, and not the witness of the state.

1

2

3

4

5

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

C

it is too big a job for me. He said, 'Well, we can fix that all right. I said, I didn't think I would care to try it.

1

2

3

- 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

26

So he asked me if I would not like to consider going with him to Chicago, if I had any objection to going. I told

4 5 him I would like to have him wait a few weeks, and, I said, 'You can go to Chicago and if I find I am not wanted 6 7 1 can come on your side then, if 1 am favorable to your

side. " Diekelman didn, t know what a valuable witness he was.

"'Well, it is a matter we are in a big hurry about," says Hammerstrom, 'and I am up here, and I have got to get through with you so if you can give me an answer I want you to come with me. I have to go to Chicago and come back on important business.' So I told him I would not consider anything at that time; I would wait."

at tos Angeles and tells him about this; and Bibby comes in on the scene, and then they offer him \$30 a week, and they gave him the first dollar. \$30 a week whether he worked or whether he did not work, and they gave him the first 30.

And then he sends a telegram to the District Attorney

Oh, they gave him the money to come back to Los Angeles with 21 --oh, sure. But you know he testified he did not use it to 22 come back to Los Angeles with and I hope he has got it yet. 23 They gave him money. Money! Oh, money! I almost 24 hate it since I have been through the experiences of that

case, and I want to tell you I almost hate it.

Why, money!

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

And they took little Diekelman back to Chicago, this high minded man, who only wants to do what is right for the poor'workingman, he takes little Diekelman back to Chicago, 5 and George Home of Los Angeles, of the Los Angeles City 6 Detective Department has to go back there to get him, and

as good luck would have it for all of us, he got him. And then a telegram goes along the line. Cooney goes back east with instructions to tell Hammerstrom: "Do not come

back to Los Angeles for a while; do not come back until

this blows over." Why, if there was nothing wrong about it -- why not come back to Los Angeles? Why not? No, no; it is just one part and parcel of the whole thing from beginning to end. I could talk to you about that Diekelman business for

an hour and tell you something interesting every minute of it, as it is brought out here in the testimony, I have no doubt. But you remember it . I do not need to take your time on it. You remember Diekelman, and you remember the incidents, and you remember how they went there and how they took him away. Now, suppose, gentlemen -- where would we

21 22 have been without Diekelman when we tried to prove that 23 J J Mc Namara was in Los Angeles, that J B Mc Namara was 24 in Los Angeles under the name of Brice at the time the Times 25 blew up? Oh, he was their witness, was he? Well, there 26 is one thing he was absolutely sure of, and that was the

signature of Brice, that he saw Brice make the signature.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

22

23

24

25

26

It is in evidence here that we had 70 or 80 registers from

all over the country, and it does not take any very big

stretch of the imagination, or do violence to your judgment, to assume that if we only had the signature we would be

able to prove it, if we could get only proof that he wrote this one. But with little Diekelman running a restaurant back in Chicago, out of the reach of our subpoena, a good

job at \$30 a week and nothing to do, where would we be? If Biddinger was worth \$500 or \$5000, if McManigal was worth all the trial and trouble, and all the crime that was done to get him over, if Caplan was worth getting out of the

And you bet they did not waste any time getting him back to Chicago, back to Darrow's office, back to Nockles, two or three thousand miles away from where his testimony would be needed. Oh, yes, they could bring him back, or

state, and all that, what was little Diekelman worth?

he could come back. Yes, that is true. He could -- maybe. 18 Maybe he would not want to come back. 19 Now, gentlemen, I have not used one word of the testimony 20 21

of Bert Franklin so far, not one word, and yet I have shown you a chain of crime--crime fastened absolutely onto this defendant of a similar nature, intended to defeat justice and prevent the honest and proper trial of the McNamara case, just such a crime as bribing a jury would be, and

all of the time I have been talking about Diekelman and middinger Franklin was out with his men making this investiNow, Mr. Clerk, have you the check of Mr. Darrow and the

d eposit slip of Bert Franklin on October 6th? Now, I am going to talk to you a little about Franklin, and I am going to show you this case without one word from Franklin; or, I am going to show you that the truth so shedged him in on one side and on the other that he had

to tell the truth; that there was no way out of it, because it had to appeal to a reasonable man and reasonable men.

1 Bert Franklin says that he went to Darrow's office, he' 2 had had a little preliminary talk with him the day before. 3 that he had talked to him a little before, about the men 4 that he knew personally on the jury -- and, of course, he 5 could not reach anybody that he did not know personally 6 with a proposition of this kind, and very few of them, and 7 he had had a little talk with him; he had talked with him 8 about Eain prior to that time. I am going to talk now about 9 the 6th day of October; that he had talked to him about 10 Bain a little prior to that time, and that on the 6th of 11 October he went into Darrow's office, talked to him about 12 getting Bain, and Darrow gave him a check for \$1000. 13 "He then asked me what I thought about Mr Bain, and ask-14 ed if he wished me to see Mr Bain along that line and he 15 said yes. He asked me if I thought I could get him. I 16 told him that I thought I could; that Mr Bain was the 17 kind of a man if he did not want to go in that way he 18 would come out and tell me so, and that would be all 19 there would be to it. He said, all right, I will give you 20 a check for \$1000; and he turned to his desk and wrote 21 the check and handed it to me and I left the office." 22 Bert Franklin says that was on the 6th. The check comes 23 in here dated the 4th. Now, gentlemen shows that it was 24 cashed at the bank on the 6h. I do not care whether it 25 was given to him on the 4th and he has forgotten the

date, or whether Mr Darrow intentionally or accidentally

put a wrong date on it. I do not care a snap of my finger when that check was dated; that makes no difference.

The real matter worth considering is: when did Franklin cash it? When did Franklin get the money on it? And the check itself shows that he got it on the 6th day of October. The check shows that it went through the bank that day. The bank cashier or teller says that it was presented on that day, that it was Darrow's check, and he remembers it. The deposit slip at that time shows that he deposited \$1000 on that day.

that there was no other deposit on that day except that \$1000. therefore, that shows absolutely and conclusively --

that is, to Franklin's account -- that that check of a

thousand dollars was deposited by Franklin on the 6th day of October, and \$500 of it was taken out. MR KEETCH: The check is in the clerk's hands to show.

4.

MR FREDERICKS: Well, I don't know whether there is any doubt about the facts in that matter or not. If there are,

we will get the check. Then, suppose we adjourn and come tack a little before 2 -- half past 1. THE COURT: All right. Half past 1.

Thereupon the jury was duly admonished and a recess

taken until 1:30 o'clock P.M.

AFTERNOON SESSION. Friday, August 16,1912.

1:30 P.M.

THE COURT. You may proveed, Captain Fredericks.

Defendant in court with counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

21

MR . FREDERICKS . Have you those exhibits? Lay those right

out there where I can get them. Before I start on that, gentlemen, I want to call your

attention to another incident. The defense claims that

a great many of our witnesses are scoundres. They say that

Harrington is a scoundrel, that Franklin is a scoundrel,

11 that Behm is a scoundrel, that Cooney isn't much good, that 12 Fitzpatrick is a bad one, that Mayer is another bad one.

Well, suppose they are. What was Darrow doing in this great 13 case with a bunch of scoundrels? He hired them. He selected 14

them. He paid them. They reported to him. They were his 15 men. If he was hiring a bunch of scoundrels, why was he 16 doing it? 17 18 Now, I want to talk to you about the Bain case, and I

want to talk to you about as much of this testimony as 19 possible without asking you to repy on the testimony of 20 Franklin. But before I leave this thought that I had here,

22 that I had given you before, about all these men, I would 23 ball your attention to the fact that the court will instruct 24 you that even though some of these witnesses may have been

25 accomplices with Darrow in other crimes, that that does 26 hot make them accomplices in the crime under investigation The court will instruct the jury that although it may appear

in this case may have been accomplices of the defendant in some other transaction, if such should appear in evidence, yet, nevertheless, unless you find from the evidence that

in evidence that a witness or witnesses who have testified

yet, nevertheless, unless you find from the evidence that such witness or witnesses were accomplices with the defendant in the commission of the particular offense for which the defendant is now on trial, to wit, the bribery of Lockwood, then, I charge you that the evidence of such witness or witnesses does not require the corroboration mentioned in these instructions concerning accomplices.

the corroboration required as to the testimony of accomplices applies only to accomplices in the crime charged in the case on trial.

MR.ROGERS. Do 1 understand your Honor has given that instruction?

MR. FREDERICKS No, but will.

MR. ROGERS. It is not the law, and I don't think the court will give it.

MR. FREDERICKS. The court has informed us that he would

to find out.

THE COURT. Counsel is assuming that the court will give that instruction.

MR. ROGERS. He said the court will give it. If the court follows the law the court will not give it, as I understand

25 it.

give that instruction. I sent

MR. FREDERICKS. Then if the court doesn't give it, 1 simply come out wrong. THE COURT. Go ahead.

- MR . ROGERS. I take exception to the reading of instruc-
- tions that are not settled.
- MR. FREDERICKS- All right. Now, let us talk about the Bain incident without using the testimony of Franklin.
- Do you doubt for one moment that Bain was bribed?
- Can any reasonable man for one moment need any argument on that subject, that old Bob Bain was bribed; that old Bob Bain was given this \$300, given for the purpose of
- influencing his vote, and that he was promised \$3500 more if he would vote for acquittal? Now, there is no use in
- my taking your time in arguing that question.

Now, there is no use in my taking your time arguing that.

2 Bain admits it. Mrs Rain does so, also. FEvery word

3 of their testimony cuts a chunk out of their soul. They

1

9

13

26

4 would not give it unless it was true. They say that on

5 the 6th day of October, which was about the time that

6 Bain was summoned to be on the jury, and a few days after
7 his name was drawn to be on the jury, and a few days be-

7 his name was drawn to be on the jury, and a few days be8 fore he was required to appear in court as a juror -- Mrs

Bain and Bob Bain say that on that day, the 6th day of 0 ctober, Franklin gave them this \$400; that he promised them

tober, Franklin gave them this \$400; that he promised then on that day and said he intended to give them on that day 12 \$500. That was on the 6th day of October. Now, then

where did Frankling et that money, the \$500 that he promised?

In the afternoon of the 6th he went out and took this matter up first with Mrs Bain. They can say that it is

ridiculous and that it is insane and is crazy, and all
that, to go and do a thing in that way, and yet that is
the way it was done: and if you are going to bribe a man

or a woman, you have got to bribe them; if you are going
to reach them, you have got to reach them, and you have got
to talk to them, and I am not an authority on jury bribing,

to talk to them, and I am not an authority on jury bribing,
but I have no doubt that that is about as careful a way as
that very dangerous thing could be done. Franklin tried
the woman first. Bain was his old acquaintance -- his old
friend, probably. That was in the afternoon of the day

of the 6th. In the morning of that day Franklin went out

when that check was dated, although it is dated on the 6th, 22 but it is when it is cashed that counts, and it is a part 23 of this transaction as testified to by the teller. It is 24 dated on the 6th, and so Franklin takes this check, makes 25 out this deposit slip -- this check of Darrow's -- makes 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

out this deposit slip, takes it to the bank, that is, one check for 500 and draws out 500 of that money. He draws it

in cash, and hedraws it in bills, as the teller says.

The teller says they were big bills. The bills that were given to Mrs Bain were twenties. The teller says he thinks there were fifties, or probably more. Mrs Bain's bills are

there were fifties, or probably more. Mrs Bain's bills are twenties. There is a discrepancy; there is a difference as to those bills, but the teller undoubtedly was mistaken.

It has been a year since he talked, possibly, about those bills. He thought he remembered they were \$100 or \$50 bills, but, as a matter of fact, that very day we see Franklin going out to this house and handing over \$400 in bills -- in cash.

he

Now, what did do, if that is not this money, and if he

Now, what did do, if that is not this money, and if he did get big bills? What was he doing with those big bills, and how did he dispose of them, and what did he want with them?

No, gentlemen, this is all one transaction. It is all one affair. There is no if's and and's about it. Mrs

Eain got twenties and it is twenties that Franklin got from the bank, and the bank cashier is mistaken when he thinks they were fifties of hundreds. Now, that is all there is to that, or it may be that he did get fifties and hundreds and changed them somewhere, because he asked Mrs Pain out there at the house if she could change a one-hundred-

dollar bill, and it may be that he had then \$100 at that scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

time. At any rate he had this money, undoubtedly, in his pocket. This money that he got from Darrow, in his pocket,

when he was out there talking to Mrs Pain in the afternoon,
and this check, as it shows, had gone through the clearing house that day, was evidently given sometime in the

morning. The mere fact that there is a difference in the memory of this bank teller as to the size of the bills, whether they are twenties or fifties, is not a matter upon

which you can hang any great amount of importance in any affair of life, whatever. If they were thousand dollar bills or five-hundred-dollar bills, there would be a transaction that might impress you, but if they are fifties or twenties, there isn't enough difference between fifties and twenties to impress a cashier passing that kind of money out every day over the counter, so that even Franklin on the day that he got that \$500, that he got the \$500 from

Darrow, what was he going to use \$500 in cash for, if it

was in one-hundred-dollar bills to pay help with it?

That would be a foolish thing to do. A man employing help

would pay his help mostly in checks, naturally a man employ
ing help would pay them at the end of the week, and their

bills, none of them would come to fifty dollars.

23

24

c 1 I do not imagine that any of the men working for Franklin 2 would get that \$50 bill for his work at the end of the 3 week. They are not fifty dollar men who do that kind of 4 work. 5 MR . ROGERS . Just a moment-there is not one iota of 6 evidence, notwithstanding that your witness said that 7 his was at your disposal; there is not an books 8 iota of evidence to justify the statement that the men did 9 not earn \$50 a week. 10 MR . FREDERICKS I do not say there is. I am simply 11 arguing on the probabilities of life. 12 MR . ROGERS. I take an exception to it. 13 THE COURT. The exception is noted. 14 MR. FREDERICKS. If that does not appeal to your judgment, 15 that a man out and doing this shoe and heel work on the 16 street and making these investigations would get \$50 a 17 week, if it does not appeal to you that that is a figure 18 wage, then it would be reasonable to expect that any one 19 of them would get, then disregard it, but \$50 a week, 20 gentlemen, is \$200 a month. I doubt very much if your 21 experience in life will lead you to conclude that the men 22 who were running around for Franklin were getting \$800or 23 that Franklin would have any use for a fifty dollar bill 24 in the payment of his help. And, if this is an innocent 25 transaction that is all it could be used for, for the pay 26 ment of his help. No, sir, we are driven back to

conclusion that Mr. Young, the bank teller, is mistaken.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

23

THE JUROR. Yes.

That is all there is about it. That is a fair, square and

reasonable proposition.

Now, then, Mr. Franklin takes this money, talks to Mrs.

Now, then, Mr. Franklin takes this money, talks to Mrs.

Bain about it, gets her to agree, then she tackles Bob,

then Franklin goes out that night; Franklin's testimony

as to what he did corresponds absolutely with theirs.

It dovetails just as only truth can dovetail with truth.

He goes out there. He gives Bob Bain \$ 400 and tells him that he has not the other hundred and will give it to him later; that he has used it in some way. Now, then, that

is the 6th; that is the day that he got \$500 from Darrow; that is the day that he needed \$500 and that is the day that he used \$500, the very very day.

15 A JUROR. May I ask a question here?
16 MR. FREDERICKS. Yes.

A JUROR- I would like to know when the money was paid by
Franklin to Darrow after the 6th? What date was the money
paid? I do not remember what day?

20 MR. FREDERICKS. All right. I will look that up. You want 21 me to give you the date when money was paid by Darrow to 22 Franklin after the 6th?

24 MR. FREDERICKS. I do not know that that would help us much,
25 for this reason, that we do not know exactly the number of

for this reason, that we do not know exactly the number of men he was employing from time to time, and the money that scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

was coming to him and that he was using from time to time.

He says that he had a settlement with Darrow in December, and

there was then a balance.

4 A JUROR. The 16th.

MR . FREDERICKS . Have you a memorandum of that payment?

Well, I don't know.

MR. ROGERS. On the 16th of October there was \$500--after

the 6th, and then again of \$500 on the 23rd.

MR. FREDERICKS. That is what his bank book shows.

THE COURT. That bank book is in evidence and the jury can

consult it if they want to.

MR . FREDERICKS. That does not help us a great deal, because

I don't know what his necessities were or what he was using

Now, we will take that proposition. Bain gets that

whenever the date is set—I have forgotten the day—Bain comes up into the jury, into the court room. His name is drawn from the box and he takes his seat here, over there in the corner, I think he sat somewhere. Mr. parrow starts to examine him and examines him. He is examined by both

sides, trying to find out whether he is a fair juror,
weighing Bob Bain, looking into his soul as far as you can,
investigating him as far as you can from his talk, listening to him, then determining after that whether to keep

him or not. Now, all that time Bob Bain has got that \$400.

Darrow, you keep him all right—I am sure he is all right—keep him, Franklin knowing all the time that he had given Bain \$400 and promised him \$3500 more, all the time as they sit there with their heads together Franklin knows this and he tells Darrow, "You keep him," but he don't tell

sit there with their heads together Franklin knows this and he tells Farrow, "You keep him," but he don't tell him why. Why, it is absurd, absolutely ridiculous. Do you suppose Darrow wouldn't say, "I want to know why. Why do you say to keep him? Why do you want me to keep

why do you say to keep him? Why do you want me to keep him?" There sits Franklin. He is Darrow's hired man. He is getting paid by Parrow right along. He is reporting to Mr. Darrow. He is working for Darrow day by day, day by day and night by night all this time, working striving, working and reporting, working for parrow,

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

7975 using Darrow's time, using Darrow's money for his automobiles, using Darrow's money for his hired men, expending all that money, and Darrow don't know what he is doing. Franklin is keeping it to himself. Franklin won't let him know. Gentlemen. Franklin is shown by this testimony to have been the considential agent of Darrow, to have been very confidential with him, and do you suppose for one minute that Franklin would risk that \$400 that he had paid Bob Bain and let the chance of their putting Bob Rain off the jury without his telling Darrow what he had done, even though Darrow didn't know it before? It is absurd -- it is rediculous. Now, gentlemen, in the name of reason, the name of reason, can there be anything clearer or plainer than that? If you won't convict a man on testimony of that kind, then you have made jury-bribing safe for all time. there can be and never will be presented to a jury more clear, more convincing evidence of a man's guilt than that. The man who got the money, the man who actually passed the examination, the man who had agreed to be for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 the defense, the man who had been bought to be for the de-22 fense, the man who had gotten his money for it, the man 23 who was examined by the defendant, the man in charge of 24 the case and his word final, and they assume that if any-25 body a stranger, did that thing. No sir. I am not going 26 to suppose that there lives on earth twelve men who would

- 2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

juror.

in the bank.

an honest impression.

- 3 whether they were twenties or whether they were fifties.

- The little matter as to difference in bills as to

- be so unreasonable, not for one moment.
- - is to infanitisimal as to amount to nothing absolutely.
  - Simply the memory of a bank teller after a year, and you
  - can not grab a hold of a little thing and lay down on it.
  - and say that settles it; that settles it; I won t go any
  - further; that settles it. You have got to take it altogether.
  - You have got to be reasonable men. You have got to
  - reason things out in a reasonable light that will stand
  - reason and stand your conscience in future years, and you

- attention is called to it a year after or nearly a year
- after. He gives you his impression, and I believe it is
- JUROR WILLIAMS: There are a few of the facts I would
- like to have read again from the record. The record
- handed to the defense by Mr Franklin on Mr Bain as a

bills were twenties or whether they were fifties when his

- MR FREDERICKS: Was that introduced?
- JUROR: It was read to the jury, and Mrs Bain's testimony
- with regard to the subscription for the Examiner, and Mr
- Young's testimony with regard to the bills handed out
- MR ROGERS: So far as the record handed on Mr Bain is cor
  - scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

cerned, my understanding is that it was not Mr Franklin's

personal report, as I remember it.

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

3 MR FREDERICKS: Simply a report by one of his men that came 4 through on August 18th.

5 MR HOGERS: The report on Bain, testimony of Young and tes-6 timony of Mrs Bain with theerence to the subscription to 7 the Examiner.

THE COURT: That will be read a little later, Mr Williams. MR FREDERICKS: I remember what Mrs Bain said in regard

to the subscription. You mean in regard to money, don't you? She asked about the subscription and Franklin says, -now. I don't know whether it was a fifty or a hundreddollar bill. Do you wish to know whether it was a fifty or a hundred?

JUROR: WILLIAMS: Yes; just exactly what she said. MR FREDERICKS: Mrs Bain said that Franklin said, I want to talk to you anyway, so I allowed him to come in and

got a receipt book, and he said, let me make it out. Now, the receipt book there evidently refers to the Fxaminer. he says, yes. He says, all but the money, he said. You

19 20 "He said, let me make it out for nine dollars for a years' 21subscription. " I said, now, this affair is settled, and 22 23 want some money? I said, yes, that is veryessential. He 24 smiled and I said - - he asked me if I had change for a 25hundred-dollar bill or a fifty, I wouldn't say, postive 26 which it was. I laughed, and I said, no, I havenenoth Wilbrary

That is what you want. Do you want any more? JUROR WILLIAMS: That is all. 

MR FREDERICKS: What was the other you wanted? Young? 

Franklin drew \$100 against the deposit and received therefor 2 \$500 in big bills." 3 But there is no doubt about it. He said that he thought 4 the bills were either fifties or hundreds. 5 MR . ROGERS. No, he did not say that. He said that there 6 were no twenties. 7 MR . FREDERICKS . Yes, I am going to that too. He said 8 there were no twenties. MR . ROGERS. They were not ptwenties. MR · FREDERICKS · 1 think that there were no twenties is the same as they were not twenties. That is what Mr. Young said; that is what Mrs. Bain said. There is no controversy about it whatever. The point is that he did get

1

9 10 11 12 13 14 \$500 of Darrow's money in cash that day out of the bank. 15 Now, as to whether when he went out that afternoon he did 16 take bills as the bank cashier thinks he gave him, and the 17 fact that Mrs. Bainsays he asked to change a fifty or a 18 hundred, would indicate that he did -- that would be the 19 indication that he did -- the fact remains that he appeared 20 there that night with 400 in twenties. Now, that fact 21 remains. My notion of the thing is that the bank cashier 22 was mistaken. It is possible that Franklin took his big 23 bills, as a matter of precaution, and that the bank cashier was not mistaken, and Franklin took his big bills as a 24 25matter of precaution and got them changed into smaller

26 There is no testimony to that effect. MR . ROGERS . There is testimony by Franklin that

- do that; that he took the identical money that he got at the bank out there and paid it over.
- 3 MR FREDERICKS. There is no occasion for your breaking
- 4 into my argument. I am going to be fair.
- MR . ROGERS. I want the testimony.

15

19

- MR · FREDERICKS ' You are getting the testimony . Why,
- do you suppose I would stand up here and deceive this jury?

  They would know it in a minute. I say there is that dis-
- 9 crepancy and there is just as much discrepancy as that in
- every true story that you ever heard since the beginning of time, just as that contained in the Gospel of Saint Matthew
- and the Gospel of Saint Mark in describing the same thing.

  I don't know just exactly how that occurred: you don't
- I don't know just exactly how that occurred; you don't know. If I knew I would be glad to tell you. But I main-

tain that it is not material, that it makes no difference,

A JUROR. Is there anything in the evidence that Mrs. Bain

- that it is a small matter of memory, and somebody has forgo ten something in regard to that transaction. That is all
- 18 there is to it. Now, that is the Bain transaction.
- 20 had the money?
- 21 MR. FREDERICKS. Yes, there is.
  22 THE JUROR. What was the testimony? The prosecution got
- back \$300 of that \$400.

  MR. ROGERS. He testified it was the same money that he
- used.

  26 MR. FREDERICKS. Exactly. She said she received twenties,

and the prosecution got back twenties, and the testimony

is that she did receive twenties. There is no controversy

about that. She did receive twenties. I don't think there is any doubt but what that exact money is the money that she

turned in . I do not think there is any question about that I am sure it must be so. But that bunch of twenties was

given to her by Franklin.

1

2

3

4

5

6

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

7 8 Now, whether the bank cashier was mis taken or whether 9 Franklin has forgotten and did change that money, I don't 10 know and I do not pretend to say, but I do pretend to say, 11 gentlemen, that that is too small a matter to take into-12 consideration, and disbelieve the entire Bain transaction

\$500 that he got that very day--that very day of all days in the world, the \$500 that he took in cash out of the thousand dollar check. Now, this was a small payment. Bain was not wise enough,

because the other ear marks to it fasten it indelibly upon

this defend ant, fasten it indelibly upon Franklin, the

perhaps, to make him put up \$3500 in somebody's hands. He was not wise enough to do that. Bain was taking a foolish chance, if he wanted to get that \$3500. I have no doubt. It was not a big transaction, and it did not call for the use of any amount of big money. So far as the money of it was concerned, it was not a big transaction.

Now, if the Bain incident were all that we had to consider it might be of some moment,

FBut we find Franklin over and over again doing identically the same thing with others, trying identically the same thing with others, doing this on a wholesale scale, you may say, doing it on Darrow's time, doing it when he was Darrow's confidential agent; and we have proved that not by Franklin's admission, but by the testimony of Eain, of Lockwood, or Yonkin, or Smith, of Kruger -- and Undersood is dead. There were six men here that he had gone to and tried to get all six of them to stand for acquittal in this case. Five of them have come here to testify to it. Five of them have said that he came to them and tried to bribe them, and they did not accept the bribe. Lockwood's case is a little different and I will come to it. Now, with such a wholesale proposition as that going on, would it be reasonable to suppose for one moment that the attorney could sit there and not know anything about it, that Franklin was going up and down the earth doing this for some third party, and Darrow not know about it? There is another idea, gentlemen. If there was a third party in it that Darrow doesn't know anything about. why doesn't Franklin tell on the real man? Why tell on the real man, the other man, if you would have it so? Why not tell the truth, if this is not the truth? There is only one reason for it -- there is only one reason for it. The story of Franklin has got to match up with reason

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

with judgment, has got to match up with common sense, has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

got to match up with the other things in the case. That

is what it means. And Franklin could no more tell a story of that kind and have you or anybody else believe it than he could grow wings and fly. Why, you would scout it at

once. Suppose he told you that a stranger came to him. a sharp man like Franklin, a man he didn't know, and offered

him \$4000 to commit a crime with. Why, is there any doubt but Franklin would think that somebody was laying a trap for him? Men don't talk about those things to strangers, men don:t talk about those things to chance acquaintances, and strangers don't pass over \$4000 to strangers, either. Why. it won't do at all.

And we are going right through this and will show you . 14 time after time that Darrow was the man that was doing 15 this sort of thing, Darrow was the man who sent Cooney 16 17 over to Franklin -- Cooney who had never worked for Franklin before. Now, we will come to that after a while. 18 Let me give you just a little resume of the busy life of 19

a jury-briber during the fortnight in November. 20 This man is working for Darrow, paid by Darrow, using Darrow's auto-21 mobile, getting his money from him, reporting to him. On 22 23 November 2nd, he called on Underwood and tried to bribe him. 24

on November 4th, he first called on Lockwood and made an appointment to meet him in town. On November 8th, he called 2526 on Smith in Covina. On November 8th, Mr Eain was sworn as

a juror; on that same day Mrs Bain called down at Franklin's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

office and talked to him, that a stranger, a strange man had spoken to her. On November 8th, the same day, Lockwood

telephoned him from town and made arrangements to meet him the next day. On November 9th he met Lockwood in his office

He had a long talk with him and tried to bribe him. November 12th he called again atidLockwood's house, and Lockwood told him he wouldn't engage in the matter. About November

12th, he called on Kruger, and on November 18th, he tried to bribe Guy Yonkin. All of those things between Movember 2nd and November 18th, and all of those things on Darrow's time, and all of those things while he was Darrow's employ,

working for Darrow, and Darrow didn't know what he was do-14 Why, it is absurd, absolutely absurd, gentlemen --15 absolutely absurd. 16 Now, let us take up some of the incidents as they came 17 along. The Eain matter we have passed, and Bain has gone down and come into court, the trial has started and Bain has

18 19 been examined and is seated in the box, not yet sworn. 20 Now, we will come to the 4th day of November, when he first 21 called on Lockwood. He called on Lockwood. He says he 22 had a conversation with Darrow in his office about Lockwood 23 just a fe w days before. On November 4th, he had talked 24 to Darrow about Lockwood, and told him his views about 25 Lockwood, and so forth. On November 4th, he drives by 26Lockwood 's house out at Baldwin Park, and he stops. Lockwood was his acquaintance. Lockwood had been a deputy sheriff

2 was going by. Lockwood's testimony in that regard and 3 Franklin's testimony absolutely coincide. when the court 4 work was going on. The next incident that we have of 5 Franklin after the Bain and the calling on Lockwood, the 6 next criminal incident is the calling on Frank Smith . 7 I will not read you what Franklin testified, it is prac-8 tically the same that Smith testified, so let's see what 9 Smith testified: "Well, he came out and said could he 10 approach me or talk to me." This was the 8th of November. 11 "And I says, 'What is it?' And he started in and he said 12 I was to be drawn on the jury, and he asked me if any 13 inducement would make me stick, and he went on and said 14 how was 3,000. He was talking to me about that. He went 15 up to four." And you will find through it all that is the 16 figure, four. "I said 'there ain't no use, because you 17 haven t got enough money to buy me. Q Well, what further 18 was said? A Well, he wanted me to be drawn and try to 19 stay on the jury. Q And what if you did stay on the jury? 20 A Then hesaid there would be 4,000 in it, maybe more. I 21 told him there was no use. Q Under what condition, what 22 were you to do? A Well, I would acquit the McNamaras." 23 Smith says on cross-examination, after Franklin learned his 24 opinion, he asked him to keep secret, and so far as we did 25 know he did keep secret; not, I think, by reason of any 26 care that he had for Franklin, but because he didn't want scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

He stepped in there about 9 o'clock in the evening as he

1

LB

anybody to know that Franklin would dare do such a thing as that. Probably that is the more reasonable explanation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

25

26

Franklin says in regard to Smith that he told Darrow to let him alone, he would probably ask to get off the jury.

That is November 8th. Let us follow this man along and see the trail he is making, and see if he could be making

that kind of a trail for anybody else except Darrow. On the same day he has a conversation with Mrs. Bain. Bain has gotten on the jury. Bain was sworn that day, and he relates that conversation when she went down in his office,

she was getting nervous, Bain had been sworn in. She was

getting afraid, womanlike, and some man had talked to her and she was fearful, and she went down and talked to Franklin, and Franklin told her not to talk to anybody. Franklin had told her therefore not to spend any money; Franklin had told her all those things that a man would naturally caution a person about under the circumstances, and she went down and Franklin told her not to talk to anybody and not to even speak to him when they met on the street.

20 day that he is out with Smith, taking up a part of his time. 21 Smith is another part of his time. The 4th with Lockwood, 22 another part of his time. That same day Lockwood telephoned 23 in and he makes an appointment to meet him the next day, 24 and he meets him the next day. Franklin also says that

about that time -- no, it is a little later that he visited

Their testimony agrees along that line. That is the same

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

- Krueger. We will take that up then a little later. I will take Krueger up here, because I may not have it

1

2

3

4

- tabbed. About that time, as near as I can figure it from his testimony, it would be along about the 12th, however,
- 5 that he first went down and had a talk with Krueger. Krueger was another man he knew, all of that on Darrow's time; all
- 6 of that while working for Darrow; all of that on Darrow's 7 8
  - pay; all of that time included. And automobiles probably paid for and all that sort of thing, because you cannot
- 10 scoot around in these automobiles where you hire them from the rent service for two bits an hour, you cannot 11
- do that, it counts up pretty high. Your experience will 12 tell you about what the automobile would be for November 13 8th, running out to Covina and back, and for November 12th, 14
- running down to Krueger's and back again; on the 12th going 15 out to Lockwood's and all that sort of thing. Darrow paying 16
- for all this and doesn't know anything about it, or is 17 somebody else? Tut, tut. 18 MR. ROGERS. Wait a moment. We don't have any reply, your 19
- Honor please --20 MR . FREDERICKS Just say what you want to and don't take 21
- up my time with apologies. Go ahead. What is it? I don't 22 wan t you to take up my time . It isn't pfair for you. 23
- MR . ROGERS · Your Honor please, I desire to call attention 24 to the fact that counsel has said all the time Darrow was 25 paying these automobile bills. It was not so. Darrow did 26

- 1 not pay his automobile bills. Mr. Franklin paid his own
- 2 automobile bills.
- MR . FREDERICKS Of course. 3
- MR . ROGERS. What he did was done for the defense and not 4
- f or Mr. parrow or anybody else. 5
- MR. FREDERICKS. All right, I don't mean--6
- 7 MR . ROGERS. I will just take a little time right here to
- say I want to be courteous and brief as I can and counsel 8
- 9 ought not to interrupt.
- MR. FREDERICKS. I thought you were through. What is the 10
- difference between Darrow paying Franklin's expenses and 11 sending an automobile to Darrow. That is tweedle de and
- tweedle dum. That is what that means. 13
- MR. DARROW. I want to take an exception. None of this 14
- work was done for me. 15
- MR. FREDERICKS' Now, testify some more. 16
- MR . DARROW. It was done just as much for me as every lawyer 17
- in the case, all done for the defense. 18
- THE COURT. The objection and the exception will be noted. 19
- MR . DARROW . I never saw an automobile, as the evidence 20
- shows, or an automobile bill. 21
- MR. FREDERICKS. Oh, no, you didn't pay the bills. You did 22
- pay the bills due Franklin two months after he was arrested 23
- in December, something over a thousand dollars for expenses 24
- MR . DARROW . Did I? 26

and services.

12

MR . FREDERICKS. Then let us talk about Krueger. Kruege

lives at the Palms.

e	r	

1 They did not waste any money on Kruger, because that was 2 a pretty good gamble that Kruger would not and through. 3 But he was there, his name was on the list, and if he could 4 get through, why, so much to the good -- so much to the 5 good. He would have been a good one for them if he had 6 gone through; no doubt in the world of that. So he goes 7 down and tries to get Kruger, but, mark you this, he does 8 not give Kruger any money.

- THE COURT: There are no interruptions.

  MR FREDERICKS: I can hear counsel talking.
- 12 MR ROGERS: You have got me beat, because I could not.

I would like these interruptions stopped.

9

10

11

15

- 13 MR LARROW: I object to the statement, your Honor. The
- 14 evidence is that MF Kruger offered to --
- on that. Oh, I will tell the testimony, don't worry

MR FREDERICKS: I am going to cover all that. I just started

- 17 about that.
- 18 MR LARROW: We have a right to correct you if you do not.
- 19 MR FREDERICKS: Yes, but do not interrupt me until you
- 20 see that I am not being fair.
  21 They did not give Wruger any money. I do not care a
- They did not give Kruger any money. I do not care about the offer and the talk and all that sort of thing. That
- does not count. You can go up and talk about what you are going to do, and I will give you so and so, and wouldn't
- you like to have it, and all that sort of thing, but I
  wonder what would have happened if old Kruger would have

said: sure, give me \$500 of that now. I suppose Franklin

1

12

16

17

18

19

20

26

2 would have said, well I left my check-book att home. That

will be all right, Kruger, we will fix that up all right.

The next time I am down we will fix that up; there will be

The next time I am down we will fix that up; there will be no trouble about that. That I figure is about the dialogue that would have occurred. But Kruger says, no, I don't want it now, I don't want it now. And he does not get it, and would not have gotten it, if he had said he wanted it, not a bean of it, because they knew it was too risky;

9 not a bean of it, because they knew it was too risky;
10 they knew that Kruger could not pass the District Attorney's
11 examination. They knew that the District Attorney would

still, they took a chance. Kruger was pretty safe, and
they were not risking much. They would get him if they
could, and if they could it would be just so much velvet.

All of this, and Darrow not know anything about it!

have wasted a peremptory on him if necessary. But

Tut-tut.

Now, we come to the conversation with Lockwood on the 9th, down in his office, that Darrow was not interested in. This man who was making his living, and Darrow was his

pay-master, and Darrow was giving him his money, and the
money was coming out through Darrow, and possibly Darrow
was having to account to somebody -- I don't know -- for
his expenditures; this man, who was getting his money from
Darrow sits down in his office, and he spends quite a

while talking to Lockwood. I do not need to go over that

testimony with you unless you ask for it. But you will remember that the testimony of Lockwood and the testimony of Franklin on the stand, absolutely coincide, word for word, almost nothing left out from one that was left out from another; just a little bit, just a few little words that do not amount to much. But the general substance is

the same.

Lockwood; George Lockwood. George Lockwood, I wonder if you were tempted that day. You are an old man, George Lockwood, and you have not laid up much; a little; bot a little farm. But, George Lockwood, I wonder if you were tempted that day. You told him you would think it over. Ah, gentlemen, there is nothing wrong about the man who is tempted, but it is a glorious thing to the man who goes and fights it out with his own soul and comes out and says: I won't; I am going to be honest; I don't want it; I won't take it. I don't know. This testimony does not

show, as I remember it, whether Lockwood was tempted or not, whether Lockwood really felt inclined to do this damnable thing or not, but certain it is when George Lockwood came to think it over, and Franklin came to him the next day, which was the 12th, again on Larrow's time, Larrow's hired man again, comes to him in an automobile on the 12th, and Lockwood says: no, I won't do it; I won't

do it. Dismisses the subject. But Franklin leaves it with

a little string to it. Well, he says, George, if you ever

change your mind, let me know. Well, let me tell you some-1 thing, gentlemen. It is the honesty and the integrity 2 of George Lockwood, as you will see in viewing this tes-3 timony, that blew up the McNamara case; the honesty and 4 the integrity, as you will see in viewing this testimony. 5 of George Lockwood, that made the mark. I claim no astute-6 ness. I claim no greater ability than the ordinary man. 7 I am not able to see behind men's eyeballs and know what 8 they are thinking about. George Lockwood came, as he 9 says, and told me what Franklin was doing. I then knew, as 10 his testimony shows that, sitting down there on the jury.

says a few days after Sunday, and Sunday was the 12th. 14 Unless you wish me to show you the testimony of Lockwood 15 and Franklin agree in this matter, I will not take the 16 17

Lockwood come. He does not remember exactly.

was old Bob Bain bought, sold and tied against us. When did

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

time to read it. But on the 12th, this is the day that Lockwood turned Franklin's offer down.

Lockwood comes to the District Attorney's office and

tells him.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

23

24

25

26

All this time the fight is going on down in court. All this time jury panel after jury panel is being issued.

All this time the big jury wheel is turning and the clerk can go out and go in, and the names of the jurors are being drawn, and they are being summoned all over the county.

The lawyers sitting there, sweating, working, endeavoring to get a jury, all this time and all of these days, and planted back there all this time is Bob Bain. And then Lockwood comes and tells the story, tells the story about the other man that Franklin says is on the jury who will be with him, the other man whom he knows and knows better than he knows Fraklin, and the only one he knew was Bain .

17 12th was Sunday, Monday the 13th and Tuesday would be the 18 14th. It might from his testimony have been the 15th, because 19 he says, "Early in the week," and Wednesday might be consider 20 ed to be early in the week, as it is the middle of the 21 week .

That was probably from his testimony about the 14th-- the

wow, gentlemen, think over the situation. Think what we were up against when Lockwood came and told that story. Every day the wheel was turning. Every day when we would come and sit and look that jury over perhaps our eyes would light on Bob Bain. And what to do? What to do?  the attorneys were examining the jurors, every day they

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

2 were working over the case. Lockwood says when he told 3 his story the District Attorney told him to go back home and

And all that week, possibly, as the record shows wait. here, every day the wheel was turning and we were looking

to see whether Lockwood's name would come out. In a day

or two morethe wheel would be turned and we would look

to see. Whom could you tell? Where could you go for advie? Whom could you trust? Remember the District Attor-

ney knew at that time, as this evidence shows, of all these 10 other things that I have narrated to you. Whom could you 11 trust? Could you say that your own official family was 12 honest? Could you say that they, some one of them, had not 13

fallen or would not gossip?

And still the wheel turns, and still Franklin works, and on the 18th, which was 4 days probably after Lockwood came to me, we find Franklin again, this time by the testimony of Yonkin, the iyoung man down on Broadway, still at the same old game. These things are all plain now. We are looking

now at this thing with the lid off. All we could know then 20 was that if this man Franklin had bribed Bain, and was trying 21 to bribe Lockwood, that there must be others, there might 22 be more of them on there that we didn't know anythingabout. 23

All we could do would be to imagine, all we could do would 24 be to guess, all we could do would be to think that Frahlin 25 was active right along. And he was, as the evidence shows 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

--down trying to get another one, and so on the 18th Yonkin says he tried him.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

It is just about two weeks, according to the record, from the time when Lockwood first revealed this matter to

the District Attorney, that Franklin was actually caught. He was caught on the 28th, which was Tuesday, and probably Tuesday the 14th was the day that Lockwood first revealed the matter. For two weeks then almost--because his name came out on the 25th-we were waiting for Lockwood's name to come out, to see what Franklin would do. to see what move he would make. There we had -- we knew that Lockwood would tell us--1 say "we"--1. Now, gentlemen. is it reasonable to suppose that inall that time, with

you the testimony of Yonkin. You remember it. You don't wish me to read you the testimony of Smith. You remember it. The testimony of Underwood, of course, is gone for ever. Now, I am going to come up briefly to the scenes of the week before Thanksgiving and the week when these men plead guilty. Mr. Darrow tells you that he had given up this

all that work going on, this defendant didn't know what

was being done? Certainly not. You don't wish me to read

case. I am going to show you by this testimony that that is not true, and I wish you to remember that the deductions that I shall draw here are the deductions from the testimony that is given. I will show you by the testimony itself, not scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

from any testimony of mine, that when Davis said on Wednesday before Thanksgiving that I had agreed to a bargain, I will

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

26

show you by the testimony itself that that is not true. By their own testimony and their own acts. I have never

yet and don't think I ever will take the position of witness and attorney in a case, unless I should be the defendant

7 myself, but it is not necessary that I sould testify to 8 you as to what these facts were, and there debar myself from 9 arguing the case or participating in it further. It is not

necessary, because I can show you by the testimony of Davis and Steffens and others that has been introduced here, that there was not any thought of letting J J McNamara, the head of the great big union, plead guilty, until Thanksgiving day

and I will show you that just as plainly as day. Now, I am going to take up the events of that period and I am going to go over it step by step. Let me give you one little idea to start with. On Sunday, when they say -when parrow says he had given up we find him sending the

18 19 night before, sending Cooney over to Franklin to get some hostile jurors out of the way. We find how many crimes 20 21 committed on that Sunday? One by Franklin when he went down and tried to get Krueger. Another by Franklin when he 22 23 went out and tried to get Lockwood. Two. Another by Cooney when he tried to get Elliott, and warn Elliott. 24

Another one when they traied to warn Sackett, and another one when they tried to warn Dolly. That is five that I can scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

think of right off hand.

. 9

Now, then, gentlemen, on Sunday that is what was going on. Does that look much like giving up the case? Now, I

will tell you just what that situation was, and then take a recess and I will show it to you from the testimony.

That situation was this, and remember I am telling it to you from the testimony, for I would not pretend to stand here and testify myself without giving counsel an opportunity to cross-examine me. I will show you from this testimony that it is true that on Menday Lincoln Steffens tried tostart something to get us to let go of J J McNamara and accept a plea of guilty from J B, That he started on Menday from Steffens. I will show you of Steffens that day coming to me, on Tuesday, and was turned down, and that he got a reply back at that time the same as he always got, "There are cases against two men; two men must plead

to come to me. There was no committee meeting in this
matter, I will show you, until Wednesday, the night before
Thanksgiving, the day after Franklin had been caught, and
I will show you by this testimony that they tried to get

guilty." I will show you that they tried to get Chandler

chandler to come to me to persuade me to let J J McNamara go. I will show you by this testimony that their one idea in this whole matter was to save the curse from union labor and to save J J McNamara, not because he was J J

McNamara, but because he was the secretary, and treasurer of scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

the great International Iron Workers Union. That is what they were trying to do. That is all Lincoln Steffens, with his sloppy palaver was trying to inject into me in this roundabout way. They wanted me to take this one man, this pawn, this fellow, this hired man, this fellow Brice, the brother, the actual dynamiter and punish him, and then say, Oh, Labor Unions had nothing to do with it. He is some crazy fellow, he is some crazy fanatic that got mad and he wanted to do that for the purpose of saving J J McNamara and helping of the unions.

canned by LALAWLIBRARY

They wanted to do it to keep the curse off of labor unionism, as they called it. I say the blessing for labor unionism if there has ever come to labor unionism since the begin-

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

26

ning of time any blessing, it is this blessing of exposure, I don't know what it is, but according to their view at that time that is what they wanted to do. They wanted to

do that, and they tried it on me, and they got that answer back. Why, gentlement, I haven't the slightest doubt in the world that that would have been a splendid thing for them to have tried at any stage in the proceedings.

I don't know whether they had gotten an intimation that Bob Bain was not going to stay put or not. I don't know whether they feared they were not going to make jury-bribing stick or not. They had tried several, and they had not made much headway. They had one, got Bob Bain on and maybe they got a hint that Bob was not going to stick by it, be that as it may. That would have been a good thing for them and they would have been willing to do it to

let J.J. go and let J.B. plead guilty, and let J.J. go, and let the whole proposition go, and catch this measley 20 little dynamiter. That is what I will show they were trying 21to do, and they thought perhaps they could make it stick. 22 It might be there were some mushy people down town who 23

thought that would be a good job. Remember, that it was 24 25their proposition; not mine.

Steffens says he went to Meyer Lissner Monday, and on Monday this typewritten thing that has been shown you was written out, before they had ever sait anybody to me to let J. B. plead guilty and let all the rest off. That was their proposition from the beginning. I down And they did think that they could put that through. probably. I think this fellow Steffens is so unable to carry correct information that he probably peddled back to them the idea that that could be done. On Wednesday Davis says he talked to me in a joshing way, or I talked to him in a bantering way about this case. He had never heard of it. Well, now, if Davis had not heard of this important thing going on, Davis was not very close to the inside and did not know a great deal about what Darrow was doing. But on Wednesday I told it to Davis, and he did not think I was serious enough in the matter to report it at all until Thursday, when they had sent for Older. If there is any doubt about these dates. I want to go right to the record for them, because they are important. They had sent a telegram on Teusday, the 22nd for Fremont Older to come down here, and talk it over. Talk what over? Not to talk over the proposition of J.J.McNamara and J.B. pleading guilty. That was not it, because on Thursday, it fell on them for the first time by Davis' testimony, as he says, and by Davis' statement after Older vaschere, that

I was going to demand both of them. So when Older was sent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 8003 1 for, when Gompers was sent for -- and Darrow says that on that day, Thursday, the 23rd, he had already before he talked to Davis, had already sent to Gompers or sent 4 a man out -- so that when Older and Gompers we re sent for, the idea that was being worked on then was simply accepting a plea against J.B., and letting J.J. go, up to Thurs-7 day. That is what these men were brought here for, to 8 see whether they would stand for that. Of course, the pro-9 secution did not know anything about what they were doing. 10 But we get it in the testimony now. 11 So, starting there, and when they sent for Gompers, and 12 Nockels afterwards responded -- and, by the way, has not 13 been here; you have not heard his testimony in regard to 14 the matter, but from others it appears that he did get 15 here sometime afterwards -- when these men were sent for 16 there was no proposition under consideration at all, except 17 the one proposition of getting J.J. McNamara off at the 18
- sacrifice of J.B. That is the proposition.

  19 MR DARROW: I want to correct that. Nockels was wired to
  20 first.
- 21 MR FREDERICKS: All right. It don't make any difference.
  22 That is not what I said. You say yousent to Compers before
- 23 Thursday to send a representative here.
  24 MR FORD: Harrington wired Gompers.
- 25 MR FREDERICKS: Well, I don't care./Nock els came as their 26 representative. I don't care when Nockels came.

MR DARROW: He was not wired to by me.

MR FREDERICKS: That is what you said. Himinate Nockels.

I don't care anything about it. When you sent to Gompers to send a representative here. That was before Thursady.

before Davis told them that they could not put that propo-sition through, so all of their gathering of their clans, 

if they gathered any, were gathered with the idea: should they throw J.B. to the volves, as they call it, to get J.J. off, and save the curse from union labor? Now, that

ss the proposition. If the court will take a recess now, I will take up

another subject. THE COURT: Bearing in mind the usual admonition, gentlemen

of the jury, we will take a recess for 15 minutes.

1

2

3

5

14

20

MR FREDERICKS: Now, gentlemen, I am going to take these

negotiations, so-called -- and I say "so-called" advisedly.

it on Wednesday in a bantering way -- I am going to take

too -- You know what Davis said when I talked to him about

them up until Saturday night, and I am going to leave them and take up the Lockwood bribery, and then take them up

again after that. 8

Now, let us imagine what was the situation with the de-9 fense in regard to the Lockwood incident during the week 10 that Fremont Older was here, say. Franklin had had his talk 11

with Lockwood. Lockwood had apparently considered the mat-12 ter, and he had gone out to see Lockwood on Sunday, the 12th, 13

and Lockwood had turned it down; so that while there was

a string left on it, enough to make Franklin come and see 15 him again on the proposition. Lockwood had turned it down 16

17 an idea that he could come again to Lockwood if his name 18 ever came out of the box. It had been swinging in there for 19

a long time. So that was the situation with regard to

to Franklin. Of course, you must assume that Franklin had

Lockwood during this week that Older was here. And remember 21 that on Thursday they had gathered their clans, or older --22 if you can call him a clan; -- with the idea of getting 23

J.B.McNamara off on a plea of guilty, and letting J.J. 24 go scot free. And remember they found out then that that 25 could not be done; that the District Attorney would not 26scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 stand for it. Now, they ssay that just as soon as they 2 | found out that the District Attorney would not stand for 3 it, why, they said. "Oh, well, then, let's throw J.B. to the wolves." Gentlemen, there was as much difference 5 between J.J. McNamara pleading guilty and J.B. McNamara plæding guilty in the fight that they were making, the fight that was being financed by the American Federation of Labor to the tune of \$200,000 that you have already heard about -- there was just as much difference between one of 10 those men pleading guilty and both of them pleading guilty 11 as there was between Heaven and harth. The idea of saying, 12 "Well, if we can't get one, we will throw the other one in", 13 is preposterous and absurd, because the throwing in of the 14 other one meant the throwing in of union labor -- that is 15 what it meant -- and that is what they would not do. 16

17 18

19 20

2122

2324

And when they say to you that on Saturday or Sunday they had any idea of letting J J go I say to you that is not

1c1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3 true and that is not borne out by the testimony or by human 4 experience. 5 Now, remember that they had always gotten one statement 6 back from the District Attorney from the beginning to the

end; there never was any change, there never could have been any change. Remember that they had tried to get this one man off, this man J J off scot free. No man puts all his apples in one basket. Clarence Darrow did not put all his bait on one hook. Even from their own testimony, that on Sunday they had agreed to come up and let J J go, even from their own testimony they were only going to let him go on a condition, and that condition was one that they knew nothing about the fulfillment of until the judge had been seen on Friday after Thanksgiving, for they said--Davis said, and said that flatly, that if the judge would not consent to take my recommendation that they would go on and try the case. There was the name of Lockwood that came out of that box on saturday. Lockwood

that they knew about: Lockwood that Franklin had talked to and reported to Darrow about; Lockwood that Franklin believed still that he could get, and Lockwood that Franklin went out to see on Sunday, and then Lockwood, under the instructions, as he says, of the District Attorney, took him on and let him think that he could be scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

8008

bribed. Now, what are they going to do? They have been trying here from the 11th or 12th of October until the 25th of November to get a jury. They had gotten one man on there, Boh. Bain, but one man does not want to stand out alone on a proposition of that kind, maybe, and it is better to have two or three, and they wanted to get another one, and they felt that they could get Lockwood, perhaps. At least, Franklin went out on Sunday and saw him and found out that he could get him. Now, the train was moving. Lockwood was going. The opportunity was passing and what shall we do? What shall Darrow do? Shall we go on and complete the arrangement with Lockwood, or shall we let Lockwood go and take a chance on being able to pull through the negotiations that he says he had already pending? Or shall we make certain of both? Shall we not risk either, rather, by taking a chance of \$500, and that is all that they took a chance to lose on Lockwood, only \$500; and it was not Darrow's money, either. Shall they take a chance? It was not his own personal money. Shall we take a chance of \$500 on Lockwood, who is going into that box, and thus make conviction absolutely impossible, or shall they let the opportunity go? It was passing; it was passing; it would be too late on Tuesday. Lockwood would report up here on Tuesday. If nothing was done with him, -and he was a fine specimen for them if they could have landed him, a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Shall they pass it up or shall they risk \$500 on it?

2 We don't have but one string to our bow in this life.

3 We try to get through one way, we try to get through another

4 way. We try to get through another, perhaps, and out of the

multitude of our tryings, we will find some way, and so. with Darrow in this case. He didn't base everything on

7 one man. we didn't base everything on one throw. I say 8 to you that this evidence shows that he had another man

9 out trying to bribe jurors besides Franklin that Franklin 10 didn't know anything about. Frank Fowler. That is what 11 this evidence shows just as plain as day. He said he didn't

13 helped him get this jury. Strange! Strange! Strange! 14 Isn't it strange? Shows the connection between Darrow and

know Frank Fowler, and yet he admits that Frank Fowler

12

17

23

15 Frank Fowler. It don't go very far. It don't go very far, 16 perhaps, but it goes far enough to show you that Darrow had

18 and he didn't trust it all to one pitch of a coin. Just 19 remember this idea, that the opportunity to draw this man

other hooks out; had other lines out; had devious vays,

20 Lockwood on the jury was passing just as the hands of the 21 clock were turned; just like taking a train. You cannot 22 make up your mind whether youvant to go to another town

or whether you don't, but the trains go today. Without 24 making up your mind on it, you have got to get the train

25 that goes. So it was with Lockwood. He was coming into 26He was going into court, probably, so far as they

knew he was going on the jury, and they had talked to him. 1

Franklin had talked to him. What was going to be the ef-

fect of that? Either they must get him, and naturally get

him and keep him close to them or he might be an awful 5 dangerous man on that jury if he got on there. He might

talk. He might when he came to take his examination on

7 that jury, he was going to have to take it because he was

8 coming up here on Tuesday and sure as there was a sunfrising 9 on Tuesday that man Lockwood would have to be examined by

10 both sides and the court as to his qualifications. 11 Suppose now, when Lockwood came to take the stand and he

12 had been approached by Franklin, Franklin knew it. Frank-13 lin told it to Darrow. He turned him down. Now, then,

what sort of a situation are you in? What sort of a situa-

15 tion is the defense in with this man Lockwood coming in 16 that situation into that jury? Why, gentlemen, it meant

14

17 taking an awful chance, a chance that no man would take if 18 he could better it or change it. Something must be done 19 with Lockwood. He must either be gotten one way or another, 20

and so Franklin goes out to see him again on Sunday. Frank-

21 lin went to see Kruger on Sunday also. Lockwood's name 22 came out of the box Saturday. The defendant says about

23 11 o'clock. I don't remember, but assume that is correct. 24You remember that the record shows that on the day before

25 that, Friday, a panel had been drawn of 40 or 50 men, 26and you remember that the testimony shows that it was

Franklin's business to go out and hunt up those when the panel was drawn and report on them and report on those who had not already been reported on and so forth. That panel drawn on Friday, it is fair to assume, was keep-ing Franklin out, Friday and Saturday, and it is fair to assume he was out working on that Friday and Saturday, and that is why he didn't get the Saturday panel until saturday night. Now, let me tell you --

1 great big book--you have seen the report book here. I don't 2 know whether it was introduced in evidence or not, but you have seen the report book here, a great big book, and 3 it would take some time to go through that list and mark it. 4 If nothing was going to be done anyfurther, why not have 5 taken the list and stuck it in your pocket, and said when 6 Franklin came in that night, "Oh, well, I have looked it 7 over -- it is all right -- it is pretty good. Don't bother 8 about it, don't bother -- take it easy tomorrow. We have 9 other work to do-we are every busy, we have other names 10 an yhow." 11 Oh, no. The very opposite of that course is pursued. 12 Some new activity is taken up that was never taken up 13 before. This man Cooney, Darrow's man, who never before 14 had been sent to Franklin, is found by a Darrow 15 and Darrow says to Cooney, "Go and report to Franklin 16 and get someone else"--Fitzpatrick, I believe--" to go with 17 you and help him out. He has some work to do." 18 MR. ROGERS. Let us settle up this matter about that venire 19 proposition. I am going by the numbers. Number 11 which 20 is the venire returnable on the 28th, the one upon which 21 Lockwood's name appears, was drawn on the 25th. The next 22 preceding venire, marked here Number 10, was adrawn on the 23 22nd . 24 MR . FREDERICKS . Well, my memory is that a jury was idrawn

on Friday, but if I am not correct on that, forget it.

25

8015 1 I understand -- I say, forget it if I am not correct, and it 2 appears not to be correct; at least, you are the judges of 3 their testimony, and I do not care to contend for it in the 4 ace of what counsel says -- let Mr. Ford look further . 5 Now, then, Cooney is Darrow's own man, working on his 6 end, the Harrington end, not attached to Franklin's end, but 7 Cooney is sent by parrow to help Franklin out. Some heavy 8 and especially hard work to do, eh? Cooney is sent by 9 parrow, as Cooney swears, to get some hostile jurors out 10 of the way. That is Cooney's testimony absolutely--let 11 us have no question about it. If there is any question 12 about it I will read it. Cooney says Darrow told him to go 13 and report to Franklin, that there were some jurors there 14 that were hostile, and he told him to go Saturday night, 15 the testimony shows that they went and reported to Franklin 16 and Franklin gave them a list of what to do on Sunday. 17 There you get Darrow's close relation, close confidential 18 relation with Franklin -- talking about the jury list, getting 19 all of those things together, sending men over, telling 20him there were men there that were hostile, to help get 21 them off, and you get absolutely the close contact and 22 connection between Darrow and Franklin there. 23 Now, then, he goes. Does parrow know what he is going 24 You know, gentlemen, it is not a nice thing to do

that sort of a thing. It is not a lawful thing to do that

25

26

sort of a thing--go out and try to prevent a man getting on scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

the jury, and to go out and call him up on the telephone, if you have heard he is going to be hostile, and tell him to get out of the way. Nobody wanted to get onthat jury, it is reasonable to suppose. It was going to take a long time, it was going to take a long time to keep people away from their work, to keep people away from their business. Do you suppose that Darrow wasn't taking a big chance in doing that wrongful act on Sunday?

There Co oney testifies to his being directly sent to get 2 some hostile men off that jury, to get them away, and the 3 facts bear it out, bear it out absolutely, show that he did

do it, show that he went on that Sunday -- he and Fitzpatrick 5 together went down to Compton, went to a telephone exchange, 6 called up Mr Elliott, the banker, and told him -- we get 7 this from the testimony of Elliott, the banker, -- told

8 him that he was going to be called on the jury and if he 9 did not want to serve to get out of the way. But they went 10 over and did the same with Sackett, and did the same thing 11 with Polly, and all these three men came here to testify to it. Well, now, then, that is taking quite a chance. That is taking quite a chance, if a case is all over, to send this man over there, this man Cooney, that had never been sent there before, to work for Franklin. On Satu rday night. according to the testimony of both kruger -- no, according to the testimony of Franklin alone; and this is about the first time I have referred to the testimony of Franklin alone -- Franklin went down to Kruger's to see

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Kruger, whose name was on that list. Now, on the other side 21 what was the District Attorney doing? He had 22 seen that Lockwood's name had come out, too. He was seeing 23 two sides of a game here, and you can well imagine, from 24 this testimony, that he was wondering what in the world 25 these fellows were trying to do, trying to bribe jurymen 26 here on one side that he had gotten from Lockwood, and

other side talking to him about one of these men pleading 1 quilty. You can well imagine that an ordinary man would 2 wonder what under the sun they were trying to do, and 3 might suspect, probably, that they were trying to put him 4 to sleep, simply trying to put him to sleep in order that 5 they might get all they wanted on the jury. But I think 6 the better understanding of it is that they were simply 7 working two strings to their bow. Always willing and de-8 lighted and glad to have gotten J.B. off if J.B. would 9 10 not have to lose his life, always glad to do that, and this 11 fellow Steffens thinking maybe it could be done. But Dar-12 row, finding that it could not be done, and girding up his loins again and starting into the battle with all the vigor 13 14 and force on Sunday. Brown of the District Attorney's of-15 fice was called in then for the first time and sent out to Lockwood's house. Why, it is reasonable to suppose that 16 17 we suspected the first thing Franklin would do when he got that list would be to break for Lockwood. We did not know, 18 of course, that he had another man or two on his string; 19 that he was going to Kruger. So Browne takes two or 20 21 three detectives and goes out Saturday night and watches 22 Lockwood's house, but Franklin goes down to Kruger's and 23 finds no one at home. Then the next day is Sunday --24 let me tell you, you cannot follow these sleuths. If you 25 try to follow one of these wise fellows, you would last just about that long. They step into a doorway every so 26 scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

often and see who goes by, or they get into an automobile and whisk and they are gone. You could not follow Frank-To save your life you could not follow Franklin with-out getting caught at it, anyhow. So, on Sunday, Franklin gets out to Lockwood's house without anybody there to watch for him, and he has the conversation with Lockwood which both have narrated practically the same, and he offers him then a bigger sum. He had only offered him \$2000 before. Now, he offers him the full amount. I suppose probably Franklin was getting \$5000, as he says, and all he could save out of that was Franklin's. But finally he puts it up to the top notch. \$4000, where he puts it with all of them. I don't know who would get the saving. I don't care.

R2c1 That is simply a matter of bargaining, like buying potatoes, an vw av . 2 Franklin goes out then on Sunday to Lockwood's house. 3 There was nobody there to watch him and he makes his 4 proposition and Lockwood, under the instructions of the 5 District Attorney, or the advice of the District Attorney, as 6 he has told you, takes him on. Then Franklin comes 7 back and tells Darrow on Monday morning what he has done 8 about Lockwood. Now, then, you are up against a proposition 9 there. tockwood has been tampered with; Lockwood has 10

11

12

lB

been talked to; Lockwood is coming into that court room door on Monday morning, just as sure as the sun rises. I do not care if they have agreed that both J J and J B should plead guilty, and that they both should be hung, that they would have to play that string of Lockwood's out if it only took \$500 to play it out anyway. And so on Monday What happens?

13 14 15 16 17 I find the evidence is -- I don't know as it is material --18 that there was a jury drawn on the 22nd to appear Friday the 19 24th, and there was no court that day, and there was none 20 Saturday, and the matter went over with a full jury. There 21 w as quite a bunch there . 22 Now, let us see on Monday. Mr. pavis tells you--and 23 Davis has to help out a little here--I think Davis's memory 24 has just slipped a cog or two. Davis told you that old 25 Judge McNutt, who is now dead, and aside from my desire to scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

see any one live, I wish he was not. It seems to me, as
I have listened to this testimony, that a whole lot of
things happened when Judge McNutt was not around that
would not have happened when Judge McNutt was around, if
Judge McNutt had been here to tell about it, but that
be as it may, Davis says he went over Sunday night and
Judge McNutt told him that both of these men were willing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

to plead guilty.

Now, let us see about this. They had to send to Older and Gompers when they felt that one of them was going to plead guilty, the pawn, the poor puppet, the dynamiter, when they thought he was the one that was going to plead guilty and sent to Older and Gompers to get their advice on it, and yet they took the responsibility among themserves -- parrow takes the responsibility himself for throwing J J to the wolves as they call it, for throwing the American Federation of Labor to the bad, he takes that responsibility himself. Not in a thousand years. Not in a thousand years! On Monday Pavis says he did know that J J would plead guilty if he had to. Well, Steffens says he didn't. Here is Davis's testimony, taken from the 68th transcript, 5587. Davis testified: "I went up there to the District Attorney sometime on Monday and I said what was this proposition you told me that had been made to you." referring to me. "And hey that is the District Attorney, related the same proposition and I said, the boys hever would

plead guilty and let the judge fix the sentence of John unless they knew the judge's idea as to what that sentence

1

2

3

4

5

21

22

23

24

25

26

would be."

"Q When he said that he told to you the same proposition he had stated before, what was that? A That Jim would have to take life and J J would have to take a term of years, and that the judge would have to fix it." Something that they were never willing to do under their own testimony

6 7 8 and under this testimony right here. Then he says that he 9 knew at that time that J J was willing to plead guilty, but 10 11 he would not tell it to me. Let's see what this babe in the woods, Steffens, says about it. Here is what Steffens 12 13 says--MR. APPEL. Just a moment -- with your permission, Mr. Freder-14 icks. 15 MR. FREDERICKS. Yes. 16 17 to just quote one statement of Mr. Davis's. I think he 18 19 20

MR. APPEL. We insist that it is not right for Mr. Fredericks will find Mr. pavis said to him, "What do you mean by a term of years?" That he said to him, "Ten years." Right there in that commection. He left that entirely out. MR. FREDERICKS. That is not the point that I am making at all. The point that I made there was that he said he would never let them plead guilty if the judge was to fix the sentence, and I said the judge would have to fix the sentence, and that I suggested ten years. Now, then, he goes back and he said he reported this to

Darrow on Monday. This was on Monday the 27th, mind you. 1 the day that Franklin was going to Darrow and telling him 2 3 about Lockwood, that they could now get Lockwood and they were wondering what to do. I imagine, and here is what 4 Steffens says, quoting from 65, 5262 and on down further: 5 "A--This was the conversation, I think, Monday morning, or 6 Monday sometime. Mr. navis came back and reported that he 7 had seen Captain Fredericks, and that Captain Fredericks 8 was asking in addition to J B taking life, J J should take 9 a sentence. I don't remember just what it was. I have an 10 impression that it was ten years. I remember Darrow and I 11 separately--" here is the point, "I remember Darrow and I, 12 separately from pavis, who didn't know all the plans, you 13 know at this moment -- Mr. Davis didn't know that Darrow was 14 willing to consent to have J J go too. Mr. Darrow and I 15 talked this over, and felt that what Davis reported confirmed 16 what I had been reporting, out of the dark, so to speak." 17

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

22

18

19

20

21

\_\_\_\_

2324

25

"Mr Rogers -- What did Mr Darrow say when Mr Davis reported what the District Attorney had said to him on that Monday? A -- As I remember it, he told Davis that he would not let J.J. go, and he told me to go out and make a fight and say to everybody," and so forth. On Monday Steffens says that Davis came back and that Davis didn't know all 6 the plans. That Davis was not on the inside and didn't know that J.J. -- that Darrow was willing to have J.J. plead guilty. So says Steffens. Well, Davis says he did know Well, he didn't know it because that is why Frankit. lin had to run back and forth on that Monday and see Darrow. You remember that when Franklin first came to Darrow that morning, Darrow said that he would see if he could give him the money. You remember that at 11 o'clock, sometime be-14 tween 11 and 1, as the testimony shows, Franklin went over 15 to see if he could get Cap White to act and hold this money. You remember that he came back and talked to Darrow about it, and still Darrow didn't have the money. You remember that he told Darrow he wanted it that night, because he had said that he had told Lockwood -- that he had arranged with Lockwood to call him up and come to his office. You remember still, Darrow was shilly shallying, still undecided, 22 still didn't give him the money. Why, he had sent Davis --23 Davis says Darrow sent him that day up to the District 24 Attorney's office to find out what the last word was about 25 J.J., and when they came back and Davis told him that 26

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

1 J. J. would have to go, he made up his mind he would have to 2 play the game a little further, at any rate, and he told Franklin, "I will give you the money the next morning, " 4 and he was there to give it. 5 Now, what was Lockwood doing on Friday? He came in 6 on the train and called the District Attorney up on the 7 phone, as he says, and, fearful of coming to the office 8 for fear he would be seen, was directed to go out to his 9 house, and there told him of what Franklin had done with 10 him the day before, and the conversation and arrangements 11 that had been made. And then Browne is sent for and told 12 about it. The conversation is not gone into there very 13 generally, for it would be hearsay, but Browne is sent for 14 to come to the District Attorney's house, and then 15 Browne leaves and goes and gets his men, and the District 16 Attorney takes Lockwood in his automobile and takes him 17 out, out into his own country, so that if Franklin wanted 18 him he would have to go to his country for him. Franklin 19 wanted to get him into his office. Ah, these fellows are 20 foxy. He goes out there for another reason, goes out 21 there so that there would be a record made of the tele-22 phone message to Franklin, in order to get corroboration 23 and cinch Franklin and close the case on him, and he tele-24 phones to him -- leaves Los Angeles and goes to El Monte 25 and telephones in to Franklin and tells Franklin that he 26can't come to town that afternoon, and that if he wants

8026 see him he will have to come out to his house, and Franklin 1 telephones back and says, "All right", and asks shall he 2 bring the big one? On Sunday, they had been talking about 3 Cap White. Franklin evidently referred to Can White. 4 who is a big one physically, as you saw him here on the 5 stand. Lockwood says, "Yes", thinking that he meant Dar-6 row, because Lockwood said that on Sunday Franklin had 7 talked to him, and told him that he would talk to Darrow 8 and ask him how they could make it safe. But reason 9 10 would tell you that Darrow wasn't going out there. And then Lockwood goes, and they get Constable Hicks out there 11 12 so as to have another witness of the bribing, they go to the District Attorney, and the District Attorney takes 13 Lockwood and Hicks out and leaves them there, just as Browne 14 15 comes up with his men. Now, counsel made an effort to show that there was a 16 great scheme to get Darrow out there that night. That is 17

all nonsense, because the testimony shows that Browne left and got his men and went out there before this telephone business started, must have started out there, before this telephone message was ever received or ever talked about. And there they planted themselves around the house there that night, trying to catch Franklin in this nefarious business, and he comes out. But he has not brought the money yet, and so the deal doesn't come off, but the men are planted all around in order to catch them, and another appointscanned by LALAWLIBRARY

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

-25

ment is made, and the appointment is made for the city of Los Angeles on the public streets of Los Angeles, and if there has been any argument here that it would be foolish to think of passing money on a public street, I will guarantee to meet any man on any of the public avenues or streets of this city, if I am not suspected and pass him a roll of five or six bills anywhere on the streets, and it would be safer to do it there than it could be done on to top of Mt Lowe or on the top of a tree or on the top of a house.

Lockwood had to be here the next morning -- you have got to figure on that. The clock keeps moving, and Lockwood had to be here the next morning. Franklin knew it, and so Franklin arranged with White the day before to meet him at a certain phace, any one place would have been as good as another, and White was going to get the money.

Well, if there is any doubt about the sincerety of that whole transaction, all you had to do was to look at the face, the putty face of poor old Cap White. You had to look at him swallow and catch his breath while he was trying to tell his story, which corroborated Franklin in every important particular except one. There was a difference in their testimony as to how much White was to get out of it, but that is immaterial. And so these men from the District Attorney's office get tack at midnight, come back between 1 and 2 o'clock, and the plans are laid for the next

day down here at 9 o'clock.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Ulc 1

I want to tell you, gentlemen, that if it had been laid in a rooming house it would have been a snap to catch them all, for you could have planted men here and there to look through transoms, or through keyholes, and all that sort of thing, but where are you going to hide detectives out on the street that they wont be seen? Where are you going to hide them that they wont be seen down on the street? And the transaction came off just as it has been narrated here. I do not intend to take up your time going into the details of that transaction. If you are not convinced by the testimony that you have heard here of the absolute correctness and sincerity of that, then all the talk/that I could do would have no effect whatever.

I will call your attention to just one discrepancy in that, and that is that Franklin's testimony does not agree in all particulars with the testimony of all the others, and I will tell you in my judgment why—and it does not make a great amount of difference one way or the other. We get our memory from our ability to pay attention to what is going on. Franklin that morning was struck a terrific blow. Imagine, if you can,—and I only want you to imagine it for a while, for I would not want you to leave you for long in that situation—imagine Mr. Franklin, 40 to 45 years old, going on his way through life, known all over this country, known all over Los Angeles, having his friends, his lodges and so forth, engaged in this that he knew was an

1 unlawful and dangerous and penitentiary offense, when he 2 first saw Jim Campbell down there that morning. You can 3 well imagine that his heart gave a thump. While Jim 4 Campbell was likely to be anywhere, the deal had been 5 s tarted, and he stands and watches it. He was innocent 6 enough, and Jim goes out of sight. Browne is down at the 7 corner. Jim and Browne had gome down onthe street car and 8 passed the corner of Third and Los Angeles in the street 9 car, and then got off on the other side, and after the deal 10 was pulled off, as it has been narrated here by Lockwood 11 and White and Home and Ong and Browne--after the deal was 12 pulled off -- I do not believe that Franklin saw George Home 13 until that time. we says he did but I claim that he did not, 14 that the shock to his mind at that time was so great that 15 he could not remember a accurately as these other men do 16 who were only performing the ordinary--although 17 --but the things that they were hired to do and were not in 18 any danger or there was no occasion for any shock. But when 19 he first sees George Home there that morning -- he had seen 20 Jim Campbell before -- his mind was working on that thing. 21 Oh, he said to Lockwood and White: "Don't look around; 22 don't look around. The sons-of-bitches." Oh, gentlemen, 23 that is when his heart began to flutter. Then is when the 24 blood went to his head. Then is when he realized that the 25 trick was up; they had him in a trap; they had him and 26 they had him good and plenty. And he turned to Lockwood and he said: "Be on the square with me", or "Are you on the square with me?" or something to that effect, and Lockwood gave him another jolt when he told him that there was somebody out around his house that night. There was a condition of mind there at that moment that was absolutely calculated to destroy a memory, a keen memory, at any rate, of thesuccession of vevents, and he may think he saw George Home twice, but I don, t believe he did. Whether he did or whether he did not, it does not make a great amount of difference. But I am sure he did not.

Now, we come up to the actual occurrences that connect this defendant with this offense. What was Franklin doing down there, anyhow? Why didn't he stay away from there and give the money to White and let White go onand do the job? \$\\\^44,000\$ is a whole lot of money. It is a whole lot of money to trust to a fellow that is engaged in the commission of a crime like that, that nobody can tell about, and that you cannot make him give back. Franklin was watching his money to see that the deal came off, and remember that had to be reported to somebody pretty quick, because Lockwood was going to come into court at 9 o'clock or a little after, and somebody had to know whether it was all right or not.

- 1 Somebody had to know it and had to know it right. He 2 was watching his money and he was watching to see 3 whether the deal came off or not, so he could run up and 4 report it at once to Clarence Darrow. And Clarence 5 parrow was watching his money and was wanting to know 6 whether the deal was coming off all right, because he had 7 to be up in court there at 9 o'clock and he had to pass, 8 in a measure, at least, on the examination of George Lock-9 wood, and he wanted to know what was going to happen and 10 going to be prepared. 11 MR. DARROW We object to that statement, your Honor, that 12 I had to pass on George Lockwood. 13 MR. FREDERICKS Well, the judge had to pass on it. 14 MR . DARROW . I would not have known anything about it . 15 MR. APPEL. We take an exception to the District Attorney's 16 remarks, that Lockwood had to be in court at 9 o'clock that 17 morning, because the evidence is uncontradicted that he had
- 19 MR. FREDERICKS. 1t does not make any difference.

never been summoned as a juror .

- 20 MR. APPEL. It does not make a difference. He is mistaken 21 in the fact that he had to be there in court at 9 o'clock
- In the fact that he had to be there in court at 9 o'clock
- 22 that morning.

- 23 THE COURT. The exception is noted. The jury are the exclu-
- 24 sive judges of the testimony.
- 25 MR . FREDERICKS . Now, listen, I will cover that.
- 26 MR. APPEL. He had not been summoned, and the record shows it

THE COURT Proceed, Captain Fredericks. MR. FREDERICKS He did have to be there that morning. Franklin told him that his name was on the list. Franklin did not know he had not beensummoned; parrow did not know he hadn't been summoned, and he was going to be there anyhow, he told Franklin that he would be there. The mere fact of having a paper served on him didn't make any dif-ference. He was going to be there. Parrow did not know that he did not have any paper served on him, did he? If he did how did he find it out? MR . PARROW. The record of the sheriff shows that the man wasout of the county and has never been served. MR. FREDERICKS Did Darrow know that? MR. DARROW. It is a public record. MR. FREDERICKS. It was not a public record until after it 

was filed in court here on the 28th day of November .

- 1 MR APPRL: Just a moment. When it was filed it became a
- 2 record. It cannot be contradicted by the statement of
- 3 | the District Attorney.
- 4 MR FREDERICKS: That don't ring true to me, those interrup-
- 5 | tion s and objections.
- 6 MR APPHL: We want to state to the court it was a public
- 7 record. It was a public record from the time it left the
- 8 care of --

15

- 9 MR FREDERICKS: Those in terruptions don't ring true to me.
- 10 You are not doing that for a lawful purpose.
- 11 MR APPEL: They do to any honest man.
- 12 THE COURT: The objection and exception is noted.
- 13 MR FREDERICKS: I maintain to you that Darrow didn't know
- 14 but what he had to be here, and he did have to be here and
- but that he had to be here,

Lockwood knew his name was on that. He was going to be

- 16 | here and Franklin told him he was going to be here, and
- here and Franklin told him he was going to be here, and
- 17 Darrow had to kno w about it, and Darrow wanted to know,
- 18 what to do and what attitude to take when he saw George
- 19 Lockwood come in that door.
- 20 MR DARROW: Captain Fredericks knows perfectly well that
- 21 the lawyers would not have to pass on that for two weeks.
- 22 It isn't fair.
- 23 MR FREDE ICKS: It isn't fair for you to take up my time.
- 24 MR MARROW: It is fair when you are stating something that
- 25 is not true.
- 26 MR APPHL: We take an exception to his saying that Darrow

- 1 knew he had to be there at 9 o'clock, because there isn't
- 2 any evidence of that fact.
- MR FREDERICKS: Gentlemen of the jury, if I sat on a jury 3
- 4 and saw a prosecuting attorney badgered and bothered in
- 5 this vay, I would come to one conclusion, and one only,
- 6 if there wasn't any evidence in the case, and that is that
- 7 they were afraid to hear what he had to say in his
- closing argument. 8
- 9 MR ROGERS: With all due respect, we take an exception, be-
- cause we are not badgering. We are merely calling at-
- 11 tention to the record because we cannot reply and when the
- 12 record --

- 13 MR FREDERICKS: Say what you want to say and don't take up
- 14 my time.
- 15 MR ROGERS: The record is being misquoted, and is as fol-
- 16 lows: George Lockwood left county year and a half ago.
- 17 Not served. That is the record.
- 18 MR FREDERICKS: yes, that is the record. There is no doubt
- 19 about that, but there is no doubt about the fact that
- 20 George N. Lockwood's name was drawn from the box, and that
- 21he had not left the county, and that Franklin told him to
- 22 be here, and that his name would come out, and he was going
- 23to be here, served or no served. I don't know how that
- 24got on there, and I don't care. It doesn't stop the truth,
- 25 and you know it doesn't stop the truth, you know what the
- facts are. And so Darrow had to know that morning. He didn't 26

have to pass on his qualifications, that was done by the 1 judge, but yet, I conclude from this testimony and from 2 all of it and from common sense and common judgment that 3 Darrow vanted to know before George Lockwood came into that 4 court that morning what was going to happen. He wanted to 5 know before he saw George Lockwood entered those doors, 6 whether George Lockwood was going to say anything about 7 what Franklin had been talking about or not. In addition 8 to that he wanted to know whether Franklin was playing 9 square with that \$4000, and he was down there watching to 10 find out. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Why, this poppycock story about going over to headquarters! I wish I had time to sit down and read that editorial which this man Hawley says called his attention to the fact that there was an alliance between the Liquor interests and the Good Government Organization, and therein Clarence Darrow from Chicago should be called in to tell them what to do advise us. Yet, Clarence Darrow says he always wanted to be in court. Oh, shucks! Nonsense! Well, you don't expect that Darrow is going to tell you what he was really there for. Let me tell you, gentlemen, of all the men in all the world who might have been, at that particular time, isn't it strange that as the officer of the law put his hands upon the felon Franklin, that felon's boss, Darrow, should come right up and stand by his side. Isn't it a remarkable circumstance? Can logic or

tears or wails or fears convince you that Clarence Darrow 1 2 was there by accident and mere accident? Ah. non-3 sense, nonsense! Absurd! Why, gentlemen, if there was 4 absolutely nothing else in this case, if you would go out 5 from here and tell your own souls in two weeks from now that 6 Franklin was arrested caught bribing a juror just around 7 the corner a few hundred yards from Darrow was standing 8 when he was arrested, that just around the corner two or 9 three minutes before, four thousand dollars had been passed-10 passed for what purpose? Passed in the case on trial in 11 which Darrow was chief counsel, and that Franklin had 12 finally admitted that Darrow gave him the money, why, if you 13 ever tried to satisfy your souls two weeks after the glamour 14 of his oratory had left you, that that man vas not guilty, 15 you would have an awful job to do it. You couldn't do it. 16 You couldn't do it, in the light of day. Why, look at it, 17 gentlemen. What was the business that was being pulled 18 off down there at Third and Los Angeles? Business in 19 which the chief counsel of the McNamaras was interested, 20wasn't it? Strange then, that he should have been just 21 about in that lo cality and you have seen the scene and 22 you know how far away it is. The strangest thing 23 that of all times and in all the world in all the months 24that he has been here, that that one time at a little 25less than 9 in the morning, should have been the one time 26that he chose to make a crossing there, and that that one

time of all times in the world, should have been the one time that Franklin was there being arrested. Strange that such a coincidence should happen innocently. Why, gentlemen, it is preposterous. It is absolutely absurd. It corroborates Franklin absolutely. Why, without Frank-lin's testimony at once you would say, "Well, that looks mighty close to Darrow. What is he doing down there? Court is in session up here. It is after 9 o'clock, why isn't he up here. He says he belongs here; he says he is always here generally; why isn't he? Why is it he is running off down there? Strange that he should happen to be there just at that time." You will never be able to explain that to your own conscience on any ground of inno-cence, and it je absolutely satisfies reason in every particular without anything else. 

Now, the idea, remember, that Darrow was not risking any \$4000 there, don't get that into your head. Darrow was risking just \$500, because the bargain with Lockwood was that if he didn't vote for an acquittal, and he couldn't vote for an acquittal, if the case was dismissed, or if the men plead guilty, if he didn't vote for acquittal, the \$3500 was to come back, so he was only risking \$500, that is all, unless you call it a risk to put it in the hands of white. There might be some element of risk there, but that is not an element of risk that we can consider here.

lw

Darrow says in his argument to you that that is an argument of his innocence, because if he had known that was going

to come off he wouldn't have been there. Gentlemen, how

absurd! Suppose now that he had not been there; supposing

he had been over on Figueroa street; supposing he had been

in San Francisco; then he would argue to you, "Why, I wasn't there. I was over on Figueroa street. I was in

San Francisco, so of course I had nothing to do with it-
1 wasn,t there when this man was arrested. I wasn't around
the corner just a few minutes after the bribe was passed--

Ah, gentlemen, take it together with all the things in this case, it is an absolute absurdity. It is an absolute waste of time to argue anything else.

And what is his conduct? Now, you may say that one man

i didn't know anything about it." He would have made

wouldn't act like another, that is true—that is true.

One man would not act like another. Darrow saw Browne coming down the street right after Franklin. Here comes Franklin and Lockwood, here comes Browne right after him. Here is Darrow coming across the street, and it is quite possible that just as he got about the middle of the street and asw Browne, Browne saw him, and he turns and goes back—he turns and goes back. It is very reasonable to suppose

that Browne, the skilled detective, saw Darrow as quick as

Darrow saw him, and that their eyes met, there was no going

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

1 back and he got to Franklin just in time to warn him that 2 they are onto him, because he saw browne right back of him 3 and he knew they were onto him. And what does he do? 4 What does he do? 5 Let us assume that he is an innocent man going down the 6 street, accidentally meeting one of his employes, and that 7 employe meets him and he meets other employes just as he 8 is put under arrest. Now, it is not necessary to create any 9 scene--he didn: t create any scene when he talked with Prowne 10 down here on Franklin street afterwards, did he? It was 11 not necessary to do anything of the kind. But, let me tell 12 you, there was another shock that came that morning. 13 Franklin had gotten his terrific shock just a few minutes 14 before, when he saw George Home, and he got it again just 15 that minute when Browne took himup. But there fell on 16 Clarence Patrow at that minute a terrific shock, a terrible 17 blow. My God! the lights went out. Think of it! 18 years old, a skilled attorney, the head counsel in the Mc-19 Namara case, caught right there, when he knew, when he 20knew just what had happened, when he knew that Franklin had 21 left him only a few minutes before with the money, when he 22 knew that the jig was up and he didn't know just how close 23 he was to it himself. What a shock--oh, what a terrific

And what would a man do? Back off. Back off. Back off until he could catch his breath, until he could get his

shock!

24

25

1 thought, until he could catch his senses. Ah, if he had 2 been an innocent man, why, there would have been no fear 3 there, there would have been no apprehension there. Do 4 you think he would have obeyed Browne? No. Why, if he 5 had been an innocent man he would have said something 6 different, something absolutely conclusive -- would have 7 said, "Why. Browne, what does this mean, Old Man? What 8 ddes it mean here? What are you fellows doing? You don't 9 mean to tell me you are arresting Franklin? You are joking 10 What do you mean by this?" Or he would have fallen into 11 a rage, one or the other, or there would have been some 12 question asked. There would have been some conduct that 13 would have been natural to innocence. No man is going to 14 see his hired man, his close confidential agent, grabbed 15 up on the street and back off, back off, and turn and go 16 away without a word, without a sound, without a syllable. Are you going to believe that that was the adt of an 17 18 innocent man? Why, no--no. 19

innocent man? Why, no--no.

And then he turns. He says he doesn't follow them.

He says he doesn't come for the purpose of following them,
but he accidentally meets Browne as Browne is coming in the
court house. Let me read you what he said to Browne.

Browne says he wrote it down. Browne says, "I went up to
the District Attorney's office, "--and he wrote it down what
Darrow said. Here is what Darrow, this innocent man-oh, no, you can't hook up this with innocence--this is what

20

21

22

23

24

25

8042 1 Darrow says: "My God, I wouldn't have had this happen for 2 the world"-\_and he wouldn't; if he had known it was going 3 to happen this way -- "I never would have allowed it to be 4 done"--and he wouldn't, not if it was going to happen that 5 way. "Isn't there anything that you can do? This is 6 terrible." "Oh, and it was. He had had a few minutes to 7 think. "This is terrible." Browne said, "I said you will 8 have to talk to Captain Fredericks. Darrow then said, 9 Browne, this is terrible. For God's sake, can't you do 10 anything for "--for -- "for us." For us. Not for Franklin--11 for us. "Can't you do anything for us?" 12 "I answered, 'You ought to have known better than employ 13 a man like Franklin, he is always drunk. I don't know whatt 14 I can do for you.' Darrow says, 'He came to me highlyu 15 recommended fiby Mr. McCormick and others. He said, Browne 16 do the best you can, and I will take care of you'. I said, 17 'Mr. Darrow, you will have to take a big smoke,' and I turned 18 and left." 19 "Browne, do the best you can and I will take care of you." 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

Take care of whom? Take care of my detective? Take 1 care of the man who was working for the prosecution? 2 Take care of Browne? "I will take care of you." Can't 3 you do anything for us?" That, gentlemen, is the same 4 old idea, that permeates this man's talk and this testi-5 mony from beginning to end; it is the idea that he could 6 get men to do things and shove them around like fawns and 7 he would take care of them. He was going to take care of 8 Biddinger. He was going to take care of Browne. Gentle-9 ment What is that, if it is anything? What is that offer 10 to Browne? What is it? If it is anything, isn't it a 11 12 direct bribe to Browne? Suppose Browne had gone a step 13 further then, and said: Darrow, what do you mean by taking 14 care of me? Ah, what answer do you suppose he would have 15 gotten? What answer do you suppose he would have got-16 ten? "I will take care of you" is a general statement. 17 Innocent! Oh, shaw! Why, gentlemen, there is not an iota 18 of innocent thought in the whole thing. 19 I am not going to take up your time in going over the con-20 versations that Franklin narrates he had with Darrow up 21 in his office on Monday when he was trying to get this money 22 and Darrow was holding off. I am not going to bother to 23 go into the conversations that he says he had with Dar-24 row on the morning that he gave him the money. But let me 25 tell you one thing, if Franklin had been framing a 26lie on this thing he would not have put Job Harriman into it;

1 he would not have put Job Harriman into it. He would 2 not have put two men into it to swear against him. He 3 would have put Darrow into it alone. That is another cir-4 cumstance. Isn't it strange, isn't it passing strange that 5 this happened down on Main street just about long enough aft-6 er Job Harriman had been to his vault to get up to his 7 office, and for Franklin to meet him, and Franklin get 8 down and to where he did and do what he did? You can 9 trace it all back, minute by minute, and you will find 10 that it will connect exactly with Job Harriman's time at 11 the vault. Did Franklin know that Job Harriman went to 12 the vault that morning? Was Franklin doing this for poli-13 It was not while politics were going on. Nobody tics? 14 told Franklin that Job Harriman had anything to do with it 15 while politics were going on, Oh, no, there is nothing 16 of that kind in it, gentlemen. How did Franklin know that 17 Job Harriman was going to his vault that morning? Why, 18 gentlemen, you cannot put aside all these circumstances and 19 say: we won't believe him. You cannot do that. True, 20 Job Harriman puts up a pretty good reason for going there 21 that morning. But why, of all the mornings -- that note 22 had been presented to his office, as the records on the 23 notes show, a notice had been sent to his office on the 24 23rd, and a messenger had come again on the 27th, and 25the bank teller, the bank's cashier at the note window, 26 says that on Monday -- Job Harriman's secretary came there scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

on Monday with a check to pay that note, and the note was 1 out. Now, of course, in the great raft of business that 2 comes before a teller in a tank, the teller might possibly 3 be mistaken. 4 MR DARROW: I want to object to that, because the bank 5 teller swears on cross-examination that he didn't remember. 6 MR FREDERICKS: He doesn't say anything of the kind. You 7 remember the testimony. He brought it out clear and strong 8 that he remembered, and he said the name of the bank that 9 the check was on. I asked him the name of the bank that 10 the check was on that was presented to him Monday morning 11 and he gave the name of the same bank that Harriman's 12 money was in. I have forgotten the name of the bank. 13 But what of it? Men might be mistaken about those things, 14 and it does not make a great amount of difference one way 15 or the other, whether he was or whether he was not. 16 A teller in a bank might be mistaken about when check was 17 brough t there. I do not believe he was. He says he was 18 not. Let it goat that. He may have been. The fact is 19 that he chose that morning, that morning to pay the note. 20 You know this alibi does not hang together very well, for 21 it appeared oncross-examination here that when the 500 22 vas deposited, there was enough money in the lank to pay 23 the note, and it could have been paid that day. But that 24 does not make a great amount of difference one way or 25 the other. The fact remains that Job Harriman went to his 26

vault that morning .

1

3

5

7

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Now. I am not going into details on that. Mr Ford went 2 over it with you, and you will see that it is absolutely demonstrated by his calculation that he could not possibly 4 have sent this Iphone to Mr Darrow until half past nine. Mr Hawley's testimony is a complete fabrication from be-6 ginning to end. Why is it a complete fabrication? Why didn't they ask Job Harriman when he was on the stand--8 why didn't they ask Job Harriman if he had had a talk with 9 Hawley that morning? They did not ask him that. Not one 10 scintilla of testimony did they get out of Job Harriman 11 about Job Harriman's having a talk with Hawley that morn-12 ing: not a word. Why? Because it is so dangerous to try 13 and match a lie in with anyone else's testimony. That is 14 why they did not ask Harriman those questions. Not a word 15 did they ask Harriman as to whether he had seen Hawley 16 17 that morning. Now, on all this talk about a lack of motive. 18

mys, in transcript 69, page 5602, that if it had been left entirely to the judge we certainly would not have done so; we would have gone on and tried the case, certainly. When did he know they were not going on and try the case? When did he know that the Judge would listen to the recommendation of the District Attorney? Why, after all this affair was over; after it was all over; he didn't know. They were simply playing safe, that is all, and I asked him

if he did not know that Judge Bordwell was a strange judge in criminal practice, and if I had not told him that I did not know what he would do, and that he knew as well as I did and he said yes.

And nobody knew until that Friday morning whether the case would have to go onand be tried with that jury or not, and if this Franklin and Lockwood episode had not have come up, if Lockwood had been what they thought he was, and had taken the bait and had taken the money, and slid through and been examined as we were examining jurors all Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday—Thursday was a holiday, and he had gone on through, there would have been a mighty short show for any compromise or any dickering about anybody pleading guilty, in my judgment.

Steffens says, transcript 67, page 5369: "We were always afraid during the negotiations that it would leak out and the case would have to be tried." I haven't quoted that verbatim, but that is the substance of it. Steffens says in his article, and I would like that article, Mr. Smith, if you will give it to me. It is on several sheets of paper pasted on. Steffens says in his article, published December 2nd: "If the judge's sentence did not correspond to the District Attorney's representation the case would go on."

Now, Davis says, and I could get this in the book, but I want to hurry, but if you are in doubt about it I will get it. Davis testified here that he and I had agreed on Wednesday that both these men were going to plead guilty.

Now, I am going to tell you why that is not true by this testimony without testifying about it myself at all. Davi

26

says that they had told me on Wednesday, the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, that J J was willing to plead guilty. I say this testimony shows absolutely that he did not tell me anything of the kind. Yea. Lincoln Steffens got together and arranged a meeting of business men down here that night, Wednesday night, and Lincoln Steffens testifies that was the first committee meeting they had had, and Lincoln Steffens says that he labored with them that night, Wednesday night, to get them to come to me to accept a plea from J B and let J J go, and he says he did it with all the force he had, and that he never for one moment intimated that it was possible that J J would plead guilty wednesday night down there at the meeting of the business men, that he thought he was going to come and talk to me so that J J would not plead guilty, and Davis tried to make you believe that he had told me personally on that afternoon that they would. what a fool notion to send Steffens down there to make a plea on a proposition of that kind, on something that they had already given up and told me so. How absurd, and yea, there is another reason why you may know without me saying one word of testimony that they never gave up J J until Thanksgiving day and that they gave him up then in order to end this whole business, and quiet it down, and that is the telephone message that LeCompte Davis saidhe had with me at 2 o'clock Thanksgiving afternoon. Davis called me up then and he had forgotten about that until I brought

1 to his attention and I said to him, as the testimony shows, 2 and as he admits, that he asked me if he could come out 3 that night and see me. Thanksgiving night. I said to him, "There is no use in your coming, Davis, unless they are both 4 willing to plead guilty." Now, in order to get around 5 6 that idea they say, Oh, they were both willing to plead 7 guilty but they were not both willing to plead guilty at the same time. Ah, shucks, rot! What difference does 8 it make whether they plead guilty at the same time or at 9 another time? You knowwhat an absolute absurdity that is, 10 so they both plead guilty. What difference does it make 11 whether they plead guilty together or separately? They 12 couldn't, of course, then bunco me into getting a light 13 sentence, or bunco the court into getting a light sentence 14 on J B unless they had a plea of guilty of J J, and there 15 is many a day passes between the plea and the sentence, and 16 they were going to deceive, they say, to deceive their own 17 clients. 18

Now, then, Steffens knew why.

He gave it to the world and the whole world knew that these

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

What was all that wrestling over there, and all that fuss and all that striving, and all that pleading on Thanksgiving day if it was not to get them to plead guilty and to get JJ, and here is Steffens account of it, which has been intro-

duced in evidence which he wrote on Friday night: "All that

men never agreed to plead guilty until Thanksgiving Day.

1 5

rect, objected to his brother Joe doing the same thing.

J J was willing. He, J J, gave his consent after five or
ten minutes talk, and I sat with Jim while the lawyers
talked to Joe. He gave his consent after five or ten
minutes talk. Talk about what happened over there Thanksgiving Day and say there was no intention—I don't know that
there is any use of taking a great deal of time about that,
for under their own admission it don't make a great deal of
difference, for under their own admission the case would
have to go on unless the terms I recommenced were acceded to
by the judge, and they never knew whether they would be
acceded to or not.

need be said now in regard to the occurrence at the jail

before to plead guilty himself, and I think that is cor-

is that Jim, that is J B, who had consented four or five days

Gentlemen, I am purposely cutting out a great many things here, because I think they are not necessary. You have heard this testimony. I have gone over here in detail just about twenty crimes that the evidence in this case shows that this defendant committed, and I am not going to take up your time further with this matter. I am going to let you get these instructions and go out and settle this matter. I have shown you 22 separate and distinct crimes. There is one that I didn't refer to here that I see now.

It is the running off of the witness Skillan. Skillan was not brought on the stand. Harrington testified—

MR. DARROW. There is no evidence in this record anywhere that Skillan was a witness or knew anything about it.

MR. FREDERICKS. Harrington testified that Darrow told him about giving a man named Skillan a hundred dollars to get away and that he was a witness. There hasn't been much about that and I have not referred to it particularly because it hasn't been gone into, and Skillan was not gotten, but there is that much in the testimony and they count up 22.

1 CRIMES (

Crime No. 1. On June 5th, the endeavor to corrupt Bidding-

3 er in Chicago.

2

5

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

4 Crime No.2. On June 18th, the employment of Behm to come to

Los Angeles and induce McManigal a State's witness, to re-

6 pudiate his confession.

7 Crime No.5. Beginning June 27th, the advising and en-8 couraging of Behm in Los Angeles in the attempt to cor-

g rupt State's witness McManigal.

10 Crime No.4. On August 1st, advising and encouraging the

running out of the state of State's witness Flora Caplan.

12 Crime No.5. August 14th, coaching Behm in his testimony

13 before the Grand Jury.

14 Crime No.6. Attempt to corrupt Biddinger in Los Angeles

15 at the Alexandria Hote, August 15th.

16 Crime No.7. August 21st, or 22nd, again a ttempting to

17 | corrupt Biddinger in San Francisco.

18 Crime No.8. September 2nd, securing of \$10,000 in bills
19 to be used for the crime of jury bribing.

Crime No.9. The Dickelmann affair, about September

20th.

Crime No. 10. October 1st, the running off of witness

Skillen.

All of these established without one word from Franklin,

who had been at work all this time gathering information about the jury. When the selection of the jury became more

important than the matters of evidence, Franklin and

- 2 his work came to the front, and then came
- 3 Crime No.11. The bribing of Robert Bain, October 6th.
- 4 Crime No. 12. November 2nd, the attempt to bribe Underwood.
- 5 Crime No.13. November 4th, the beginning of the crime
- 6 of attempting to bribe Lockwood, which was completed as a
- 7 separate crime on November 9th.
- 8 Crime No.14. This was afterwards renewed by the commis-
- 9 sion of another crime in attempting to bribe Lockwood.
- 10 November 25th to 28th. 11
- Crime No.15. November 8th, the crime of attempting to bribe 12 Frank Smith of Covina.
- 13 Crime No.16. November 8th, in the advice, assistance and
- 14 encouragement given to Mrs Bain.
- 15 Crime No.17. November 12th, the first visit in the at-
- 16 tempt to bribe Krueger.
- 17 Crime No.18. The attempt to bribe Yonkin, November 18th.
- 18 Crime No.19. The final attempt to bribe Krueger, Sunday,
- 19 November 26th.
- 20 Crime No.20. November 26th, the attempt on the part of
- 21
- Cooney to have juror Elliott, the banker of Compton, 22
- avoid jury summons. 23 Crime No.21. November 26th, the attempt to have juror Sackett
- 24 of Artesia avoid jury summons.
- 25 Crime No.22. November 26th, the attempt to have juror
- 26 R. E. Dolley of Norwalk avoid jury service.

And practically all of them brought before you by the testimony of others than Franklin -- Franklin's testimony simply of its own weight, that is all:

1

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

3 Now, gentlemen. I am not going to talk to you further. 4 I am going to leave this with you. This is your affair 5 from now on. As I said it to you in the beginning, if 6 you want to make jury-bribing a safe industry, then 7 acquit this man on this testimony, for you will never 8 again -- no other jury will ever, in my judgment, have 9 submitted to them a stronger case of this most damnable 10 crime. Think of it, gentlemen! With all the witnesses 11 who have come here, with all of them right out of their own 12 camp, who have come here to tell this story of corruption! 13

If sympathy for Clarence Darrow weighs more with you than the desire to blot out this damnable thing, then let him go. But let me call your attention to the fact that history tells us that George Washington wept when he signed the death warrant of Major Andre. But he signed it nevertheless. Now, in God's name, be men; in God's name, be strong men. In the name of the state and in the name of decency, don't let us have this snakey monster crawl its filthy length through our courts of justice and coil itself up in our jury box. Don't let us have it. Why, gentlemen, don't let us tear down the statue of Justicia on the court house and erect there the head of a serpeant. Don't do it, Simply because its scales are bright and it is beautiful.

scanned by LALAWLIBRARY

don't do it, my friends, but obey your consciences in this matter.

.

.

Last1

3

4

5

16

25

26

Dôn't let sympathy lead you. I do not care what punishment

2

is meted out to this man; he should get the same that

Franklin got. What an absolute absurdity and traversty justice it would be to punish the instrument, the hired

man, and letthe other fellow go free. Do not do it, gentle-

6 men; in the name of Heaven, do not do it. Do not do it. 7

You cannot reconcile it with your consciences, you cannot live with your consciences if you go out and do a thing 8

like this. Do not do it. Go and vote this man guilty, as 9 10 this evidence shows him to be, and if, by reason of his age, if by reason of anything else under Heaven--for which 11 I cannot see any reason-he is entitled to any courtesy or 12

13 any clemency, let the court extend it to him. But say by your verdict, Gentlemen, that you believe that he did 14 this thing. It is nothing to me personally. I have no 15

must make my living in the courts, and I want to go up 17 against honest jurors. I want to go up against an honest 18 court. What is it we have left in American if we have not 19

more interest in this than you have. As I said before, I

got our courts? Where can we go if the accursed power of 20 money is going to reach into the courts and meet us there 21 and thwart us there, and drag our witnesses away, and drag 22 our jurors out -- where is it going to end? What have we 23 got left? 24

Gentlemen, I leave it with you and your God -- and your God. You cannot make any mistake when you find Clarence Darre

guilty of this crime. And if you do not, I tell you the result of that verdict will not end in your lifetime and mine. I thank you. (Whereupon, after the usual admonition to the jury, a recess was taken until 8 o'clock A.M. August 17, 1912.)