

Full  
Leased Wire  
Dispatches

# The Daily Capital Journal

Today's News  
Printed Today

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

SALEM, OREGON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1914

PRICE TWO CENTS

ON TRAINS AND NEWS  
STANDS — FIVE CENTS

## DAY'S STORY OF WAR FROM ALL SOURCES; ALLIES STILL GAINING

London, Dec. 12.—Warsaw's fate was believed today to depend on the result of a new engagement reported from Petrograd to be developing between the Germans and Russians in the eastern theatre of war.

Both sides were said to have been heavily reinforced and it was stated that Grand Duke Nicholas, the Slav commander, was re-distributing his men. British experts were of the opinion, judging from cabled descriptions of his operations, that the grand duke considered it necessary for him to check the Teutonic advance from the north at any cost.

According to Petrograd accounts, this drive from the direction of Mlwa had already, in fact, been repulsed, and, following up their advantage, it was asserted that the Russians drove several German columns backward in disorder. It seemed clear, however, that this gain was not deemed final and decisive.

It was stated also in dispatches from the czar's capital that the Slavs had checked the German movements on Warsaw from the west and south.

The Austro-German attempt to raise the Russian siege of Cracow, too, was declared to have failed.

Automobiles were said to be figuring extensively in the campaign in Poland. The Russians were described as having made repeated attacks on the enemy with armored machines. On the other hand, it was said that his automobile transport service was what enabled General Von Hindenburg, the Kaiser's commander, to hold his line against the Slavs' numerical superiority.

**German Attack Fails.**  
Petrograd, Dec. 12.—Austro-German attempts to smash the Russian line south of Cracow have failed completely, the war office announced here today. The "Army Messenger," the war office's organ, declared that thousands of dead covered the field where the fight occurred. The engagement was described as one of the most important since the present conflict began. It was also said to have been one of the bloodiest.

The publication referred, too, to the Russians' efficiency in bringing down hostile aeroplanes. Two of them were said to have been shot down Tuesday.

**German Give Way.**  
Paris, Dec. 12.—Evacuation by the Germans of the west bank of the Yser, north of the Ferryman's house, in which vicinity there has been most desperate fighting and of various other positions on the Teutonic battle line was officially reported by the French war office today.

"On December 10," said the communication, "that enemy completed the evacuation of the west bank of the Yser canal, north of the ferryman's house."

Artillery duels continue in the Aras region. "The French heavy guns in the region of the Aisne have silenced the German field pieces and destroyed a battery of their mortars."

**War Office Not Moved.**  
Paris, Dec. 12.—The war office was the only government department which was not working here again as usual today.

War Minister Milholland it was explained, did not want to move back from Bordeaux at present because the transfer would inevitably interfere with his work and he did not consider the time opportune for having it broken in upon.

President Poincaré held a conference with the cabinet members today.

**Fighting Was Fierce.**  
Paris, Dec. 12.—The Germans were making desperate efforts today to regain a foothold on the Yser south of Ypres.

The allies had repulsed them again and again but they had been reinforced and were still pressing the attack. The fighting was at short range and exceedingly bloody.

In the region of Perthes and the Gracie woods artillery and infantry actions have turned to French advantage. "On the heights of the Menne two German batteries have been destroyed and a blockhouse they held has been blown up."

**Up to the French.**  
London, Dec. 12.—General Joffre being recognized as commander in chief of the allies' forces in the western fighting zone, it was stated here officially today that the British were leaving it to the French to decide whether to accept or reject the pope's proposal of a Christmas truce.

Probably it was said, Joffre's decision would depend on the military situation just before December 23.

Russia's reported rejection of the pope's suggestion, it was explained, did not necessarily mean that it would be rejected also by the combatants in the west. Incidentally, attention was called to the fact that the Russians don't celebrate Christmas on December 25, but on January 7.

## PRISON REFORM IS HOBBY OF NEW, RICH SING SING WARDEN



THOMAS MOTT OSBORNE  
WARDEN OF SING SING PRISON

Thomas Mott Osborne, rich and with his own ideas of prison reform, has just taken up his duties as warden of Sing Sing prison, the worst in the country. It was Mr. Osborne who spent a week in Auburn prison, New York, as a prisoner under the alias of Tom Brown so as to learn first hand what prison life is like. Here are some of Mr. Osborne's prison reform ideas:

"There may be one inescapable out of 10 men. If I punish him he will not only grow to hate me, but he will resent the society I represent, and the others will sympathize with him. As Judge Wood said, 'Don't let the ruff wag the dog.' I intend to have the nine men who wish to behave take care of the one who doesn't."

"I believe the warden should devote part of his time to the educational problem of the men. I may arrange for informal talks by outsiders, such as professors. One great trouble at Sing Sing is that there is no one meeting house where all the men can come together."

"I would rather have the men work hard two hours instead of putting along for eight hours. One of the worst things this state can teach the men is to work badly."

"The real object of prison life is to send the men out with such efficiency as to labor and in such a state of mind that they won't come back. It is to the interest of the state to aid the men to that end."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

"The model prison should be based on the farm plan, with workshops, where the men could labor like human beings, instead of a number of foretresses huddled together."

## FRESH ASSAULTS EASILY REPULSED IS BERLIN REPORT

Dispatches from Berlin Say  
Allies Are Checked and  
Prisoners Taken

HAVE MADE GAINS  
IN MANY PLACES

In Russian Poland Russians  
Are Driven Back by Ger-  
man Cavalry

Berlin, by wireless to London, Dec. 12.—"French attacks on the direction of Langenscheidt, Flinders province, Belgium, were repulsed Friday," the war office announced this afternoon. "The enemy losing 200 killed and 340 prisoners."

"Our artillery bombarded Ypres railroad station to hinder any movement of the allies' troops."

"The French again attack us near Souvain and Perthes, but unsuccessfully."

"In the Argoonne forest the French attacks were very weak and easily repulsed. We gained certain important positions by a mine explosion. The enemy lost heavily."

"French attacks on us near Apremont and Marbais were repulsed."

"On the East Prussian frontier our cavalry drove the Russians back. We took 350 prisoners."

"Our operations south of the Vistula are assuming greater importance."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

"Russian attacks on the Austro-German positions in southern Poland have been repulsed."

## LEO FRANK'S CASE NOW BEFORE HIGHEST COURT IN THE NATION



LEO M. FRANK

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

Washington, Dec. 11.—The supreme court of the United States has received the brief prepared by Louis Marshall of New York in behalf of the request presented by Henry A. Alexander of Atlanta, Ga., for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in the case of Leo M. Frank, who has been sentenced to death in Georgia for the murder of a factory girl in 1913. Mr. Marshall's brief asserts that danger to the court and counsel from a hostile mob at the time of Frank's conviction prevented him from receiving the protection of due process of law. Not only was Frank himself absent in jail, on the suggestion of the presiding judge that his presence might subject him to rough treatment if the verdict should be in his favor, but the two lawyers then of his counsel were also absent and for the same reason. They had been told by the presiding judge, says the brief, that they as well as the prisoner would be in danger of violence if they should be in the courtroom when a verdict of "Not guilty" was rendered. Frank's fight for liberty has been remarkable. He was convicted largely on the evidence of a negro janitor.

## RUSSIA IS PREPARING FOR RAID ON TURKS; MAY GIVE UP CRACOW

By J. W. T. Mason  
(Former London correspondent for the United Press.)

New York, Dec. 12.—News of a visit by the czar to Tiflis, the administrative center of the Trans-Caucasian region, suggests that Russia is maturing plans for a serious campaign against the Turks, whose territory adjoins Trans-Caucasia to the southward.

In striking contrast to the publicity it is giving to the Russo-German campaign in Poland, the Petrograd war office is maintaining a deep silence concerning events in the southeast. Presumably this is because a Slav army is being concentrated there. If so, it is understandable that the czar should prefer to prevent the fact from becoming known to the Germans, since it would indicate to them a weakening of the Russian forces they are engaged in fighting.

For the Slav ruler's personal presence in any particular zone of hostilities there can be no particular reason except that of arousing his troops' enthusiasm. This could not be accomplished unless the troops were already on the ground—that is to say, his majesty's visit to Tiflis would be without much object if it were made in advance of the soldiers' arrival.

Such a situation opens an opportunity to Russia in Asia Minor. It comes at a moment, however, when the Germans are seriously threatening Warsaw. Nevertheless, if a choice must be made, the Slavs are capable of abandoning the Polish metropolis as a strategic necessity, in preference to denuding it with troops they want for a campaign against the sultan.

Certainly the situation must be embarrassing to Petrograd. It has developed just as the Germans hoped it would when Turkey was projected into the war and Constantinople was dangled as a prize before the Russians.

Several weeks ago the Turks announced that they were marching victoriously on Batum, the most important Transcaucasian Black sea port. This advice appears to have been halted, without any explanation either from Turkish or Russian sources. Similarly the Turks seem to have suspended their campaign against Egypt.

In fact, as stated in this column Friday, the only positive result thus far of Turkey's participation in hostilities has been the British occupation of southern Babylonia, at the head of the Persian gulf.

**Bulgaria Will Join.**  
Probably, having been plighted into the struggle by a few Germanized Turkish militarists, the majority of the leaders of the Ottoman government are preventing the departure of the bulk of the army from Constantinople's defenses.

Bulgaria unquestionably will enter the war as an ally of the Anglo-Franco-Russian combination whenever it receives satisfactory assurances of territorial reward for its assistance.

Bulgarian co-operation would permit of an attack on the Turks from the European side of their territories, and if the Turkish army were engaged at still afloat at the time but apparently in distress, and the general opinion was that it foreshadowed the night, which would explain Sturdee's failure to report it as destroyed.

**NEW WHEAT RECORD.**  
Portland, Ore., Dec. 12.—Due to the strong foreign demand for new high records were established in the wheat market today when interior growers were offered \$1.18 per bushel for Club, \$1.20 for Forty Fold and \$1.21 for Bluebonnet, laid down at tide-water.

The high prices were being offered to induce the growers to sell their holdings, which are known to be small.

The warring European nations have bought up practically all of the wheat in the northwest. Bluebonnet has advanced about 43 cents since several months ago.

**"WORLD AT WAR" ATLAS**