Leo Frank, As A kegular Newspaper Contributor.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE.)

Not long ago, a rich Hebrew, most influentially connected, stole two million dollars from the working people of New York, many of whom were Jews.

Henry Siegel stole the money under the familiar disguise of a commercial failure. He was tried and convicted—and sentenced to pay a fine of one thousand dollars, and to serve 9 months in prison.

Whereupon, the Pulitzer paper, *The World*, admits that there *does* seem to be in this country one law for the rich and another for the poor.

Now, in the State of Georgia, we are doing our level best to prove that the law treats all men alike, and the Pulitzer paper is doing its best to defeat our equitable aim.

The Pulitzer paper has never before sought to dictate to our courts. Neither have the other Hebrew papers of the North done so. From year to year, we have had crimes, and have punished some of them without raising all the racket this Frank case has raised.

For what reason is Frank entitled to special privilege, and a new code of procedure, and a new law of evidence?

The New York *World* has taken sides with the negroes, against the white people of the South, on all occasions.

The Pulitzer paper has been notorious for that. It claims that the negroes are as good as we, and that the negroes should enjoy social and political equality.

So extreme has been the Pulitzer paper on this line that it sharply reproved President Wilson in the matter of the William Monroe Trotter episode.

The New York *World* virtually says that the President deserved the insolence of the negro delegation, in that he had not interfered to prevent the heads of the Departments from requiring that the negroes use separate water-closets, &c.

Yet in the Frank case, the great point emphasized by the World and the other Jewish papers is, that the main witness against Frank *was a negro!*

It seems that negroes are good enough to kill our ballots, make our laws, hold office, sleep in our beds, eat at our tables, marry our daughters, and mongrelize the Anglo-Saxon race, *but are not good enough to bear testimony against a rich Jew!*

It is all wrong for us to disfranchise the negroes, all wrong for Secretaries McAdoo, Burleson and Williams to require them to eat in separate restaurants, use separate washrooms, and go to separate toilets; all wrong for the President to allow any difference between whites and blacks, *but no negro must be taken as a witness against a Jew who can command unlimited money.*

That sort of logic is a fair sample of all the Leo Frank special pleading. None of it will hold water. None of it would be tolerated a minute, if there had not been such a systematic propaganda in favor of this worst of deliberate criminals.

From the very necessity of the case, we have to take the evidence of negroes in some cases—else Justice would be defeated.

Criminals do not summon the best men in the community to witness their crimes.

The murder in the brothel must of necessity be proved by bad women. No good woman is there to see it—nor any good man, either.

Time and again, in Georgia, as in all States, it has happened that the only witnesses to the crime were negroes, or bad white men. What is the law to do, in such cases?

Must it let murder go unpunished, for the lack of white men of the best character?

How would you ever convict an assassin, if you rejected utterly the testimony of his accomplice?

How could you ever convict the murderer whose killing was done at a negro frolic, or in a low dive, or in a "blind tiger?"

Every case must of necessity stand on its own merits, and be judged by its surroundings. A witness, otherwise objectionable, may become invincible *by reason of the nature of his association with the criminal*, and with the *res gestae* of the crime.

If Conley were offered as a witness against Governor Slaton, or against Chief Justice Fish, the impression made by his evidence would be entirely different from that made when he testifies against a man who chose him as an employee, used him in illicit commerce, and made him the confidante of his amours.

Isn't this so? Isn't it common sense? Isn't it human experience?

You know that it is!

This would be true, even if Conley had not been powerfully corroborated by facts and circumstances, as well as by unimpeachable white witnesses.

I will not thresh this old straw again, but will remark that *no innocent man could have been where Frank was shown to have been, when his little victim disappeared forever!*

No other man was shown to have been in pursuit of Mary Phagan.

Into no other man's private room was she seen to go—AND NEVER COME BACK ALIVE.

In his latest proclamation to the public, Leo Frank stresses the point that the reviewing court has never passed upon the question of his guilt, or innocence.

In other words, he asserts positively, in a carefully prepared written statement, that the Supreme Court of Georgia has never reviewed the evidence in the case.

Good God! What an arrant falsehood!

Every tyro in the legal profession knows better.

In a first motion for a new trial there are three grounds which are so invariably taken, that even the form-books lay them down, as stereotyped.

The defendant *always* alleges that the verdict was strongly and decidedly against the evidence, against the weight of the evidence, and without evidence to support it.

These three grounds are as inevitably a part of every ordinary motion for a new trial, as are the allegations of crime in the indictment.

Therefore, the Supreme Court *had* to pass on the evidence. The Supreme Court *did* pass on the evidence. And the Court *did* say that the evidence was sufficient to sustain the verdict.

There was no "mob" threatening the Supreme Court. There was no military display menacing the Supreme Court.

Those serene, experienced lawyers were *not* twelve terrified jurors, for whom Leo Frank is now so sorry.

The circumstances under which the Justices of our Supreme Court heard the evidence, heard the arguments, consulted with one another, and reached their conclusion were not such as would have "horrified" Leo Frank.

He now says that the twelve jurors who found him guilty were on trial for *their* lives.

Were the Justices of the Supreme Court similarly intimidated?

On their oaths and their consciences, those superb lawyers, coolly deliberating in private and in the profoundest security, *had to say whether the evidence set forth in the record was sufficient to warrant the verdict of those twelve jurors.*

And those Justices, *upon their oaths and their consciences*, said the evidence was sufficient.

Yet Leo Frank has the brazen effrontery to argue that his case has never been tried, except by twelve men who were scared into a verdict by the Atlanta "mob."

This attempt at misleading a sympathetic public is on a par with the efforts made to suppress testimony, to frighten those girl witnesses, to buy up the Reverend Ragsdale and his deacon.

It is on a par with that pulpit crusade they started in Atlanta. It is on a par with William J. Burns' "utterly confident" explorations in Cincinnati and New York. It is on a par with Burns' interviews with Conan Doyle, John Burroughs and a whole lot of other people who have never seen the record in this case, *nor been charged with the fearful responsibility of trying this man for his life.*

The State of Georgia and its Judiciary, and the honest jurors who were sworn to try Frank, have been vilified, held up to scorn and made objects of derision and hatred by irresponsible persons who know nothing of the evidence, except that Jim Conley is a negro.

The public has been gulled, again and again, by the noisy protestations of William J. Burns, and by the assurance that something wonderfully sensational would explode very soon.

But nothing ever comes of it. Every time there is a show down, it is the same old thing. The same old fatal pursuit of the girl by Frank; the same old undisputed and damnable fact of the little victim being lured back to his private office, to get the pitiful balance of her pitiful wage; the same old disappearance of the girl, *and the same old utter inability of Frank to give an account of himself.*

The efforts to buy off witnesses shows his guilt; the efforts to use the bought testimony of the preacher and the deacon, shows his guilt; the efforts to use Conley's own lawyer, and the miserable failure to make the deal pan out, shows his guilt.

And let me call your attention to one thing that may have escaped your notice:

Frank never mentions Mary Phagan's name!

In his last careful and elaborate statement, you couldn't tell who it was that Frank was accused of killing.

With the instinctive horror of a guilty man, he shrinks from the mention, of that little girl's name!

Those who know human nature, and the psychology of crime, cannot fail to be profoundly impressed by this.

Let me quote one sentence from a masterful book which has recently been published, and which has been widely read. Its author is Edward A. Ross, Professor of *Sociology* in the University of Wisconsin: the name of the book is, "The Old World and the New."

This expert in Sociology makes a study of Immigration, the changes brought about by it, the diseases, crimes and vices incident to this foreign flood, &c.

On page 150, he says—

"The fact that pleasure-loving Jewish business men *spare Jewesses, but PURSUE GENTILE GIRLS* excites bitter comment."

This bitter comment is made by *the city authorities*, who have had to deal with these pleasure-loving Jewish business men who spare the Jewish girls and run down the Gentile girls!

God in Heaven! If Professor Ross had had the Frank case in his mind, he could not have hit it harder.

Here we have the pleasure-loving Jewish business man.

Here we have the Gentile girl.

Here we have an employer who came down from the North, where the Five-dollar-a-week working girl is presumed to need the financial aid of "a gentleman friend."

Here we have the typical young libertine Jew who is dreaded and detested by the city authorities of the North for the very reason