

# The Jeffersonian

Vol. 11, No. 52

Thomson, Ga., Thursday, December 31, 1914

Price, Five Cents

## Where Ought Law Cases to Be Tried? And How? And By Whom?

READERS of The Jeffersonian know, that I have never had anything to say about law-cases that were pending in the courts.

A person accused of crime ought to be tried by the men who are set apart by the law for that purpose. He ought to be tried at the place pointed out by the law. He ought to be tried in the manner set forth in the Code.

We Georgians did not act as though we had any business trying Nan Patterson, Harry Thaw, Albert T. Patrick, or Police-Lieutenant Becker.

We left New York to handle her own cases. We assumed that New Yorkers knew all about them, and knew how to try them.

We assumed that the sworn jurors, and the sworn judges of New York were honest, competent, and conscientious.

We would have taken it as an insult to our own intelligence, and a gross affront to the people and the courts of New York, had we gone to prostituting our newspapers for or against Patrick, Becker, and Thaw.

We would have laughed to scorn the proposition that we Georgians go to holding mass-meetings to influence the lawful, responsible authorities of New York.

The Jeffersonian didn't have anything to say about the Frank case, until after the Atlanta Journal had published its outrageous editorial, endeavoring to intimidate Judge Ben Hill and the Supreme Court, in the discharge of their duty.

The extra-ordinary motion for new trial was then pending, it was a contempt of court for the Atlanta Journal to publish that editorial.

### In Re Leo Frank

*No such thing had ever before been done in Georgia!*

Why was an exception made in favor of Frank?

If a newspaper can be allowed to bombard the court with thousands of copies of a violent editorial, why not station mob-orators around the court-house, to denounce the judges, in advance of their decisions?

Where would that kind of thing lead us? If the newspapers are to resort to mob methods, why not turn loose the mobs, themselves, and let them fight it out?

In olden times, there was Trial by Battle. The strongest man won the case.

Shall we have that again? Shall the big mob convict the criminal by routing the small mob? Shall a mob of newspapers undo what the sworn officers of the law have done?

Some prominent New York preachers are flooding the country with a circular letter in which they say that the State of Georgia has denied Frank a fair trial, and that "such denial constitutes the gravest possible infringement on the rights of an American citizen."

This circular is signed by Dr. Parkhurst, Dr. Hillis, Dr. Remensnyder and several others.

Upon what do they base their accusation? They base it on the Connolly-Burns articles in Collier's.

Those New York preachers have never read the record in the Frank case, and they know nothing of the evidence which proves his guilt.

Shall a lot of preachers and lawyers, living in a distant State, usurp the functions of our Courts?

Or, shall the modern Trial by Battle take the shape of a contest between the Money and the Law, between the Big Purse and the little one, between the Rich and the poor?

Already, there is a most hurtful, demoralizing idea abroad—that the Law cannot grapple with the monsters of the vast deeps of crime, but can only pin-hook the minnows.

Is that true, in Georgia?

We shall see!

Last Friday, the State of New Jersey, put to death a 17-year-old boy, who had committed murder.

The killer was an Italian: the man killed was an Italian: and the crime was one of revenge, a normal human passion. The boy shot the deceased, not intending to hit him at all, but to kill another man whom the boy's uncle wanted "removed."

New Jersey tried this 17-year-old boy, convicted him, and executed him, without causing a ripple of excitement anywhere.

He was poor: his people are poor; and he is dead.

Why didn't the New York World, the Baltimore Sun, the New York Times, and Collier's make an effort to have that little boy's sentence commuted?

Why didn't Doctors Parkhurst and Hillis make an effort to get him off, with a sentence for life?

Just a waif of Italy, a land of hot passions, of much squalor, and of much lawlessness: just one little boy who had had no raising,

(CONTINUED ON PAGE EIGHT.)

## Do the Roman Catholic Editors Try to Tell Their Readers the Truth?

MORE than once, The Jeffersonian has called attention to *Truth*, the Catholic magazine published in New York, Senator Ransdell of Louisiana being a member of its honorary directory.

When a periodical gives itself such a name, it ought to strive earnestly to live up to it. *Truth* does not do so.

It not only publishes positive falsehoods, but it deals constantly in the half-truths that deceive those who are not acquainted with the whole truth.

Speaking of the celebrated Elizabeth Patterson who married Jerome Bonaparte, *Truth* lauds Pope Pius VII. for refusing to grant the divorce which Napoleon sought for his young mad-cap brother.

Senator Ransdell's magazine should have given its readers a more correct statement of the case.

Napoleon and the Pope were at outs, over that eternal question of Temporal Power.

Consequently, the Pope gratified his spite by refusing the divorce.

As every student of history knows, divorces can be obtained from Popes, whenever the Pope can get his price.

Only a few months ago, the rich Drexel family of Philadelphia got a marriage "annulled," that being the word which Catholics use in place of the Protestant word "divorce."

After all, the high-priests of Rome gave Jerome Bonaparte his divorce; and he married a Wurtemberg Catholic, while his Baltimore wife, also a Catholic, was living.

The Roman high-priests also divorced Napoleon from his Catholic wife, Josephine; and his second wife, the Austrian arch-duchess, was also a Catholic.

Therefore, Napoleon had two Catholic wives living at the same time; and the Pope, that same Pius VII., saw fit to wink at the bigamy—for from the Papa's point of view, it was bigamy.

In spite of papal favoritism to those who are rich and in power, Senator Ransdell's magazine digs up that one bad "break" made by Luther and Melancthon, away back in the popish Middle Ages, when they sanctioned the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse.

Luther and Melancthon were wrong in that instance; but there is this much to be said by way of explaining their conduct: the Roman Catholic church had taught Luther its own doctrine in regard to indulging the powerful.

What is called the *morganatic marriage*, is the Catholic form of bigamy, and it prevails in Roman Catholic Europe even to this day. It also prevails in Russia.

Under that form of marriage, Catholic princes have two Catholic wives, at the same time.

Luther made a mistake in one exceptional case, under exceptional circumstances, and at a time when the Reformation was in desperate need of princely support.

But Luther did not systematize his wrong, and his one bad example was never copied by the Reformers.

Now let me tell you a fact which Senator Ransdell and his magazine will not dare to deny:

*The Catholic princes of the royal houses in Europe are all permitted to keep acknowledged concubines, and to have two Catholic wives, if they so desire.*

Usually, the Catholic concubine of the Catholic prince is as well known at court as his wife is. She is "the mistress," and she generally has more influence than the lawful wife.

She always has her priest, and this priest rules the prince through her—and she is often his concubine, also.

As to the morganatic wife, she is simply the legalized concubine. She does not share her husband's princely state or title; and her social position is about the same as that which the favored concubine used to have under Jewish kings, Oriental despots and Turkish sultans.

*This system of bigamy, is a strictly Roman Catholic invention and institution.*

The Protestants have never endorsed it.

## WHERE OUGHT LAW CASES TO BE TRIED?

### AND HOW? AND BY WHOM?

In Re

LEO FRANK.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE.)

no advantages, no education, no chance, no friends, no money, no political pull—and so he is dead.

Never a word did the papers or the preachers say for him, and he was right there, next door to them!

Never a word did the Chicago lawyers, and the Knights of Columbus say for him, and he was up there, right in their own midst.

Little 17-year-old Ruggigiri had no money: Frank commands unlimited money, and that makes all the difference in the world.

And yet it seems a hard thing for the State to kill a boy whom the State itself has neglected, and given no chance to be good and useful. That boy, according to the evidence, did what his uncle told him to do. Surely here was a consideration that might have moved the compassion of the World, the Times, the Sun, and Colliers.

Here was an element of loyalty to clan that might have appealed to Doctors Parkhurst and Hillis, to the Chicago lawyers, to the officious Connolly, and to the Chicago Knights of Columbus.

But the little Italian boy had no rich kinspeople to stir up racial pride, and so he is dead.

His crime was committed after Frank's: his trial was not more in accordance with established methods than Frank's: the boy had not been sent to college and given the best of chances in life, as Frank had been: but the boy has gone the hard road of the transgressor, while Frank, with his double crime on his head, is reaching out to employ more lawyers, more press-agents, more influences to save his guilty neck, and to leave an indelible stain upon the records of Georgia.

One lady whose letter appeared in the New York World, stated, that the only evidence against Frank was "the circumstantial evidence of one witness, and he a scoundrel."

It never occurred to this sympathetic lady, that a case of "circumstantial evidence" cannot very well rest upon the testimony of "one witness, and he a scoundrel."

For the benefit of this Northern lady, and of the professional sentimentalists, who are meddling with our Georgia affairs, let us suppose a familiar case:

Let us suppose that this lady—whom we will call Miss Sally Simple—is the owner of a jewel-box, and that a negro of thievish character had several times tried to steal it. Let us suppose that Miss Sally Simple had trusted this box to the negro for half-an-hour, and that at the end of that time, the box was gone, and that the negro could not explain what he had done with it. Suppose that next day the box was found, broken, near the place where the negro worked, and where no one else worked; and the ruined box was all that she found—the jewels were gone!

In such a case, upon whom would Miss Sally Simple lay her simple hands?

The negro knew she had the jewels, the negro had tried to filch them, the negro manages to get the box into his possession, when no one else is near; the empty box is found where the negro admits he went, at the time of the theft; the jewels are gone; and the rifled box is lying there, with its voiceless evidence of the crime.

Who would Miss Sally Simple accuse, and convict, and punish?

Reasoning forward, on the natural force

and meaning of the proved facts, you would say, that negro got the jewels.

Reasoning backward, by the process of exclusion, you would say the negro got the jewels, because no one else had the desire, the knowledge, the opportunity, AND THE POSSESSION.

It is notorious that the recent possession of stolen goods, unexplained, condemns the person in possession; but how much more powerful is this presumption, when the person in possession is shown to have coveted those very goods, and to have tried, before, to get them?

If twenty white witnesses swear that the accused was in the habit of stealing goods of that description; and that he had shown a decided craving for the particular goods in question, would it shock the sensibilities of Miss Sally Simple, if a Georgia jury returned a verdict to the effect that the man got what he wanted?

He was after it; that kind of thing was his passion: the goods went into his possession: they are found on his premises: he cannot tell how they got there.

Wouldn't Miss Sally, herself, vote the man "Guilty?"

Wouldn't Dr. Parkhurst do the same thing? Wouldn't Dr. Hillis do likewise?

Would the Chicago Knights of Columbus attempt to dictate to us, in a case of that sort?

In the Chicago Evening Post, of Dec. 21, 1914, appears a call for a mass-meeting to be held in behalf of Frank. The call is signed by Abraham Meyer, Nathan Kaplan, Bernard Mahoney, Max Schulman, Sylvanus Levy, and Stephen Love, who signs himself "Knights of Columbus."

When did the State of Georgia lose jurisdiction over her own affairs, and over men who come here to live?

Where do these Illinois lawyers get their authority to impudently pass judgment upon Georgia cases and trials?

What have the Knights of Columbus to do with it?

Many and many a time, we Southern people have felt bitterly the fact that Northern sympathizers, who weep over the lynching of negro rapists, never shed a tear over the white girls who suffered a fate that was infinitely worse than lynching.

In this Frank case, we see the same revolting feature: all of this mawkish sentimentality that is being worked up by the Pulitzers, the Abells, the Benjamins, the Abraham Meyeres, the Nathan Kaplans and the Sylvanus Levys spends itself on Frank, alone.

There isn't a single thought for the little maiden who was this gorilla's victim.

There isn't a single care for the other little girls, after whom so many other Franks are prowling.

There isn't a single word for the blighted home in this case, nor for the shadow of Fear which such men as Leo Frank cast over other homes which shelter young girls.

These girls have to go out to work. Dire necessity drives them into employments where danger and temptation beset them.

They toil at the pitiful wage of five dollars a week: they can hardly keep body and soul together on it: and if the natural desire of youth for pleasure, and admiration, and pretty dressing, and flattering attentions gets hold of them, they fall right into the snares of just such fowlers as Leo Frank.

The negro who commits the one unpardonable crime is bad enough, God knows! but the depraved married white men who hire girls to work, at five dollars a week, and who consider themselves licensed to tempt the girls into the path that leads to hell—THEY are the lepers that contaminate society, break up happy homes, turn the once dear faces to the wall, fill the dens of prostitution; and spread vice, disease, want, and desperate outcasts, up and down the wintry streets.

And I am sorry to say that when a Jew,

who has money and no morals, takes after women he is the worst of libertines, and his victims are not of his own race: his prey is the Gentile girl.

Circumstances convicting any defendant are established, usually, by a number of witnesses, testifying to independent facts. Some of the facts are known to one witness, and some to another, but all of the facts interlock to form the chain.

This was so in the Tom Woodfolk case, in the Durant case, in the McCue case, in the Beattie case, and in the Hans Schmidt case.

None of the champions of Frank will argue the evidence: none of them will study it.

They howl about "mob atmosphere," "mob spirit," and about "Passion, Prejudice and Perjury;" but they take good care not to enter into the convicting details of the case.

Such a nation-wide crusade is being waged against the State of Georgia, and so many honest people have been misled, that it is of the highest importance for our people to be set right before the country.

This my apology—if any is needed—for again reviewing the convincing and convicting details of this horrible crime, door of the public school, here at home.

It is madness: IT IS A SIN AGAINST OUR OWN CHILDREN.

According to the report of Bro. B. R. Bernard, Treasurer, the contributions to Foreign Missions for 1914, show an increase.

And cotton selling at 6 cents! The foreign free schools maintained in luxury, and our home schools starved out!

The foreign students having free education shined at them, and the home boys and girls pleading vainly to get it!

Secular education running ten thousand miles to catch a Turk or a Chink, and evading the grasp of the children who eagerly run after it. HERE AT HOME!

Ah, Brethren, your system is wrong.

### Kicking Them into Kingdom Come.

THE greatest paper on earth, The Atlanta Georgian, publishes the following item of news from the European war:

On straw, only bits of straw at that, along the sides of these miserable, filthy hovels huddled human forms in blood-stained, muddy uniforms. Around the doorways, in the stable, everywhere they lay, heedless, inanimate, motionless.

A priest in high boots and black coat was standing near one lot. He removed his hat and placed over his coat a gold-embroidered stole. He kicked with his boot the man nearest. He kicked again and again.

The huddled bit of humanity ulled itself to its knees. The priest spoke to him and as he spoke kicking the next one to arouse him to life.

Priest Blesses Stricken.

Hardly had he blessed the first than he sank into a bundle again.

The third man was senseless to the kicks so long that I thought his soul had already gone into a vast eternity. Yet he lived. He tried to rise to his knees. He could not. He sank back powerless. The priest blessed him and passed on to kick into consciousness others.

The "blessing" of this priest-in-boots was equivalent to a pass to Paradise. Without such a "blessing," the papist goes to purgatory from which he cannot be released, except by the payment of much money to the priests.

"Socialists and Socialism" by Thos. E. Watson, has a vast amount of information of interest and value to those who think they know what Socialism stands for. Price 50c. The Jeffersonian Pub. Co., Thomson, Ga.

Life and Speeches of Thos. E. Watson will encourage every ambitious young man who has to struggle for success. Price 50c. The Jeffersonian Publishing Company, Thomson, Ga.

## A New Hoss In De Harness

Bro. Crumpton No. 2

**A**T the recent session of the Tuskegee Association, held with Concord church, in Lee County, Ala., I made a speech on "The Commission of Christ." Brother H. T. Crumpton, kinsman of Dr. W. B. Crumpton, and pastor at Notasulga, Ala., rose to "a point of order." The chair requested the point. It was stated that my speech "tended, or would tend to disintegration." The chair declined to rule on it. I challenged him before the audience. He declined.

After the adjournment, Brother Crumpton No. 2 said: "You should not inject such things into our work." I inquired, "what things." He replied, "I saw the way you were going, and anticipated you." That was a thundering proposition for an "educated" Baptist preacher. Points of order are raised, when the point develops. He sold himself though, by saying, "you are with Watson," thus acknowledging that Watson is in the air, in Alabama, and that the breeze stiffens as the information he proposes goes to our people.

That was the dagger of his obstinate aversion to truth, proposing to deaden me with the aspersions he, Brother Crumpton No. 1, and their religious kinfolk heap on Watson, with the antipathy they have for him because they cannot answer him. My God, what a cowardly way to deal with a man "in the land of the free and the brave."

In the Nov. 5th issue of the Jeffersonian, Tom Watson was charitable enough to say "the local preachers who beg for the money, are honest, but deluded." We all have our definitions of honesty, for ourselves and others. Mine, for myself is when I am put on notice of a fact leading to the truth of a thing, I pursue it till the truth is reached. It seems to me that would be good honesty for all of us Baptist preachers who have the least intimation of the inefficiency of our mission methods, not only from Tom Watson, but our own missionaries on the foreign field, such as Brother T. F. McCrea especially, who argues the question with such pungent and incisive cogency that no "honest" preacher could persist in imposing on our Baptist people with collections in the name of missions resulting in "a positive hindrance" to the gospel of Christ, and "a positive disgrace" to Christianity, after knowing what he says.

The real truth is, I am sorry to say, too many of us preachers are more afraid of "Our Boards" than we are of God, or of the devil, lest they put us out of a "job" if we do not obey their behest in money getting to be expended by them according to their dictum, if our most thoughtful, reputable, faithful, and efficient missionaries do tell us, against their dogmatic protest, the whole thing is a failure, considered in the light properly due. When I mentioned Brother McCrea's "Open Letter to Southern Baptist" to Brother Crumpton No. 2, he showed he had contempt for it, knowing nor caring anything for it, because Brother Crumpton No. 1, I presume, had whispered in his ear that I was "with Watson."

"Our Boards" in secret complicit conjunction with our Baptist press, tacitly, or otherwise understood, by mutual consent, intervened and censored it peremptorily from them, by a dogmatic assumption characteristic only of incredulous usurpers of the things belonging to the Kingdom of Christ, not for His glory, but to gain methods of mission work now would go down in the annals of Southern Baptist, if the facts.

After is the property of Baptists, belonging to them

as a matter of absolute right, for the purpose it was written, because it was addressed to them, through Our Boards, as agents of the denomination, to be communicated to them accordingly, not to Our Boards for themselves alone, as their acts unjustly indicate, in the exclusive way they exercise control over it.

Some of us, a few at least, are not so docile in disposition as to submit to such without protest, because the open glare of irrefutable facts and figures will not permit without suicidal violence to all the known rules of correct reasoning for determining questions on principles properly harmonious with the demands of Holy Writ, "Our Boards" to the contrary, notwithstanding.

I am not "with Watson" as a man alone, but for the principles he advocates as a loyal American citizen, not only on the mission question, but others that foster supremely, freedom of speech and of press, the only known bulwarks of American liberty which appears to be endangered by the censorship exercised by "Our Boards." Tom Watson is a Baptist. The name means freedom. I am proud of him and the name. God grant that he may live long and dip his pen deep enough in his ink to quell every enemy of freedom, and instead of being antagonistic to him, we Baptists should uphold him. May we do it. God help us.

W. R. WHATLEY.

Alexander City, Ala.

### ROMAN CATHOLIC ENCROACHMENTS AND ROTTENNESS.

Dear Sir: Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of The Morning Star, in which your paper is given a roast with the Menace, the Peril and other papers opposed to the Roman Catholic church. The editor requests all his subscribers to write members of Congress to have your awful papers suppressed. In same paper you will find letters from Catholic Knights to W. J. Bryan, Postmaster General and the U. S. Senate. Also notice the interesting account of the miraculous medal. The New Orleans Item which is also sent you contains a garbled account of the case of Mrs. Roth against Father Scotti, in which you will notice an effort to throw discredit on the woman. Where the priest met the woman is not stated either by her or the priest's defenders, but if it was in a respectable place or a brothel does not alter the fact that the priest got from her \$6,200 "for investment." It is reported that Scotti promised to marry her and leave the church, but when she learned she was only one of a dozen victims of the wily priest she demanded the return of her money. Scotti wrote threatening to put her in the penitentiary if she dared to expose him. When Mrs. Roth entered suit, Father Scotti fled and since last spring has not dared to return to the city. New Orleans people in London early last summer saw him there at a hotel with a woman. You will notice that the item admits that Father Scotti will not dare to return to face the charge. The woman has papers to prove her claim. The clergy and Knights of Columbus are doing their utmost to discourage the woman, to discredit her and prevent the matter coming before the court.

Yours truly,  
La. G. S.

"Huge battleships they build, and huge guns they mount on these floating ramparts, until a file of Dreadnaughts line the coast—for what? To be ready for perils that may never come. But I give them a pitiful little purse; and, in return, they issue to me the lawful right to unmask my batteries on every square; and my guns play upon humanity, every day and every night, of every year."

From "The Song of the Bar-Room," in Watson's Prose Miscellanies, second edition. Price \$1.00. THE JEFFS, Thomson, Ga.

Watch the label on your paper. Don't let your subscription expire.

## THE JANUARY ISSUE OF Watson's Magazine IS AN UNUSUALLY GOOD NUMBER.

ARTICLES BY THE EDITOR:

### The House of Hapsburg (Conclusion).

(Gives historical data in fascinating form, proving how the union of Church and State has always resulted in such war as is now convulsing Europe.)

### The Supreme Court of Massachusetts Passes Upon Another Maria Monk Case,

(In which a Roman Catholic Bishop was sued by a woman of a Roman Catholic parish.)

### The Leo Frank Case.

(Mr. Watson, as a criminal lawyer, gives a resume of this celebrated case. He sums up the entire case, from the commission of the crime, in which a poor, little factory girl, Mary Phagan, was brutally murdered, to the final decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.)

Editorial Notes.

ORDER FROM YOUR DEALER NOW

The Jeffersonian Publishing Company  
Thomson, Georgia.

## Two Splendid Books

By THOS. E. WATSON

LIFE AND TIMES OF ANDREW JACKSON      LIFE AND TIMES OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

In these books the author has given the result of years of research into two epochs of American history. The period is brought down to the time of Jackson's death, and much historic information not found in other books will be found in each volume.

Mr. Watson has carefully studied the original authorities, exhausted every source of information, and found much that has never been tapped by any other historian.

These books will be indispensable to students and teachers who want to learn of the South's share in National history, and to be truthfully and impartially informed on those great sectional differences which led to the Civil War.

Handsomely bound

Richly illustrated

Price:

LIFE AND TIMES OF THOMAS JEFFERSON, Paper Cover, \$1.00

LIFE AND TIMES OF ANDREW JACKSON, Paper \$1.00, Cloth 1.50

Jeffersonian Pub. Co., Thomson, Ga.

## NEW EDITION OF NAPOLEON

By THOS. E. WATSON

THIS BOOK IS REGARDED AS A STANDARD,

BY EMINENT SCHOLARS

Limited Edition

PRICE, \$1.50.

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUB. CO., Thomson, Ga.