

The Jeffersonian

Vol. 12, No. 21

Thomson, Ga., Thursday, May 27, 1915

Price, Five Cents

Why Are Frank's Hired Champions Afraid to Publish the Official Record, and to Let the World Read the Evidence Which Convicted Him?

THE readers of The Jeffersonian are again requested to take notice of the fact that never had a word to say about the Leo Frank case, until after his final conviction, by the Supreme Court of Georgia.

Immediately after this highest judicial tribunal had passed upon the law-points, reviewed the evidence, and officially approved what the court and jury below had done, the Haas Finance Committee employed the notorious Burns Detective Agency, and began a systematic campaign of misrepresentation of the evidence, manufacture of "mob intimidation," and reckless, malicious slander against the dead girl, the honest jurors, the upright judges, and the respectable citizens of Georgia, whose only offense is, that we want the laws enforced against the rich, as well as against the poor.

It was not until the Atlanta Journal had hung at Judge Roan, the twelve jurors, and the Justices of the Supreme Court, the outrageous and unprecedented insult of saying that Frank's execution under the sentence would be *judicial murder*, that I volunteered in the columns of this little paper to defend the integrity of our courts, and the good name of our people.

May God so judge me, as my motives have been commendable.

Convicted Him?

The most astounding methods continue to mark the progress of this never-ending case.

New lawyers are added to the string nearly every day; and the names of some of these hired attorneys are paraded in the newspapers as "converts" to Frank's innocence, when in fact they are recruits to his regiment of attorneys.

Lawyers and lobbyists are hired to pass legislative requests in behalf of Frank, and Governors of States are importuned to meddle with our affairs; school children sign monster petitions; Ladies' Peace Societies fall into line; and mass meetings are held in Chicago, and elsewhere, and these Northern "mobs," gathered from the promiscuous elements of city-life, pass resolutions about a case of which they know nothing, except what is excitedly stated by some inflammatory speaker who has never himself seen the official record.

Why did not the Haas Finance Committee print a summary of that evidence, as the basis of the appeal to the public?

Why did Frank's lawyers virtually suppress the sworn testimony and go to the public on the impudent falsehoods of Burns,

Connolly, McDonald, and other hirelings?

Can you frame in your mind a satisfactory answer to the question—"Why was Frank and his lawyers afraid to publish the facts?"

I dare say, you cannot: your common sense tells you that the simplest and best policy on the part of an innocent man, *unjustly convicted*, would have been, to lay the evidence before the people, and thus appeal from the jury of twelve.

You have heard a great outcry to the effect that Frank did not have a fair trial, and that he ought to be given another chance.

In regard to the trial, the best lawyers and the highest court of the world have decided that he *did* have a fair trial.

Ought not the decision of the United States Supreme Court be satisfactory to the Governor of Michigan, the Legislature of Arizona, and the Senate of Tennessee?

As to another trial, on what grounds would you give Frank "another chance," when the law has already given him what it gives to everybody else in his situation?

Is Frank to have a new law, made specially for himself?

Can a man order for himself a new set of laws, as easily as he orders a new suit of clothes?

(CONTINUED ON PAGE SEVEN.)

Which Side of the Hyphen Does the Loyalty of German-Americans and Irish-Americans Lie On?

ACCORDING to the New York Times, two German wireless stations have been in operation in this country, by virtue of the permission of President Wilson. It is stated that the Germans promised the Princeton school-teacher that they would communicate with Germany, alone, and would not violate neutrality.

Is the astounding statement of the Times based on facts?

Is it possible that the President licensed German spies to use the wireless telegraph in this country, upon no other guarantee than the promise of the spy?

Is the Princeton academician the only man in America who does not know how Germany keeps promises, verbal and written?

Is the President not aware of the fact that German faith has now become synonymous with the ancient Punic faith?

I have no doubt whatever that those licensed German wireless stations "shadowed" the Lusitania, and kept the Romanist traitors and German submarines on the Irish coast informed of the progress of the doomed vessel.

In his first note against German assumption of the right to destroy neutral commerce, President Wilson warned the contemptuous Germans that he would hold them to "strict accountability."

The sinking of the *Gulflight* and the *Lusitania*, was Germany's answer to the Wilson threat.

Then, in his essay upon these latter events, President Wilson says, in effect, that he does not believe that Germany meant to do what

she actually did, and what was being loudly exulted over, at the time Wilson was composing his second academic paper.

Yet, the German Ambassador had advertised in the New York papers, warning Americans, in effect, that Germany meant to sink the Lusitania.

And to make Wilson's second academic essay all the more absurd, the Germans justify their sinking of the English passenger-ship, with 150 Americans on board, by reminding us that the German Ambassador had warned Americans not to sail on the Lusitania!

In other words, Germany went into the American newspapers with an official advertisement of her intention to sink the ship; and, although they actually sunk the vessel, accordingly, our President, after the event, says in a formal state paper, that he does not believe Germany meant to do what she virtually threatened in those advertisements.

If this is a fair sample of the wisdom which owes its existence to orangeade and grape-juice, I think Wilson, Bryan, and Robert Lansing, would mend matters by taking an occasional glass of mild beer. Whiskey, of course, is a stronger tippie than their mental constitution could bear.

I wonder if Wilson, Bryan, and Lansing believe that Germany meant it, when she murdered the women and children in Belgium.

In that case, also, the officers and the men probably exceeded their instructions.

I am less of a militarist than Wilson and Bryan, but I am more of a fighter. My opinion is, that life is not worth having, if we are too weak and too cowardly to maintain our rights.

The ocean was not made for England, nor for Germany, nor for any one nation. It is the common heritage of mankind.

Whenever Germany marks off "zones" in the high seas, and dares the United States to enter those zones with her peaceful commerce, I would take up that dare, and resist that arrogant assumption of lawless power.

Germany has been banking on the disloyalty of the hyphenated citizens of this country, the German-Americans and the Irish-Americans.

It is high time we found out, by actual test, WHICH SIDE OF THE HYPHEN the loyalty of these citizens lies on.

If the loyalty of German-Americans lies on the left hand of the hyphen, the sooner we learn that fact, and slam the door of immigration in the face of Germany and Austria, the better. If the allegiance of Irish-Americans lies on the left of the hyphen, and belongs to the Dublin traitors or to the Vatican plotters, let us know it, and shut the door of immigration, before it is too late to preserve the Government and the liberties of the American-Americans.

Too much hyphen, is ranting around on our streets, in our public meetings, and in our newspapers.