

duties are so absorbing as to leave no time for other matters.

Imagine my amazement therefrom when I read the lengthy deductions of Mr. Alexander concerning the Frank case in the Sunday papers.

I have no interest in the Frank case in which the defendant was promptly convicted for murder by a jury of the State court.

I am complaining that the U. S. District Attorney, who was not employed in either side of that case in devoting his time to undo the conviction of a man convicted of the murder of a Georgia girl, instead of devoting his time to aid in bringing to justice the man accused of the murder of my sisters.

If his deductions in the Frank case were spontaneous they would be of little value, and if the product of sufficient time and thought to prove, as attempted, that he could have acquitted Frank where Rosser and Arnold failed, then I think we were entitled to the time and thought the District Attorney has devoted to a case in which he has no more concern than I have.

MARSHALL NELMS.

In this connection, the public may remember that William Smith, attorney in the Nelms case, stated that he had made a deal with W. J. Burns, by which the two cases were to help each other.

HELP EACH OTHER, HOW?

(3.) It is a peculiar and portentous fact, that every one of the numerous efforts that have been made to start something in favor of Frank, in Georgia, falls flat, the moment it gets out of the offices of political lawyers, and jelly-fish editors.

They tried to buy the work girls of Atlanta—and couldn't.

They tried to buy the work men of Atlanta—and couldn't.

They tried to buy a poor old rickety, ramshackled Baptist preacher—and fell down on it.

They tried to work up sentiment in the towns and villages—and failed.

They had Dr. Jacob White to preach a sermon on it—and Jacob's flock, to a large extent, walked out on him.

The lawyers stay bought: the editors keep the muzzles on: the detectives are not to be discouraged while the money holds out; but any one who wants to see, can see, that the great mass of people in Georgia are dead sure of this man's awful guilt.

The Invisible Power has not been able to make the slightest impression upon the honest, intelligent, unprejudiced Georgians who have studied both sides.

Everlasting honor to the working class of Atlanta, for choosing the part of honest poverty and incorruptible civic virtue, rather than all the gold that could be temptingly offered.

Everlasting shame upon the three Atlanta papers which sold themselves in the open market; colluded with the traducers of Georgia's good name, her courts, her laws; and utterly refused to allow any man, or any woman, to use an inch of their space in the defense of our people!

THE ATTEMPTED USE OF A DEAD MAN.

(4.) It is a peculiar and sinister thing, that, after having utterly failed to manipulate the jury into a petition for Frank, the whole case should be rested upon the grave of the dead judge.

It is the blackest feature of the defensive methods, blacker than the attempt to bribe witnesses, and to suppress evidence—for those people were alive, and could defend themselves.

With Judge Roan, it was different: the attack on him was postponed, until death had made him helpless prey.

Not until his pulseless hand could not strike back, did his bosom friend, and former partner, Luther Rosser, produce that letter.

Very precious, indeed, is a piece of evidence relied on to save a guilty man's neck, but which can not be given into the hands of the officials who are asked to assume all responsibility!

Why could not the lawyers of Frank have kept the certified copies, and the lithographs?

Those copies will be as valuable to the lawyers, as the original is, for we must suppose that the petition for clemency is the last place where the letter can be used.

When, before, did lawyers demand that a legal tribunal accept copies of an existing original?

Like everything else in this phenomenal case, the acceptance of those copies, by the Prison Commission, was without precedent.

The letter from Judge Roan to Rosser pretends to have been written on some unnamed day in December last.

Presumably, Rosser got it in December, and in reply to a letter from himself to his former law-partner.

Did Mr. Rosser write to Judge Roan in December, when the Frank case was confidently expecting a victory in the United States Supreme Court?

Does Mr. Rosser want to be understood as having had no confidence in Frank's appeal to the Federal Court?

Will he publish the letter he wrote Judge Roan?

In December, 1914, Judge Roan's face was in such a terrible and agonizing condition, that an operation, taking away his jaw, and almost the whole side of his face, had to be performed.

In December, the sufferer could not hold a pen. He was not a man who could write on a typewriter.

He certainly could not have prepared such a letter as Frank's lawyers presented, without assistance.

Who assisted Judge Roan in the preparation of that letter?

Who typed it? Who signed it, with stencil, or otherwise? Who addressed it? Who mailed it?

Where is the envelope, with the North Adams, Massachusetts, post-mark on it?

The Rosser letter is in hopeless conflict with the written statement of Rev. H. C. Emory, the pastor of Judge Roan, who held a confidential relation with him during the Frank trial, and who conversed with him privately, afterwards.

THE STATEMENT OF JUDGE ROAN'S PASTOR.

I give Rev. Mr. Emory's statement, in the form of question and answer, as he gave it to me at my residence, last Friday, in the presence of Messrs. Julian Hill, L. D. McGregor, J. W. Skelly, and Mrs. A. L. Lytle: a careful perusal of it, the questions and answers, will convince any impartial mind that this Methodist clergyman vindicates the probity of the dead jurist in a manner perfectly consistent with the official record, and with the known character of the upright judge:

Q. How long have you known Judge Roan?

A. Since 1910; I was his pastor for four years, till 1914.

Q. Were you his intimate friend?

A. Yes, as much so as pastor and parishioner could be.

Q. Did you visit his home immediately following the Frank trial?

A. Yes.

Q. Did he say whether or not he believed Frank guilty?

A. He declined to commit himself, saying that was not his part in the trial.

Q. What was the attitude of the mind of Mrs. Roan in reference to Frank's guilt?

A. She told me she never had believed Frank guilty, and admitted that she besieged the Judge continuously during the arguments for a new trial, begging the Judge to grant a new trial.

Q. Did the Judge say why he did not grant a new trial?

A. Yes; he said Frank's counsel failed to

substantiate any of the many grounds set forth at the hearing.

Q. Did you talk with the Judge about what he said when sentence was pronounced?

A. Yes; he said that people had come to him, from the mountains to the sea, some positively saying they knew Frank was guilty, others saying positively that they knew he was innocent, and offering the Judge advice as to what his duty was. He said he intended to put himself on record as saying that whoever knew what his duty was, set himself up as an oracle, for he himself had heard the evidence, and the trial had been extended through six weeks, all told, and he could not positively say he was guilty or innocent.

And he said he meant nothing more than this by his statement, notwithstanding the newspapers of the State tried hard to read into the statement a great deal more than this.

Q. What other matter was specially mentioned in connection with the case?

A. The Judge said, after all, with reference to my remarks at the time sentence was pronounced, no man's private opinion is worth anything at a legal trial, and at the hearing for a new trial, it was a question of evidence, and ACCORDING TO THE EVIDENCE, FRANK WAS UNQUESTIONABLY GUILTY; and there is but one sentence for first degree murder in Georgia, and I had no alternative, the jury was responsible for the verdict, and not me.

The very fact that I was unbiased, is conclusive evidence that I was a competent Judge in the case.

I am glad that the Supreme Court will have an opportunity to find whether or not I made a mistake in any of my rulings—for during the two weeks' review of the case, I fail to find it myself.

Q. Did Judge Roan ever discuss with you his intimate relation to Luther Rosser?

A. Yes, he and his wife both mentioned the fact to me, that Rosser was one of his bosom friends; and one reason why the trial went so hard with him, was that he so often had to rule against Rosser—his best friend, while at the same time he felt that he must do his duty, in every respect, as Judge presiding.

Q. Of what disease did Judge Roan die?

A. It is reported to me that he died of cancer.

Q. Did he undergo a serious operation prior to his death?

A. Yes; his jawbone was removed.

Q. Did he suffer with any other trouble than that which caused the operation?

A. Yes; embleism at the base of the brain, not long after the Frank trial.

Q. Do you believe the nervous strain brought on by the Frank trial was responsible in hastening Judge Roan's death?

A. Yes, indirectly.

Q. During your pastoral visits, did you talk of other matters with the Judge?

A. Yes; we talked of his appointment to the Appellate Court; I remember he remarked that he was glad he would soon be free from the duties of circuit judgeship, as he would not go through the mental torture of another trial like the Frank case, for \$10,000 in gold.

Q. Were you at Judge Roan's funeral?

A. Yes; I officiated.

When Judge Roan remarked to Parson Emory, that the evidence proved Frank to be UNQUESTIONABLY guilty, the following is the evidence he had in mind:

The evidence, that Frank was lascivious, and given to running after the little Gentile girls who worked for him:

The evidence, that he had acted indecently in his place of business, by opening the door of the girls' dressing room, and leering at them, when they were partly undressed:

The evidence, that he had gone into a private room with one of the girls, several times, during work hours, when neither Frank nor