

The Jeffersonian

Vol. 12, No. 32

Thomson, Ga., Thursday, August 12, 1915

Price, Five Cents

Why Do They Keep Up the Big Money Campaign Against the People and the Courts of Georgia?

HERE is a Moving Picture circuit controlled by Marcus Loew.

Marcus is doubtless a worthy descendant of Moses.

Like most gentlemen from Jerusalem, Marcus loves money, and never knows what it is to get enough.

Marcus is advertising Jack Slaton as an asset in his business, and is evidently expecting to coin many ducats thereby.

Perhaps the rich Jews believe that they are entitled to get some of their money back—the money which gave Burns a front page display for more than a year, and then gave Slaton an army and a war-zone of his own.

Marcus Loew advertises in The Billboard his new attraction, which he aptly terms, "The Million-Dollar Publicity Feature."

Underneath the million dollars, comes Jack Slaton's picture—which shows that Marcus knows how to hang pictures.

On a parallel line with Jack's face, appears another, which is labelled "Leo Frank," but it is not a picture of Frank.

Marcus is too shrewd a person to present to the public the real Leo Frank, with his sadistic mouth and degenerate features.

"Governor Slaton: Leo Frank!"

"The only genuine and authentic Motion Pictures of the Principal Characters in our Nation's Greatest Legal Conflict. Posed with their permission."

In advertising his Million Dollar Attraction, the agent of Marcus Loew says:

"I secured moving pictures of Governor Slaton, his wife, and of Leo M. Frank, and his mother, upon condition that I would use them in conjunction with a film to be called 'Thou Shalt Not Kill,' which argues for the abolition of capital punishment in America.

"Never before in the history of the moving picture industry has it been possible to make a picture of a man confined in a penitentiary for the term of his natural life, and never was a picture made as was the case with Governor Slaton, while he was surrounded by the militia, who were holding at bay the howling mob of over 10,000 people."

(So, you see, Marcus says that he took Slaton's picture while the mob was howling—and Jack never howled at all. Maybe he was again "snoring sweetly."

And he allowed the rich Jews to pose his wife for commercial purposes, also.

Sig Montag is the uncle of Leo Frank, and he threatens to prosecute me for defending the honor of our courts and our people.

Isaac Haas is the brother of the man who is Chairman of the Haas Finance Committee, which has vilified Georgia from sea to sea.

These two rich Jews have put a written demand on Hugh Dorsey, THAT HE BECOME MY PROSECUTOR.

It is not the duty of a Solicitor to become anybody's PROSECUTOR.

Let Montag and Haas COME INTO THE OPEN, and swear out a warrant against me, or have their names signed as Prosecutors to a bill to go before the Grand Jury.

THESE RICH JEWS HAVE USED GENTILE AGAINST GENTILE LONG ENOUGH. LET THE RICH JEWS WHO HAVE THREATENED TO CRUSH ME, TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ATTACK.

Perhaps it will clear up the atmosphere if the Frank case is re-opened, its putrid spots laid bare, and its horrible secrets told from the house-tops.

LET MONTAG & HAAS EMPLOY ROSSER, ARNOLD & SLATON TO PROSECUTE ME. I will act as my own lawyer; and when I get through with the Frank case, the people will understand it.

The rich Jews of Boston, New York and Atlanta have long made their threats, and I have been expecting the attack.

LET IT COME, but let the Jews be brave enough to make it, OVER THEIR OWN NAME.

We have had enough of Cat's-paw work. ATTACK ME YOURSELF, MR. SIG MONTAG.

ATTACK ME YOURSELF, MR. ISAAC HAAS!

And he is now opposed to capital punishment!

Thus Slaton becomes an active accomplice in the continued defamation of our courts, and our people.

That a man who so recently occupied the highest State office, and who came so near to becoming a United States Senator, should stoop to commercialize himself, AND HIS WIFE, and become a party to the systematic vilification of the State which had so honored him, is one of the marvelous developments of this never-ending Frank case.

The Marcus Loew advertisement continues:

"The feature that has had millions of dollars of front-page publicity."

Yes; it had the millions, all right.

Boxed in a separate place appears the noble sentiment of Slaton—

"I did what I believed to be my duty, and refused to become a second Pontius Pilate, and deliver innocent blood to the mob."

Most noble Roman! The mob that sentenced Leo Frank to death consisted of twelve sworn jurors, two Superior Court Judges, four Justices of the Supreme Court of Georgia, and seven Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

To round out the mob, we will include two members of the Prison Commission.

The twelve jurors, the Superior Court Judge, and the Supreme Court constituted, in the Wilburn case, a mob that was perfectly satisfactory to the noble Slaton.

In the Cantrell cases, the same mob sent two Georgians to the scaffold, and Slaton made no mention of Pontius Pilate.

In the case of the old North Georgia tenant, Umphrey, there was no criticism of the mob which had condemned him on circumstantial evidence; and Slaton did not compare old man Umphrey to Jesus Christ.

The aged tenant was accused of killing a landlord whom he accused of wronging him (CONTINUED ON PAGE TWO.)

The Commutation of Frank's Sentence Is Null and Void!

OUR Supreme Court has repeatedly decided that a Judge cannot preside in a case in which he had been of counsel.

No lawyer would ever contend that a Judge could legally preside, or sign any decree in a case where he was then of counsel.

Such action would be null, and time could not make it valid.

If John M. Slaton had been of counsel for Leo Frank, but had ceased to be so when he became Governor, it would have been illegal had he re-tried the case, and reversed the courts.

But since he actually was of counsel for Frank, his commutation was not only a base betrayal of his trust, but his decision is a nullity.

By retaining his membership in Rosser's firm, he continued to be one of Frank's lawyers.

He didn't have to go to the offices of the firm, every day; he didn't have to assist his partners in the preparation of their cases;

he didn't have to appear in the court room.

By remaining the partner of Rosser & Phillips, he remained of counsel for the client of the firm.

Will the papers ever see the point?

Just as the Law fixes a man's legal residence, and just as the Law fixes the reciprocal duties of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, master and servant, so the Law fixes the status of partners, both as to themselves and to the world.

In the eye of the Law, the Georgia Railroad is one person, although it may have a thousand stockholders.

In the eye of the Law, an Insurance Company is one person, although thousands may have an interest in it.

Rich Bros. Company is one person, in law, although half a dozen capitalists are joint owners.

A partnership is one person, and the act of each partner, is the act of the firm.

One partner may act for all, and legally bind all, in any business of the firm.

Law partnerships contemplate joint action in the interest of clients.

Law partnerships contemplate unity of purpose, and a division of fees.

Governor-elect Slaton became the partner of Rosser & Phillips after they had publicly appeared as Frank's leading lawyers.

Governor Slaton continued to be the partner of Frank's lawyers all through the gubernatorial term—the entire two years during which he could not legally and openly act with the firm.

Why did he retain a useless partnership?

How can you explain his conduct, except upon the idea that he formed it intending to use it?

When you see that he held on to it, and finally used it for the benefit of the client of his firm, how can you escape the conclusion that he and Rosser had that very thing in mind?

(CONTINUED ON PAGE SIX.)

Why Do They Keep Up the Big Money Campaign Against the People and the Courts of Georgia?

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE.)

about a bale of cotton; he had not followed up a little girl who ought to have been at school, and he had not lured this girl into the field and left her lying there on her back, with a rope around her neck, her drawers ripped up the seam, and her privates bruised and bloody.

He had not screened a negro accomplice, and gone to manufacturing evidence against an innocent person.

He had not been foiled in his efforts to hang the innocent negro, by the confession of the guilty one.

And his lawyer had neglected to form a co-partnership with the Governor-elect: consequently, there was no member of the firm in the Executive Office, when application for commutation was made.

Lawyers who know that their clients are guilty should, in all possible cases, associate the Governor-elect with the defense, so that, if all the courts condemn their client, the gubernatorial member of the firm can save "innocent blood from the mob," thereby avoiding the error of Pontius Pilate.

When one's lawyer is on the bench, one may expect favorable rulings; and when one's lawyer is Governor, no innocent blood need fear such mobs as constitute a jury and two Supreme Courts.

Innocent blood, however, should not be sent to languish at the State Farm, even though Warden Smith is most kind, and the prisoner is allowed his own sumptuous bed, his luxurious carpet, his electric fan, his electric cigarette lighter, and his roller-top desk.

Such innocent blood as *that*, ought to be accompanying his lawyer on his delayed and protracted honeymoon trip.

Characteristic of all the wild statements which have been, and are still in circulation against us, are the following editorial lines in *The Fra*, the magazine founded by Elbert Hubbard:

"Guilty!" said the Courts.

"Reasonable Doubt!" said the American people.

The evidence that convicted Frank was furnished by a flat-headed nigger. He is the typical, shiftless, no-account, lazy, Southern nigger. It was proven that, on the day of the crime, he was sodden drunk on whiskey. He admitted himself to be an accomplice—but he maintained that Frank was the principal.

The Courts said: "We believe you!"

The Public at large said: "Mistah Coon, the crime was a savage crime. It recalls to our mind other savage crimes in which a drunken coon, a girl, and a lynching played a part. Too often you change your story. You know too many of the details, too intimately."

Leo Frank said: "I did not commit the crime. I am innocent!"

Does it not occur to *The Fra* that if "the American People" tear up the verdicts of sworn jurors, and the decisions of sworn judges, "the American People" will lynch the courts?

How can a sane editor hope to have the lynching of criminals discontinued, if "the American People" lynch the courts?

How can a sane editor expect to have anybody's guilt ascertained, if not by jurors and judges?

If "the American People" are to reverse the courts, on the unsworn and ex-parte statements of detectives, lawyers, hack-writers, and hysterical sentimentalists, what becomes of our judicial system?

When the case of Leo Frank was singled out for a national campaign of slander against the people and the courts of Georgia,

reasonable people should have suspected the honesty of the wire-pullers.

Innocent men do not need to demand that the outside "mob" reverse the courts.

It was not attempted in the Beatty case, the Thaw case, or the Becker case.

It was never before done, IN ANY CASE!

Why was it done in Frank's case?

Was he entitled to exemption from the jurisdiction of our judges and juries?

Mr. Hearst's string of papers, and the Jewish papers, and space-rate papers, demanded that the State of Georgia abandon her legal jurisdiction over a Georgia criminal.

They demanded that Georgia abdicate her sovereignty, discredit her own courts, and admit the State's intention to commit judicial murder.

They demanded that we accuse nearly fifty white witnesses of perjury, twelve sworn jurors of a false verdict, two Superior Court judges of base truckling to an imaginary mob, and our Supreme Court of being as infamous as the witnesses and the jury.

When before did Mr. Hearst ever demand of a State a complete surrender of her constitutional powers and responsibilities?

When before did a lot of jackass Doctors of Divinity in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Atlanta, ask that the evidence of scores of white witnesses be treated as a mass of lies?

How can any State maintain respect for Law, for the courts, and for the orderly administration of Justice, if a mob of outsiders arrogate to themselves the right to *howl down the patiently considered verdicts and decisions made in court-houses?*

In the Frank case, Mr. Hearst insulted the State of Georgia as no State in this Union was ever insulted before.

He sent to Atlanta a member of the Supreme Court of New York, after our Supreme Court had twice decided the case; and this New York Judge wrote out an opinion to the effect that, excepting Conley's evidence, there was nothing in the record against Leo Frank!

The New York Supreme Judge who did this unheard of thing, is Clarence Shearn, a little one-hoss Jew attorney that never led a murder case in all his obscure life.

He was Hearst's lawyer, and he knows just enough law to defend the Hearst papers in damage suits.

Hearst laid that written decision of Clarence Shearn before Governor Slaton, and asked him to accept it as a virtual reversal of two decisions by the Supreme Court of Georgia!

How would Florida like to have her courts flouted in that contemptuous way?

How would Alabama like it? How would Texas?

What would have been thought of me, if I had sent my personal attorney to New York, to review the record in the Becker case; and had then asked Governor Whitman to accept the opinion of my lawyer?

That is exactly what Hearst did in the Frank case—and a more insolent invasion of a State's rights was never made.

The newspapers have been slow to realize the danger of THIS PRECEDENT.

The bitter cup that we have had put to our lips, may be passed around.

Other States may have to bow to the dictation of Jew Money!

Other States may have politicians and papers that are for sale.

What Big Money has done to Georgia, it may do to any other State.

Why did other States assume that, in this one case alone, we Georgians were blind to facts, and deaf to reason?

We tried, condemned, and executed Tom Woodfolk, one of whose victims was a little

girl; and Mr. Hearst, Adolph Ochs, Joseph Pulitzer, and Dr. Parkhurst did not go into spasms over it.

New York's highest court sent to the death chair, two weeks ago, *five men* at one time; and the sentences rest on no stronger foundation than did the three sentences on Leo Frank; yet Brisbane and Shearn were not sent to Albany by Mr. Hearst, to review an adjudicated case!

Why was Frank's case taken out of the jurisdiction of Georgia and thrown into the emotional world, swayed by newspapers?

"The evidence that convicted Frank was furnished by a flat-headed negro," says *The Fra*.

Is there some peculiar objection to the evidence of men whose heads are flat? If *The Fra* will glance at page 218 of our August Magazine, it will see that Jim Conley's head is *not* flat: it is less so than Leo Frank's.

But *The Fra* says that Jim is the typical, shiftless, no-account, lazy Southern nigger.

Southern! Niggers who go North invariably lose their Southern faults, I suppose.

Well, may I ask *The Fra* to tell its readers why Sig Montag and Leo Frank kept such a vagabond on their pay-roll for two years?

Are rich Jew manufacturers so fond of having their money wasted on a "no-account nigger," that they keep it up for more than 100 weeks?

They had not only been employing this vagabond for two years, but there had been no intimation of their wish to get rid of him.

If Frank hadn't killed the girl, and dragged the negro into it, he would probably be working for the pencil factory yet.

At the time of the trial, in July, 1913, Jim was 27 years old. He had worked for the Orr Stationery Company, for Dr. Palmer, for Adams Woodward, for S. S. Gordon, for S. M. Truitt, and for W. S. Coates.

He worked five years for Mr. Coates, two years for the Orr Stationery Company, and about a year and a half for Dr. Palmer, from whose employment he went to Leo Frank's pencil factory.

So, you see, this lazy, shiftless, no-account nigger had been continuously at work for respectable white men, ever since he became old enough to go out and make his own living.

In twelve years, he had changed places only five times, and he was apparently a fixture at Frank's factory, at the time Mary Phagan was murdered.

Do these facts, from the official record, give *The Fra* a new view of the case?

But *The Fra* says that "on the day of the crime, he (Jim) was sodden drunk on whiskey."

Well, in the first place, a man who is sodden drunk, cannot do any sexual thing to a woman.

A man who is sodden drunk cannot knock another person down, and carry off the body.

So, you see, *The Fra* goes wild at the start. Now, let me ask *The Fra* to cite me to the evidence that Conley was drunk that day.

Mrs. Hattie Waites saw Frank and Conley on the street, together, in close converse, at about 11 o'clock a. m.

Would Leo Frank have been seen on the sidewalk in close talk with a drunken vagabond?

As a matter of fact, Jim Conley's alleged drunkenness that day was never heard of, until after he blocked Frank's "frame up" of Newt Lee by confessing that he, Conley, and Leo Frank were the guilty parties.

After Conley's confession stopped the frame up against the innocent negro, Conley began to drink, and at first was tipsy, then

mildly drunk, then very drunk, and then sodden.

The Fra gives him more whiskey than any one has heretofore done, and Jim is so very drunk that he is unfit for any earthly purpose.

It may surprise *The Fra* to learn that the official record shows Jim Conley to have been sober enough to have deceived four white witnesses; and sober enough (according to the belated theory of the defense) to assault the girl, find a cord to tie securely around her neck, and then carry her in his arms down a stairway, and then down a ladder!

Two white men, Graham and Tillander, saw Conley that morning, at the factory, and they spoke to him; and they swore that if he was drunk, they could not tell it.

Mrs. Arthur White saw him sitting where he usually sat, and it was near noon, and he did not appear to be drunk.

The Fra says that the courts said to the negro, "We believe you!"

Does *The Fra* suppose that our Law allows the courts to say that, to an accomplice?

Does *The Fra* know that the Law requires the evidence of the guilt of the accused to be practically complete, to the exclusion of the evidence of the accomplice?

The Fra says that the crime was too nearly similar to other savage crimes committed by drunken negroes on white girls.

Will *The Fra* cite the cases?

Tell us about those "other savage crimes of drunken coons."

Show us the ravished white girl whose dead body was found with a hemp cord imbedded in her neck.

Show us the negro rapist who emitted no spermatazoa in the commission of the crime.

Show us the case where a drunken coon reverently placed the hands of his victim across her bosom, after she was dead.

Show us a case where a drunken coon, sodden on whiskey, sat down beside his victim, and wrote notes to her mother.

Show us the case where a negro rapist reduced to writing his accusation against another negro, and then followed it up by having the innocent coon arrested, a time-slip forged on him, and a bloody shirt stealthily put into his clothes-barrel.

Show us another case where a negro accused a white man of assault and murder, and where the white man was afraid to face the negro.

Show us another case where the wife of the white man, accused of immorality and murder, refused for three weeks to go to her husband, in jail, in the same city.

Show us another case where the negro successfully underwent a cross-examination of eight hours, and the white man refused to allow a single question to be put to himself.

It counted heavily against Becker, that he would not take the witness stand, so that Whitman could cross-examine him.

But in Frank's case the accused exercised his privilege to make a long statement, occupying the greater part of a whole day; and when he had twice exercised this privilege, he stood upon his, of not being questioned!

Frank was convicted on the evidence of white people, most of whom gathered their facts before they knew that Frank would be prosecuted, and most of whom were his own employees.

As I have undertaken to demonstrate in our August Magazine, the following white persons gave the evidence which convinced the jury, satisfied the presiding Judge, and satisfied our Supreme Court:

Lady witnesses—Hattie Hall, Frank's stenographer; Monteen Stover, Helen Fergu-

son, Mrs. Arthur White, Mrs. Geo. Jefferson, Corinthia Hall, Mrs. Emma Freeman, Magnolia Kennedy, Dewey Hewell, Irene Jackson, Myrtice Cato, Ruth Robinson, and Grace Hicks.

Men witnesses—R. P. Barrett, Mell Stanford, Albert McKnight, John Black, Harry Scott, John Starnes, L. S. Dobbs, Dr. H. F. Harris, and Newt Lee.

The Fra reminds us that Frank protested his innocence.

Not more firmly than Becker.

From the Washington Post, I clip the following:

Father Curry and Father Cashin, the priests who passed the last hours with the condemned man, declared their belief that he was not guilty.

Just before he entered the death chamber Becker gave the following statement to Father Curry:

"I am not guilty by deed, conspiracy or in any other way of the death of Herman Rosenthal. I am sacrificed for my friends."

Becker had a miniature photograph of his wife, which the warden allowed him to keep in its frame.

Pins Wife's Photo Over Heart.

Before leaving he called a guard, took the bit of pasteboard from its casing and pinned it over his heart.

"I want to go away wearing it," he said, with a smile.

In a few more seconds, this New York Gentile was dead in the electric chair.

He was the fifth man that the New York courts and juries put to death for the murder of the Jew gambler.

In Georgia, the blood of Mary Phagan yet cries in vain for vengeance; and the Jew who atrociously assaulted her, and choked her to death, occupies luxurious quarters at the State Farm, where the heat is fanned from him by electricity, and where a rich carpet keeps his delicate feet off the bare floor.

Does *The Fra* know that one white girl swore that Frank took her into his private office, the second day she worked for him, and tried to act indecently with her person?

Her name is Nellie Wood.

Does *The Fra* know that Frank tried to tempt Nellie Pettis with money, and never let her alone, until he saw she was not to be bought?

Does *The Fra* know that eleven white ladies went on the stand and swore to the lascivious character which Frank had established in his factory—the factory where Mary Phagan was assaulted and murdered?

Does *The Fra* know that the official record discloses the fact that Frank would creep around the ladies' dressing room, while they were partly undressed, and leer at them with the disgusting look which the lascivious Jew is in the habit of casting upon young and pretty Gentile women?

Does *The Fra* want to learn the real nature of this sadistic pervert, Leo Frank?

If so, persuade a Catholic physician to visit the House of the Good Shepherd, in Cincinnati, and obtain permission to examine the thigh of Miss Dewey Hewell.

(This girl lived in Atlanta, was of Georgia birth—according to my information—worked for Leo Frank in his pencil factory, and he ruined her.

She was tried, afterwards, for "delinquency," and this Atlanta girl was sentenced to the Ohio hell-hole, in which she now slaves for the Pope's priests.

Can a court in Atlanta send white slaves to the Pope's Ohio hell-holes?

It seems so.)

Let *The Fra* examine the official record in the Frank case, and learn that he was in the habit of using one of the hired girls, in the daytime and during work hours.

Let *The Fra* learn another thing from the official record:

Conley swore to peeping through the key-hole and seeing Frank commit the crime of sodomy with "a lady from the fourth floor," and Frank's lawyers were afraid to try to disprove it by the simple method of making a witness out of every lady who worked on that floor.

The inference is unavoidable:

There was some woman on that floor who was guilty, and not willing to perjure herself to save Frank.

And the negro also described how he peeped and saw Frank at the same loathsome business with a woman of the town.

The negro described the woman's position, and Frank's.

It is most difficult to believe that a robust, natural buck, like Conley, had ever seen a man and a woman at that unnatural commerce, anywhere else.

Negroes are not that way; and of course this negro had never been in a white brothel, nor could he have witnessed that sort of thing, even if he had.

Besides, his description of what he saw through the key-hole makes it different, in the manner of the thing, from any description you ever read or heard.

Let *The Fra* examine page 285 of the 141st volume of *Georgia Reports*, and then remember that the State proved by white witnesses that this abandoned woman of the town was a visitor of Frank at the factory.

Will you please reflect about the state of mind produced by a systematic campaign against lawful tribunals, acting according to time-honored rules and principles?

Is it a healthy condition favorable to our future, when newspapers clamor against constituted authorities?

Can you imagine any course more likely to undermine the stability of our system, and to encourage tumults, disorders, riots, and lynchings?

A Lincoln, Illinois, editor writes:

If the Jewish people of America gave money to fight Leo M. Frank's case, it was because judge, jury, Court, and higher courts were against him. It was because Frank faced the hopeless task of beating the other fellow at his own game.

Did you read anything that was more insane, more distorted in its idea of what is right?

This Illinois editor tells his readers that it was proper for the Jewish people to finance a national fight for Frank, because "the judge, the jury, court, and higher court were against him!"

Because the legal tribunals pronounced the man guilty, the illegal tribunals must take control of the case!

With that kind of reasoning, you can resolve the States back into chaotic lawlessness.

If the Jewish people are to follow the precedent set in the Frank case, no guilty Jew can be legally punished, since we have no other legal way to do it, than by juries and judges.

Apparently, we are put on notice, that our laws, our juries, and our judges have no jurisdiction over a Jew who can command Money.

New Edition of "The Story of France," by Thos. E. Watson. Just off the press. Two volumes, \$3.50 the set. Handsomely bound, gilt tops, gilt lettered. This book is regarded as standard by the French readers and scholars. The Jeffersonian Publishing Company, Thomson, Ga.

New Edition of "Napoleon," by Thos. E. Watson. Just off the press. One volume, \$1.50. Handsomely bound, profusely illustrated. This book is regarded as standard by the French readers and scholars. The Jeffersonian Publishing Co., Thomson, Ga.

The Jeffersonian

Issued Every Thursday.

Office of Publication: THOMSON, GA.

Entered as second-class matter, Dec. 8, 1910, at the post office at Thomson, Georgia, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription Price.....\$1.00 Per Year.

In clubs of ten only, with cash accompanying the order, can The Weekly Jeffersonian or Watson's Magazine, be offered at the rate of fifty cents for a year.

Where lists containing less than ten names, are sent, the subscriptions will be entered only for six months.

There can be no deviation from this rule.

OUR ATLANTA REPRESENTATIVE.

Any one wishing to subscribe to THE JEFFERSONIAN (Weekly Paper)

Or to WATSON'S MAGAZINE (Monthly)

Can give the money to

MR. G. W. SEALS,

502 Austell Building, - - - ATLANTA, GA.

Advertising Rates Furnished on Application.

Aug. 15 If the above date appears on the label on your paper it means that your subscription expires this month. Subscriptions are discontinued promptly on date of expiration. **RENEW NOW.**

THOMSON, GA., AUGUST 12, 1915.

The Commutation of Frank's Sentence is Null and Void.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE.)

Men like Rosser do not form academic co-partnerships.

Men like Slaton do not go into firms that cannot use them, or be used by them, for two whole years.

Rosser knew why he needed Slaton, and Slaton knew why Rosser needed him.

When Rosser was hurriedly retained by Frank's kinsmen, that Sunday, while Mary Phagan lay at the Morgue, Rosser soon saw what a desperate case he had.

To save his client from capital punishment, he needed a partner who could wield the pardoning power, and he hurried off to associate the Governor-elect.

When Slaton became Rosser's partner, he became, *in law and fact*, THE ASSOCIATE COUNSEL OF LEO FRANK.

The law says that one partner of a firm is the same as another: a partner is *in*, for all purposes.

He cannot be both *in*, and not *in*: being a member of the firm, he is as much the firm as any other partner.

Therefore, under the law, and the decisions, Jack Slaton's decree relieving Leo Frank of the thrice pronounced death penalty, is *absolutely invalid*.

If the Solicitor and Attorney General will move a re-sentence of that guilty murderer of a little girl—a most revolting and atrocious crime—Rosser and Slaton will be utterly unable to show legal cause why that man should not be re-sentenced.

They would have to plead the commutation paper signed by Slaton, and the State's attorneys would merely have to prove the fact that the Governor who signed it, was *then* the partner of Frank's lawyers.

The courts would be compelled to treat the commutation as a nullity, and to re-sentence Frank to be hanged.

There is nothing that I know of to prevent the State's attorneys from moving for a Writ of *Habeas Corpus* and having Frank carried back to Atlanta, for a hearing on the plea that he is illegally detained at the State Farm, *under an illegal commutation*; and that the State is entitled to have him brought back to Fulton County for re-sentence.

Will the Jew Bootlicks Who are Defending Slaton Answer These Fair Questions?

(1.) DO you know that the Atlanta dailies —after Mary Phagan was murdered and Rosser employed to defend her—announced the formation of a partnership between Governor-elect Slaton and Leo Frank's leading attorney?

(2.) As Slaton was scheduled for inauguration in June, and would be unable to practise law for two years, why did Frank's lawyer need him as a partner?

(3.) As Slaton was scheduled to be Governor for two years, and would be unable to practise during that period, what use did he have for a partnership with Frank's leading lawyer?

(4.) Do you know that Governor-elect Slaton was assigned his own private office, by his firm, after he became Rosser's partner, and that John M. Slaton's name appeared on the front of the door of this private office?

(5.) Do you know that the files of The Jeffersonian will show that I called Slaton's attention to the fact that his private office was being used by C. W. Burke, the detective of the Slaton-Rosser firm; and that in this private office of John M. Slaton vigorous and criminal efforts were being made by Burke to bribe some of the witnesses against Frank, and to scare others into changing their evidence?

(6.) Do you know that the affidavits in the official record prove this, and that when I called Governor Slaton's attention to it, he made no denial, and no change in his relations to Burke and Rosser?

(7.) Do you know that before Ex-Congressman Howard was employed, Luther Rosser went in person to see Senator Ollie James, of Kentucky, and offered him a tremendous fee to appear before Governor Slaton on the application for commutation?

(8.) Do you know that Luther Rosser told Senator James that the argument in the case would be prepared for him?

(9.) Do you know that Luther Rosser said to Senator James, "As a lawyer, you need not be afraid to take the case. YOU HAVEN'T A CHANCE TO LOSE?"

(10.) Do you know that Senator James manfully refused to play an ignoble part in a drama of infamy, and that they then turned to William M. Howard, who had already expressed his benef in Frank's guilt?

(11.) Do you know that, after they fell down on Bob Davison, and lost one of their expected votes in the Prison Commission, Luther Rosser hurried up a back street, late that night, for a secret, and lengthy, interview with his partner, Slaton?

(12.) Do you know that I learned, next morning, of this clandestine meeting of the rascally partners, and that I caused each of them to be informed that I was aware of their midnight juggle, the night before?

(13.) Do you know that neither Slaton nor Rosser could deny it; and that Slaton's explanation was, that Rosser had come to confer with him about the appointment of Judge in the Griffin circuit?

Rosser is not supposed to care who is judge of the Griffin circuit, and a conference on such a topic is not supposed to require back-street travel, midnight concealment, and a prolonged conference.

(14.) Do you know that a Rabbi in Co-

lumbus was telephoning mysterious "good news" to the Columbus Israelites, on Saturday morning, at about the time the Atlanta Jews were preparing for the celebration banquet they held at Frank's house that Saturday night?

(15.) Do you know that Slaton virtually said he would commute, before the case ever reached him, and that Frank's wife was so certain of it she did not appear before the Governor at all, as Mrs. Becker did before Governor Whitman, and as so many wives have appeared before Governors in Georgia?

Let the Georgia editors exercise their privilege to take sides against their State: let them join in with those who accuse our courts of a felonious purpose to judicially murder an innocent man.

Let them lick the feet of Jew advertisers, and chime in with the Burns detectives, the paid hack-writers, and the Jew papers of the North.

Let the editors who enjoy this outside defamation of their own people, keep it up. They are free to crawl and cringe, if they want to; but let them try to stay somewhere in the vicinity of the truth; and let them use nice, smooth, molasses-like verbiage.

They get too mad over their glorious work of villifying their State.

They use language which convicts them of having guilty consciences.

They lost their temper when they lost their virtue.

They became violent in proportion as their cause grew weaker.

Like the lawyer who "bellowed like hell," when he had neither law nor evidence to go on, some of the Frank-ite organs are deafening the jury with bovine noise.

Easy, gentlemen! You are not going to ruffle my temper, I assure you: therefore, you may as well control yours.

In the meanwhile, you may soothe your passions by a perusal of the following affidavit:

Georgia, Fulton County.

In person before the undersigned authority, an officer duly authorized by law to administer oaths, appeared A. W. Nolan, who being duly sworn, deposes and says on oath, that on Friday and Saturday before the Monday on which Hon. John M. Slaton, then Governor of Georgia, commuted the sentence of Leo M. Frank, deponent was in Memphis, Tenn.

On said two days, to wit, Friday and Saturday, the Jews of said city were openly betting "four to one" that Governor Slaton would commute Frank's sentence to life imprisonment.

Deponent was recently conversing with one of the most prominent Jews in the city of Atlanta, who stated to deponent that he knew on Thursday, before the sentence was actually commuted on Monday, that it would be commuted, but that the Jews of Atlanta had agreed among themselves that they would refrain from making any bets on the outcome of the application for commutation. This same Atlanta Jew further stated to deponent that the Jews had a cipher code which was used in communicating to the Jews throughout the United States the information that the sentence would be commuted, in order that they might place bets and win back as much as possible of the money they had contributed to Frank's defense.

A. W. NOLAN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 11th day of July, 1915.

A. A. OWENS,

Notary Public and Ex-Officio J. P., Fulton Co.

Do You Want to Understand Why Our Country Is In its Present Condition?

THE business depression and financial crisis now afflicting the people are the results of evil laws.

This is fully explained in two books that we sell.

Read our "Handbook of Politics and Political Economy," and Watson's Speeches which treat of these very matters.

Has the State of New York Killed an Innocent Man?

A LINCOLN, Illinois, paper says that the American Jews were justified in their national campaign for Leo Frank, "because the jury, the judge, and the higher courts were against him."

It has to be that way, you know, unless you resort to lynching.

Nobody can be legally put to death, unless the jury, and the courts are against him.

It seems that rich Jews who lust after Gentile girls, and who take life in the pursuit, are to be exempt from Gentile punishment.

During the Big Money campaign, when so many hack-writers were following the lead of the noble Wilham J. Burns, there appeared a big head-line—

"HAS GEORGIA CONDEMNED AN INNOCENT MAN TO DIE?"

Beneath the head-line came column after column of stuff which pretended to be official evidence.

Instead of its being evidence, it was made up falsehood that had no foundation save in Jew money and Gentile mendacity.

But what about Becker?

Read the following clip from a New York paper:

Becker died an innocent man, in the opinion of his spiritual advisers, Fathers Curry and Cashin.

"From your experience with condemned men," Father Cashin was asked, "isn't it your belief that a guilty man always confesses in the last few hours?"

"Invariably," the priest responded. "Usually the confession comes after the sacrament has been given. Becker maintained his innocence to the end."

"Father Curry said to him, after we had administered the Holy Sacrament: 'Are you guilty, by word, or deed, or in any manner whatsoever, of this crime?'"

"Becker answered: 'Father, as I stand on the brink of the grave, I am not.'"

Now, let me tell you two things about Becker:

(1.) A man who, in his farewell interview with his wife, told her to place on his coffin a plate, *accusing Governor Whitman of murdering him*, had not forgiven his "enemies," as he professed to have done, and had not really become a Christian as he pretended to have done; and he went to his death with such malignant hatred of Whitman that he would have caused *him* to be assassinated had he, Becker, ever got the chance.

(2.) Becker meditated and planned a crime against the Jew gambler, Rosenthal; and while that crime may not have contemplated murder, Becker was guilty of murder, if in the carrying out of his felonious plan, Rosenthal got killed.

You will notice that the priest confined himself to "this crime"—that is, the crime of murder.

The priest has not said that Becker denied being guilty of *any* crime against Rosenthal.

The priest may not know that the Law holds a man guilty of the crime of murder, if in the course of a felonious design against another's life or property, the intended victim of the felony loses his life.

If Becker was not guilty of murder, why did the priests refuse the high mass to Becker's remains?

If he was innocent of *any* crime, why was his body denied the fullest honors of the Roman Catholic Church?

After Curry had confessed the condemned man, and put the pan-cake in his mouth, wasn't Becker as sure of salvation as Curry is?

The New York priests have not appeared consistent in this case.

Rev. Curry made an affidavit to Becker's innocence of the Rosenthal murder; and he gave Becker a regular pan-cake absolution.

Yet he would not allow his widow the consolation supposed to be peculiar to High Mass and a place in the chancel.

Why not?

Mr. Hearst should instruct Arthur Brisbane and Supreme Court Judge Shearn to investigate, and report to him in *this* case.

The Jew Judge of the Supreme Court of New York came to Georgia, under instructions from Mr. Hearst; and *this Jew Judge took jurisdiction of the Frank case, reviewed it, AND REVERSED THE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA.*

Judge Shearn told Mr. Hearst that he had visited Frank, and had carefully cross-examined him!

It was probably as severe a course of sprouts as Rosser gave to the Rev. Ragsdale, before Rosser dictated the perjured affidavit which put \$200 of somebody's lucre in Ragsdale's pocket.

At any rate, Frank was mighty careful not to allow Hugh Dorsey to ask him any questions when the trial was in progress.

Why is an educated and intelligent white man afraid of questions, when accused of living a double life, accused of bestial vices, accused of unnatural intercourse with an unconscious girl, and accused of choking her to death with a piece of hemp cord?

When did innocence ever sit silent under those terrible accusations—silent except in carefully-written statements which are not subjected to the fair test of a legal cross-examination?

If there ever is a time for innocence to answer every fair question, it is when it is charged with such crime.

Becker wouldn't go upon the witness stand, because had he done so, the State could have cross-examined him about his statement.

Kinder to the defendant than New York law is, Georgia allowed Leo Frank to go upon the stand and talk all day in his own behalf—but as he wouldn't offer to answer any questions, the State *couldn't* ask him any.

And when the Jew Judge of the New York Supreme Court cross-examined Frank—if he ever did it—he was careful to exclude witnesses.

Leo Frank cannot *now* stand up under a cross-examination, any more than he could at his trial.

The rich Jews of Atlanta knew this, on the day the girl's body was found in Frank's place of business, and they hurriedly pussy-footed to the best lawyers in Atlanta, before a single Gentile had pointed to Frank as the guilty man.

Why did Franks' uncle, and his father-in-law, and his Haases, employ Rosser on Sunday, a few hours after the girl's bloody corpse was found?

What caused *them* to know that Frank needed the best lawyers before the Gentiles suspected such a thing?

And do tell us what it was his wife knew, *that same day*, which kept her away from her husband for *three weeks*?

When a man's own wife avoids him, and his kinsmen rush to employ lawyers before he is accused, and when he himself won't allow the State to ask him questions, what does your common sense tell you?

Those undeniable, and undenied facts, all appearing in the official record of the case, carry moral conviction of the man's guilt, outside of the two scores of white witnesses who testified against him.

Has New York killed an innocent man?

The Jewish-Hearst papers answer, "No!"

The inconsistent conduct of the Roman clergy answers, "No!"

The verdict of the jury, and the decision of New York courts answer, "No!"

Did Georgia condemn an innocent man to die?

Anyway, he didn't die.

Jew dollars were too many for us.

They bought us up.

They flung us down, and put filth on us.

Be Careful How You Send Money.

RATHER than go to the trouble to buy a postal order, or stamps, or to register a letter, people wad up dimes and dollars in a letter, and mail them to us.

Sometimes the cash comes through, and sometimes it doesn't.

We are not responsible for money sent in that careless manner.

Like all other branches of human industry, the postoffice service has dishonest people in it, and when one of these men—black or white—feels money in the envelope, he steals it.

My daughter and Mrs. Lytle open our mail, and whenever the cash makes a safe trip through the mails, the person who took that risk gets what he ordered.

Not only is money stolen from the mails, but books, magazines, and even papers are often swiped.

As it costs us at least 10 cents to get a bank check cashed, please do not send small sums in that way.

A man who sends us a check for ten cents, knowing that it will cost us ten cents to collect it, needs religion.

And lots of it.

"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.

The Handbook of Politics by Thos. E. Watson, is a book every American citizen should read. Contains every party platform; fourth edition almost exhausted. Price, 50c. The Jeffersonian Publishing Company, Thomson, Ga.

Watson's Magazine

THOS. E. WATSON, Editor.

NOW IN ITS EIGHTH YEAR

DEVOTED TO

History,

Biography,

General Literature,

Exposure of Italian Popery, the Deadliest Foe to Religion, Liberty and Human Progress.

Short Stories,

Poems, Etc.

PRICE, \$1.00 PER YEAR

In Clubs of 12, Price 50c. Each, or \$6.00 for the Club.

THE JEFFERSONIAN PUBLISHING CO.
THOMSON, GEORGIA.

Do the Jew Business Men Want to Provoke Us Into a General Boycott?

THE Dannenberg firm, in Macon, boycotted The Telegraph, because the paper printed something on the Frank case that these rich Jews did not relish.

Walter Dannenberg said they would quit advertising in The Telegraph, and "make it sweat awhile."

Walter Dannenberg also said that his firm was almost in the mood "to sell out and leave the damned State!"

The Rich Brothers Co., of Atlanta, were accused by one of their clerks, *over his own signature*, of discharging him because he would not sign the petition for commutation in the Frank case.

The Jeffersonian published the clerk's letter, and stood ready to publish a denial, if the Rich firm saw fit to make one.

Did they make it? Not they.

On the contrary, they tried to use two Gentiles who own stock in this Jew store.

Those two Gentiles were silly enough to think that they could get me to make the denial which the Rich firm should have made.

If the clerk, Lester, had lied, it was their business to say so, not mine.

He signed his name to his letter, and he will probably meet the Riches on that issue whenever they choose to make it.

Their sly attempt to use Gentile against Gentile, was similar to the effort of Isaac Laas and old Sig Montag to have Solicitor Hugh Dorsey become my prosecutor.

If the Jews want a fight, they can get it. But let them come out in the open, and not make their malignant attacks from behind Gentiles.

In the latest issue of Nathan Straus' Puck, there appears another cartoon picturing me as putting the knife in Creen's and, the night he is said to have scraped Frank's neck with the hog-knife.

The label under the cartoon is, "The Man behind the Knife."

Straus says in one of his truthful paragraphs—

A citizens' meeting in Georgia adopted resolutions calling upon Thomas Watson to leave the State for good within one week.

This citizens' meeting was no doubt held at the R. H. Macy store, which belongs to Nathan Straus.

The resolutions were probably adopted by the New York negro men, while the white girls were serving them at the tables of Straus' restaurant, in the Macy store.

If decent people all over the country should discontinue their patronage of the Straus New York establishment—the R. H. Macy department store and mail-order house—it might have a sobering effect on the rich Jews.

If the Dannenbergs of Macon were left to the patrons of their own race, the Dannenbergs might "sweat awhile."

If the Michaels of Athens were left to the raelites for a year or so, perhaps they might moderate their demands on the city government, a little.

If the Rich Bros. Co. were avoided by the mi-barbarous Gentiles of Atlanta, they might give Mr. Nathan Straus a timely piece of advice.

Rich Jews who nationalize a campaign of vilification against us on behalf of as vile a domite and murderer as ever lived, and who blow it up by threatening to run Georgians out of their State, and who instigate assassination in the most obscene cartoons, ought to be further enriched by Gentile customers.

Let the rich Jews beware! They are rattling dynamite.

If they make themselves unbearable in this country, as they have done in all others, to what haven of refuge will they run?

One of Nathan Straus' paragraphs in "Puck" reads:

Be not downcast, Georgia, at your failure to "get" Frank. Part of your motto, remember, is "Moderation," and while there are no available statistics of attempted murders with butchers' knives, there are statistics of lynchings, and these show clearly that you have no cause for chagrin. You are more than holding your own, for out of twenty-four lynchings last year, eight, or one-fourth, occurred in Georgia. "Law and Order" are not wholly extinct where such an average prevails.

In its next issue, Puck will have to modify its figures slightly, for last week, Texas burnt a negro, Oklahoma lynched one, and Florida, one.

The crimes deserved death, and lynchings followed, because the Frank case has about destroyed public confidence in the certainty of "getting" a rapist, or a cold-blooded murderer, by the prolonged processes of the law.

One result of the infamous collusion of Rosser and Slaton—the lawyer and the Governor—will be—

The next Leo Frank case in Georgia will never reach the courthouse.

THE NEXT JEW WHO DOES WHAT FRANK DID, IS GOING TO GET EXACTLY THE SAME THING THAT WE GIVE TO NEGRO RAPISTS!

"Los Angeles Investigation" on Its Travels Again.

OUR old friend, "the Los Angeles Investigation," has begun to ride around in the mail-bags, once more.

It goes to sleep, occasionally, and keeps quiet for a few months; but Gullivan comes along, wakes it up, and sends it journeying, hither and thither, like the Wandering Jew.

Somebody must have loaned Gullivan a few Georgia mailing lists, or maybe he stole 'em; for it seems that Georgia has been flooded with the "Los Angeles Investigation."

The "distinguished Masonic committee" which made the celebrated investigation are Roman Catholics and Knights of Columbus!

They investigated themselves, and whitewashed themselves.

That's all.

The Jeffersonian Publishing Company has repeatedly challenged the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus to a showdown of their treasonous and persecuting oath, and they are afraid to face A REAL INVESTIGATION.

In my pamphlet, advertised and sold by us for more than a year, I give my reasons for being certain that the fourth degree K. of C. do take substantially the oath they are accused of taking.

That pamphlet was published before the fourth degree Knights of Marshall, Texas, murdered William Black in the most cowardly and deliberate manner, because he had taken that oath, and then exposed it.

If ever these Georgia K. of C. jump on me for publishing their treasonous oath, I will produce some evidence that will make them sweat blood.

However, this oath is not essentially different from that taken by every Catholic priest.

The terrible oath of the fourth degree Knights is merely an amplification of the oath of the Jesuits.

The horrible oath of the Jesuits was dragged into light in the Supreme Court (Parliament) of Paris, France, in the celebrated Lavalette case.

The Catholic bishop's oath was brought to light for the first time by the Parliament

of Great Britain, at the time King Henry VIII. was suppressing monasteries and nunneries.

During the last few years, the English officials in Ireland have secured legal proof of the murderous oath taken by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and similar secret societies.

In spirit and in purpose, those diabolical oaths are all the same.

The spirit is that of religious hate, and the purpose is, the complete destruction of Protestantism.

The hatred breathed in these terrible oaths is the same that drenched Europe with the blood of Protestant martyrs.

The methods mentioned in the secret vows, range all the way from boycott and malicious mischief, to arson and assassination.

I have published some extracts from the court records in Ireland, and if the Los Angeles Investigation continues to ride on the trains, I may have to republish the legal evidence given in Irish courts by Irish Catholics.

Perhaps, the average American would rather believe a number of Irishmen, swearing in open court, as to the oath of these popish societies, than to believe these Los Angeles Irish Catholics who were not under oath.

EDITORIAL NOTES

By J. D. WATSON

ONE year of the European war has passed, and the situation is practically what it was months ago—Germany waging an aggressive campaign that has gained her some temporary advantage without bringing her any success.

While the Teutons have driven the Russians from Galicia, have continued their drive on through Poland to Warsaw, and taken the ancient capital, they have completely failed in their two main objectives.

Germany's two great objectives were to nullify France, as an active foe, and then crush Russia, but both of these have failed.

While the German armies are on French soil, the Kaiser is further from Paris than he has been at any time since the outbreak of the war, and while the German army has taken Warsaw, and the Russians are in retreat, many military critics believe that the German drive into Russia will hasten defeat for the Germans—that the biggest mistake the Kaiser has made was to stretch his lines so far into a country that he can never hope to conquer.

The simple fact that the Germans are fighting in the enemies' country means little, because there is to be considered the great cost in men and resources paid for this temporary advantage, and to a cool outsider it looks like the German military authorities have inaugurated a campaign that will result in a catastrophe.

Every man lost to Germany now is a serious loss—Germany cannot afford to sacrifice a single soldier, while the allies have millions that they can yet put in the field, and in the long run this resource will be the allies' greatest.

Germany's hope was in quick success, and when the German armies were thrown back in their great drive for Paris, Germany's best chance for victory was shattered.

Germany's position now is very similar to that of the South during the Civil War, and as time drags along it will become more apparent to the German people that their fight is a hopeless one, and that their country has been thrown back at least a quarter of a century, simply because a crazy "me and God" military tyrant imagined himself another Frederick the Great.

* * * * *

The most asinine proposition ever made is

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

JUDGE BENJ. H. HILL CORRECTS ONE OF OUR CORRESPONDENTS.

Dear Sir: My attention has been called to the following extract which appeared in The Jeffersonian on Thursday, July 15th, 1915:

"I am informed that the 'Judge' who sentenced Frank the last time suggested the same thing to Slaton, and offered to fix the date of Frank's execution so that Gov. Harris would have to pass on the application for clemency; and that Slaton said 'No.' He demanded that the case come before him."

I am the "Judge" referred to. The information given you was not only incorrect, but without the slightest foundation of truth. I never spoke to Gov. Slaton on the subject of fixing the date for the execution of the sentence of Leo M. Frank. It would never occur to me to seek the advice or to accept suggestions from the Executive as to the exercise of my judicial functions. Neither Gov. Slaton, nor any friend of his, ever spoke a word to me on the subject of fixing the date for the execution of Frank's sentence.

The only man who ever did, at any time, speak to me on the subject, was the Solicitor-General, and he did so in the line of his official duty, without making any suggestion as to the date for the execution of the sentence.

In fixing the date, I acted entirely upon my own initiative and responsibility, selecting the medium between the maximum and minimum dates, under the statutes, as I had done on two previous occasions, and I did this on the last occasion regardless of the personnel of the Governor who might have the responsibility of passing upon any future application for executive clemency.

Kindly insert foregoing in next issue of The Jeffersonian.

Yours truly BENJ. H. HILL.

(Comment.)

It gives me pleasure to publish Judge Hill's letter.

The gentleman who wrote me evidently mistook a rumor for a fact, for there was undoubtedly a rumor that Slaton was being urged not to act on his partner's case, but let it go over to the incoming Governor, Harris.

There was not only a rumor to that effect, but I have in my possession written evidence to show that at least one member of the Atlanta bar wrote to Slaton, intimating as delicately as possible that his partnership with Frank's leading lawyer disqualified Slaton to act.

My own opinion is, that Slaton had no more right to pass on Frank's case than Rosser had.

Wouldn't the whole legal fraternity be shocked and scandalized, if a member of Rosser's firm had presided as Judge in the trial of Frank?

It is the Law which defines and fixes the relationship of partner to partner.

In the eye of the Law, your partner is yourself, in business transacted by the firm.

Therefore, in the eye of the law, Rosser himself commuted his client's sentence when his partner did it.

The papers seem slow to recognize this scandalous fact.

The people recognize it, and are intensely outraged by it; but the papers are silent about it.

As long as Rosser & Slaton were partners, the act of one was the act of both, so far as their clients and the business of the firm were concerned.

Suppose that Benj. Phillips, another partner of the firm, had been appointed Judge pro hac vice to try the case, would the papers have been silent?

Ben Phillips had just as much legal right to preside in the court-house, as Slaton did to preside on the case in the Executive Office.

A partner is just as much disqualified to sit on the case of a partner, as a juror is disqualified to try the case of his partner.

The stockholders of Frank's pencil factory were no more disqualified to serve as jurors for him, than was Rosser's partner to serve as committer for him.

In legal contemplation, Frank's sentence was commuted by his own lawyers, and it is therefore outrageously illegal.

In the eye of the Law and of Justice, the commutation is a nullity, and would be so held by the best lawyers in the world.

If the Attorney-General will move to have Leo Frank re-sentenced, treating the Slaton commutation as a legal nullity, the judges would be compelled under the Law to hold that Slaton's action was absolutely illegal, because his legal relation with Frank's lawyers made him Frank's lawyer, too.

Finally, I assure Judge Hill that had he done exactly what my informant alleged, his conduct would have met my warm commendation.

Every judge is a high officer of State, and naturally prizes the honor and dignity of the State; and if Judge Hill, or Judge Bell had spoken to Slaton on this subject, it might have deterred him.

While so many outsiders were arrogating to themselves the right to dictate, an influential voice, and a friendly warning from an insider might have saved the State from a greater stain than the Yazoo fraud.

I am not able to see that it would have been improper for Judge Hill to act as amicus curiae and to have said to Slaton—

"You are Rosser's partner, and therefore Frank's lawyer: THINK OF THAT, and disqualify yourself, as any honest juror, or any honest judge, would do!" T. E. W.

REFERS TO THE TIMES OF LONG AGO.

Dear Sir: As you know, ever since I met you in old Screven county, when you were but a young man, teaching school, and studying law, I have been your friend and admirer. I thank God that I have lived to see you championing the cause of the down-trodden, poor and helpless people of the State, and of the Union as well; but most especially since reading what you have had to say in the Leo Frank case, and how you have stood by little Mary Phagan who, in my opinion, died fighting to defend her virtue, I feel, if possible, I am a greater friend to you than ever.

I am sorry that John M. Slaton commuted the sentence of Leo M. Frank, for in doing so he has brought down upon himself the righteous indignation of 75 per cent of the people who once admired him, and who stood by him in his political career.

But we read in the Book, "Be sure your sins will find you out."

We all admire, love and respect you for the fearless stand you have taken for Right and Justice. Your friends are increasing by the thousands. I know many who used to curse and abuse you who are now speaking in the highest terms of you.

May God spare you for many years to fight the battles of the poor, helpless working people of Georgia.

I am truly and sincerely yours,
Ga. H. G. EDENFIELD.

HERE'S OLD UNCLE JIM PARRISH AGAIN, AND OF COURSE, WITH A LIST OF NEW SUBS.

Dear Sir: After sending a club of ten last Monday, I am glad to be able to send another club of ten today, Saturday. I would be glad to know that there were five thousand of your many good friends sending you two clubs a week.

I hope that the good people of dear old Georgia who are taking the Atlanta Constitution, the Journal and the Georgian will write to the editors and tell them they do not want any more of the things, as they were bought over by the big Jew money to slander and abuse the courts in the Leo M. Frank case. I hope the good people in Alabama will also stop the rotten things, and let the editors know they do not want any more of the things to come to their homes.

Your old friend,
Ala. JIM PARRISH.

HE WAS AT THE "WATSON HOME COMING" IN 1892: HE UNDERSTANDS IT, NOW.

Dear Sir: Some twenty-five years ago, when you came from Congress, my father, who was a Watson man, and I, drove twenty miles to Thomson to hear you make a speech. I remember when the train came up how the people shouted and hurrahed. They toted you to a carriage which was driven to a piece of pines I would say, east of Thomson, where you told the people what was being carried on in Congress. I did not understand what all this toting and shouting for Watson meant. But as I have grown to manhood and watched you through life I see that you are doing more for the poor and

common people, uncovering more hidden mysteries in church, politics, Frank, and Slaton, than any living man.

Those who do not read The Jeff only cheat themselves out of their rights.

The Jeff proves Frank guilty, and Slaton equally so. If it could be left to a vote to every man and woman who is competent to judge, and not paid to see it from a certain angle, Slaton would never return to Georgia again. He has done more to encourage lynch law than any man of today.

I write to express to you my appreciation of a Georgia man who money cannot buy. Long may you live and have God to protect you.

Yours truly,
Ga. J. E. BLANCHARD.

ALABAMA PEOPLE INTERESTED.

Dear Sir: I have given away a lot of copies of The Jeffersonian, and only wish that mine would come more often so that I could distribute it all over this country so that the common people could get a peep in on the dirty work that is going on in the inner circles of the fellow higher up. Yours truly,

Ala. W. A. CLOUD, JR.

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

SONG

"Little Mary Phagan"

Words and music by J. C. Lenderman, and a short biography of her and history of the case. Price 10c per copy, prepaid. This is the latest and best yet. You must have a copy. Address,

J. C. LENDERMAN, McRae, Ga.

P. S.—Send dime for remittance.

ALL THIS FOR \$5.48

27 PRESENTS FREE

Securing is believing! READ OUR OFFER.

Return this adv. to us naming your Express Office and we will ship you 2 Fu 1 & will ship in same package 1 S & W Mod. Full worth \$7.50; 1 Solid Nick. Stern Wind & Set Watch Wostenholm's Style Razor retails \$2.50 to gether with 27 FREE shown above and which we have not space to describe, the Cigar Co. D. \$5.48 by Express and ALLOW EXAMINATION & if you don't think goods are worth twice the amount don't pay O. D. system then remit our Special price \$5.48 with order and we will include One Dozen Additional Presents to those named and will also send you 26-10c Cigars for your own smoking or you may retail them for \$2.50 with the understanding that we refund your money if goods are not as we say. After 50,000 additional customers have been enrolled this Special Offer will be withdrawn. Order Today! Address, DIXIE CIGAR CO., Dept. 30 JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

A New Department of

The Jeffersonian

JOB WORK

ESTIMATES FURNISHED

Best Material. Perfect Workmanship.

Write for Estimates of what you need.

J. D. WATSON, Manager,

Jeffersonian Publishing Co., Thomson, Ga.