

The Jeffersonian

Vol. 11, No. 49

Thomson, Ga., Thursday, December 3, 1914

Price, Five Cents

Leo Frank, As a Regular Newspaper Contributor

NEVER before in the history of this country has any convicted criminal been given the freedom of the daily papers, that Frank has enjoyed.

It is a lonesome week when we are not regaled with several columns of old hash, freshly warmed over by this filthy and murderous Sodomite.

Simultaneously with the appearance of this stuff in the Georgia papers, at appears in the Northern papers which are owned by rich Jews.

The Baltimore *Sun*, owned by the Abells; the New York *World*, owned by the Pulitzers; the *Times*, owned by the Ochs; the *Observer*, owned by the Benjamins, seem to receive Frank's statements by telegraph at the same time that he hands out copy to the dailies in Georgia.

Who pays for all this?

What is the purpose of this continued and systematic crusade in behalf of one convicted

Jew whose connections command unlimited wealth?

Why is it that, when the Governor of Georgia goes to New York to borrow money for the State, he should be asked to talk of the Frank case?

Jack Slaton has been in New York for the purpose of arranging a big loan to refund the old loan, and the rich Jews of the North have apparently made a dead set at him.

If the Governor does not resent this, the people do—and they consider it an outrage.

Is the State of Georgia to be held up, in the money market?

Must the Governor give some sign in favor of a condemned Sodomist and murderer, before he can borrow money to refund the bonds?

I do not say so, but all men will agree that it was most improper to mention the Frank case at all, or to sound Gov. Slaton as to his

intended action on the proposed plea for a commutation of the sentence.

Jacob Schiff is the richest Jew in New York, and Jacob wielded such influence on the courts that a poor Israelite was sentenced to 48 years in the penitentiary for entering the house of Schiff's son. The impecunious Jew actually served 7 years of the sentence, and when finally let out, he was made to leave the State of New York.

Jake Schiff would not consent for his fellow Hebrew to remain in the same State with his opulent self.

The offense of the penniless Jew in that case was, apparently, that he had an assignation with young Schiff's wife; and therefore, the penniless Jew seems to have been condemned to 48 years of penal servitude for adultery—which proves that rich Jews consider some things too good for Jews that are poor.

(CONTINUED ON PAGE EIGHT.)

Republican Negroes Insult President At White House:

THE JEFFERSONIAN has not been in a hurry to comment upon the disgraceful scene presented to the world, when a self-appointed delegation of political negroes took themselves to the White House and insulted the President of the United States.

First of all, it was best to wait until all the facts were agreed on.

Next, it was advisable to wait until the Northern Democrats had had their say.

Now, however, all the facts are agreed on, and the Northern Democrats have had their say.

Therefore The Jeffersonian may now be permitted to preach on the subject without running the risk of being too hasty.

How came those negroes at the White House, at all? Who made the appointment for them? Who asked for it? What was the delegation expected to do?

The President of the United States is sup-

The New York World Earns the Praise of William Monroe Trotter.

posed to be a very busy man. Sometimes the most prominent white folks cannot gain access to him, no matter how hard they try.

Familiar instances, of recent occurrence, will at once occur to your mind.

There were the California Shriners, who went from the Atlanta Convention to Washington City, and begged for an opportunity to pay their respects to President Wilson.

These Western Masons were accompanied by their wives, and were at considerable extra expense in carfare and hotel bills, on account of their natural and complimentary desire to see the President.

But the acting-President, Patrick Tumulty, (a bitter Jesuit and a traitorous Knight of

Columbus) refused to make an appointment for these California ladies and gentlemen.

Tumulty insolently informed the Masons that, if they would remain over in the Capitol for the next week, he would arrange for the President to see them!

Another case was that of the Bishop of Alaska, a Protestant clergyman, who came from that distant territory to see President Wilson on business connected with his Alaskan duties.

The Protestant Bishop was coldly refused an audience. He waited around Washington City for more than two weeks, endeavoring to gain access to the President. Tumulty shut him out, and the Bishop had to return to Alaska without having been allowed to enter the White House.

In *The Protestant Magazine*, published at Tacoma Park, D. C., the editor, Prof. W. W.

(CONTINUED ON PAGE FOUR.)

The Mexican Situation Compared to the Turkish Incident

ONE of our national ships, the *Tennessee*, was in Turkish waters, near Smyrna, and the captain took it into his little head to go ashore.

He is supposed to have known that Turkey is in a state of war, as the ally of Germany, and that she has to keep prepared to meet the attacks of England, France and Russia.

Consequently, the captain of the *Tennessee* ought to have known that Turkey could not think of leaving such a harbor and town as Smyrna's open to seizure.

One of the chief custom-houses of Turkey is there, and Smyrna is about as important to Turkey, as Vera Cruz is to Mexico.

But this little sap-head of a naval captain of the *Tennessee* gayly leaped into his launch with a select crew, flung out the Stars and Stripes to the salubrious atmosphere, and started into the harbor of Smyrna.

What business did he have there? Who was he going to see? Was he intending to

buy some oil? Or was he in search of amusement and adventures?

Anyway, this pin-head Captain of the *Tennessee* had not gone far in his launch before there was a most emphatic protest from Turkey.

Four batteries opened fire on the U. S. flag, and four cannon balls came ripping right in front of the Captain—as who should say, "Skiddoo! Beat it! Get out! Where are you gwine? Scat!"

Well, Sir, that Captain was the worst surprised man that ever was seen, on sea or shore—but what could he do?

He turned round in a stupified way and went back to his ship.

Did he get any apologies for those four round-shot that plowed the waters just in front of his launch? No.

Did he demand that he be given a salute to his flag? No.

Did he propose to land U. S. Funston at

Smyrna, seize the custom-house, kill a couple of hundred Turks, and go to collecting the duties at the port? NO!

Did President Wilson and Secretary Bryan say anything about upholding our "dignity and honor," and about going down to Turkey to serve mankind? No.

The Turks at Smyrna knew that the *Tennessee* was our vessel, knew that our flag was flying over the ship, and over the launch, yet four different batteries deliberately opened fire on the flag!

Why? Because that flag had no business there.

Captain Decker had no right whatever to enter the port, without express permission, nor did Admiral Mayo have any right to land his marines at Tampico.

To fire upon our launch and our flag, was a more serious act than to temporarily detain a few sailors who were trespassing in Mexico.

(CONTINUED ON PAGE FIVE.)

Leo Frank, As A Regular Newspaper Contributor.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

How would you ever convict an assassin,

if you rejected utterly the testimony of his accomplice?

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

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

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

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

You know that it is!

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

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

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

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

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

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

Good God! What an arrant falsehood!

Every tyro in the legal profession knows better.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Were the Justices of the Supreme Court similarly intimidated?

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

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

Yet Leo Frank has the brazen effrontery to argue that his case has never been tried, ex-

cept by twelve men who were scared into a verdict by the Atlanta "mob."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Frank never mentions Mary Phagan's name!

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

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

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

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

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

On page 150, he says—

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

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

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

Here we have the pleasure-loving Jewish business man.

Here we have the Gentile girl.

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

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