RETRY LEO FRANK, SAYS RABBI LYONS New York Times (1857-1922); Nov 29, 1914; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2008) pg. 13

RETRY LEO FRANK. SAYS RABBI LYONS

Necessary to Vindicate Courts from Charge of Yielding to Prejudice and Passion.

SEND SERMON BROADCAST

Brooklyn Clergyman Speaks of Gov. Glynn as Victim of Religious Prejudice in Recent Election.

Copies of a sermon preached by Rabbi Alexander Lyons in the Eighth Avenue Temple in Brooklyn, Friday night, in which he referred to the prejudice against Leo M. Frank that existed in Atlanta during the trial of Frank, which resulted in a verdict convicting him of the murder of Mary Phagan, are to be mailed to thousands of people in all the larger towns of Georgia. The subject was "Prejudice in American Life." The speaker referred to the religious

The speaker referred to the religious opposition to Gov. Glynn as an instance of prejudice, "vicious and unpatriotic, subordinating principle to thoughtlessness and passion."

With reference to the Frank case, Rabbi Lyons said in part:

"There is in many quarters a conviction—which is shared by a number of distinguished Christians, such as, for instance, Justice Holmes of the Supreme Court—that Leo M. Frank was not tried entirely upon pertinent facts. The fact that he was a Jew was mentioned so frequently before and during the trial that it is hard to believe that he was tried as an ordinary American citizen, without consideration of race or religion.

"Defendants answering to the charge of lesser crimes than this

without consideration of race or religion.
"Defendants answering to the charge of lesser crimes than this have often been granted a change of venue to escape an atmosphere of prejudice; and in the temper of the communit; at that time it would have been hard for Frank to have a fair trial aside from questions of religion. When we consider that the presiding Judge, with the calmness of his juddelal experience, said that rigion. When we consider that the presiding Judge, with the calmness of his judicial experience, said that the evidence was not convincing, the agreement of the jury on conviction suggests either that they were all superior to the presiding Judge, which is not likely, or that they were swayed by an element which he as a representative of the consideration of the presiding suggests. is not likely, or that they were swayed by an element which he as a representative of justice thought should not have been admitted as determining influence.
"Frank should"

"Frank should be retried for the sake of the elevation of our judicial procedure above the charge of the in-fluence of passion and prejudice."