A STUDY FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS.

New York Times (1857-1922); Jun 25, 1915;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2008)
pg. 10

A STUDY FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS.

Large numbers of healthy and, in most of their relations to life, perfectly normal citizens of Georgia today constitute, in their united action, such a'study for the psychologist as is rarely presented. They are trying to justify all that may have been said of the sway of unreasoning passion in Georgia by the people, in all parts of the country, who strove to save LEO FRANK from the gallows. The Governor who, after a patient investigation of the case, was compelled by his conscience to commute FRANK's sentence is hanged and burned in effigy as if he were a monstrous offender instead of a just and upright man who has dared to defy popular prejudice in the per-

formance of his duty. Perhaps this subjugation of reason to passion is not so uncommon as we would like to think. Similar manifestations of the force of prejudice in defiance of judgment were to be noted in various parts of this country when the famous Sampson-Schley case was an uppermost topic of discussion, during the preposterous Cook-Peary controversy, and recent-ly in New York when the case of BRANDT was fresh in the public mind. In Georgia the people have spread before them the Governor's statement of the Frank case from its beginning, lucid and convincing, but it has failed of effect so far as many thousands of Georgians are concerned. Yet we must all admit that the Georgian is not a peculiar type, differing at all in mentality from the rest of us. The disturbance does not call for denunciation, but for grave

call for denunciation, but for grave consideration from a psychological point of view.

One of the strangest developments is the published statement of one of the Frank jurors, A. H. Henslee, condemning the Governor in flaming terms, declaring that the "daughters, wives, sisters, and mothers" of Georgia are in danger. Yet this juror frankly says that, after listening for three weeks to the evidence against

FRANK, on the first ballot in the jury room he cast his vote as "doubtful." Now he condemns the Governor, who studied the records of the case patiently and without prejudice many days, and made investigations the jurors had not made, because he, too, is doubtful of FRANK's guilt. The Governor was aware of the feeling against Frank in Georgia and dared to act according to his conscience. He was not, however, closeted with ten convinced jurors and one doubtful as himself while a prejudiced mobwas waiting outside the court for the verdict. This juror himself is a fine subject for psychological study.