PRESS ON FRANK CASE.
New York Times (1857-1922); Dec 4, 1914;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2008)
pg. 12

PRESS ON FRANK CASE.

Editors Declare a Miscarriage of Justice Seems Imminent.

Following are additional extracts from editorials on the case of Leo M. Frank:

Persecuted Because a Jew.

From The Duluth Herald.

The successive failures of the attempt to save Leo M. Frank of Atlanta from the gallows make it look as though the country were about to look on at the hanging of a man regarding whose guilt there is a tremendous doubt, many level-headed men close to the scene believing firmly that he is innocent.

That the proof was not strong enough to hang a dog seems to be beyond any question whatever.

C. P. Connolly, himself a former Prosecuting Attorney and now a magazine writer, who was sent to investigate the Frank case from an entirely unbiased viewpoint, has become so thoroughly convinced that Frank is innocent that he is writing to the newspapers of the country, earnestly protesting against what he conceives to be a monstrous miscarriage of justice.

He quotes "a distinguished lawyer and a law partner of the man who prosecuted Frank" as saying that "no Jew in modern times has been persecuted as this Jew has been."

For Frank is a Jew and a Northerner; and these facts seem to be what brought about his conviction—not the flimsy evidence of a dissolute negro, who is a self-confessed criminal; and yet the whole case rests on his testimony.

Mr. Connolly declares—and many have said the same thing before—that the pejudice against Jews and Northerners was such in Atlanta that when Frank was on trial a bitter and insistent public clamor beat upon the jurors, accompanied by therats. "Before the verdict was rendered," says Mr. Connolly, "the mob, breathing vengeance in the very face of the court and jury, let it be known that it would tolerate nothing but a verdict of guilty. 'Innocent or guilty, we will get the damned Jew!' was their cry, heard by numbers of respectable citizens."

Victim of Yellow Journalism.

From The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle.

Leo M. Frank has been called another Dreyfus. There is no indication, however, that racial prejudice enters very prominently into the matter. The case is rather that of a man accused of an atrocious crime, against whom public prejudice was fanned to a white heat by the cunning of a newspaper owned by Mr. Hearst, and which used the case, in the familiar way employed by Mr. Hearst's newspapers, to increase its circulation.

The state of public feeling being what it was, he never had a chance for a fair trial. His case was for all practical purposes tried in the newspapers, and a verdict of guilty assured before the first witness was sworn.

The Purpose of Justice.

From The Pittsburgh Dispatch.

Justice Holmes, in denying the (Frank) motion because it was too late, declares his doubt as to due process of law to be because of the threat of mob violence. It thus appears that a man remains under sentence of death although the highest judicial authority, in passing on his case, doubts the full process of law by reason of the practical demand of a mob for his conviction. Justice is not always so particular against the granting of appeals. In Missouri a municipal spoilsman had his conviction vacated because the word "the" was omitted before the words "City of St. Louis." In Brooklyn a convicted bank President was released because a panel of jurors was drawn at 10 o'clock instead of 9. But in Atlanta it holds under sentence a man whose conviction was called for by a mob so threatening that the Judge conferred in court with the Chief of Police and the Colonel of a militia regiment.

Certainly, the case seems to illustrate the necessity of impressing on the highest judicial authority that the function of justice is to do justice, and not to enforce certain strict and invariable rules.

A Rule and a Human Life.

From The Houston (Texas) Chronicle.

From the press reports of the trial, the conclusion was unescapable that Frank was tried under a condition of public sentiment which made a "fair" trial, within the meaning of the Constitution, impossible. Then, he was not present in court when the verdict was rendered, as it was his clear constitutional right to be. He made that a ground of motions to set the verdict aside, but it seems that the Supreme Court of Georgia held "the motion came too late."

The Chronicle believes in rigid enforcement of the law and does not believe in the interposition of technicalities between criminals and their just punishment, but at the same time it does not believe any man should be denied relief where a right has been denied him because of any question of order or time, or because of any rule or precedent in practice and procedure. No rule or no precedent is as valuable as the rights, much less the life, of a citizen.

A Legal Lynching.

From The Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union

We strongly doubt Frank's guilt, and we have plenty of company. The question of guilt is not the only one or the most important one. The most important question is whether a man is really to be given the rights conferred by the laws of Georgia or whether the courts will merely make a pretense of giving them. It is admitted by all that the Judge, the lawyers, and the court officials feared a riot if a verdict of not guilty had been found. How could the jurors give an unprejudiced verdict under such circumstances?

The hanging of Leo Frank will be a greater disgrace to Georgia than all the lynchings that have occurred in that State.

State of Georgia at the Bar.

From The Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

The interest in Frank is not emotional or hysterical, but is due to an evidently widespread feeling that, guilty or not, he did not, and under the circumstances could not, receive a fair trial, and that as the case now stands it is the State of Georgia that is at the bar. The question is one of justice and legal procedure that should be freed from the influence of popular passion; it will be a relief to the country at large if Frank is yet given a new trial.

FEWER TIMID DEPOSITORS.

Officials Report Plenty of Money in East Side Bank Vaults.

Smaller crowds than on the two previous days lined up yesterday morning in front of the Public Bank at Ludlow and Delancey Street and the State Bank at 52 Norfolk Street. Both banks have posted notices in three languages waiving any provision for notice of withdrawal. Edward S. Rothchild, President of the Public Bank, said yesterday that the run was a small one and did not worry the officers of the bank in the least.

"The Directors of this bank," he said, "have $50,000,000 worth of capital behind them. I myself own property worth more than $1,000,000 in New York City. We have in cash in our vaults here in the building at this present moment $2,447,543. Since this run started on Tuesday about 235 depositors have withdrawn a total of about $150,000. We have nearly 100,000 depositors. In the three days fresh deposits of close to $150,000 have been made here. From a business standpoint this run is profitable to us, as the depositors who withdraw their accounts lose the half-year's interest which they would receive on Jan. 1."

Officials of the State Bank said that since the run began on Tuesday between 200 and 300 depositors out of a total of nearly 50,000 have withdrawn their funds, the total amount withdrawn being about $60,000. President Richard said the bank had more than $4,000,000 cash on hand and had refused that morning an offer of the National City Bank to advance $1,000,000.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.