FRANK RAILROAD, E.V. DEBS ASSERTS Special to The New York Times. New York Times (1857-1922); Dec 28, 1914; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2008)

## FRANK RAILROADED, E. V. DEBS ASSERTS

Declares Race Prejudice Made His Trial a Farce and He Had No Chance.

## SAYS THE SOUTH IS BLINDED

Race Intolerance Traced to Years of Injustice to Negro—Real Lynch Law in Frank's Conviction.

Special to The New York Times.

TERRE HAUTE, Ind., Dec. 2 gene V. Debs, date for Pres President. has written

date for President, has written the following on the Frank case:

I have followed the Frank case in the press on account of its extraordinary nature, and the conviction was forced upon me long ago that Frank's trial was a farce and that the prejudice against him on account of his race was so interest that however imposent he might

him on account of his race was so intense that, however innocent he might be, he had not a ghost of a chance for his life.

Had this boy been the son of a "first family" instead of an alien Jew, he would not even have been arrested upon the testimony of a "nigger." who was himself suspected of the crime, and, in all likelihood, the case would have been summarily disposed of by lynching the "nigger."

The question at this time is not as to Frank's innocence or guilt, but as to whether or not he had a fair trial, and in that question every American citizen is vitally interested.

Now, no one, least of all those who are thirsting for his blood, pretends that Frank was fairly tried. From the very beginning his fate was sealed. The Court House in which the farce was taged was surrounded by an angry and threatening crowd. Every point scored against the unfortunate victim was greeted with an outbreak, which the court made no attempt to suppress, and when finally the verdict of guilty was brought in by the trembling jury, a demonstration of frenzled jubilation followed, which, even had he been guilty, would have been a disgrace to a civilized community.

Not an editor dared to protest: not a minister opened his mouth, although it was notorious that the lawyers for the defense and the jury were threatened with summary vengeance if Frank was not convilted. If the presumption of innocence is not valid in the case of Leo Frank simply because he is a Jew, then not one of us has any right to the protection of the law. The constitutional guarantees of the accused have been denied him, he has been convicted upon purely circumstantial evidence and this evidence of flimsiest character, and if he is permitted to go to his death under such circumstances it will be an everlasting disgrace to the country. The South is bilinded by race prejudice, one of the inheritances of chattelslavery. There is no law and no justice for the black man in that section, and I have traveled over it long enough to know. The bare susplicion of guilt is