

The Jeffersonian

Issued Every Thursday.
Office of Publication: THOMSON, GA.

Entered as second-class matter, Dec. 8, 1910,
at the post office at Thomson, Georgia,
under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription Price.....\$1.00 Per Year.
Advertising Rates Furnished on Application.

Sept. 16 If the above date appears on the label on your paper it means that your subscription expires this month. Subscriptions are discontinued promptly on date of expiration. RENEW NOW.

THOMSON, GA., SEPTEMBER 28, 1916.

Casual Comment on Affairs in Georgia.

JUDGE ROBERT HARDEMAN, delivering his charge to the Grand-jury of Washington County, strongly denounced the freedom of the press.

Of course those who indulge in this kind of talk always pretend that they do not oppose the right kind of liberty of the press. What they oppose, they say, is the wrong kind, namely, "license."

This is mere bosh. Between liberty and license, there is no difference. Any book of synonyms will give you the one word, as the exact equivalent of the other.

In the Lippincott "Handy Book of Synonymes" (1888), I find—

"Liberty, leave, license, permission, freedom."

In the "Dictionary of English Synonyms," by Fenby, published in Great Britain, in 1907, I find—

"Liberty, independence, unrestraint, freedom, privilege, immunity, leave, license, permission."

Under the word "License," I find the following synonyms—

"Leave, permission, license."

Roman Catholic priests are loudly condemning liberty of the press, saying that what they object to is not liberty, but license.

Judge Hardeman has evidently been reading this Romanist rot, and been taken in by it.

When the Pope controlled Europe, scholars had to get a license, before they could print.

Roman Catholics have to do it, YET!

No Catholic dares to publish any work on faith, morals, theology, or any other thing touching religion and the church, without first obtaining the o. k. of his bishop.

The great Catholic publishing house, The Benziger Bros., of New York, Chicago, and Cincinnati, printed "The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII," in 1903; and, before they dared do so, they secured the permit of Cardinal Farley and of the Pope's censor in Rome, Remigius LaFort.

These official approvals had to be printed on the fly-leaf of the book!

Formerly, all persons were obliged to secure a similar license, as a condition precedent to publishing. That's how the word license came to be equivalent to liberty. The Pope gave the license to print, which meant, liberty to print.

Now, when John Milton hurled against the Pope's censorship the celebrated "speech" in favor of freedom of the press, he called it a "Speech in favor of unlicensed printing"—that is, he wanted every one to enjoy unhampered freedom to print.

If Judge Hardeman had used the word "licentiousness," instead of "license," he would have said something; and the Grand-jury, too, could have said something, by reminding him that our laws provide ample

restraints and punishment for licentious printing.

Judge Hardeman expressed deep indignation against those wicked men who even go so far as to criticise the President of the United States! Those men are truly wayward and wicked, but what can be said of miscreants who even have the temerity to criticise Judges, such as Bob Hardeman?

Mere words are inadequate. Violent pantomime is needed, and even then one's horror and wrath are not commensurately demonstrated.

Less than two years from now, somebody will be in the race against Bob; and that hateful opponent will rake up Bob's tirade against the freedom of the press; and Bob will be running over the circuit, telling a dozen different sorts of lies about it.

I hope Bob will not stop, though, until he repeats his Sandersville charge in Emanuel, Jefferson, Screven, and Bulloch.

John Slaton rushed into the New York Times (Adolph Ochs) with a letter which claims, in effect, the recent election in Georgia was a vindication of himself.

Mr. Ochs was so pleased, that he put Slaton on the editorial page.

What do you suppose the alleged vindication is based on?

Slaton says that John H. Boykin was elected to succeed Dorsey in the Solicitorship, and that the two dissenting Judges of the Supreme Court had no opposition—therefore Slaton is vindicated!

Gov. Harris doesn't seem to see it that way: old Nat intimates that Slaton and the Frank case played h—ll with him.

Col. Nat ought to know, for he was sure out in the climate, where melancholy events were transpiring.

Slaton did not tell his friend Ochs that Justices Fish and Beck did no more than decide, that Judge Roan had erred in allowing Conley to state what he saw Frank doing to the girl from the upper floor, when he, Conley, peeped through the key-hole.

That was a detail, not at all necessary to the making out of the complete case against Leo Frank—as I demonstrated in the September 1915 number of our magazine.

But these two Justices sided with the others in refusing to hear a re-argument. They also decided that there was no merit in the Extraordinary motion for new trial, which the then governor Slaton had helped to fabricate, and which he stressed so much in that 15,000 word defense of his.

There was absolutely no criticisms of Justices Beck and Fish, any more than there has been of Justices Holmes and Hughes, of the U. S. Supreme Court.

The furious rage aroused by Slaton grew out of his dual role in the case, and out of his manifest intention to disregard laws, courts, and justice.

To act as governor and lawyer in the same case, shocked popular instincts of right. As governor of the State, he was sworn to execute the laws: as attorney for Leo Frank, he was actively working to save a convicted criminal.

As governor, he owed a duty to the State and to the Law: as Frank's lawyer, he worked with the detectives who were trying to suppress evidence, manufacture testimony, and run witnesses away.

It was this duplicity, SUGGESTIVE OF CORRUPTION, that caused the storm to break.

Then when all the Courts had decided against Slaton, the lawyer, Frank's attorneys went through the farce of pleading the case before one of themselves, ACTING AS GOVERNOR.

Senator Ollie James examined the record of the official evidence, and refused to accept a big fee to participate in the comedy

which Slaton's associates in the case were to act before him.

When as bold a man as Luther Rosser thought it advisable to creep to Slaton's house, at midnight, for a final conference between partners, they both were bound to know they were defying destiny.

In any event, Dorsey would have defeated Harris; but if the Governor had avoided Slaton, and not allowed him to secure the pardon of Stripling, the votes would have been much more evenly divided.

An amazing thing to see a new man like Dr. Keese, unknown to public life, cut into the campaign, without fuss, speaking tours, daily papers, big advertisements, money, or patronage, and beat the Harris-Slaton-Rosser-Senators combine by 38,000 votes!

Even in Fulton County, where the Frank case issued was most intense, Dorsey beat the whole bunch!

Where then, does Slaton's vindication come in?

Ask Gus Fite what the Frank case did to him.

As to John Boykin, a little knowledge of the facts may be illuminating:

In the first place, Boykin's violent abuse of me, and his frenzied zeal for Leo Frank assured him practically all of the Catholics and Jews.

In the second place, there was the financial backing of Slaton, Grant, Rosser, and some others.

In the third place, his running-mate, Stevens, was considered a fine man and good lawyer.

In the fourth place, Nat Harris had loaded Eb Williams with Hamp McWhorter's son; and Hamp had done the only fool thing I ever knew him to do in politics; he had written letters to Fulton County voters, soliciting votes for his son.

It was reported that Eb Williams had been married by a priest, that his wife was a Catholic, and that Ebenezer had been forced to sign a bill-of-sale, as it were, to his expected children, delivering them to the Italian pope.

Besides, Eb. was accused of being a Leo Frank sympathiser, himself.

Hence, the average voter in Atlanta was between the Devil and the Deep Sea. He couldn't enjoy himself, in either direction; and, in many cases, the perplexed citizen took to the woods.

Of course Slaton didn't explain all this to Mr. Adolph Ochs, of the New York Times.

By the way, suppose Hughes is elected President!

That would be another vindication of John M. Slaton.

Are Hearst, Ochs, Pulitzer, Abell and Slaton supporting our Baptist brother, Charley Hughes?

If not, why not?

Vindictory logic should be consistent.

If the re-election of Justices Fish and Beck is a vindication of the pro-Frank champions, they should rally to Brother Charles. He, also, dissented from the majority of the Justices.

Is the Atlanta Journal for Hughes?

Is the Georgian supporting Brother Charles?

Is the Catholic morning daily in Augusta roaring for Hughes?

Is George Long of Canada bringing The Telegraph over to the dissenting Justice whose decision was so loudly praised, last year?

I guess our vote for Fish and Beck commi's us to voting for Hughes.

Is it not so?

Don't all speak at once.

Hon. Carl Vinson paid the old Pops a nice compliment, by naming J. C. C. Black as first man on his delegation to the Congressional convention.