

## FRANK MASS MEETING CALLED

### Will Be Held in Chicago to Protest Against Proposed Execution

*Special to The New York Times.*

CHICAGO, Dec. 21.—Prominent Chicagoans are arranging for a mass meeting to promote the movement to save Leo M. Frank from death. A conference held today resulted in the issuance of the following call upon men of all creeds and races to join in the movement:

"The Leo M. Frank case, recently tried at Atlanta, Ga., can be reckoned among causes celebres of the civilized world. So great an interest has been aroused in this prosecution that it has become the subject of magazine articles, as well as newspaper editorials, throughout the whole United States.

"In the past numerous efforts have been made through the tribunals of the State of Georgia, as well as in the United States Supreme Court, to obtain for this man reversal of the judgment and a new trial. It is our belief that some concerted action ought to be taken to devise some method whereby this unfortunate man's life be spared, and to prevent a great miscarriage of justice. For this reason you are invited to join us in our efforts in behalf of this talented, and, we believe, much wronged young man."

This call was signed by Abraham Meyer of Mayer, Meyer, Austrian & Platt, attorneys; Nathan D. Kaplan, representing the Young Men's Hebrew Institute; Bernard J. Mahony, Assistant State's Attorney; Max Schulman, representing the Federation of Zionists; Sylvanis G. Levy, attorney; Thomas G. McElligott, ex-State representative; Arthur Donoghue, member of the State Board of Equalization; Stephen Love, representing the Knights of Columbus; Edward A. Hochbaum, attorney, and Walter Stanton, counsel for the Sanitary District.

### THE PRESS ON FRANK CASE.

#### His Trial "Reeked with Unfairness" —Justice Alone Sought.

Below will be found editorial expression on the Frank case, supplementing those hitherto reproduced in THE TIMES:

#### Nothing More Heinous in Russia.

From The Duluth Herald.

Frank was convicted in a trial that reeks with unfairness, and there is nothing more certain than that mob pressure and race prejudice, not evidence or equity, brought about the verdict.

Russia, with all her benightedness, never produced anything more heinous than the case of Frank, who is headed for the gallows for a crime that there is no reason to believe that he committed, and apparently because he is a Jew and was suspected, and because the mob demanded a victim and preferred a Jew victim.

Though everybody seems to agree that the trial was a farce; that fear of the mob rather than conviction dictated the verdict, and that the evidence was so flimsy and absurd that it would be a crime to hang a dog upon it, the days go by, the time of execution draws near, and still this doomed young Jew is un-saved.

#### Outsiders Seek Only Justice.

From The Chattanooga Times.

At last the newspapers of Georgia are making note of the real issue now in the case of Leo Frank, which is in its final analysis, and, all other subsidiary and intercedent questions aside: Did Frank have a fair trial, and was his conviction had after due process of law? Shall Frank have a new trial under freer conditions than obtained when his conviction was secured? \* \* \*

These expressions, from the columns of The Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, indicating that the people are beginning to realize the real and underlying motive for the energy that has been exhibited in Frank's behalf, are hopeful and will no doubt be helpful to Gov. Slaton if the matter should ultimately be forced upon him for decision. It may be said with absolute truth that none of those who have interested themselves in Frank's trial outside of Georgia has done so with the purpose of saving a guilty man from the gallows; on the contrary, their sole purpose is to prevent, if possible, his execution until it has been shown beyond the peradventure of a doubt that he is guilty. Georgians—even those most insistent upon the execution of Frank's sentence—who are themselves fair and reasonable, while they may be disposed to resent outside interference, cannot take it amiss when outsiders like this newspaper, for instance, express a horror over the legal hanging of any human being about whose guilt the trial Judge, presiding over their own court, expressed a serious doubt.

It would be strange if the whole country should not be exercised over the possibility of a tragic legal mistake—if no worse—in such circumstances as we have recited.