

# The Jeffersonian

Vol. 13, No. 7

Thomson, Ga., Thursday, February 10, 1916

Price, Five Cents

## Is Georgia the Worst of All the States?

THE Montgomery Advertiser is greatly disturbed by the lynchings which have taken place in Georgia.

Which ones?

Was it any worse for the people of our State to lynch negroes who brutally murdered a sheriff, than it was for the Alabama people to lynch negroes who were accused of poisoning a mule?

Naturally, we think more of our sheriffs than we do of our mules.

Of course, if a different rule prevails on the other side of the Chattahoochee, it isn't our fault.

Is Alabama afflicted with a peculiarly bad lot of sheriffs, or is she blessed with an especially fine brand of mules?

Why this invidious discrimination in favor of "the animal which has no pride of ancestry and no hope of posterity?"

According to the best of my recollection, Alabama has had her fair share of lynch-law, and we Georgians have always been willing to assume that the coons strung up by Alabama deserved what they got.

Is it worse for the State of Georgia to lynch a negro for murdering an officer of the

law, than it is for New York to so feebly enforce *HER* laws, that men can be hired to commit murder, at from five dollars up?

Only a few days ago, a New York girl admitted that she hired a couple of men to murder a woman whom she desired to get out of the way.

Would society have suffered a serious injury if a mob had taken hold of that beastly Catholic priest, Schmidt, and put him to death, when his awful crime against his concubine, Anna Aumuller, had been judicially ascertained?

A more horrible murder was never committed, since Cain killed his brother; yet for three years that blood-stained priest has made a mockery of the laws of New York.

Was it a triumph for justice, when Governor Dix pardoned Albert Patrick, who had been legally convicted of the poisoning of old man Rice, to get his money?

Did the Supreme Court of Missouri strike a noble blow for justice, when it reversed the conviction of the St. Louis hoodlums, who had been legally tried and condemned, but whose sentences were annulled, because of the omis-

sion of the article "the" before the words, "State of Missouri," in the indictment?

Did the Supreme Court of the United States deepen our respect for law, when it interpolated the word "unreasonable" into the Statute which said "all combinations in restraint of trade" were criminal?

When the law was on its passage, an effort was made to insert the word "unreasonable" before the word "combination," but Congress rejected the amendment.

In spite of the official record, showing what Congress meant by the law, the Jesuit who now controls the Court deliberately interpolated the rejected word into the Statute, and thus gave liberty, immunity and legality to the Big Rich criminals whom Congress was trying to reach and punish.

Has anybody's respect for law been increased by the juggling of the Diggs-Caminetti case, where two white men of California were accused of debauching two school girls, taking them into Colorado, to live with them?

These men have been convicted, the Circuit  
(CONTINUED ON PAGE EIGHT.)

**I Will Address the People at the Court House, Thomson, 10 O'clock Coming Saturday.—THOS. E. WATSON.**

## Is the State of Georgia to be Raped by Wilson's Administration?

IN ANOTHER place, will be found a day-letter sent to Hon. Carl Vinson, the Congressional Representative of the District in which I live.

When you read it, you will know what sort of request he made of me, and his reason for it.

The following letter explains itself, the writers having given me permission to make it public:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C.

January 3, 1916.

Hon. Thomas E. Watson,  
Thomson, Georgia.

Dear Sir: In the course of an interview with officials of the Department of Justice, we learned that efforts will be made shortly to procure indictments against you in jurisdictions outside of Georgia by authority expressed in the case of Haas vs. Hinkle, 216 U. S. Report, p. 462, and other correlated decisions.

These indictments are to be based upon publications regarding the Frank case.

In conclusion, we wish to say that we have discussed this matter from every angle, and are impressed with the seriousness of the situation.

Very truly,

S. J. TRIBBLE,  
FRANK PARK.

I am allowed to state that Governor Harris called on the Attorney General of the United States, and protested against the design to have me indicted outside the State of Georgia.

As the Governor knows, the South was not

insulted and outraged in that manner, even during the lawless and hideous era of Reconstruction.

Federal soldiers, with guns in their hands, confronted Benj. H. Hill when he made his famous Davis Hall speech, and the fierce attack which he made upon the Radical Republicans in that speech, in his Bush Arbor speech, and in his "Notes on the Situation" were bitterly resented by the North, but no threat was ever made to seize him and take him among his enemies for trial in a Northern court.

When the Government prosecuted the Ku Klux, the defendants were not removed from the States.

What chance would the Red Shirts of General Gary, General Butler, General Hampton and Ben Tillman have had, if they had been indicted in Maine or Illinois?

What chance would Generals Forrest, Toombs, and DuBose have had, if they had been prosecuted in Pennsylvania?

Governor Harris remembers that frightful period in Southern history; and he knows full well that General Gordon, Howell Cobb, Ben Hill, Linton Stephens, Bob Alston, General Ransie Wright and other stalwart Georgians could not have driven out the negro and the Carpet-bagger in 1868, if the Carpet-bagger could have prosecuted those Georgians in the Northern states.

Lamar and Walthall would have been

equally helpless in Mississippi; Morgan, in Alabama; Harris, in Tennessee; Ransom and Vance, in North Carolina; the Lees and their supporters, in Virginia.

Where would the States be, if they surrender their jurisdiction over their citizens, allowing the Federal Government to drag into other States, alleged "moonshiners," defaulters, rioters, bank wreckers, cheats and swindlers, violators of the Sherman law, of the income tax law, of the Internal Revenue law, of the mailing laws, of the libel laws, and so on?

It would be anarchy in judicial procedure. Did the Government try to snatch the accused Night Riders of Tennessee into Delaware?

Are robbers of the mails tried in New England for crimes committed in the West?

Are Southern moonshiners taken to Michigan?

Are the white slavers of the North brought South for trial?

Such a system would lead to monstrous abuses, and it would annihilate historic precedents, as well as personal security.

Governor Harris, being a good lawyer, knows that the conspiracy law cannot be applied to an editor, or to a publishing company, whose subscribers are not its agents, and which has no news-dealing, or distributing agency outside the State.

The Governor is no doubt familiar with  
(CONTINUED ON PAGE SEVEN.)

hold that you conspired with the publishers?

When our Company mails The Jeffersonian to Thomson, and a citizen of Pennsylvania takes it out, for the purpose of circulating it, he is guilty of a violation of law, provided the paper is obscene; but his act was independent of the Company's, and his offense is individual.

And the law does not say that one word, or sentence, or article can be indicted: the paper must be indicted as a whole, judged as a whole; and it is for the jury to say whether the entire paper is rendered obscene by one article, or two articles, one passage, or several. If that is not the law, then Congress did not know how to express itself when it wrote section 211, which the Roman Catholic priests have seized upon, as the handiest weapon to bludgeon the freedom of the press.

You can mail just as many filthy pictures as you like in the Sunday papers, and in the lurid novels; you can "tell it all" on the sermons, on the White Slavers, and upon the Red Light district; but the minute you criticize, expose, and persist in assailing this foreign ecclesiastico-political organization, when Uncle Sam gets wonderously concerned about his mail pouches he is contaminated.

To prosecute a citizen outside his State, and in several States, is not an honest effort to uphold the Law: it is a vindictive use of governmental power to ruin one man, and to gratify a malignant passion for revenge.

My learned brother, Gregory, may rest assured that the State of Georgia will so understand it, that the other States will so understand it, and that the fearless, unbiased papers everywhere will so understand it.

Some malevolent interest wants to wreak vengeance upon the State, and upon the citizens who defended her against mercenary abuse and misrepresentation.

Not being able to indict the whole State, they do the next best thing: they grossly insult and outrage the State, and they select the man who defended her for sacrifice.

That's what it really is, and all intelligent Georgians know it.

Whether my learned brother can unearth several Grand Juries willing to set a revolutionary precedent, and endanger the personal liberty of every citizen of this Republic, remains to be seen.

And whether or not the U. S. Judges in Georgia will become parties to the contemplated revolution in procedure, also remains to be seen.

In the meantime, all I can do is to "wait for the wagon."

Can you conceive of a judicial policy more ruinous to men who have little, or no money?

Torn from their homes, dragged off into distant States, how could poor men employ lawyers and pay witnesses to travel thousands of miles?

What would become of the families of these men, during the months they are imprisoned in remote jails?

All citizens are endangered, when the Government adopts a revolutionary policy, violative of the precedents and the principles of centuries.

All States are menaced when the U. S. Government treats with contempt the reserved rights of any State.

P. S.—I trust my learned brother, the Attorney-General, will admonish his District Attorneys that it is improper for them to make speeches against me to the Grand Jury.

Down here in Georgia, an Assistant District Attorney pleaded with the Grand Jury, for an hour, urging it not to find a true bill against a man who had mailed to me, from Sandersville, some of the obscenest, filthiest letters ever typed.

On the other hand, when the second bill against me was being sought, the former Dis-

trict Attorney, Alexander Akerman, Esquire, made an hour's speech to the Grand Jury urging the bill.

So you see, my Uncle Sam is adopting a new Code of Law and Practise for the especial benefit of his Uncle T. E. W.

In this case, at least, there is no such thing as the Government's being "too proud to fight."

#### TELEGRAM TO HON. FRANK PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. J. Brown writes that Attorney-General claims letter was published in The Jeffersonian, after my trial in Augusta, threatening insurrection, if I were again taken into court.

The Attorney-General has been deceived by some enemy of mine.

No such letter, editorial, article, statement or insinuation was ever published in either of our periodicals.

The letter referred to appears on page three of weekly Jeffersonian of October 21, more than a month before my trial. The letter speaks for itself and refers to the threat published in Straus' magazine, "Puck."

The substance of the Straus threat was, that I should be hanged, and the State of Georgia subjected to another Sherman's march to the sea. The exact language of the letter was this: "Dear Sir: Ever since reading that threat against you and others my old blood has been hot. When General Straus, Colonel Hass, Major Ochs, and all that great army of Jerusalemites, march into Georgia, to run you and others out of the State or even whisper assassination, I feel like greasing my old Betsey, as I did in Johnson's army in '64-'65. I am an old Confederate soldier, but am not too old to fight, if I am top old to run. When such riotous talk as that comes out in the Jew-owned newspapers, that same old spunk that our forefathers had in 1776, 1812, comes right into a fellow."

You will see from this quotation that the threat, if it was one, was not against any court, nor against any law, nor against any government. It was simply a statement of the old Georgia soldier's willingness to fight in defense of my life against assassins and to again go to the firing line, if another Sherman's march should threaten the State of Georgia.

I give you the information in order that the Government may be in possession of the actual facts, instead of the malicious fiction of my enemies. Instead of fearing or shrinking another trial, in the United States Court, in Augusta, I have instructed my attorneys to insist upon a trial at the approaching May term.

(Signed.) THOS. E. WATSON.  
Thomson, Ga., Feb. 7, 1916.

### Is the State of Georgia to be Raped by Wilson's Administration?

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE.)

the case to which Hon. Wm. H. Fleming calls my attention; namely 25 Federal Reporter, page 902 where that very point was expressly decided.

Mr. Fleming assures me that this ruling has never been reversed, or even questioned.

It was that decision, probably, which saved the Western editors when President Roosevelt tried to drag them to Washington City.

When the Richmond, Virginia, paper published the filthy details of the Beattie case, where were the publishers indicted?

In Richmond; and the Federal judge quashed the indictment, just as Judge Rufus Foster quashed the indictment against me.

When the Atlanta dailies published the obscene evidence given against Leo Frank, were they prosecuted? Oh, no.

Is it too late to drag Clark Howell, James R. Gray, John Cohen, and James Nevin into New Jersey, and try them for mailing that filthy stuff? Oh, no.

I did not publish it, but the State of Georgia did, in her supreme Court Reports: why not indict the judges of our Supreme Court and Charley Byrd, our Public Printer?

It would be a fine spectacle—a Democratic Administration sending U. S. marshals to arrest our editors and Judges, and hauling them off to Rhode Island for trial.

The most obscene and filthy cartoons that ever saw daylight, were those which the

Strauses published in their salacious Puck magazine, last summer. Those cartoons grossly and coarsely lampooned the State of Georgia, her courts and her people.

They also pictured me, again and again, as the kept paramour of a big, black brute of a negro wench.

Could you conceive of a more dastardly insult to your wife and children, than a vile cartoon of that sort?

If this Democratic administration is sincerely concerned for the chastity of literature and the virginal purity of the mails, why does it not have the Strauses indicted in Atlanta and brought from New York for trial?

Why is it that the Government never notices "obscenity", until the Roman Catholic church gets hit?

Almost every Sunday supplement of Mr. Hearst violates the section under which I was indicted: why not employ Alexander Akerman, Esquire, to get a bill, in Macon, against Mr. Hearst, Mr. Brisbane, Mr. Carvelho, and Mr. John Temple Graves?

The Union Library Association of New York sells and mails such books as the Decameron, the Heptameron, Madame Bovary, and Rabelais: why doesn't a Blue-law administration put the New York company out of business?

The New York firm, Benziger Brothers, sell St. Augustine's "City of God" which contains passages so sickeningly obscene and filthy that they dare not translate them: why doesn't this virginal administration of the chaste Woodrow Wilson, put that Catholic publishing house out of business?

Last week an Ohio jury acquitted Paterson, the Cash Register man: will the Government blacklist Ohio, because it failed to convict Patterson?

Is Connecticut to be put into the pen of the black sheep because it failed to convict our virtuous fellow citizens William Rockefeller, George Baker, Lewis Cass Ledyard, in the New Haven cases?

The entire South is besmirched when the Government grossly insults one typical Southern State,

What has Georgia done to the Democratic party, that an Administration which owes its existence to the South, singles her out for an outrageous libel, never before published in any State of the Union?

All jurors in Georgia are black-listed, all courts stigmatized, by the utterly unwarranted assertion that a Democratic administration cannot get a fair trial in this pathetically patient and loyal Democratic state.

Georgia jurors are connected by blood and interest with all other Georgians; and the whole white citizenship of our proud old commonwealth is indicted, held up to the scorn of the world—just as the Strauses cartooned her in their nasty little magazine.

President Wilson wouldn't dare to inflict such an unheard of outrage UPON A POLITICALLY DOUBTFUL STATE.

### Watson's Books on Sale in Atlanta and Macon.

A complete line of Thos. E. Watson's books are on sale at Miller's Book Store, in Atlanta; also at Macon, with Brown's Book Store. People in those cities and vicinity would do well to call and look them over. Jeffersonian Publishing Co.

"Waterloo" is a classic. It touches the depths of romance and tragedy. By Thos. E. Watson. Beautifully bound in cloth. Price, postpaid, 50c. The Jeffersonian Publishing Company, Thomson, Ga.

Read Foreign Missions Exposed, by Thos. E. Watson. Beautifully printed. Profusely illustrated. Price 30 cents. The Jeffersonian Publishing Company, Thomson, Ga.

## Is Georgia the Worst of all the States?

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE ONE.)

Court approved the conviction, the case reached the U. S. Court, which approved the decision of the courts below, and which, after flatly refusing to allow the case to re-argued, changed its mind within a few hours, and consented to have the case re-opened.

Nobody seems to know what has become of the case, but we all know how W. J. Bryan and Attorney General McReynolds favored the defendants, and how a Republican District Attorney threw up his commission in disgust, because of the manner in which Washington influence was used for the accused.

The father of Camminetti is one of President Wilson's high appointees, next to a Cabinet officer.

Does this account for the extremely peculiar and unprecedented flop of the Supreme Court?

In Florida, a man who was accused of the fiendish murder of two white women, was shown in court to not only have murdered most cruelly and brutally those unprotected women, but to have set fire to their dead bodies.

Was he condemned to death? Not at all.

He was sent up for life, and of course, in a year or two, certain newspapers and certain individuals will begin to agitate for a pardon.

Of course, the real text and subject of the Montgomery paper was the same as that of the Atlanta Constitution; namely, that of the Frank case.

The less said about the Frank case by the corporation press and the men who are afraid of the wealthy Jew advertisers, the better judgment they will exercise.

It is capable of the most convincing proof that the Governor who upset all the courts, in that case, acted personally as Leo Frank's lawyer during the time he was Governor of Georgia.

At his office, adjoining the offices of his partners, Rosser, Phillips & Brandon, John M. Slaton conferred with the detectives during the very time they were engaged in the noble endeavor to bribe some of the witnesses, frighten others, and thus manufacture material for the extraordinary motion for a new trial.

In other words, it is capable of proof that John M. Slaton, who was under a solemn oath to enforce the laws of Georgia, was actively and personally engaged with C. W. Burke, the detective, in his most outrageous efforts to change the sworn testimony upon which Leo Frank had been legally and justly convicted.

What are the people to do, when Governors and Supreme Courts act in this manner?

Did not Lord Macaulay himself write manfully of the wild justice which the indignant people sometimes apply, with their own hands?

Did not the historian, H. H. Bancroft, compile an elaborate memorial, in vindication of the "Popular Tribunals," which administered lynch-law in the West, and brought the lawless element in subjection?

When the man who afterwards became known as General W. T. Sherman, sternly commanded a corrupt Judge and a corrupt District Attorney to resign within twenty-four hours, was it not a case of lynch-law, dealing with a situation which the Judge and the attorney had made intolerable?

Oliver Cromwell lynched a tyrannical king, and John Milton applauded the act.

The rebellious barons would have lynched King John, if he had not quailed before those stern eyes and the strong hands which held blazing swords.

The Great Charter of our liberties was a triumph of lynch-law.

The heroes of the French Revolution lynched a king and a queen, and then adopted a new Constitution, which, after many ups and downs, at last became the great charter of French liberties.

What was Martin Luther, if not a rebel?

What was John Wesley, if not a rebel?

What was Roger Williams, if not a rebel?

What sort of law was it that our Revolutionary forefathers applied to American Tories, if it was not lynch-law?

What sort of law was it that dumped the tea in Boston harbor, compelled the owner of the Peggy Stewart to burn his ship (named after his daughter), and which applied coats of tar and feathers to refractory citizens, in nearly every city in the thirteen colonies?

What sort of law was it that was praised by Theodore Roosevelt, in his books, and given credit for ridding the West of horse-thieves and professional Bad men?

What sort of law was it that Illinois applied to the Mormons?

What sort of law was it that the ex-Confederate soldiers, General N. B. Forest, General Robert Toombs, General Dudley DuBose, General Wade Hampton, General Mart. Gary and General Butler applied to the negroes, when they had gone crazy on the new wine of freedom, and when the stern methods of the White Camellias, the Red Shirts and the Ku Klux were absolutely the last desperate effort of a conquered people to protect their homes, their wives and children, their civilization, and the white race itself, from the hideous menace of those black savages?

It comes with poor grace, from an Alabama paper, to fling reproaches upon the people of any sister Southern State.

Has the Montgomery Advertiser forgotten what happened in Eufaula?

Is it entirely ignorant of the horrors of Reconstruction in its own State?

Let it familiarize itself with Alabama's own sad story, before it heaps odium on the people across the Chattahoochee.

Not long ago an ex-Judge of the Supreme Court of Georgia told me, in words of great earnestness, that the Atlanta riots had been provoked by the intolerable insolence and daring crimes of the blacks, and that he could not imagine any remedy which would have met the evil, except that remedy which an uprising of the whites applied to those lawless blacks.

It was lynch-law, all right, and it had the desired effect.

As a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina has boldly said, publicly, at meetings of the Bar Association: "Lynch-law, in its last analysis, is the honest effort of an outraged people to administer justice where the courts themselves have failed to do it."

### President Wilson's Speeches in Favor of Prussian Militarism.

HOW many of our people have seriously reflected upon the changed attitude of the President?

No Chief Executive has so completely reversed himself.

Let the undisputed facts do the talking:

He went into office, as the result of Bryan's betrayal of Champ Clark; and Bryan defended his perfidy upon the ground that he believed Clark had made a bargain with Wall Street.

A bargain, of what sort?

Considering Bryan's financial principles—or pretended principles—it was supposed by the Baltimore Convention and by the people generally, that Bryan's accusation against Clark meant a surrender by Clark on the Money question.

What else could Bryan have meant when he, an instructed Clark delegate, assailed him, knifed him, and balked him of the Presidency,

after he had been holding a decided majority of the Convention votes?

What was the best service that Clark could have rendered Wall Street, if he had sold out, and obtained the Presidency?

The best he could have done for the Street was, to have legalized the Money Trust.

Taft and Aldrich had tried to do it, but failed.

Well, Bryan's perfidy toward Clark elected Wilson, and the first work of President Wilson and of Secretary Bryan was, to legalize the Money Trust.

Is it not so? The fact cannot be disputed.

The Money Trust was not only legalized in the new Regional bank law, but the interest-rate of the Aldrich bill was lowered so that the national bankers and cotton gamblers got some \$400,000,000 of new paper money at 3 per cent. instead of 5; and, as I understand it, the Government no longer compels the banks to pay interest on Government deposits.

Not only were these colossal favors showered on the Money Trust, but the national bank due bills—some \$750,000,000—were made part of the national currency.

It is therefore literally and absolutely true that under the system legalized by Wilson and Bryan, the Money Trust reaps enormous riches on the debt it owes the people who use their due bills as money.

We borrow \$750,000,000 of the debt which a favored and privileged class owes us, and we pay as high as 100 per cent. interest for the use of those evidences of indebtedness.

Mankind was never cursed with a system more infamously unjust; and it was made possible by the very man who howled his way upward, yelling for "Free Silver" and damning national banks.

Candidate Woodrow Wilson, in his vote seeking tours, dwelt with reverent affection upon the Baltimore platform.

It was not syrup to catch flies. Wilson said so with Puritan unction and fervor.

He said that the platform was a contract with the dear people, and must be lived up to, by successful candidates.

Bryan was even more emphatic. He said with virtuous vehemence—that a man who repudiated the platform to which he owed his election, was worse than the embezzler of trust funds.

Well, one of the strenuous declarations of the Baltimore platform was a stern demand for the abolition of useless offices, a return to Jeffersonian simplicity, and the adoption of rigid economy.

Before the new President had learned his White House gaits, a thousand new jobs had been created in the Treasury Department alone, to say nothing of other branches of the service.

So rigidly did the Departments practice their economy, that my old Missouri friend Alexander Dockery, demanded and obtained a general uplift of salaries in his own sphere of action, where employees suddenly discovered that they could not live on the pay allotted to them by the profligate administrations of Roosevelt and Taft.

Appropriations? Why, the Democrats emptied the Treasury with indecent haste, spending immensely more money than former administrations had done, and clapping upon the common people new taxes, to the tune of \$100,000,000.

To keep down the murmurings of the people, the Democrats assured the country that the new taxes were merely intended for one year.

Those new taxes have already become permanent, as all intelligent folks knew they would.

There must have been a secret bargain between Woodrow Wilson's managers and Wall Street, else he would not have made the legal

### John M. Slaton Assumes Control of Mr. Hearst's Atlanta Paper--The Georgian.

SOME two months ago, it was rumored that John M. Slaton had gone to New York, accompanied by his brother-in-law, John Grant, to purchase the Atlanta Georgian.

It was said that Mr. Hearst refused to sell, but appointed Slaton to be general counsel for the Georgian, and general manager of its political policies.

It will be remembered that Mr. Hearst came to Atlanta, to see Slaton, who was then occupying the dual position of Georgia's governor and Leo Frank's lawyer.

It will also be remembered that Mr. Hearst brought his great editor, Mr. Arthur Brisbane, to Atlanta, to write in the interest of Frank, but Mr. Brisbane was attacked by a severe illness, and was unable to do the work.

Mr. Hearst also imported into Georgia his personal attorney, Clarence Shearn, who had been elevated to the Supreme Court of New York, by the Hearst influence.

This little Jew lawyer, Shearn, pretended to make a careful re-examination of the official record, in the Frank case, and the result of his impartial labors was, to reverse the Supreme Court of Georgia, and to nullify the statement of the Court, to the effect that the verdict of the jury was sufficiently supported by the evidence.

After Governor Slaton had given his client a new trial, and had upset the decision of all the courts, the Hon. John Temple Graves made a speech to the Press Club in Pittsburg, in which he stated that the Hearst papers would support Slaton, either for the Senatorship for the Vice-Presidency.

It is to be presumed that the Vice-Presidency has been selected, inasmuch as there now seems to be harmonious relations between Slaton and the Georgia Senators.

The happy union of thought and purpose which they manifest in regard to the outlawry of the State of Georgia, in the Frank case, and the determination to prosecute a Georgian in four or five outside States, at once, is quite suggestive.

It remains to be seen whether Mr. Hearst will find Slaton to be an asset, or a liability.

It also remains to be seen whether their acquiescence in the gross insult flung at the State of Georgia, by the Attorney General, will become to them a political asset or a liability.

The Attorney General states that twenty citizens of Georgia came to his office, and declared to him that the Government could not get a fair trial about the Frank case, and against Watson, in this State.

Who these twenty gentlemen are, has not been revealed to us: evidently they were men of the highest standing, and most ponderous weight.

The Attorney General took the bare word of these twenty Georgia patriots, and immediately black-sheeped the other two hundred thousand.

These twenty men stand so high, and weigh so much, the Attorney General did not even require them to sign an affidavit; he did not ask for any corroborating evidence; he did not call for an opinion from Judges Newman, Speer, and Lambdin. Apparently he did not consult the District Attorneys.

Don't you wonder who were those twenty men that outlawed the State of Georgia, by a few words, spoken in private, not under oath, and not corroborated?

Don't you think that the Atlanta, Georgian, should publish their names?

If it should appear that one of those men was John M. Slaton, what would you think about it?

Suppose it should appear that John Grant,

and the Haas brothers, and Sig Montag, and the two Seigels, and Nathan Straus, and Lewis Marshal, and Hooper Alexander, and John Cohen, and Luther Rosser, and Ben Phillips were in the bunch that put the bar-sinister on their native State, what would you think of the Administration which outlawed a sovereign State in a secret, one-sided, star-chamber proceeding?

If the Congressmen from Georgia do not demand of the Attorney General that he publish the names of those twenty traducers of their own State, their constituents will consider it strange.

### How America Got Its Name.

THE daughter of the lady who wrote the "Grandmother's Stories" has requested me to give my authority for the statement that America is the native Indian name for this continent.

She, of course, does not remember that I did this, some years ago, in the beginning of the sketches of "The South and West."

For the present, it will no doubt be sufficient to explain that Governor J. M. Brown, and the well-known author of standard works on money, Delmar, devoted a great deal of study to this question, and collected a large amount of data, which conclusively proves that "Amaraca" was a favorite with the Indians of South America, and that, under many variations, it was given to provinces, rivers and mountains in remote interiors, where Americus Vespuccius had never been heard of.

Governor Brown, in his wonderful book, "Astyanax," presents a map of South America, which shows that the word "Amaraca" was literally sprinkled all over the Southern part of this hemisphere.

Indeed, Governor Brown seems to prove that Vespuccius got the nick-name of "Amerigo" from the fact that he had discovered Amaraca, just as "Chinese" Gordon got his nick-name from service in China, and just as individual scouts and Indian fighters were called "Texas" Jack, "Buffalo" Bill, "Comanche" Bob, "Pawnee" Bill, &c.

The Italian voyager visited Western America at the time it bore the original name of Cundin Amaraca, the word Cundin meaning Western.

He visited the empire of ancient or primitive Amaraca, while it still bore the name Hue Amaraca, the word Hue meaning ancient, or primitive.

The god of the Brazilians bore the name of Hua Amaracan.

They have a river which they call Maracay, and a town named Amaruca, with many other towns, lakes, mountains and rivers bearing such names as Amaragi, Maraca, Merocca, Miraki, Maracana, &c.

Maraca was also a tribal name, throughout all that vast Amazon region, up to the Panama territory, and thence to the Rio de la Platte, the Indians used a sacred rattle called the Maraca.

Thousands of miles in the interior, where none of the early discoverers and explorers were ever seen, or so much as heard of, these names were in constant use, to-wit: the name which a different race, with a different way of pronouncing, would readily change to the present form America.

It is quite probable that, with the Indians, the soft-flowing pronunciation placed the accent on the third syllable, where we place it on the second; just as the Indians always accented the last syllable of such names as Ogee-ee, Ogeechee, and Chattahoochee.

We make an effort to pronounce Toccoa, when we put the accent on the second syllable, but the Indian more easily and musically pronounces the word as if spelled Toc-co-way, with the accent on the last syllable.

On the map which Governor Brown pre-

sents in his book, you find the word "Maracas:" you will see at once that it is a mere question of accent to make the word appear as "Americus."

It seems that Chili bore the ancient name of Marukas, while Brazil was divided into provinces called Western Amaraca, Primitive Amaraca, &c.

The map shows that one of the rivers bore the name, "Amerique;" there was an island on the coast of Brazil, and off the Amazon River, which bore the name "Amarioca."

It is utterly impossible to account for these various names, bearing a family resemblance, without attributing them to a native origin.

No Italian discovered could have plastered a whole continent with HIS name in such a manner.

Governor Brown mentions that Vespuccius in his last voyage spent five months collecting Brazil wood, in the region where that name Amaraca, was familiar, and built a fort, near the mouth of the Mucuri River, one of whose tributaries is the Amarianis River.

I have no doubt that ex-Governor Brown, whose address is Marietta, Ga., would be glad to correspond with anyone who is especially interested in this fascinating subject.

### Roman Catholics of Macon Georgia, Appeal to "All Fair-minded Citizens."

THE two daily papers in the city of Macon publish as an advertisement, the signed card of certain local Romanists, who deplore the fact that the Protestants engaged an ex-priest to deliver a series of lectures. These local Romanists, who refrain from signing their names, allege that during the last 75 years, a cordial friendly feeling always existed between themselves and votaries of other faiths.

These anonymous Catholics say, that during all that period of 75 years, they have been attending to their own business, and always ready to work for our city, and respond to every call of charity.

Were they attending to their own business and doing charitable work, when they expelled the Hotel Dempsey to discharge their manager, because he declined to allow Romanists the use of the ball-room, stating that he would have to first consult the owners?

Were these Macon Catholics attending to their own business, and serving the cause of sweet charity, when they pursued that discharged manager, with malignant letters and telegrams to Atlanta, warning the hotel there not to employ him?

Were the Knights of Columbus working for the city, and for charity, when they picked up a fellow citizen who had exercised no legal right to join the Guardians of Liberty?

Were they serving the city, and the cause of charity, when they published a card in the Macon Telegraph, insolently telling the Protestants of Georgia that it was none of their business if the Roman Catholics of this State obeyed the marriage laws of a foreign potentate, instead of the marriage laws of this sovereign commonwealth?

Was Mr. A. J. Long working for the city and for charity, when he rudely affronted Rev. Augustus Davisson, agent of the Jeffersonian Publishing Company, and told the city of Macon should never give our company a single dollar of advertising patronage if he could prevent it?

He not only threatened the boycott, carried it into effect; and the weekly paper which has by far the largest circulation in Georgia, has never been allowed to carry a single inch of advertising for the city of Macon, or for the State Fair—one of the chief feeders of the city.