**FRANK CASE YIELDS NEW BRIBE CHARGE**
Special to The New York Times.
*New York Times (1857-1922);* Mar 13, 1914;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2008)
pg. 3

# FRANK CASE YIELDS NEW BRIBE CHARGE

## Parents Accuse Detectives of Trying to Induce Their Daughter to Give False Testimony.

## PASTOR PLEADS FOR FRANK

### Conley, the Negro, Ready to Talk to Burns—More Georgia Newspapers Urge a New Trial.

*Special to The New York Times.*

ATLANTA, Ga., March 12.—More evidence to support their charge that the detectives and Police Department of Atlanta 'framed up" the evidence on which Leo M. Frank was convicted of the murder of Mary Phagan was obtained to-day by the attorneys for the condemned man. The new charges against the detectives are made voluntarily by W. S. Jenkins and his wife, and relate to alleged efforts by Detective John Black to induce their young daughter, Lulu Belle Brown, by bribes and threats, to give false testimony against Frank. Mr. and Mrs. Jenkins volunteered their evidence, saying they were moved by a desire "to prevent the execution of an innocent man."

Mrs. Lulu Belle Brown has been married since the Frank trial, and is now in Milledgeville. Last Spring she was 16 years old, unmarried, and living with her parents. About one month after Frank was arrested, the Jenkinses assert, John Black came to their home and asked to see Lulu Belle.

"You are the girl who went with Mary Phagan to the factory the day she was killed, aren't you?" the detective is said to have asked. When the girl told him no, he pressed the assertion, and added:

"You went there with Mary Phagan, and, Frank sent you away and kept Mary Phagan there, saying she had some work to do."

The girl, according to her parents, denied this assertion also, and after some more questions by the detective, he went away. But, the parents said, the detectives came back next day and one of them told the girl he would give her part of his salary if she would swear she was the "girl in the red dress" who was supposed to have gone to the factory with Mary Phagan and to have been told by Frank that she need not wait for Mary, because she would be detained at the factory for some time.

**Didn't Know Mary Phagan.**

Mr and Mrs. Jenkins both said their daughter told the detectives repeatedly that she was not the girl in the red dress; that she did not know either Mary Phagan or Frank, and that she had not visited the factory. Nevertheless, they assert, the detectives were insistent in their demands that she say she was the "girl in the red dress."

The detectives returned a third time and told the girl that a Mrs. Moody had told them Lulu Belle was the girl in the red dress. Then they all went to Mrs. Moody's home, according to the story, and there Mrs. Moody denied ever having made any such statement. Jenkins and his wife both insisted today that the detectives were overbearing and threatening in their manner, and said they had good grounds for tracing the movements of Lulu Belle.

Asking only that some disinterested white man, particularly not a friend of Frank, be present to see that he got fair play, Jim Conley, the negro accuser of Frank, said to-day that he not only would be glad to see Detective William J. Burns but that he would tell again all he knew about the case. Conley said he would answer every question put to him by Burns. The detective is expected to arrive in Atlanta on Friday, and one of his first moves will be to interview the negro.

Frank and his attorneys are convinced the negro is the real murderer. They believe that Detective Burns will be able to get the true story of the tragedy from Conley or penetrate some weak point in his testimony that will cause the whole fabric to collapse.

Despite the willingness of the negro to see Burns, it is not improbable that his attorney, William M. Smith, will attempt to prevent an interview. Mr. Smith did not take a definite stand, but intimated that the detective would not be allowed to have a free rein with the negro.

**Fears Third Degree.**

"I don't propose to stand for any third degree work," said Mr. Smith, "but further than that I can make no statement now. My client must be protected, but I want to do anything that is fair and right in the matter, and I certainly won't say at this time that I will attempt to prevent an interview."

In the opinion of Newport Lanford, Chief of the Atlanta Detective Department, Burns will fail to get any results if he does question Jim Conley.

"Conley has told the truth and all the truth," said Chief Lanford to-day "I don't care what methods Burns uses, he won't get anything more out of the negro than has already been obtained by the men who worked the case."

It was reported to-day that the Grand Jury which indicted Frank might be called together informally to discuss certain matters incident to the indictment. It has been repeatedly charged that certain illegal things occurred in connection with the deliberations of the Grand Jury. One member of the jury said to-day that it should be called together, the veil of secrecy lifted, and the public informed of just what had occurred. He insisted that the interests of justice demanded that the public be informed of what occurred in the Grand Jury room.

**Letter from a Rector.**

The Rev. C. B. Wilmer, rector of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, and regarded as one of the clearest thinkers in Atlanta, made public a card to-day, demanding a new trial for Leo M. Frank. The card, which was addressed to The Atlanta Journal, follows:

To the Editor of the Journal:

I beg to congratulate you on your editorial in Monday's Journal, headed "Frank should have a new trial." I am only one man, but I believe that everybody who feels about the matter as I do should come out and say so.

I have not arrived at this double conclusion that Frank should have a new trial and that those who think so should say so publicly without giving thought to a very serious phase of the matter on the other side—viz., the danger and wrong, in general, of saying or doing anything that can tend to weaken the confidence of the public in our courts. I do not mean to reflect on the jury that convicted Frank. To the best of my information and belief they were honest in their verdict and not consciously swayed by hostile public opinion. I am not even questioning the correctness of the conclusion at which they arrived. It may be that this same conclusion would be arrived at by any honest and intelligent jury listening to all the evidence and viewing it in the "dry light of reason." Nevertheless, the question remains: Ought Atlanta to stand for a trial conducted under the conditions surrounding this trial, and which you so vividly picture? On this question Atlanta herself is on trial before the bar of enlightened public opinion all over the country and perhaps all over the civilized world.

**Moral Point of View.**

I know, of course, that our Supreme Court has passed on the question of a new trial and refused it, although not unanimously. It is not in conflict with our duty to respect this decision to say that it was a legal decision, and that legal decisions, that is, on points of law, do not always go to the bottom of the moral questions involved, or even profess to do so. Looking at the matter, then, from the moral point of view, it seems to me that there should be a trial of this case conducted in what one might call a more judicial atmosphere; especially in view of the fact that the trial Judge himself was not convinced either way.

Furthermore, the very strong pressure of public opinion, or the opinion of at least a portion of the public, having been brought to bear against Frank, is not the opinion of those who are in doubt as to the guilt of the accused in this case entitled to be heard and the conviction of those who thoroughly disapprove of the conditions under which an adverse verdict was arrived at?

Then there is another reason in favor of a new trial, which I beg to mention without at all desiring to argue the case. I refer to the point made by Mr. Alexander in his pamphlet analyzing the note written admittedly by Conley, that it is exceedingly improbable that this note, so full of negro superstition, should have been dictated by a white man. This point was not brought to the attention of the jury, and is certainly worth considering.

**Satisfy the Public Mind.**

Finally, the moral value of an execution must depend in great measure, in these democratic days, on the satisfaction of the public mind with the justice of the verdict of guilty.

For all these reasons I beg to join with you in expressing the wish that some way might be found for a new trial of the accused in this case. As you so well point out, if guilty, he can be found guilty again, and under circumstances to carry along with that decision the concurrence, or at least the acquiescence, of the whole public. If innocent, he can be acquitted, and judicial murder be prevented.

In the meantime, Mr. Editor, you have rendered a public service by bravely calling attention to certain things in connection with the trial that were not right, and in so doing you have given an illustration of what is possible for journalism when it sets itself to be more like the pole star and less like a weather vane.

Yours truly,
C. B. WILMER,
Rector St. Luke's Church.
Atlanta, Ga., March 12, 1914.

**Other Press Opinions.**

As indicating the trend of sober public sentiment in Georgia in regard to the Frank case, editorials from The Albany Herald and The Rome Tribune are significant. The Albany Herald is published in Southwest Georgia and The Rome Tribune in North Georgia. Each is the leading paper in its territory. The Albany Herald says:

Contending that Leo Frank did not have a fair trial and without entering into a discussion of facts referring on the condemned man's probable guilt or innocence, The Atlanta Journal, in a leading editorial demands, in the name of public opinion, a new trial for the man convicted of the murder of Mary Phagan. The Journal treats the Frank case as "a finished case" so far as the courts are concerned, and one which a newspaper, may, therefore, discuss with entire propriety.

We believe The Atlanta Journal's position is correct. The Herald has given expression to similar views since the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the celebrated case, and subsequent developments have strengthened our conviction.

We do not believe any twelve men in Georgia are so immune to the influences of passion, prejudice and the spirit of mob law, as manifested in Atlanta at the time of Frank's trial, that they could fail to be so swayed by them as to be incapable of fairness to the accused. There was never a trial in Georgia like the Frank trial, and the sober second thought of a people who are above all things fair minded now demands that the injustice hastily done be undone while there is yet time. It is not within the province of a newspaper to tell the courts what they should or should not do, but it has a right and privilege to speak for fairness and justice when both are being forgotten or ignored.

The Rome Tribune says:

We are pleased to note that The Atlanta Journal comes boldly out and demands a new trial for Leo Frank. That is right and proper from the fact that the crime was committed in the city of Atlanta, its home.

On last Sunday morning, believing it to be our duty, The Tribune made a similar demand, requesting the press of the State to speak out and prevent the execution of Frank if possible from the lack of reliable testimony as submitted in the trial and under the excited condition of the people at the time.

We have maintained from the first that the character of the evidence was not sufficient to convict any man for the crime of murder. By all means giev the unfortunate man a new trial, that justice may prevail.

# LITTLETON QUITS CLUB.

### Tells President O'Dwyer Democracy Never Rested on a Technicality.

A difference of opinion arose yesterday between Chief Judge O'Dwyer of the City Court, and President of the National Democratic Club, and Thomas F. Smith, chief clerk of the City Court, and a member of the club's Board of Governors, as to how many members ought to be dropped, if the same ruling as to the non-payment of dues was enforced against them as had been made against Charles F. Murphy and his associates. The Judge thought that 65 members were in jeopardy, while Mr. Smith was certain that at least 125 must consider their membership a doubtful quantity.

To the undesirables, who would not be permitted to pay up their arrears, Judge O'Dwyer added yesterday a new name, that of Henry Siegel, the indicted merchant and banker. He said that all the sixty-five delinquents could regain their membership by settling except the Democratic leaders and Mr. Siegel.

"They are undesirables," was how he put it.

Martin W. Littleton thus expressed his opinion of the way in which Judge O'Dwyer has been fighting Murphy in a letter to the Judge as President of the club. Here it is:

To the President of the National Democratic Club, New York, N. Y.

My Dear Sir: I see that Mr. Murphy and others have been expelled for non-payment of dues. I am sure that I am most guilty in this particular, and must also be put out; but before I go I would like to say that Democracy never rested upon a technicality nor good government upon a formula. I have disagreed with Tammany Hall from the beginning, and I disagree with it or them now, but I would never regard delinquency in club dues as a sufficient offense to put it or them on trial. I can think of many more things which I wish them to explain, transcending in importance mere non-payment of club dues. I do not approve of your action in expelling Mr. Murphy and the others. If you wish to fight, fight hard and fight fair and big. This will insure respect for your cause. As it is your friends are busy trying to make your case respectable. Very truly yours, MARTIN W. LITTLETON.

Mr. Smith expressed again his views of the action of Judge O'Dwyer.

"My knowledge of Judge O'Dwyer," he said, "is that he has been one of the most faithful and fawning men to the bosses of Tammany Hall. It was not until Mr. Murphy had refused his aid to attempt to land for O'Dwyer the nomination for a higher judicial office that the Judge decided Murphy was a wicked boss."

# WHY IDA LEVINE LEFT SCHOOL

### Education, Mother Held, Would Make Her a Suffragette.

Mrs. Jacob Levine of 719 Vermont Street, was asked by Magistrate Hylan in the New Jersey Avenue Court, Brooklyn, yesterday, why she did not send her fourteen-year-old daughter Ida to school.

"Judge," said she, "I don't want her to get too smart. If she goes to school and gets a whole lot of education she becomes a suffragette. I want her to get married some day, and she doesn't have to know a lot to be a good wife. All she has to know is how to cook and sew, and take care of a house and children. That's what a woman is for. Now, what happens if she gets too smart and becomes a suffragette? She will run around to meetings and all that business."

Magistrate Hylan gave Mrs. Levine until March 20 to send Ida back to her studies.