

A Dilemma Purely Imaginary. According to The Columbia (S. C.) State, this paper has viewed the trial and conviction of LEO M. FRANK in Atlanta exactly as it did the lynching in another Georgia town of five negroes who had beaten a policeman. Between the two cases, The State kindly informs us, there are real and important differences. In the one, "the accused was regularly tried in a court of justice and, after representation by counsel, found guilty and sentenced"; in the other, "the five accused negroes were set on by a mob and summarily executed."

Now, whatever THE TIMES said about the lynching of the negroes was presumably in the nature of adverse criticism, and the same thing can truly be said concerning many statements it has made about the Frank trial. To condemn each of the two proceedings, however, is not confession of inability to see any difference between them, nor does it quite justify the charging of that inability. An element of inaccuracy, therefore, to say the least of it, marks The State's assertion.

THE TIMES does see as plainly as itself that the two cases are unlike in several particulars, but it insists—oh, very gently—that it is not compelled, because of having reprehended them both, to admit the impossibility of "condemning judicial procedure in Atlanta without effectively setting the seal of approval on mob procedure in neighboring villages." There is no connection between The State's premises and its conclusion, and, besides, it begs the whole question at issue in the Frank case when it slips in as one of those premises the statement that FRANK was "regularly tried in a court of justice." Tried he was, but "regularly"—well, THE TIMES is far from being alone in holding that the irregularities were so many and so grave that the verdict found should not stand.

This is not quite the same thing as saying that the verdict was a lynch verdict, but there was mob pressure on the jurors, and the evidence on which they based their finding of guilty has been declared far from convincing by a large number of disinterested persons after careful examination of it.

Another Victim of Delusion.

Letters received by a newspaper are commonly assumed to be from people who are readers of it, but occasionally one comes that betrays the author's complete ignorance of opinions held or facts presented by the paper to which he writes. Such is a communication that has just arrived from a man, apparently of the best intentions, who evidently suffers from a delusion that would have been removed had he read THE TIMES as carefully as he seems to have read some other journal.

For he says that he has recently "noted in the papers" that "for every dollar a man donates to the Charity Organization Society 60 cents goes to expenses and 40 to actual charity." As we have several times of late laboriously explained that this familiar charge is utterly untrue, and shown that not 40, but 100, cents of every dollar given to the Charity Organization Society for what this correspondent means by "actual charity," is so expended, our naïve correspondent fails to excite us by his repetition of an unfounded accusation.

He means well, but he doesn't know, and he doesn't know because he has been following guides either false or careless. The truth as to the Charity Organization Society—and as to others that can make no such boast about "every dollar," though of those, too, many are excellent institutions—is accessible to him, and he really ought to get the facts before he asks help to form a new society for doing what is already admirably done. And with increased and more accurate information he will, it is to be hoped, come to realize that the giving of alms and doles—what is technically known as "outdoor relief"—is not the only, is not even the most important, way to "help the poor."

There be folk not wholly without sense who think it worth while to spend money in attacking poverty itself. They do not expect to conquer it today, or even next year, but they are not despairing.