

THREE WHITE MEN
AND ONE NEGRO ON
TRIAL FOR ASSAULT

Unusual Spectacle In Special Term Called In Georgia Court

LYNCHING SPIRIT IN MEASURE APPEASED

Crimes When Committed Roused Citizens to Wrathful Desire For Revenge

CARTERSVILLE, Ga., Sept. 7.—At a special term of the Bartow County Superior court here Jack Worthington, white, was today convicted of criminal assault upon Miss Mary Eird, with recommendation to mercy, and was sentenced to twenty years in the penitentiary. Duke Worthington, co-defendant, was acquitted.

The case of Will Collier, another white man, charged with criminally assaulting Miss Annie Gentry, is now on trial.

Although there was considerable excitement in the northern part of Bartow county following the commission of the assaults upon Miss Eird and Miss Gentry, and threats of lynching were freely made, the excitement was appeased when the special term of court was ordered to drop this over.

The controversy is becoming known, however, here. Commander Peary's statement is undoubtedly accepted as true, but there is a large following faithful to Collier. His lecture before the spectators early tonight, however, added little to the information he had already given out with reference to his position, and he repeated the declaration of his intention to withdraw details until the publication of his book.

An Unusual Spectacle.—While the verdict in the Worthington case fails to meet the approval of many of the hundreds of citizens from the northern section of the county, who are in attendance upon the court, it is not apprehended that there will be any attempt to do either of the Worthingtons violence.

The spectacle of three white men facing trial at the same term of court charged with criminal assault, a crime heretofore associated almost exclusively with a certain type of the negro—is unparalleled in the history of American courts. The details of the assaults upon the two young women, as recited by them, were revealing.

It is certain that Judge Elkes of Cartersville, at the same term of court, was all that prevented at least an attempt to lynch the three men.

Howard Stukely, a negro, is in jail and will probably be tried tomorrow on the charge of criminally assaulting a seven-year-old negro girl. A verdict in the Collier case is expected tomorrow morning.

(Continued on page four.)

OIL INSPECTION LAW VALID; INJUNCTION IS DISSOLVED BY COURT

Judge Conner Holds That Possible Increase in Price of Oil Immaterial

RAIDING A SALOON

Special to The Citizen

ATLANTA, Sept. 7.—The trial of Lieutenant L. W. Hazlehurst and Private Grover B. Elam, of the Second Battalion, Eleventh Infantry, on charges of non-combatant desertion, was adjourned yesterday afternoon at the insistence of the defense attorney, Captain Edward W. Conner, on the night of August 1, opened before the general court martial at Fort McPherson today.

The star witness of the first day of proceedings was Private Elam, who fired the shot which killed Captain Lieutenant Hazlehurst last October, equal to investigate a salvo made in a near-beer saloon on the fort when approaching the saloon two soldiers ran out and made for the reservation, and was captured, but Conner failed to obey a command to halt and was shot down by Private Elam, who claims to have acted under orders from the Lieutenant.

"Sir, if Lieutenant Hazlehurst told me to fire into the air, I didn't understand that that was," declared Elam, "I was escaping from me. I didn't know whether to shoot or not, so when my officer I understood him simply to reply 'yes' should that command I fired and should tell?"

Elam told the court that he did not shoot with the deliberate aim of killing Coulter. He said that he was not afraid to swear that Hazlehurst did not say more than once, "Yes, sir," about what he heard nothing more.

Private Elmer N. Smith, the other member of the squad under Lieutenant Hazlehurst, testified that Private Finkston, who ran out of the saloon with Coulter, obeyed the command to halt, and was left in his charge while Hazlehurst and Elam descended in pursuit of Coulter. He did not hear the order to fire. He testified that Elam was intoxicated.

Elam said that the shooting took place outside the reservation. After Coulter fell, Lieutenant Hazlehurst said to witness "why I told you to fire into the air."

(Continued on page four.)

RIVALRY BETWEEN COOK AND PEARY WILL PROFIT BOTH

Startling Prices Offered Cook For His Lecture And Book Already

WILL KEEP DETAILS FROM PUBLICATION

In First Public Address He Tells Little New About His Experiences

(By Associated Press)

COPENHAGEN, Sept. 7.—One of the most remarkable results of the recent Peary's lecture on the Polar expedition is the interest shown by the citizens of the city. The books printed from the sketches are likely to be largely measured. It is expected today afternoons for days to come lectures on the figure previously developed. One American citizen, the highest standing and a veritable most startling, and it is believed beyond any one hitherto given for such work. Dr. Cook is likely to profit by this offer.

The controversy is becoming known, however, here. Commander Peary's statement is undoubtedly accepted as true, but there is a large following faithful to Collier. His lecture before the spectators early tonight, however, added little to the information he had already given out with reference to his position, and he repeated the declaration of his intention to withdraw details until the publication of his book.

Prince Presents Medal.—The king and queen, Prince and Princess George of Greece, and members of the members of the royal family together with a large gathering of the most prominent people in Copenhagen this afternoon witnessed the presentation to Dr. Cook of a gold medal by the crown prince, and it went to the explorer's lecture hall.

The king and queen, Prince and Princess George of Greece, and members of the members of the royal family together with a large gathering of the most prominent people in Copenhagen this afternoon witnessed the presentation to Dr. Cook of a gold medal by the crown prince, and it went to the explorer's lecture hall.

(Continued on page four.)

(Continued on page four.)

WILL INVESTIGATE RATES FROM PORTS TO INTERIOR

Traffic Managers Cited to Appear Before Corporation Commission.

WARRANT ISSUED FOR TIGERS' PITCHER

Special to The Citizen

ATLANTA, Sept. 7.—A decision of the U. S. Post Office Board of Appeals, rendered yesterday, that the rates of compensation to be paid to contractors for the transportation of mail between the ports of entry and the interior of the state of Georgia are reasonable, was upheld by the court of appeals.

Mr. J. P. Frazee, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable. The court of appeals rejected his contention.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the

decision of the board of appeals

was correct, and the court of ap-

pels was denied.

Mr. W. H. Alexander, attorney for the contractors, argued that the rates were excessive, and that the compensation was not reasonable.

In the opinion of the court, the