

THE LYNCHING.

In our last issue we bitterly denounced the lynchers. For this we have been severely criticised by a few. We have no apology to offer. We denounced lynching as against the law of God and man, and placed the ENTERPRISE where it has stood from its earliest advent into life, upon the side of order, religion and humanity and upon these principles it proposes to stand or fall. We have watched and guarded, as far as in our power, the rights, privileges, immunities and interests of our people and stand, as we always do, against ~~any~~ ~~manifestations~~ of outlawry, believing the safety and good of our institutions, our happiness and success, depend upon upholding law and preserving order, and, until convinced that we, as a people, have retrograded to the earliest stage of civilization when force was the recognized rule to secure obedience, or insure protection, we will always, as men and as editors, be found for a full and faithful observance of the laws and opposed to mob violence or rule.

It is true that Hance was guilty of an attempt to outrage innocence, but the attempt was not one of excessive force; otherwise, he was master of the situation and could have coerced, but the circumstances rather indicate that his attempt was conditioned upon the will of the wronged. The effect of such mob violence is not to prevent the recurrence of such insults but, with parties who make no more than improper proposals, to induce them to commit murder to protect themselves from detection and lynching.

We have the best authority for the statement that Hance only attempted an outrage which has since been distorted into a consummation of the purpose. After remaining in jail several weeks when cooling time was allowed, he is ruthlessly snatched from the hands of the law and hanged for an offence which the law itself, has, in no civilized country, pronounced capital.

Let us examine the few cases which we can recall. Ten years ago it was supposed a colored man had ran off to Washington with a respectable farmer's wife, who, at that time, resided in Frederick county. The people were greatly incensed and justly so, and upon the party's return to Point of Rocks, seized the man, tied him to a horse, dragged him three quarters of a mile, hung him to a tree and would not permit the body to be cut down for several days. In two years, Pomeroy, the leader of the gang, and a well-digger by trade, fell into a well and was killed. Shortly after it was known that the so-called man and wife bore no other than sinful relations toward each other. Only last Summer a colored man, Carpenter, by name, was supposed to have run off with Steer's wife, (white) both then in the employ of Mr. J. H. Key, of our town. The people were greatly incensed, and, had Carpenter been found, that he would have been lynched, we have but little doubt. In a short time it became well known that the parties were never married, and that Carpenter had as much right to live in a state of sin with the woman in question as the man, Steer. In Anne Arundel county, two years ago, a man was taken from the officers of the law and lynched because he was troublesome as a burglar and thief. Only two weeks ago a man was shot by the male relatives of a wronged girl, while in a Kentucky Court. In a few days it was known that an innocent tramp had been murdered,—one who had never seen the young lady in question.

What is the history of lynching to-day? That one half of the victims are innocent, and that notwithstanding the recent lynchings, crimes of such nature are on the increase. What is the language of the law,—of religious thought,—the feelings of justice? Better that ninety-nine guilty men go unpunished, than that one innocent man should suffer.

We invite those who disagree with us to consider before they speak. It is publicly asserted that Ex-Judge Dan'l R. Magruder, a lawyer of great ability and a pure and conscientious man, should be lynched. For what? Simply because he is endeavoring to do his duty toward his client, Biscoe, whom all recognize as a murderer. Suppose Biscoe was sentenced to be hung to-morrow, and was taken suddenly and dangerously ill, and a physician was sent for. What man of religion, of any sense of justice, of any humane feeling would say, let him die now because he is to hang to-morrow? What doctor would fail to relieve such a sufferer? And a doctor of law takes substantially the same oath as a doctor of medicine. Such declarations, often made by parties who would not, for any consideration, become murderers, induce an element in our midst to rise above the law and become outlaws and murderers, and such acts of violence induce a feeling of insecurity with every class, occupation or profession. Suppose a lawyer or any other citizen transcends duty, how should the evil be corrected? The civilized idea would be by meetings expressive of

the errors in which any man or set of men have fallen. Indignation meetings have been held in our county and in every case, with a marked degree of success.

But there are some who, while they do not justify lynching, do not condemn it. Such positions are quasi-endorsements. To these we would say, beware! To the lynchers who pretend to feel justified, we would say, go to the confessional and learn whether or not you have become murderers. To those of the lynchers of other religious denominations, we add, ask the opinion of your ministers and learn of what you have been guilty. To those who believe in religion, law and order, we would say, stand for law, which is founded upon religion and order, and see that it is enforced against all offenders. Law is something *fixed, permanent and universal*. Let it be so and remain so in the mind and acts of all, for upon it depends the safety and good of our

close. We are told that our personal friends were a-
e lynchers. ~~can~~ can be
at our father: e among
ber; our brother, or other
atives, the ENT. PRIZE would
t justitia, ruat cœli in.