

## The "Sun" in Error.

The *Sun's* reporter, Dr. H. A. Brooks, visited our county last week to write up an account of the Hance Lynching case. The Doctor, whilst minute in giving details of the tragedy, is at fault in the formation of his opinions as to the sentiment of the county in regard to the affair. For the Doctor who, was only in the county a few hours and, who interviewed according to his own account, those who were implicated in the affair, to attempt to shape public sentiment by the publication of such opinions as this, that the jury's failure to agree upon a verdict was a practical abandonment of the case, and that it was improbable that any judicial investigation would be made of the lynching, is a reflection upon our authorities and law abiding citizens too grave to find space in a journal like the *Sun* and too ridiculous to be entertained by an intelligent community. The majority of citizens of this county are too much of a law abiding set, and the Doctor would have found the same true, if he had felt the sentiment outside of the village or listened to any save those implicated in the lynching, to sanction any such opinions. The true sentiment of the community is against lawlessness, and it is useless for Dr. Brook, or any other reporter, to attempt to shape a different sentiment, even if he is backed by such an able auxiliary as the *Baltimore Sun*, which is supposed to shed light for all, but which, in this instance, through its trusty reporter, Dr. H. A. Brooks, attempts to mislead the general public by giving utterance to expressions, which, if they mean any thing, convey the idea of justification, rather than a condemnation of the crime. We think it highly censurable in a paper like the *Sun* to send into a community a reporter who throws his personal feelings into his report. The reporter's duty, if we mistake not, is to state facts, regardless of his personal likes or dislikes. Whilst we think there are some in the community who are lawless, as is evidenced by recent occurrences, the body of the people are by no means so. We think the expressions of approval of the recent lynching is limited to those either implicated in the affair, or who have friends who were connected with it. Though this class is small, it is nevertheless to be guarded against and hence the position we take in our editorial in today's issue.