THE LYNCHING of Asbury Green last Monday night was a lawless act, and, as like begets like, so one lawless act is too apt to beget another. That Green, from the brutality of the crime committed, deserved the death penalty but few thinking persons will deny; yet the constituted authorities of the land pronounced otherwise. and their edict should have been obeyed. The court-Judges Robinson, Wickes and Stump-in making up the sentence did not, because they could not, take into consideration what Green deserved or did not deserve, but what the law required and demanded from the facts brought out at the trial. The court was administering law, not personal opinions and feelings. The court thought there was a possibility of a doubt as to the identity of Green, and gave him the benefit of that doubt. Had it not been for this fact the sentence would have been death. We have no doubt the court believed that he deserved hanging, but the law would not permit them to hang him, and they did the best they were officially permitted to do-21 years' confinement and

hard labor in the penitentiary. That lawless acts are apt to beget lawlessness was demonstrated in this case. The colored people of this town and elsewhere, blinded by excitement, ignorance and prejudice, held the white people of the town responsible for the deed. Their contracted mental vision would not permit them to look beyond the limits of the town threats made against life and property.

and ascertain where Green committed the helnous crime, for which he deserved a legal death, and who were the most interested parties; but simply because the crime was committed in this town the white people thereof were at once accused, and dire It is seldom that lynch law can be justified. A majority of the leading journals of the country have justified the lynching of the Italians at New Orleans after acquittal. In that case the jury was bribed. We repeat; while Green deserved his fatedeath—for the commission of his brutal ether, his lynching is unjustifyable.

1