

LYNCH REPORT IS TURNED DOWN BY CHURCH BODY

Federal Council Bows to Eastern Shore Mob Sentiment.

SECTION CALLED BACKWARD AREA

Dr. Broadus Mitchell's Report Caused Furore.

NEW YORK—On account of what they call "misunderstandings" created by discussion of the recent report of Dr. Broadus Mitchell of Johns Hopkins University on the Salisbury lynching, that document will not be included in the official publications of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, its general secretary announced this week.

In a communication to a white churchman at Salisbury, Samuel M. Cavert, general secretary of the council, said:

"As a result of counsel given us by friends of the Federal Council, we have not published Professor Mitchell's report in our weekly 'Information Service.' These friends have advised us that in view of misunderstandings created by discussion, the printing of the report in one of our own organs might occasion still further misunderstanding by making it erroneously appear that Professor Mitchell's findings have been adopted as expressing the official judgments of the Federal Council, although the full text of the report had originally been scheduled to appear in the Federal Council's publication during the week of February 1."

Bow to Sentiment

Many churchmen in Maryland are of the opinion that the decision of the Federal Council, of which Dr. George E. Haynes is one of the national secretaries, not to include the Mitchell document in its official bulletins, is a direct bow to lynch sentiment on the Eastern Shore.

They point out that it is common knowledge that hundreds of whites witnessed the lynching in which Williams was taken from a hospital, where he lay helpless, strung to a tree and then his body dragged about the streets of the city and later burned. Dr. Mitchell spent several days in the lynch area and it was his report that the sentiment of the whites of the community condoned the mob action.

His statement that he found the Eastern Shore a backward section of the state, brought a flood of criticism of that section.