

The Rev. Dr. Ainslie Criticizes President Ames, of Johns Hopkins, For Failing To Condemn Lynching

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The Salisbury lynching has afforded more opportunity to remind us that there are fine people on the Eastern Shore than that Negro lynching is wrong. The latter has almost faded out in comparison with the constant reiteration of what fine people live on the Eastern Shore. It is an astonishing shift of emphasis from refusal to face facts to substituting therefor an issue which is secondary. Of course, there are fine people on the Eastern Shore, but it is the backward element there that is in the majority, and it is this backward element that has committed a crime that rests on the whole nation.

It is not surprising that politicians should look lightly on Negro lynching, or even certain types of churchmen, but why the president of Johns Hopkins University should feel that he must defend the fine people of the Eastern Shore, and at the same time express no condemnation of Negro lynching, is the most surprising factor in the whole controversy. Surely Dr. Ames must recognize that if education does not function in human relations it misses its purpose. It is difficult to see how anyone could think that Dr. Mitchell was sent to Salisbury by the university, and, therefore, the unnecessary statement from Dr. Ames. It would have been well if the university had sent him.

The burning of a human being in the public square of a city, whether he be white or black, saint or sinner, is such a fact in the experience of backward people that education must grapple with it and help to make its repetition impossible there as well as elsewhere. But after the publication of Dr. Ames' letter, it is altogether possible that we may hear that Governor Ritchie has removed from his files all data gathered on this subject.

PETER AINSLIE.

Baltimore, Feb. 10, 1932.