

C. L. U. Receiving no reply after four days we communicated with him by telephone. In the conversation that followed he would neither deny nor affirm that he is at present a member, but speaking of that communist organization, he asserted: "I heartily agree with what they stand for and what they are doing."

Concerning the organization he so heartily endorses, a committee of Congress, investigating communistic propaganda in the United States, recently made this report:

"The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 per cent of its efforts are on behalf of communists who have come into conflict with the law. It claims to stand for free speech, free press and free assembly; but it is quite apparent that the main function of the A. C. L. U. is to attempt to protect the communists in their advocacy of force and violence to overthrow the government, replacing the American flag by a red flag and erecting a Soviet government in place of the Republican form of government guaranteed to each State by the Federal Constitution."

A committee of the New York Legislature, back in 1928, reached the following conclusion:

"The American Civil Liberties Union, in the last analysis, is a supporter of all subversive movements; its propaganda is detrimental to the interests of the State. It attempts not only to protect crime but to encourage attacks upon our institutions in every form."

Roger N. Baldwin, the guiding spirit of the A. C. L. U., is to Prof. Mitchell the personification of a hero, for he said: "I know Mr. Baldwin personally, and I think more of him for the work he is doing."

This is the same Roger N. Baldwin who was formerly a member of the I. W. W. and served a term in prison as a draft dodger during the war.

Testifying before the Congressional committee, Baldwin was asked:

"Does your organization uphold the right of a citizen or alien—it does not make any difference which—to advocate murder?"

"Yes," the witness replied.

"Or assassination?"

"Yes."

Here, then, we have examples of the principles and conduct which Prof. Mitchell does approve and we felt it was not necessary to go any farther in quest of an interpretation of his mental processes.

It is significant to add, however, that the Baltimore branch of the Civil Liberties Union joined the International Labor Defense, another known communist organization, in filing a brief with the Maryland Court of Appeals on behalf of Euel Lee and it has been very outspoken in recent weeks against the Eastern Shore.

Having this background and endorsing the principles of communism, it

PRESIDENT DECLARES FOR SHORE

Dr. Ames Says Dr. Mitchell's Report Does Not Represent Hopkins Viewpoint

Salisbury, Md., Feb. 9.—In a letter published in the Salisbury Times, Dr. Joseph S. Ames, president of the Johns Hopkins University, declared it would be "unjust" to regard the report of Dr. Broadus Mitchell, associate professor of political economy at the institution, on the lynching of Matthew Williams, negro, here December 4, as representing the point of view of the university.

Dr. Mitchell's report, made to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, described the Eastern Shore as "backward in its mental and spiritual development."

Praises Shore Civilization

"I have spent, myself, a great deal of time on the Eastern Shore, and I have never met anyone there whom I have not liked," Dr. Ames wrote.

"I have never come in contact with any questions dealing with religion or politics when I have been there, but my whole reaction toward the civilization on the Eastern Shore is that I think it is fine, and I have often said that I would like to live there.

"I never have any desire to interfere with any one else's opinions, nor do I have any desire to change anyone's opinion. The regret I have in regard to Dr. Mitchell and all the publicity in connection with it is that some people may associate this university with his point of view.

Dr. Mitchell "No Crusader"

"This, of course, is obviously unjust, because it is no more proper to think the university, as such, holds the views of Dr. Mitchell, than it is to think that a church society to which he may belong should be held responsible.

"Dr. Mitchell did not make any investigation or study under the auspices of the university, or even with the knowledge of the university. He was acting simply as an individual. We are all of us here familiar with his point of view and with his convictions, but we are all convinced that he is intellectually honest and that he is in no sense a crusader."