

gan. Otherwise Kansas stuck to tradition, and voted Republican. Only one of the eight Congressmen elected at this election, W. A. Ayres, is a Democrat. His election was due to a combination of circumstances, chief among which was that Governor Allen also took the stump for Mr. Ayres's opponent, and talked about the industrial court in every speech he made.

The Kansas Legislature remains Republican by a majority large enough to pass bills over the Democratic Governor's veto, in case of a fight that smacks of partisanship. Governor-elect Davis has announced that his first recommendation to the legislature will be that the industrial-court law be repealed. It remains to be seen whether the legislature will act upon this suggestion, but it is well known that many of the legislators of the majority party, deprived of the leadership of Governor Allen, look upon the industrial-court law as a handicap to their party as well as to their State. If Governor Davis cannot effect the repeal of the law he can nullify the court by various non-cooperation devices, and these, his friends say, he is prepared to use to the limit. So Kansas probably will furnish the world no more pyrotechnics of the type that have attracted attention during the last two or three years.

Now, why is Kansas tired of the much-advertised industrial court? In brief, because the institution has done no good and much harm; because a State that was serene before the coming of that institution has been a battleground and a house of hate since its creation; because the law that was touted far and wide as a preventer of strikes and a right arm of Justice has proved to be a fomentor of strikes, a brewer of industrial trouble, and a right arm of oppression and injustice. Virtually all of the coal miners, packing-house workers, and railroad-shop workers have struck in Kansas since the creation of this law. Not all because of the law. A general strike in the coal-fields was the only direct-action strike called as a protest against the industrial-court law. The other principal strikes, including also another general strike in the coal-fields, were parts of nation-wide strikes. But the industrial-court law did not prevent them, did not settle them, did not halt or ameliorate them. And the people are wondering why they are paying industrial-court salaries.

The strikes that tied up the Kansas coal mines, packing houses, and railroad shops were settled beyond the borders of Kansas without the aid of the Kansas tribunal. They were long, bitter strikes. They were more bitter in Kansas than in most other places, because of the oppressive attitude taken by the Kansas State government, through the industrial court and through other agencies. The bitterness was increased by the needless calling out of bodies of militia for patrolling peaceful little country towns, and culminated in a wave of hysterical hatred and malice when the Governor, enforcing a clause of the industrial-court law, sought to prevent the free expression of opinion favorable to the railroad-shop strikers.

Because William Allen White, a nationally known Kansan, was one of those arrested for expressing an opinion favorable to the railroad strikers, the country took note, and Kansas became the butt of the colyumist's jokes, far and wide. White's case is scheduled for hearing in the Kansas Supreme Court soon, and the rest of the country may be interested to learn whether it is possible in Kansas to send a man to jail for saying that he sympathizes with another man who happens to be out of work and out of food

on account of a dispute about the wages to be paid by a big railway corporation.

White is but one of thousands of Kansans whose liberty of speech and of expression through the press and platform was denied and more or less successfully curtailed by the Government of Kansas, acting for the large employers of labor through the industrial court. But his is the most noted case, and it will perhaps serve as a test. A Democratic candidate for Congress, Rev. Clarence Hatfield, was forbidden even to mention the industrial court or the strike on the railroads in a political speech which he made on Labor Day in a little shop town. The orders were given by State military officers, in charge of the town, and were obeyed. Multitudes of persons who were not engaged in striking were compelled to remove from their windows placards which expressed sympathy for the strikers in dignified and non-inflammatory language.

Can you blame Kansas for voting in a farmer Governor, for once in a way, though he be a Democrat withal? This is what Kansas says by her vote: "Let anyone who likes it have the industrial court and the anti-free speech powers thereof. We are through with all such trappings, and we want to get back to our plowing in peace."

Elizabeth Goes to School

By GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS STEWARD

ELIZABETH is our first-born. Her six years on earth are powerless to render her of the earth. She lives in a childhood land of dolls, cut-outs, ring games, nursery rhymes, fairy tales, and glorious "pretend-like" adventures from which even an occasional spanking utterly fails to drag her.

Early in the spring school became a vital subject to Elizabeth. The neighbors' children played school on the front steps, and Elizabeth with her smaller sister was initiated into the pedagogical mysteries through the door of make-believe. And although the play school was more taken up with being sent to the principal, staying in at recess, and scoldings for being tardy than with lessons, still it all fitted harmoniously into her enchanted land.

Hence, when the day actually arrived, Elizabeth was eager for the real adventure. She was talkative to her smaller sister, and fidgety as her mother prepared her for the great occasion. With every detail complete from shoes to hair-bow, after the final maternal inspection she slipped her hand into mine, and with little sister's tears to bless her, departed. What was in her head as she trudged beside me I have no means of knowing. I have no analogous experience of my own by which even to conjecture. I know, however, that she walked as triumphantly and as importantly as a hen just emerging from her first period of incubation with one poor, wobbly chick. And thus she entered school.

I left her there, not without misgiving. Certain forebodings disturbed my return trip. They hung about the family table every day. Momentarily we expected their horrid realization. But day followed day and nothing occurred. Elizabeth came and went, always impatient to leave in the morning, always bubbling over with some new achievement, some new adventure in the evening. She learned new games and rhymes to teach her sister. She brought home a primer which was too precious for her sister to touch, and proudly exhibited her breathless facility in "reading." She

THE SHAME

Do you know that the United States is the
BURNED

In Four Years 1918-1921, Twenty-Eight Per

3,436 People Lynched

For What Crimes Have Mobs Nullified

The Alleged Crimes	The Victims
Murder	1288
Rape	571
Crimes against the Person	615
Crimes against Property	333
Miscellaneous Crimes	453
Absence of Crime	176
	<u>3436</u>

Is Rape the "Crime"

Of 3,436 people murdered by mobs in our country, only
83 WOMEN HAVE BEEN LYNCHED

Do lynchers maintain that the
AND THE LYNCHING

THE F

The Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill

The Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill was passed on January 26, 1922, by a vote of 230 to 119 in the House of Representatives.

The Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill Provides:

That culpable State officers and mobbists shall be tried in Federal Courts on failure of State courts to act, and that a county in which a lynching occurs shall be fined \$10,000, recoverable in a Federal Court.

The Principal Question Raised Against the Bill is upon the Ground of Constitutionality.

The *Constitutionality* of the

The Judiciary Committee of
The Judiciary Committee of
The United States Attorney
Judge Guy D. Goff, of the

The Senate has been petitioned
29 Lawyers and Jurists in
United States
19 State Supreme Court Justices

The Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill is not intended to protect the guilty

THE DYER ANTI-LYNCHING BILL IS NOW BEFORE THE SENATE

If you want to help the organization which has brought to light the facts about lynching, the organization
white or black, all of the time, send

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE

70 FIFTH AV

OF AMERICA

Land on Earth where human beings are
E STAKE?

Publicly BURNED BY AMERICAN MOBS

ed, 1889-1921

ent and Inflicted the Death Penalty?

Why Some Mob Victims Died:

Not turning out of road for white boy in auto
Being a relative of a person who was lynched
Jumping a labor contract
Being a member of the Non-Partisan League
"Talking back" to a white man
"Insulting" white man

of Lynching?

n 17 per cent, were even *accused* of the crime of rape.

N THE UNITED STATES

ed for "the usual crime?"

UNPUNISHED

MEDY

re the United States Senate

is Been Affirmed by
Representatives

l adviser of Congress
Justice

ver Bill by

ner Attorneys General of the

24 State Governors

3 Archbishops, 85 bishops and prominent churchmen

39 Mayors of large cities, north and south

The American Bar Association at its meeting in San Francisco, August 9, 1922, adopted a resolution asking for further legislation by Congress to punish and prevent lynching and mob violence.

Fifteen State Conventions of 1922 (3 of them Democratic) have inserted in their party platforms a demand for national action to stamp out lynchings.

to every person accused of crime trial by due process of law.

TELEGRAPH YOUR SENATORS TODAY YOU WANT IT ENACTED

for 100 per cent Americanism, not for some of the people some of the time, but for all of the people,
J. E. SPINGARN, Treasurer of the

ANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE
NEW YORK CITY

regaled us excitedly with what Tom or Helen did at school to earn the teacher's rebuke. Teacher became a goddess or fairy, grand, beautiful, and correct. School was an extension of that delightful bowerland, forever unfolding new wonders.

And then it happened. It was only a very small thing, an ordinary childish question put to her mother. But it was realization of the entire train of tragic foreboding that had haunted the household every hour since Elizabeth entered school. "Mother," she asked one day, "why doesn't the teacher let me march with Dorothy any more, but always makes me march with Lucy?" Now, that seems a simple question. But two words complicate it. Two words change this whole story, and bring to the fore an ugly facet of the great many-sided lie which besmirches American democracy.

Elizabeth and Lucy are brown. Dorothy is white. Brown and white—those two little words—and the forebodings are realized. The teacher was true to form when she introduced Elizabeth to the American race problem at the age of six. Hereafter she marches with brown Lucy, not with white Dorothy, until the end of time. What the resultant ignorance of white and brown, each of the other's way, will produce in misunderstanding, prejudice, and hate is a consideration which apparently disturbs no one much, least of all Elizabeth.

Family councils have not revealed what reply was returned to Elizabeth. Inquiry, however, disclosed the fact that all the little brown children in the beginner's room, as elsewhere in the school, were seated together in the rear of the room. Again, painfully true to form in the separation of Negroes and whites with inference of inferiority by seating the brown children in the rear. And this to six-year-olds! The thought of deluging Elizabeth with these American horrors intensified the bitterness which I cannot avoid when I think of the Negro's place in America. Why not begin teaching this doctrine of race superiority in the nursery? Why not have the babies so indoctrinated before they reach the first grade that they will avoid the brown Elizabeths on sight? Is it not the parents' duty to give the child proper home training and cooperate with the teacher? Why doesn't the "great and growing city of Columbus," as one booster sign has it, why doesn't the great State of Ohio, boasted haven of fugitive slaves, famous port of underground railroad refugees, proud mother of Presidents, self-constituted guardian of democracy, public acclaimer of justice and equal rights, preacher of fair dealing to all races—why do not Ohio and its capital city come out as boldly for race segregation as Georgia, and cease this everlasting lying? There is a certain compelling admiration for the crook who admits his crookedness frankly and glories in it. It is the gentleman crook who is repulsive. Georgia's frankness is to be preferred to Ohio's insincerity.

With thoughts like these I went back to the school. I found Elizabeth's teacher agreeable, courteous, cultured, cheerful. She ushered me into her room with a warm welcome. The advanced section of beginners (that is, those who began in the middle of last term and are five months ahead of those like Elizabeth who began last month) was reading. They were seated in a semi-circle about the teacher. Two little brown boys were sitting together at one extremity of the semi-circle, while a little brown girl sat alone behind the others. In the other section Elizabeth was seated in the rear with a group of little brown children.

I wonder if the teacher had some inner revelation of my feeling as I looked at the brown children? At any rate, she chose for me the subtlest form of flattery, calling Elizabeth to prompt an advanced boy and commending her when she did so correctly. I waited for a few moments and then asked:

"Is there any reason why all the little colored children should sit together in the rear? Is it a rule of the principal, the Board of Education, or of the State?"

"Why no," she said. "But don't you think it's nice for all the little colored ones to sit together?"—in a tone of pained surprise.

When I told her that I did not think it nice, she asked my objection. Upon my telling her she excused herself by saying that she was only one, and asked what she should do if she had "objections from the other side," meaning from white parents, I suppose. I suggested that she seat the children alphabetically, and she then began to explain, irrelevantly, that the seats were all filled, and finding herself floundering—I really was disturbing her recitation—she advised that I see the principal.

I found the principal cool, polite, and impenetrable. To all my objections concerning the marching and the seating she repeated "I don't understand." I tried to state my case. Once or twice I thought I had made an impression as she nervously fumbled the key to her desk, or dawdled with the beads dangling from her neck, but she only returned, "I really don't understand." She reminded me that all such minor matters were left to the teachers, and I then wondered why the teacher had advised me to come to the principal.

I hazard the guess, however, that this practice of separating brown and white, universally accepted in that school, is tacitly approved, if not ordered, by the principal. I told her that such separation taught hate, that it taught children that they were different, that the inference of inferiority was intended for colored children, that separated the two races grew up in ignorance of each other, that such ignorance led to misunderstanding, and that misunderstanding was the first step to hate. She repeated, "I do not understand," and she could not see that her failure to understand was the very result of the separation she defended. She denied that there was a particle of hate in her school, seemed fearful of what she implied was my antagonistic attitude, stressed the beautiful spirit of her school, enlightened me as to how long she had been there without any unhappiness, praised her numerous colored friends, injected a little soothing syrup into the interview by referring delicately and commendingly to my "type of educated man," graciously suggested that I might be a great somebody in the colored race, announced that after all she and I were quite different, and was altogether a charming person receiving a rather misguided, unhappy, and unfortunately notional parent.

I went to the school sorry for Elizabeth because of this heartless and unnecessary forcing upon her a glimpse of what inevitably lies ahead of her. But Elizabeth lives in an enchanted land unruffled by thoughts of the future. I think I am now sorry for that principal. She lives in a hard shell of preconceptions. No consideration of the daily mounting powder-pile of hate America is building for some mad-cap to fire, nor of her own part and responsibility in the hideous enterprise remotely aroused her consciousness. The shell was impenetrable. She did not understand.

Portland's Mayor-Made Revolution

By B. A. GREEN

LONGSHOREMEN affiliated with the American Federation of Labor called a strike against the Waterfront Employers Association in Portland, Oregon, in May and June of this year. The strike was settled by the State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation, but conditions were not much bettered, and in October both the Longshoremen's Association and the Marine Transport Workers, a branch of the I.W.W., voted to strike. On Friday, October 13, about 675 men affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and 275 I.W.W. members struck. Picket lines were established immediately and everything was very peaceful. An enthusiastic mass meeting held on Saturday, October 14, in the Labor Temple, was attended by approximately three thousand strikers and strike sympathizers. On Monday, October 16, the Mayor called into conference the accredited representatives of the American Federation of Labor, and on the following morning he issued a statement branding the strike as a "revolution" and declaring that the city was in the "throes of a revolution." He called upon all citizens to rally to the defense of law and order, and declared that an army of 25,000 I.W.W.'s, fully armed, was marching upon Portland and that they planned to seize all transportation facilities in Portland and to use the city as a base for attacking other communities. A statement, published by the representatives of the American Federation of Labor with whom the Mayor had conferred, challenged all of these assertions and charged that the Mayor was only playing the game of the Waterfront Association.

However, since the Mayor had proclaimed a revolution, a revolution there must be. During the night preceding his proclamation, the Police Department swooped down on the picket lines near the docks and arrested hundreds of persons. Many men who were hauled to jail and subjected to criminal procedure were workers with lunch-pails in their hands. Police records do not show exactly how many were arrested—probably about 500—in the first raid. Every man affiliated with the I.W.W. was held as a vagrant. In the first raid 275 men were held under that section of the ordinance which describes a vagrant as "an idle and dissolute person, without visible means of support, who does not seek employment, and who refuses employment when employment is offered."

The men released were subjected to a night "kangaroo court" by officials. Thumb-prints of every man were taken on the pretext that the prints could be used as a sure means of identification of property left at the time of arrest. But the thumb-prints are filed in the criminal record room. Many of those arrested had lived in Portland for years, one since 1880. Another man, 47 years old, was born in Portland. Officials did not take the trouble to prepare complaints. Warrants were not asked for, although the State courts of record have universally held that an arrest under this section of the vagrancy ordinance cannot be made without a warrant duly issued by a magistrate. At the trials the only testimony given by the city was: "All these men are I.W.W.'s." Be it said to their credit every man admitted membership in the I.W.W., knowing that such admission might subject him to a felony charge of criminal syndicalism.

Orders were issued to arrest every I.W.W. member in Portland; men regularly engaged in selling I.W.W. periodicals were arrested and charged as vagrants. A blanket order was issued that any man with a Marine Transport Workers' button should be arrested and held as a vagrant. This meant the arrest of every I.W.W. striker. All trains coming into Portland, passenger as well as freight, were carefully searched. Men wearing workmen's clothes were held to be suspicious characters. The City Council appropriated \$10,000 to stem the "revolution," and employed one hundred or more special policemen. Thus the "revolution" was born.

During the first day all men arrested were discharged and warned to keep away from the docks. But vigilant policemen rearrested each man within a few hours. On the second day, October 16, all were discharged except sixteen, who were given ninety-day suspended sentences and ordered from town. The cases were immediately appealed but on the morning of October 17 the men were forcibly taken to the city limits and told to keep going. On Saturday, October 18, three more were deported in the same manner.

Meanwhile a raid was made upon the I.W.W. hall, with a palpably illegal search warrant. Literature, books, personal property, and everything in the hall was carted to the police station. This hall had been used for almost three years; it was openly advertised as an I.W.W. hall; the windows carried signs; a large sign was at the entrance; a rental of \$100 per month was paid. Here the I.W.W. had its offices, its assembly room, its fixtures, its piano, library, and necessary furnishings. It would be safe to say that 15,000 men each year used this hall as their home in passing back and forth from the logging camps, harvest fields, and construction jobs. On October 20, between 4 and 5 p. m., all the seized property was suddenly returned under court order. Everything was in good condition. At 5:15 the exponents of "law and order," this time without any warrant or authority, again swooped down upon the hall, arrested every man in it, seized all books, magazines, record books, papers, library books, tipped over the library shelves, and threw the whole mass of equipment and literature into boxes as though it were mere garbage. These were taken to the jail, thrown upon the jail floor in front of the door, and the seventy-three men arrested were compelled as they entered the jail to walk over their own books, literature, and personal effects. Every man entering, or attempting to enter the hall that night, was arrested. These men were released again the next morning. As fast as the municipal judge released them they returned to the hall and were rearrested and brought back to jail. Some of them had not been out of the courtroom ten minutes before they were back in jail. This was called to the attention of the judge and he adjourned court for a time, I am told, and held a conference with the Chief of Police, but the arrests continued. The officers left the hall about noon. At 4:45 p. m. the hall was again raided and fifty-three men were arrested, thirty-two of whom had been arrested and discharged three or four times in that week. The fifty-three men were placed in a bull-pen ten by eighteen