

The Curbstone Diplomat

By

WILLIAM S. COLLINS

Let's hope, that it will be brought to Mr. H. L. Mencken's attention, that the Eastern Shore pulled off the play, "Romeo and Juliet." And what is more they got away with it, as far as an appreciative audience was concerned. As to the financial success, or visa versa, I am unable to state, as I understand the costumes, etc., were expensive, but they did have a large audience.

The play was produced by some organization, class, department or some division or other of Washington College. Anyhow whatever group it was there was not enough men to take all the male parts.

This was the one weakness. Although the young ladies taking the males parts did very well, they had a physical handicap, which they could not overcome. Juliet did very well and she certainly had nothing to inspire her in Romeo, which was acted by a young lady. Relations between Romeo and Juliet seemed to lack the real warmth. Romeo did not even seem to thaw.

The first two acts of the play seemed dull, but after that the whole cast seemed to take on life and the remaining four acts were a howling success. The ladies taking the female parts and the men taking the male parts were very good without exception. The ladies taking male parts did very well considering their handicap.

Dr. Ingalls, who coached the play is to be congratulated on her success and it is to be hoped that she will produce another Shakesperian play in the near future.

Let us hope Mr. Mencken will be over the next time to inspect our "Culture."

Living on the Eastern Shore is getting to be like living on a target. The latest shot fired at us was from Prof. Broadus Mitchell, of the department of political economy of Johns Hopkins University, acting in behalf of the Federated Councils of Churches. In his attack Mr. Mitchell claims the Eastern Shore to have "backward conditions," caused he says by "geographical isolation."

Mr. Mitchell's great knowledge of the Eastern Shore conditions at present comes from a Friday to Sunday stay in Salisbury. During this time Mr. Mitchell interviewed twelve people consisting of some negroes (from whom he must have obtained a great deal of knowledge,) the Sheriff, of Wicomico county, the ministers and others. A total of twelve people in Salisbury in a stay of two days. From this he makes a report of the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Maybe the Eastern Shore of Maryland is backward but it all depends on what you compare it with. The Eastern Shore is certainly far ahead of Southern Maryland in modern conveniences and holds its own with Western Maryland. When it is compared with Baltimore it compares favorably with about ninety-nine per cent of that city. Of course the Eastern Shore does not have Baltimore's, "toonerville trolleys, minus the Jim Crow law," and in going from one business place to another on the Eastern Shore you generally have the inconvenience of being able to park an automobile within a few yards of your destination. In Baltimore you have the convenience of walking four or five blocks. Of course each have their advantages. In comparing Baltimore with the Eastern Shore columns could be written.

You know Prof. Mitchell has proved a big disappointment to me. I gave him credit for being a bigger man than he really is, even going to the trouble of looking him up in "Who's Who," where you look in vain.

Mr. Mitchell has of late years despised the Eastern Shore. He ran on the progressive ticket for the electoral college in the election of 1924. The Eastern Shore snowed him under. For example, Kent gave him a total of 71 votes. Since that time Mr. Mitchell has never had a good word for us. When in Baltimore, boys knowing I was from the Eastern Shore, were quiet often running to me with the latest cracks that Broadus had made about the shore. In fact the very things that the Eastern Shore cherishes most is what Mitchell hates; respect of parents, home life, traditions, etc.

Whether Mr. Mitchell really believes all he says or not I do not know. He has a very good mind like most of the Hopkins professors and like them, is skilled in the art learning from books and laboratories, but like the rest of them he has not common sense enough to come in out of the rain.

Publicity is something he craves and he is the idol of the young men at college, who have just learned "there ain't no Santa Claus," and who are fruitful field for communism, Atheism and other radical subjects. For Mr. Mitchell to suggest that Maryland became a nudess colony or that we go back to the stone age, would not surprise those who know him. I am told he made a remark in 1924 that it took a thousand dollars worth of fertilizer to grow five hundred dollars worth of crops on the Eastern Shore.

In substantiating what I have written about Mr. Mitchell being radical, etc., just read the clipping which is reprinted below.

"Last Summer Dr. Mitchell conducted a party of economics investigators on a tour of Russia to make a study of the Soviet five-year plan, which he hailed as the greatest challenge to the capitalist world today, adding that he hoped for its success."

All in all I think from this we can just consider that Mr. Mitchell made a poor shot at our target and did not hit as near the bull's eye as Mencken did. The wonder is why did the Federated Council of churches pick a man to investigate for them, that hails communism. They should know the communist attitude toward churches.