

Baltimore Boycotted

IT IS PLAIN that the Eastern Shore is really upset as an aftermath of last week's lynching. But is it upset because it has done a shameful thing? Apparently not.

The Eastern Shore is upset because Baltimore, speaking through its newspapers and clergymen, has heaped vigorous criticism upon the 'Shore. And, by way of revenge, 'Shoremen have started a movement to boycott Baltimore and its products. According to a Salisbury paper, this boycott will continue until Baltimore apologizes.

Now, this paper has taken an active part in the criticism to which the Eastern Shore objects. And if we have been wrong, we should be glad to apologize even though we do not regard the boycott as formidable. We do not want to be unfair to a section of Maryland, or to anything else. We should appreciate it, therefore, if the Eastern Shore, speaking through its papers, clergymen or any other agencies, would explain the point of their objections.

We have said that the lynching was a barbarous thing. If any Eastern Shoreman can convince us that it was not, we shall gladly apologize.

We have said that lynching is not the action of civilized people. Does the Eastern Shore contend that lynching is a civilized procedure?

We have said that the Eastern Shore action has disgraced the State of Maryland. Do they contend that we are wrong, and that their action reflected credit upon the state?

We have said that "Maryland justice" will be an ironical phrase unless the lynchers are properly punished. Do Eastern Shoremen dispute it?

In short, the Eastern Shoremen are angry because we—meaning the Baltimore papers and clergymen—have criticized their lynching, but they have not explained why the lynching is not a fair subject for criticism. As soon as they do, our apologies will be given as much space and prominence as were the criticisms.