

Correspondence

Jim Crowism

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In regard to the article headed Jim Crow in Texas by William Pickens [issue of August 15], while I have no desire to go into any discussion of the law as it now exists in Texas with regard to the races, I do wish to state that all of our trains provide two compartments for our colored patrons, one that may be used as a smoking compartment and the other for women and men not desiring to smoke. Separate toilets for both sexes are provided on all of our trains.

I have long recognized that the colored people pay fare the same as any other passengers, and should receive the same attention and courteous treatment as is accorded other patrons. We provide for the feeding of colored patrons of our line in dining-cars, either before or after white patrons have been served. Not only do we feel that we must comply with the laws as they exist, but we also take into consideration the human element and endeavor to give all of our patrons the attention, service, and accommodations they are entitled to.

Dallas, Texas, August 15

W. G. CRUSH,
Passenger Traffic Manager, Missouri-Kansas-Texas
Railroad Company

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The policy of the Missouri Pacific Railroad in the handling of colored traffic is necessarily in adherence to the regulations prescribed by the State and Federal governments, over the creation of which the railroad had no control whatever. The segregation of races has been built upon a traditionally peculiar racial situation which naturally exists in many of the Southern States, and, in my opinion, it is vitally essential to the peace and welfare of the territory involved.

A reading of Mr. Pickens's article impresses me with a tendency to exaggeration.

St. Louis, August 18

C. L. STONE,
Passenger Traffic Manager, Missouri Pacific
Railroad Company

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am a Southerner by adoption, having been born in a Western State and moving to Florida when quite a lad, but I have lived in the North for the last six or eight years. This gives me, I hope, sufficiently varied experience to understand the different and conflicting viewpoints expressed.

I can only say this, just now, that one who has not lived the better part of a lifetime in the South, or made sufficient study and had sufficient actual personal experience to understand the problems of the Southerner, cannot intelligently discuss the question. Whether Pickens will admit it or not, the facts are that the average Southern Negro is never an equal of a white man. He is either his subordinate or superior.

Chicago, August 16

B. M. JEWELL,
President, Railway Employees' Department, American
Federation of Labor

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I heartily agree with every fact contained in Mr. Pickens's article, so far as personal observation is concerned, and with his conclusion that the whole system is in violation of the spirit of our Constitution and the genius of our institutions, as we so proudly express them. This, together with our whole treatment of the colored race, if not quickly righted, will bring the train of disaster upon us as a people which always follows in the wake of national falsehood and injustice.

New York, August 11

FRANK P. WALSH

Electricity for Railroads

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In commenting on Stuart Chase's Junk, in your issue of August 1, Alice Stone Blackwell says: "The experts know that the best way to run a railroad is by electricity, not by steam, yet our railroads are not electrified and are not likely to be for a good while."

I wonder who the experts are who know that the best way to run a railroad (regardless of whether it is urban or rural or of dense or light traffic) is by electricity. Is it not possible that Miss Blackwell has fallen into line with many other liberals and accepted with little or no investigation the statements of the propagandists for electrification? Or maybe she has read uncritically that portion of the Superpower Survey report dealing with railroads.

J. G. LYNE

New York, July 30

A Federal Divorce Law

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the August 8 issue of *The Nation* I was much interested in an editorial upon the prospective Federal marriage and divorce legislation which is now before Congress. It was particularly interesting because of the impression it gave that your editorial writer had not fully digested the content of the amendment to the Constitution and the national uniform marriage and divorce law which Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas and Representative L. W. Fairfield of Indiana introduced into both houses of Congress last January. If he had done so I am sure that he would not have declared that the result of Federal action would be "to fasten a medieval system of divorce on every State and every individual." Furthermore, I do not think that he would have stated: "'As bad as the worst' seems to be the motto of the Federal divorce-law advocate."

As I had something to do with the campaign of education as to the necessity for such a law and conferred with Mrs. Edward Franklin White, who drafted it, I cannot allow these statements to go unchallenged. A law which permits divorce on the grounds of infidelity, physical and mental cruelty, desertion, failure to provide, commission of a crime, and incurable insanity can scarcely be called medieval; nor can it be said to be "as bad as the worst."

As the divorce laws of this country are now, they are either a farce or a tragedy, and a desire of putting an end to the tragic or farcical situation, as the case may be, prompted the General Federation of Women's Clubs and other organizations to take up the campaign for a national uniform marriage and divorce law.

The proposed amendment to the Constitution is not at all tied up to the law itself; and should the amendment be realized and the marriage bill as drawn by Mrs. Edward Franklin White passed, if it were to be found inadequate by succeeding generations, under the empowering amendment, another law could be passed to take its place.

I agree with the writer of your editorial that the Scandinavian law is ideal, but it would be quite impossible to pass such a law in this country at this time. There is no danger of Mrs. White's law "fettering or ruining the happiness of a helpless minority." As I have said, everybody who is entitled to a divorce will be able to get one, and it will prevent men and women from going into States not their own and getting divorces without the knowledge of their wives or husbands. Also it will preclude the present confusing situation by which a man and woman may be legally divorced in one State and not in another; by which they may be legally married a second time in one State and bigamists in another; by which a child by a second marriage may be legitimate in one State and illegitimate in another.

New York, August 28

GENEVIEVE PARKHURST,
Contributing Editor *Pictorial Review*

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.