

"We know of no better way to emphasize the great objections to Negro invasion as compared with the very few objections that are made against members of foreign white races, than to remind your readers that there has not, to our knowledge, been a sub-division laid out in the city of St. Louis during the past fifteen years that has not been restricted against selling or renting to Negroes. We have never heard, and do not believe any other St. Louisan ever heard, of a sub-division of this city which was restricted against any of the foreign white races. This being the case, we are at a loss to understand how any one can contend that home owners of St. Louis when they have succeeded in segregating the Negroes will proceed to segregate the Jews, or any other Caucasian race."

A colored woman writes:

"Now, Mr. Editor, if the white people need so much legislation and organization to paralyze our aggressiveness in tearing down 'nature's barriers,' are we really as stupid and obnoxious as you paint us? Did we do that jumping of the boundary lines? If we did our womanhood now is free—we are no longer slaves. We realize what virtue is and what it means and we are not a menace to the unprotected and unsuspecting whites in the South. Now can't 500,000 white people in St. Louis manage the aspirations of 40,000 Negroes and prevent their 'star' of civilization from a too dangerous westward course by any other means than to strike at their American citizenship and rights guaranteed by the Constitution? If not, too bad, too bad, that you must verily throttle the pernicious Negro and paralyze what few liberties are left because 'nature herself has set up boundaries which no laws can throw down.'"

Another correspondent writes:

"Were it necessary, even the 'paper case' which you make in favor of the scheme could be shown to be extremely vulnerable. What are the districts into which the colored population of this city has 'poured' in the last decade or two? Are they not along those streets which the former white residents abandoned in their eager desire to move farther—and still farther—west. Do we not know that the substantial residences along Chestnut, Pine and Olive streets, Cook, Finney and other avenues, were depreciated by abandonment and neglect long

before the Negro population was induced to enter the same? And is it not also true that for these abandoned residences Negroes paid a higher price, whether in the way of purchase or rental, than white people were willing to pay?

"Conceding that an 'undesirable' colored family may depreciate values by moving into a given locality, is it not equally true that an undesirable family of any other race will do the same? Are we to establish the principle that a certain majority of property owners in a given sub-division of our city may place the stamp of the pariah upon all but the chosen few whom they shall select as their associates?"

As to the result of the election the *New York Times* says:

"The Missouri Constitution contains an 'enjoyment of property' clause. Can an owner kept out of his own property be said to 'enjoy' his property? Jim Crow cars and separate schools, which Missouri has, seem not in point. They injure no property rights. They grant equal privileges of transportation and education. One of the St. Louis ordinances lays an equal disprivilege, affecting vested rights, upon both races.

"It shall be unlawful for any white person to use as a residence, or place of abode, any house, building or structure, or any part thereof, located in any colored block, as the same is hereinafter defined; and it shall also be unlawful for any colored person to use as a residence, or place of abode, any house, building or structure, or any part thereof, located in any white block, as the same is hereinafter defined.

"Would a similar ordinance, limiting the residence of Prohibitionists and Anti-Prohibitionists, native and foreign born citizens and so on, hold water? The constitutional question is interesting."

The *New York World* adds:

"What can be done in the way of stirring up race prejudice is shown by the success of the real-estate interests of St. Louis in carrying by popular vote measures providing for the segregation of Negroes. The population of that city in 1910 was 687,000, the Negroes numbering less than 44,000. With a total poll of 130,000 at the election of 1912, only 69,000 voters divided on this question Tuesday—52,000 to 17,000.

"Of the two ordinances carried, one pro-

hibits Negroes or whites from residing in blocks occupied entirely by the opposite race. The other makes the same restrictions upon blocks in which 75 per cent. of the residents are of one race. Obviously the purpose of these enactments is to establish a geographical color line, regardless of personal and property rights, which no black man can pass. If sustained, they will embody in law restrictions hitherto enforced only by the will of individuals at their own cost and never to the injury of anybody else.

"After a defeat or two in the State courts Baltimore is trying this experiment. In Washington a similar enterprise is under way without legal sanction. San Francisco attempted the same thing with reference to the Chinese and was halted by a Federal Judge. But while the United States Supreme Court has ruled on grandfather Constitutions, the new slavery of peonage and Jim Crow sleeping and dining cars, it has not yet reached a case of segregation.

"The St. Louis ordinances are said in their preambles to be 'for the prevention of ill-feeling and conflict between the races.' They might more truthfully be described as intended to promote hatred and difficulty and to deprive black men of property, liberty and hope."

A writer in the *St. Louis Star* notes certain difficulties:

"The building permits for the city of St. Louis have dwindled steadily for the past five years until they have reached the sum of \$9,000,000 for the year ending 1915. When we consider the effects of segregation from a material and progressive standpoint, article four goes the limit in placing an embargo on all building projects.

"Considering the size and population of our city, the building permits last year should have approximated \$30,000,000, to compare with any of the cities in this country. The segregation bill empowers the Building Commissioner to grant building permits after four weeks' publication in the daily papers of the applicant desirous of building to designate whether in any new section laid out, or on blocks heretofore unimproved a builder will be permitted to use such land for the desired improvements, providing notice has been posted on the property that is intended to be improved for certain purposes, or for white

or colored people. It usually takes six weeks to draw plans and obtain bids for construction, so that it means a delay of two or three months after a builder contemplates improvements before work can begin.

"No builder would be warranted in going to the expense of having plans drawn and bids taken until he knows whether he can use them. Fully 70 per cent of the moneys expended for construction work in building is supplied by builders, who either furnish the means, or borrow the money for building purposes, for constructing buildings, for investments or speculative purposes. Any embargo placed on the activities of the builder will retard and finally discourage building operations."

Another writer has this far-reaching word:

"Then what an inopportune time to do this. At such a time when Great Britain is recognizing, welcoming and honoring her black African heathen troops; when Russia is removing strictures from off her serfs and peasants; when all Europe, Asia, Africa, Canada and South America and Australia are lifting the bands from the limbs of their lesser people and when every American, black and white man, may soon be needed for 'immediate preparedness.'

"To attempt to humiliate, to label as lepers, to restrict and to discourage the leading representatives of 10,000,000 of our 100,000,000 true-blue Americans, and in imperial, great-hearted Missouri, at such a time, is the height of nonsense, the nadir of folly and a stupendous blunder."



THE BUSINESS OF PREJUDICE

R. CORDERY writes to the *Baltimore American*:

"Why is it that a hundred idle Negroes is so much larger than a thousand idle whites? Why is it that they can be seen and noticed so easily? Prejudice. Tell me, sir, how many Negroes have you seen holding out their hands for alms upon your streets or the streets of any other American city? A blessed few, if any.

"Your institutions and your prejudices close avenues of business and labor against him because of his black hide. Then you turn and point to the 'idle' Negro. Before he is born these same institutions and prejudices doom him to a certain sphere of ac-