

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION	Application for Posthumous Pardon Extraordinary	
	Applicant Name:	Max Mason
	aka/fka:	
	Date of Birth:	4/24/1899 or 8/27/1899¹

OFFENSE & SENTENCE INFORMATION

1.	Offense	Rape
	Conviction Date	November 27, 1920
	Discharge Date	September 3, 1925
	County	St. Louis
	Court File No.	6785
	Disposition	Convicted by a jury of rape and sentenced to an indeterminate prison term of up to 30 years.
	Sentence	Indeterminate prison term of up to 30 years.
	Description of Crime/Offense:	On June 14, 1920, Mason arrived in Duluth with a traveling circus. Nineteen-year-old Irene Tusken and a young man attended the circus and, as they were leaving the grounds after dark, were allegedly confronted by six black circus workers who put a gun to the man's head, forced the couple to a nearby ravine, and gang raped Tusken while she was largely unconscious. Afterwards, the young man escorted Tusken home, where she said goodnight to her parents and went to bed without any mention of the events. The young man proceeded to his night job and, in the early morning hours of June 15, 2020, told his father about the alleged gang rape. Police promptly arrested several black circus workers, including Mason, and brought them before Tusken and the young man for identification. Neither could identify any of the workers as the alleged assailants and Tusken shook her head no when Mason was presented. Tusken was also examined by a family physician who found no evidence of sexual intercourse, including abrasions, bruising, inflammation, soreness, or tenderness. Mason was allowed to leave with the circus to its next destination in Virginia, Minnesota. Thirteen others, however, were taken to jail as likely suspects, three of whom—Elias Clayton, Elmer Jackson, and Isaac McGhie—were lynched by a mob later that night. <i>See Ex. A.</i>

¹ While the application filed on Mason's behalf indicates he was born on April 24, 1899, other records suggest he was born on August 27, 1899. *See Ex. D.*

Description of Crime/Offense (Continued):

Despite his earlier release, Mason along with several others was arrested in Virginia, Minnesota, on June 16, 1920, and taken to county jail. Mason denied he was guilty, claimed he was at work at the time of the alleged rape, and some of his black coworkers corroborated his whereabouts. In the middle of July 1920, nearly a month after the alleged rape, Mason and several other jailed men were taken to the scene of the crime after dark for identification. This time both Tusken and the young man identified Mason, along with one other black man, as being involved in the alleged gang rape, not from his face but from his size, general appearance, talk, and walk. Around the same time, both Mason and Tusken were determined to have gonorrhea, though it was not entirely clear when Tusken first noticed signs of the disease. At the time of the alleged rape, Mason would have been 20 or 21 years old. *See Ex. A.*

Mason was indicted by a grand jury for the rape of Tusken on July 19, 1920. A jury found him guilty on November 27, 1920, and judge L.S. Nelson sentenced him on December 2, 1920, to an indeterminate prison term of up to 30 years. The sentence was stayed pending further proceedings and was not executed until July 30, 1921. Exs. B–F.

In June 1922, the Minnesota Supreme Court affirmed Mason’s conviction, finding his identification a month after the alleged rape, coupled with testimony that he and Tusken both had gonorrhea, was sufficient to support the jury’s verdict. Justice Dibell dissented, asserting that the cross-racial identification of Mason, a month after the alleged rape and in the dark, was unreliable and the mere fact that both Mason and Tusken had gonorrhea was “not of much weight as an identifying circumstance.” Justice Dibell concluded that it was “only a chance guess that [Mason] was connected with any offense at the show grounds” and that it was “a less likely guess that he was an actor in a crime such as is charged.” Ex. A.

Between September 1922 and March 1925, Mason was denied parole on six separate occasions. On September 23, 1925, the State Board of Parole discharged him on the condition that he go to Decatur, Alabama, and remain outside Minnesota until November 25, 1941. Exs. G–H.

PARDON HISTORY

Available records indicate Mason previously applied for a pardon or commutation in December 1922 and again in March 1924, claiming he was innocent, that the evidence was insufficient to sustain his conviction, and that the jury’s verdict was “due entirely to passion and prejudice.” Exs. I & M. During the pardon process, St. Louis County Attorney Mason Forbes expressed his

view that Mason was “rather unfortunate in that he was the only [man] of colored men involved who was convicted,” that he “never was of the impression that the evidence was any too strong,” and that Mason likely would not have been convicted “if he had been a white man.” Exs. J & N. An unidentified agent of the State Board of Parole similarly noted that “[t]here has always been considerable mystery and doubt in the minds of the Duluth people of this case,” including whether any crime had actually occurred, and that there was a “great deal of criticism over the way the matter was handled by the police and others.” Exs. K & O. The Board of Pardons denied the two applications on January 8, 1923, and November 13, 1924, respectively. Exs. L & P.

In a subsequent letter to the State Board of Parole, judge L.S. Nelson recommended either parole or a pardon, noting he “always had some doubt about [Mason’s] guilt” and, had it not been for legal questions he thought should be addressed by the Supreme Court, he would have set aside the jury’s verdict and granted a new trial. Ex. Q.

At its meeting on December 16, 2019, the Board of Pardons granted an application for rehearing filed on Mason’s behalf, which allowed for the filing of a successive pardon application. The Board, however, must still decide whether it has the authority under Minnesota law to grant a posthumous pardon.

ADDITIONAL RECORD

Available records suggest that, prior to his rape conviction, Mason spent some time in Alabama state prison for larceny and 30 days on a work farm in Louisville, Kentucky, possibly for selling whiskey. *See* Exs. D, M, & O. In their memorandum in support of a posthumous pardon, Mason’s sponsors assert he was not convicted of any crimes following his release from prison.

APPLICANT’S DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE(S)

In their memorandum in support of a posthumous pardon, Mason’s sponsors state he was convicted of a fictitious charge of raping a white woman by an all-white jury in the 1920s and based on the flimsiest of evidence, including identifications made under pressure nearly a month after the alleged incident and the mere coincidence that Mason and Tusken were both diagnosed with gonorrhea, which was rampant at that time.

APPLICANT’S PERSONAL INFORMATION

Available records indicate Mason was born in Decatur, Alabama in 1899, both of his parents died by the time he was 18 years old, he lived in Louisville, Kentucky, for a spell, and he eventually joined the John Robinson Circus in Indiana. Before joining the traveling circus, he worked in a basket factory, waiting tables at a hotel, as a porter, and as an “elevator boy.” Ex. D.

In their memorandum in support of a posthumous pardon, Mason’s sponsors state that, following his release from prison in 1925, Mason lived an ordinary and law-abiding life until his premature death at the age of 46. He married in Alabama in 1927, becoming a stepfather to a 7-year-old girl, and moved with his family to Memphis, Tennessee in 1930, where he worked as a waiter, a

porter, and a laborer. Mason and his wife separated in 1939, and he died on November 14, 1942, in Memphis from a heart condition.

APPLICANT’S REASONS PARDON EXTRAORDINARY SHOULD BE GRANTED

In their memorandum in support of a posthumous pardon, Mason’s sponsors state a pardon should be granted because Mason, a poor African-American laborer from the South, was convicted of raping a white woman by an all-white Duluth jury in the 1920s based on the flimsiest of evidence; the judge and prosecutor did not oppose a pardon when Mason requested one in the 1920s; and he went on to live a quiet and law-abiding life following his discharge from prison. They also state that Minnesota and Duluth cannot fully heal from the lynching of Elias Clayton, Elmer Jackson, and Isaac McGhie until the “other wrong arising from the horrors of those events” is recognized and righted by the pardon of Mason.

REQUIRED NOTIFICATIONS AND RESPONSES

Judge(s):	County:	Reply/Response:
Sally Tarnowski	St. Louis	Supports a posthumous pardon [not the sentencing judge].
County Attorney(s):	County:	Reply/Response:
Mark S. Rubin	St. Louis	Supports a posthumous pardon, explaining the historical record reflects Mason was charged and convicted because of his race, not the strength of the evidence, and that justice is overdue.
Victim(s):	Offense #:	Comments:
Irene Tusken	6785	Deceased
Mike Tusken (relative)	6785	Still awaiting any response, though the county attorney’s letter indicates his position in favor of a pardon “enjoys the expressed support of the victim’s family representative.”

APPLICANT’S EXHIBITS

1. Memorandum in Support of Posthumous Pardon of Max Mason submitted by Jordan Moses and attorney Jerry Blackwell, describing the events leading up to the Duluth lynching and Mason’s arrest, Mason’s trial and appeal, Mason’s requests for parole and a pardon, and the racist milieu of the 1920s. The memorandum also argues that posthumous pardons are available under Minnesota law and that Mason is deserving of such a pardon.
2. Parole Record
3. Summary of Pardon Application No. 5702
4. Letter from the St. Louis County Attorney to the State Board of Parole, dated June 12, 1925, explaining he had “been hopeful that some clemency would have been extended to [Mason] long ere now.”
5. Letter from Judge L.S. Nelson to the State Board of Parole, April 27, 1925.

6. Discharge Order, September 3, 1925
7. Letter submitted to a journal by C.F. Dight, President of the Minnesota Eugenics Society, praising Adolf Hitler's plan to stamp out "congenital feeble-mindedness, insanity, epilepsy, and some other serious conditions that are inheritable" from among the German people.
8. Pardon Application No. 5702, dated December 18, 1922.
9. Notice dated March 13, 1923, denying Mason's request for parole.
10. Letter from I.E. Nolte of the Duluth Mission, dated August 15, 1922, recommending Mason be granted a pardon or parole because of "his innocence" and reform "through religious influences."
11. Letter from Jerry Mugivan of the John Robinson Circus, dated July 13, 1922, explaining Mason was "always ready and willing to obey orders, kept his place and his morals and general character and habits," and that the circus would be pleased to reemploy him should he be released from prison.
12. Letter of support dated April 28, 2020, from the Minnesota Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, stating that Mason's conviction involved a fundamental miscarriage of justice and that a posthumous pardon would memorialize for present and future generations that "the pursuit of justice and the rule of law endure even after mortal life has long concluded."
13. Letter of support dated February 27, 2020, from Duluth Mayor Emily Larson, explaining that the lynching of Elias Clayton, Elmer Jackson, and Isaac McGhie and the related wrongful conviction of Mason were overt acts of racial hatred that have been a stain on the consciousness of the Duluth community over a century. She states a pardon would publicly remove "the taint of an evidentiary flawed and racially motivated conviction from Max Mason's record," and would also be an act of grace for Duluth and an example of justice for future generations to emulate.
14. Letter of support dated April 23, 2020, from the Minnesota Association of Black Lawyers, asserting that a posthumous pardon would right the gross miscarriage of justice that occurred against Mason and the three African-American men who were lynched for a crime that was "fabricated and unquestionably accepted on the basis of their race," and would serve as a testament to the progress "we have made in the quest for racial equality."
15. Letter of support dated April 1, 2020, from the Twin Cities Cardozo Society and the Jewish Community Relations Council of Minnesota and the Dakotas, expressing deep concern about "the grievous, racially motivated injustices perpetrated on Mr. Mason 100 years ago by Minnesota's law-enforcement and court systems." They further state that a pardon would also be consistent with the "evolving standards of American justice since 1920," which has been marked by greater protection of minority rights and the recognition or expansion of constitutional rights to counsel during custodial interrogation, counsel for indigent defendants, and equal protection.

INVESTIGATIVE EXHIBITS

- A. *State v. Mason*, 152 Minn. 306 (June 9, 1922)
- B. Indictment, July 19, 1920
- C. Jury Verdict, November 27, 1920
- D. Sentencing Hearing Transcript, December 2, 1920
- E. Order for Issuance of Commitment, July 30, 1921
- F. Warrant of Commitment, August 6, 1921

- G. Parole Record
- H. Discharge Order, September 3, 1925
- I. Pardon Application No. 5702, filed December 1922
- J. Letter from St. Louis County Attorney to the Board of Pardons, January 2, 1923
- K. Summary of Pardon Application No. 5702
- L. Board of Pardons Record showing pardon application no. 5702 denied January 8, 1923
- M. Pardon Application No. 6205, filed March 1924
- N. Letter from St. Louis County Attorney to the Board of Pardons, April 14, 1924
- O. Summary of Pardon Application No. 6205
- P. Board of Pardons Record showing pardon application no. 6205 denied November 13, 1924
- Q. Letter from Judge L.S. Nelson to Board of Parole, April 27, 1925
- R. St. Louis County Judge Response
- S. St. Louis County Attorney Response
- T. Letter from former Pardon Board members Walter Mondale, Arne Carlson, Al Quie, Mark Dayton, Tim Pawlenty, Kathleen Blatz, Russell Anderson, Eric Magnuson, Mike Hatch, Skip Humphrey, and Lori Swanson, supporting a pardon due to the “strong consensus in the articles and books written about the Duluth lynchings that [the] conviction occurred because of Max Mason’s race” and the fact that the “lynchings and circumstances giving rise to them were a stain on the history of Minnesota and do not reflect who we are as a state.”



OFFICE OF THE SAINT LOUIS COUNTY ATTORNEY

MARK S. RUBIN COUNTY ATTORNEY

February 6, 2020

Minnesota Board of Pardons
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108

Re: Pardon Extraordinary Application for: Mason, Max. Case #6785

Dear Members of the Board of Pardons,

History reveals that Mr. Mason's conviction, although upheld on appeal, was a part of a horrific set of circumstances resulting in great injustices to say the least. I refer back to the words of the successor County Attorney in 1923 where he stated in response to a request for parole:

"The defendant was rather unfortunate in that he was the only man of the colored men involved who was convicted. Personally I never was of the impression that the evidence was any too strong of this case, and if he had been a white man, I am rather doubtful he would have been convicted."

See Petitioner's Memorandum of Law, p. 13.

The Judge in the case also later expressed:

"In fact I had been hopeful that some clemency would have been extended to this defendant long ere now."

See Petitioner's Memorandum of Law, p. 14.

For over 40 years, I have been a prosecutor. In my current role as St. Louis County Attorney, criminal prosecutions are filed in my name. The historical record is before the Board. If this case had been submitted to me today, in a society where we strive for justice without racial bias, this case would never have been charged. Further, even if it had been charged, the evidence would not be sufficient to sustain a jury verdict of guilty.

DULUTH COURTHOUSE
100 N. FIFTH AVE. W., #501
DULUTH, MINNESOTA 55802
218-726-2323

GOVERNMENT SERVICES CENTER
320 W. SECOND ST., #403
DULUTH, MINNESOTA 55802
218-726-2034

VIRGINIA COURTHOUSE
300 S. FIFTH AVE., #222
VIRGINIA, MINNESOTA 55792
218-749-7101

HIBBING COURTHOUSE
1810 TWELFTH AVE. E., #107
HIBBING, MINNESOTA 55746
218-262-0158

The historical record clearly reflects that Mr. Mason was investigated, charged and convicted because of his race and not because of the strength and sufficiency of the evidence. The improper comments of the prosecutor in his final argument only served to further fan the flames of racial injustice, and distracted the jury from their appointed duty to fairly judge the evidence:

“In his closing argument, Warren Green told the jury that this case was the most important he’d ever brought into court. Why do we have mobs? he asked. It is because people think the Negroes won’t be convicted. That’s why they take the law into their own hands. People of Duluth and St. Louis County want to know through your verdict that when a white girl is ravished by a black or white man, and the man is proven guilty, as in this case, the man is going to be found guilty.”

See Petitioner’s Memorandum of Law, p. 8.

These days, our world needs all the mercy and grace we can muster up. This is at least something we can do on behalf of Mr. Mason’s memory. If the pardon will help facilitate a redemption of his name, reconciliation for our community, and a restoration of justice, then it should be granted. I should also add that my position enjoys the expressed support of the victim’s family representative.

As a prosecutor, my pursuit of justice has always been firmly rooted in my belief in redemption and restoration. Mercy sometimes, is what justice calls for. Justice is overdue for Mr. Mason. His time is now. Maybe this is the “bending of the arc of justice” that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. talked about...

I support the request for a pardon extraordinary.

Respectfully Submitted,



MARK S. RUBIN
ST. LOUIS COUNTY ATTORNEY

MINNESOTA BOARD OF PARDONS
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200, St. Paul, MN 55108
651-361-7171



County Attorney Statement

Re: Pardon Extraordinary Application for: Mason, Max Case #: 6785

I, Mark S. Rubin St. Louis County Attorney,

Support the pardon extraordinary application.

Do not support the pardon extraordinary application.

Statement to the Board (if desired):

(See Attached)

Signed:

Mark S. Rubin
St. Louis County Attorney

218-726-2323
(phone)

Dated:

Feb. 6, 2020

Please return to:

Minnesota Board of Pardons
1450 Energy Park Drive
Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108

Email: mnboardofpardons@state.mn.us

Fax: 651-603-6770



June 5, 2020

**Minnesota
State Bar
Association**

600 Nicollet Mall
Suite 380
Minneapolis, MN
55402-1039

www.mnbar.org

Telephone
612-333-1183
National
800-882-MSBA
Fax
612-333-4927

President
Tom Nelson
Minneapolis

President-Elect
Dyan J. Ebert
St. Cloud

Treasurer
Jennifer Thompson
Edina

Secretary
Paul D. Peterson
Woodbury

Chief Executive Officer
Cheryl Dalby

The Honorable Tim Walz
Governor of Minnesota
100 State Capitol
75 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

The Honorable Keith Ellison
Attorney General of the State of Minnesota
102 State Capitol
75 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

The Honorable Lorie S. Gildea
Chief Justice
Minnesota Supreme Court
25 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Re: Max Mason: Application for Posthumous Pardon Extraordinary [Matter No. 6785;
Item No. 14: June 12, 2020 Meeting of the Minnesota Board of Pardons]

Dear Governor Walz, Attorney General Ellison, and Chief Justice Gildea:

On behalf of the Minnesota State Bar Association, and with the unanimous support of our bar association's Council, please accept this message in support of the Application for a Posthumous Pardon Extraordinary for Mr. Max Mason. The background facts and realities, coupled with the wide-ranging support for this unique application, combine to make this a compelling opportunity to recognize, acknowledge, and then right a terrible wrong. Granting the application would contribute to the healing of a tragic wound—a wound inflicted not only upon Mr. Mason and his family, but also visited upon the soul of our Minnesota legal profession and community.

The Board of Pardons, as you know, spoke to this during the 1920's—discharging Mr. Mason from custody and, in effect, banishing him from our State. Even then, the St. Louis County Attorney confirmed that the evidence was such that Mr. Mason would not have been convicted "had he been a white man." Now today, the current St. Louis County Attorney, Mark Rubin, has confirmed further that: "The historical record clearly

reflects that Mr. Mason was investigated, charged and convicted because of his race and not because of the strength and sufficiency of the evidence." Their support, and the wide and deep support from the broader profession and community, confirms that the granting of this application now, especially now, is and would be the right thing to do.

Our State's treatment of Mr. Mason, and the tragic and terroristic events of Duluth in the 1920's, have long been a stain on our State and society—rooted in a racism that continues to haunt and harm our lives, and enacted under a purported and twisted version of the rule of law. The 1920's may seem now like a long time ago, but it is always the right time to right a wrong—and Mr. Mason's arrest, conviction, imprisonment and banishment is a wrong that has long called for righting.

This is a uniquely important time for all of us to right that wrong, and a unique opportunity for us to learn lessons and to live forward toward the possibility of healing and reconciliation. We urge the Minnesota Board of Pardons to grant this application—made on behalf of Mr. Mason and his family, of course; but also, in important ways, made on behalf of us all.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Nelson". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Tom Nelson
MSBA President (2019/2020)

Enclosure:
(2020 President's Page – Bench & Bar: "Our Duluth Lynchings")

Our Duluth Lynchings

On June 15, 1920—in less than a day's time—three young Black men (Elias Clayton, Elmer Jackson, and Isaac McGhie) were wrongly arrested; ripped out of their jail cell by a vicious mob; taunted, tortured and dragged to a lamppost; and mercilessly murdered. Lynched. It didn't happen "Down South;" it happened here, in Duluth. Thousands of White Minnesotans were involved. This coming June 15—100 years later to the day—in a deliberate act of remembrance and with a community-wide commitment to learning and hope, we will gather in Duluth to mark those murders and to move forward together. We will do so again the next day in Minneapolis. Please join us. Here is some background.

The basic facts are lawless and brutal. For some unknown reason, Irene Tusken claimed that six young Black circus workers raped her on June 14. Her doctor examined her, and later testified that she had not been raped or otherwise assaulted. The next morning, June 15, thirteen Black men were apprehended by the police as the circus was leaving town; seven were released; six were jailed. That evening, the Duluth Herald

headline read: "West Duluth Girl Victim of Six Negroes." A mob of thousands gathered outside the jail (having been urged to "join the necktie party"); overcame the police; broke into the jail; conducted a "trial" on the spot; dragged three of them up the street to



their ghastly deaths; posed for souvenir photographs; and left their victims dead at the lamppost. "Strange fruit," as Billie Holiday would later sing. Judges Cant and Fesler tried to stop the slaughter; as did Attorneys McClearn and McDevitt, and Fathers Powers and Maloney—only to be told: "To hell with the law!" and "We don't care if they are innocent or not." The bodies were removed the next day, and taken to Crawford Mortuary (after another mortuary declined to help). They were buried in unmarked graves—a wrong only recently righted.

Three men were convicted of "rioting," but served light sentences. No murderers were ever convicted of the murders, despite thousands of eye witnesses. Some members of the media were outraged; others excused, justified, or even tried to explain the "benefits" of the lynchings.

There was and is no excuse, of course. The throng of Minnesotans that night in Duluth did not lose their minds or misplace their consciences. They knew what they were doing and they intended to do it. The pictures show their individual faces—some somber and others smiling, seemingly proud of what they had done. Individuals don't get to blame, or hide in, some sort of "mob mentality." We lawyers know that. Mob Rule is, after all, the exact opposite of the Rule of Law.

Between the 1870's and 1950's, there were more than 4,500 terror lynchings in America. Those lynchings were intended to create fear. They were spectacles meant to be seen and to convey a message—with children on parents' shoulders for a better view; sometimes with the local Black population forced to watch. They were performed in the presence of the purported Rule of Law, and sometimes with its permission—often in the public

square; sometimes on a courthouse lawn. The killings took place while statues were being built (purportedly to honor those who fought for "the lost cause," largely during the 1890's to the 1920's, and notably again during the Civil Rights Era of the 50's and 60's), and while federal anti-lynching statutes were being resisted (filibustered in the U.S. Senate, citing the canard of "racial favoritism" or promising enforcement under states' rights). The lynchings could only have happened by viewing people of color as some sort of unworthy "Other," not as fellow human beings. A reminder of the need for vigilance, even today, when incidents and policies seem afoot to "otherize" still others.

As the Duluth killers proudly sought a photographic trophy of their treachery (suitable for postcards, which promptly flew off the shelves of Duluth merchants at 50 cents each), one of the lynchers yelled out, ironically and aptly: "Throw a little light on the subject!" Headlights illuminated the scene for those preening to be seen. That photograph cannot be un-seen; nor should it be. As Ida B. Wells said so well: "The way to right wrongs is to turn the light of truth upon them." History can be a light in its own right, helping us face forward into our future together. That's what the coming months hold: not just noting history, but making history.



TOM NELSON is a partner at Stinson LLP (formerly Leonard, Street and Deinard). He is a past president of the Hennepin County Bar Association.

This is all such a sobering part of our history; sickening, really; but also strengthening—if we learn from it. As it turns out, Duluth was the very first community in our nation to build a monument to honor its lynching victims. The Clayton-Jackson-McGhie Memorial is a dignified and moving plaza—taking back the corner of First Street and Second Avenue South (one block up from Superior Street), across the street from the site of the 1920 murders. Engraved into the walls, in bold letters, it says: “An Event Happened Here Upon Which It Is Difficult To Speak And Impossible To Remain Silent.” Sculpted into the walls are images of Mr. Clayton, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. McGhie—not as they were in that photograph, but instead standing tall and strong. That memorial calls for you to visit. www.claytonjacksonmcghie.org

These coming months (and June 15 and 16, in particular) will include unique, important, moving, and motivating moments.

■ On June 15 in Duluth, Bryan Stevenson will speak at the site of the lynchings. He is the author of “Just Mercy” and the founder of the Equal Justice Initiative in Montgomery, Alabama—site of the national lynching memorial. A sacred place. www.eji.org

■ Earlier that Monday, there will be an extended public program at Duluth’s courthouse plaza. Minnesota federal courts will be closed that day, in honor of the commemoration proceedings. Judge Richard Gergel, author of “Unexampled Courage,” will join us.

■ On Tuesday, June 16, at the Minneapolis Hilton, Bryan Stevenson and Judge Gergel will speak to us again.

Please mark your calendars to join us as we mark these moments—and as we move forward together. ▲