New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1919.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Including Postage: IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

	One Year.	Six Months.	Three Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$2.50	$1.00
Daily only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75
Sunday only	3.00	1.50	.75	.30
Sunday only, Canada	5.00	2.50	1.25	.50
FOREIGN RATES				
Daily and Sunday	$24.00	$12.00	$6.00	$2.25
Daily only	18.00	9.00	4.50	1.50
Sunday only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

Socialism and the American Schoolboy

One of the most entertaining practices of our Socialist revolutionaries is to wave one copy of the Constitution frantically aloft as a protector of their doings while kicking another copy around the floor like a houn' dog.

Touching the imprisonment of Eugene V. Debs for a violation of the espionage act, one local advocate of "the revolution," *The Call*, fairly froths with passionate words about "free speech." It capitalizes the final words of Debs: "I enter the prison doors a flaming revolutionist—my head erect, my spirit untamed and my soul unconquered." And it makes the interesting point that this incarceration of April 13 occurred on "the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, which began the American Revolution for Independence."

This is all very pretty—as pretty as it is inconsistent. The persuasive power exerted by a flaming revolutionist who argues glibly about his constitutional rights cannot in the nature of things be great. And in this case, as ever, the eloquent Socialist revolutionary making the appeal to old Americanism reveals an unfortunate lack of acquaintance with his facts. American free speech was never designed to protect such inflammatory incitements as those of our Reds. It never meant the sort of license to advocate riot and disorder in which our radical Socialists specialize. Least of all was it designed to hobble the government in time of war and prevent it from taking the steps necessary to self-preservation. Our radicals are fond of quoting Lincoln, but they never mention the fact that he closed down *The New York World* for two days for printing a forged proclamation in war time.

The truth is that Mr. David Karsner, who writes so feelingly in *The Call* of American free speech and the Battle of Lexington, has only a smattering of true Americanism. He has the phrases on his tongue, but nothing of true, historic Americanism in his mind or heart. It is a small matter, but he even blunders in his date for the Battle of Lexington, which was not fought on April 13, as Mr. Karsner seems to think, but on April 19, as any American schoolboy can tell him.

We make the suggestion for what it is worth, but wouldn't it help the revolutionaries and keep them from getting quite so red in the face with vexation at American workingmen for refusing to follow the light if they took a grammar school course in American history and avoided obvious blunders by learning a few elemental notions about America, past and present? Or would that prevent them from being radicals at all?

The Manacled Eighty

The eighty members of the Assembly who attended the Sweet caucus and agreed not to permit the health insurance bill or the other welfare measures to come to a vote list themselves as Republicans, but obviously they are little interested in the success of the party.

The statement of Speaker Sweet in behalf of the eighty is impudent. This statement says that the eighty "refuse to be browbeaten or blackmailed into supporting a programme which we believe to be a violation of the fundamental principles of Republicanism." Who gave Speaker Sweet authority so to speak? When was conferred on him a right to define the party's position? Health insurance has not been a partisan issue; it is, therefore, not one properly the subject of a party caucus.

The Republican party has taken great pride in advertising its part in the enactment of the workmen's compensation act, which is based on principles similar to those of the [illegible] bill. The two measures [illegible] for [illegible] Republican who has vision enough to see beyond the [illegible] of a county is for health insurance.

The Assembly has before it a chance to identify itself with the enactment of a great measure of social betterment. It will not only save lives and lessen misery, but will add to the wealth of the state by conserving individual efficiency. Wherever tried the system has more than paid for itself by adding to the working days of the worker. The testimony to this is overwhelming in volume, and intelligent employers as well as intelligent employes are [illegible].

The decree of the Sweet caucus is not binding. Political prudence, humanitarian sympathies and economic intelligence alike demand that the Assembly autocracy be smashed.

Here's No Relief

The proposal to limit the tax levy on real estate to 2 per cent has been reported as part of the revenue bill at Albany, and there is possibility of its passage.

The rider means a loss of $18,000,000 in the revenue of the city, and this involves the imposition of other taxes to an equal amount. The New York rent payer is uneasy. He is agitating for a lessening of burdens. Yet it is proposed to relieve the landlords to the extent of $18,000,000 and to get the sum otherwise from the rent payers, who constitute the general public.

Familiar taxation principles teach that taxation of real estate—at least of land—is not paid in a continuing way by a land owner. When a levy is a permanent one a purchaser takes notice and pays less for the property he buys. A new and higher tax level confiscates land values sufficiently to provide a fund which, at interest, produces enough to meet the tax. But, hit once, the land owner is not hit again. Conversely, when the new level is lower the land owner finds the value of his holdings added to.

An expert like Professor Seligman, applying the principles expounded in his "Incidence of Taxation," would estimate that the capital gift to the land owners of the city through a permanent decrease of $18,000,000 a year in taxation would be something like $360,000,000. Does justice require that a present of such magnitude be made to the land owners of the city?

All a Friend Claims

Concerning the covenant Walter Lippmann, collator of the data Colonel House took to Europe, may be assumed to speak with some authority. It is therefore interesting to note his claims for the instrument.

In Mr. Lippmann's analysis, published since his return from Paris, it appears that he mentions but one affirmative or substantive thing provided by it, and this is it:

> "They (the covenant writers) provided, therefore, first of all for the presence in one city of men who can speak for the governments."

This is the only claim of specific merit. Nothing else is mentioned. There is no second item. The delegates, or ambassadors, are to assemble at one place and to transact business face to face instead of through embassies as now, with more or less criss-cross correspondence and opportunity for misunderstanding. By failing to speak of any other good thing Mr. Lippmann implies that this unifying of diplomacy is the only definite gain the covenant brings. His sense of candor, a candor which others might imitate, prevents his making any other or larger claim.

It may be of benefit to have the ambassadors under one roof, but the history of European congresses, with their temporary coming together of ambassadors, does not suggest any diminution of intrigue. Home office diplomacy has a bad name, but not so bad as congress diplomacy. Vienna, Aix la Chapelle, Berlin—these are not savory names, yet at these places ambassadors met face to face. If there is advantage in rapidity of counsel at a joint meeting, there is more opportunity for the whispered and unrecorded word. Note writing may not be wholly admirable, but to put things down in black and white with the certainty that some day they will be published is sobering.

But granted that it is well to have a Delphi, as the Greek world had one, surely it is torturing language to call an agreement to send ambassadors to one place a league to enforce peace. If the designation of a common meeting place is all there is to the covenant the great hope of the world is fed on a meagre diet. Something more than this was expected by those who prayed for institutions of peace. A highfaluting preamble does not meet the demand for a world machine that would give vitality to the words "Never again!" An ambassadorial council holds out no promise of disarmament and of assured peace.

The Proletarian Illusion

Bolshevism purposes the abolition of nations and a universal extension of the class war, as it is called; the extinction of democracy, with its equality of individual right of unhindered personal development, through the forcible establishment of the rule of a minority, functioning through an autocrat; on the economic side it purposes carrying on industry through a militaristic organization whose chiefs shall give orders to [illegible].

[illegible] In its machinery Bolshevism is autocratic, for regimentation is indispensable to it.

Under Bolshevist rule directing power, as in Russia to-day, is not with the masses, but with a new aristocracy of self-appointed intellectuals. Lenine and Trotzky are not workers. American Bolshevists are notoriously non-workers, or those whose preference is strong for intellectual labor. The Russian intellectual of a special type has taken the seat of the Russian [illegible]—this is the Bolshevist revolution. Lenine acknowledged this when he [illegible] the rulership of 100,000 class-conscious intellectuals for the rulership of 100,000 oldtime aristocrats.

The best sterilization against Bolshevism is accurate and truthful descriptions of its effects. If it has reduced Russia in eighteen months from conditions of relative plenty to the edges of starvation (and that it has Lenine admits when he begs for food), what would be the effect in countries of less ample food supplies? Rioters would, of course, be able to seize and gorge for a few days on such supplies as exist, but what then? Crops are not raised by passing resolutions. Perhaps the best way to cure Germany of Bolshevism is to let her try it. To try to feed Bolshevism out of a people is clearly folly. If Lenine is able to get the Russian stomachs filled from abroad he will, of course, say: "Have I not taken care of you? Great is Bolshevism, and I am its prophet!"

Patriotism as Imperialism

It may be doubted if President Wilson will appreciate the distinction which *Humanité*, the French Socialist organ, draws between him and the three prime ministers with whom he is in daily consultation. *Humanité* declares that it still thinks highly of him despite his concessions to imperialism. But in the others it can put no trust. "We know what they are worth—they are each for his country, the very incarnation of imperialism."

This is a very clear and simple definition of patriotism, which is being for one's country. Imperialism is its synonyme. The alternative, of course, is internationalism, which is caring for every other country as much as for your own—sometimes, if the words of internationalism be a criterion, rather more than for your own. That is the attitude which *Humanité* would apparently impute to the President.

Mr. Wilson has had ample reason on many occasions to pray to be delivered from his friends. He may well regard this attempted compliment from *Humanité* as anything but complimentary. The picture of the head of the American mission as one who, unlike his colleagues, is not for his country is scarcely engaging.

New York's Side Shows

It is nothing new in the life of our old town, but we do think a word of meek protest is demanded by the tidings that New York is to be one of the freaks at the Methodist Missions' centenary celebration. Traffic policemen, the Statue of Liberty and a near-saloon are among the tidbits of New York's *vie intime* to be exhibited along with igloos and pueblos and other "strange sights and people" from all the world. No doubt a slum and a gunman and the library lions will be added.

What we object to is the statement that of the 250,000 Middle Western spectators who are expected to visit the show at Columbus, Ohio, next June, only a few have ever visited New York or are familiar with these metropolitan mysteries. What we mean to say is that New York holds nothing mysterious or awful or expensive or jazzy which 100 Middle Westerners have not visited for every one New Yorker.

We leave out the hotels as not a fair question. Nobody knows the hotels in his home town—or should know them, that is. We have in mind more legitimate objects of research—"rare and curious," as the book catalogues say—those queer little shops where you can get imitation Russian kettles for only four times what they are worth; that jolly little Italian restaurant where Mr. Caruso is supposed to dine and may even have done so once; the Aquarium; that private dancing club at ———'s, where everybody dances with everybody else and nobody is supposed to be respectable but everybody is. And so on down the row of side shows.

On the word of countless visitors from the Middle West New York is replete with these shows. Once in a decade a New Yorker is caught without an excuse and is led into one of them. But of his own initiative a New Yorker would as soon be shot as visit the Statue of Liberty or go up the Woolworth Tower or eat anywhere except at one or two mild spots where he has learned what can be eaten with a minimum of risk and expense and how to intimidate the hat-check boy into letting him keep his hat and stick it under his chair.

The big show under the big tent is about all New Yorkers have time for, or think they have time for. They miss a lot. But they can always hear about such things from their visiting cousins—or, next June, drop in at the centenary celebration of the Methodist Missions at Columbus and see themselves as the Middle West sees them. Our only protest is as to the wastefulness of this exhibition. Why place before the Middle West what every Middle Westerner knows? Why not have the exhibition [illegible] it would be a thrilling educational novelty?

Reason Enough

(From the Toledo Blade)

[illegible]

Readers Like Happy Endings

(From The Toledo Blade)

One of the things the public never finds out is how the hero and heroine in the novel get along together after marriage.

And Sing Hymns

[illegible]

The Conning Tower

Vale

When you and I were pally
—How long ago it seems!—
We tramped MacDougal Alley
And spoke of life and dreams.
Through all the arts we wended
Our near-bohemian way.
And now the chapter's ended:
You're Someone's fiancée.

For all those sprightly playtimes,
For all our youthful pranks,
For memories of gay times,
Sweet lady, take my thanks.
Life is more fair for brooding
On a dead but lovely hour.
My thanks for all . . . Including
This entrée to the Tower.

ISOSCELES.

Former Senator Bailey speaks of the President's socialistic tendencies, but the Socialists are conscious of no Woodrovian tendency in their direction. Our feeling is that you can't please some of the Socialists all the time, you can't please all of the Socialists some of the time, and you can't please any of the Socialists any of the time.

"'Whom Are You?' Said Cyril"

[From the Herald]

Honolulu has a girl swimmer whom it believes is a coming champion in the sprints.

Still, even so careful a writer of English as the Sun's Mr. F. Ward O'Malley speaks of "a lady whom Secretary Zirald said wore a green and gold lace gown."

BY NO MEANS

Sir: Would it be breaking the rule to say that the type of League the Germans want to set up is 14-pt. Gothic?

A. R. F.

Things are seldom what they seem, as Gilbert lyrically observed. But when the President sends for the George Washington, that, to P. B., seems like Lohengrin sending for his swan.

"Loquacious Man"

(A seven-cornered poker game is in progress and has been for two hours. There are four women and three men. Two of the men are husbands of two of the women; the third is a bachelor who couldn't escape. The women are all winners. The remarks in italics are from the men.)

"A quarter limit makes a sensible game, and no one ever gets hurt unless they have an awful run of luck, and even then not badly. And the best part of it is you don't have to keep your mind on it all the time. Up to me? I'll open for a quarter. Oh, yes, I was telling you she gave me a check for $18 and it came back—no funds."

"Isn't it funny that Chester can't win?—an old-timer like him. Lot of use of my winning. Don't think you can pay me off with a promise, dearie, even if you are my husband. And poor Mr. Squill hasn't had a hand to-night. You raise me? Once more, at you. Call? Three jacks and a pair of nines is all I have."

"That's good."

"Well, unlucky at cards lucky in love, they say, if that's any comfort to you, though for my part I'll take the card luck and run a chance on the love luck. I suppose some one is thinking it's a good thing I'm easily pleased. Oh, I have six cards and I simply refuse to have my hand declared dead. It's too good."

"There are two shy."

"Isn't he the old Aunt Anne? Always croaking about some one being shy. If he ever WON a pot, he MIGHT be interested. Oh, well, I'll be one to come up because I'm such a good winner, though I know I put up once. Anything to keep it a good natured game. Ha! Ha! Ha! Ha! You men all play as if your lives depended upon it. Is it opened? Of course I'm in. Doesn't poker seem silly after an afternoon of Auction? But it IS restful. Up to me? Twenty-five cents more. Only call me? All black, as you men say."

"That's good."

"I'll cash in ten dollars' worth if any one needs chips. Poor Stacey. I certainly have the Indian sign on him. Hasn't beaten me to-night, and once when he had those two pair—remember?—he didn't call and I didn't have a thing. Serves you men right."

"Somebody's shy." AMBROSE GLUTZ.

Repetition wearies the baseball writer, of course, which is why "initial sack," "willow," and similar variants are used. And, according to our own sports page, last Monday's game lasted "1 hour and 60 minutes."

We are willing to bet a quart of Pommard against a glass of wild cherry phosphate that a man who says 1 hour and 60 minutes refers to four tens as two pairs of tens.

Program for a Bolshevik Kindergarten

Singing.
"Robin Redbreast."
Fairy Tales—
"Red Riding Hood"—Anonymous.
"Little Red Shoes"—Andersen.
"Rose Red and Snow White"—Grimm.
Selections from "The Red Fairy Book"—Lang.
[illegible]

[illegible]

Mr. Mencken, in his "The American Language," speaks of the [illegible]

[illegible]

F. P. A.

A PIPE DREAM

The New Allies

By Arthur S. Draper

(London Correspondent of The Tribune)

LONDON, April 5.—War makes strange bedfellows. The Slav and the Latin fight shoulder to shoulder; the Occidental and the Oriental suffer together in the piercing cold of Siberia and occupy adjoining seats at the peace table. Prejudices centuries old have been suppressed and alliances racially, geographically, psychologically impossible have been formed.

Take the recent report of the joint industrial conference which is a direct result of the national industrial conference held here in February. This committee included employers representing great engineering concerns, clothing manufacturers, shipping industries, leather, rubber and pottery works, on one side, and on the other the employes engaged in these and other trades. It was a new departure in British industrial life; it was a revolutionary step taken at a moment of national crisis. On this committee sat men who counted their fortunes in the millions and men who had to make four pounds a week support a family of eight. On the employers' side were three knights and on the workers' two ex-Cabinet ministers and the same number of women.

On the committee capital and labor had equal numerical representation, but when they came to draw the report there was no division. The committee issued a unanimous report. That fact must be borne in mind when reading this recommendation on the question of working hours to the Lloyd George government:

A 48-Hour Working Week

"In regard to hours the committee are unanimous in recommending the principle of a legal maximum of normal hours per week for all employed persons. The number of hours they recommend is forty-eight, but they recognize that this number may be reduced by agreement, and that there are also exceptional cases in which it may be necessary that it should be increased.

"They accordingly suggest that legal sanction should be given to trade agreements for the reduction of hours, and that under certain conditions similar sanction might be given to such agreements for the augmentation of hours. They propose that if there be a desire for variation expressed by one party only a conference should be summoned whose decision should under ordinary circumstances receive legal sanction.

"They have not deemed it possible within the terms at their disposal, nor did they feel competent, to draw up a list of proposed exemptions, but they consider that an interval should elapse after the passing of the act in which applications for exemptions should be made and that inquiry should then take place into each case, and the application of the act should, if necessary, be postponed in any particular case until the completion of such inquiry.

"Thus some occupations may be altogether exempted from the act, while in others the maximum may be varied in either direction by agreement between the parties."

Capital Indorses Step

That is a radical step; it is the biggest advance British labor has made in its long fight. And what makes it especially noteworthy is the fact that British capital indorses the changes without a single dissenting voice. It means a national eight-hour day in a country where for five years the average was nearer ten hours and the maximum often fifteen hours. The second recommendation covered the question of wages, and reads:

"1. Minimum time rates of wages should be established by legal enactment, and should be universally applicable. [illegible]

[illegible]

"4. The commission should review the trade board acts, especially with the object of facilitating and expediting as far as possible the procedure in fixing and applying minimum rates.

"6. The Minister of Labor, on the recommendation of the proposed national industrial council, shall appoint the commission, which shall consist of an equal number of [illegible]

"8. The commission shall give adequate [illegible]

public notice of its proposed findings and shall hear representatives of any trade that may desire to be heard.

"7. Where an agreement is arrived at between representative organizations of employers and trade unions in any trade laying down a minimum rate of wages, the Minister of Labor shall have power, after investigation, to apply such minimum rate, with such modification as he may think fit, to all employes engaged in the trade falling within the scope of the agreement."

Alleviating Unemployment

At the present time the British government is expending more than $5,000,000 a week in unemployment bonuses which range from $3.75 for a woman to $6.25 for a man. The latest figures show that this money is being distributed among 444,277 men, 486,945 women, 26,327 boys and 31,070 girls. Unfortunately, the government believes this number will increase before the reorganization of industrial life has reached the point where the factories can absorb the majority of the workers. It is difficult at this time to estimate what the "minimum" wage will be, but, allowing for the decrease in the cost of living which Mr. Bonar Law rather confidently prophesied a few days ago, it is certain that the figure will be well above the government's present unemployment allowance, which, by the way, continues until the end of the summer.

To alleviate unemployment this industrial committee recommends the cutting down of overtime, the establishment of two shifts; the adoption by the government of a comprehensive housing programme, which would furnish work to a great number of employes and also relieve the present shortage of living accommodations; the state development of new industries, such as afforestation, reclamation of waste lands, and the development of inland waterways.

The End of Child Labor

This paragraph is devoted to the "Limitation of Child Labor":

"The committee are of opinion that child labor is bad in principle and in practice tends to decrease the chances of adult employment. For these reasons, without going into details, the committee think that the age at which a child should enter employment should be raised beyond the present limit" (fourteen years).

Oil Companies' Denial

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The New York Tribune of April 16 has again published a damaging misstatement, attributed to L. J. de Bekker, on the activities of American oil companies in Mexico.

Mr. de Bekker writes: "King Pelaez of the oil fields, . . . commander in chief of the armed force of the oil interests here, is really in serious danger."

This constitutes an accusation that the "oil interests" are supporting a revolution against the government of Mexico recognized by the United States, de facto and de jure. The accusation is absolutely false.

Mr. de Bekker also says: "Having openly employed the Pelaez government to guard their wells against imaginary attack from the Federals, . . . the oil men having maintained Pelaez in revolution against the Federal government, having provided him liberally with money, food and munitions, etc." Nothing could be falser than these assertions. [illegible]

[illegible] Aguilar appeared in the two principal oil-producing companies' camps and demanded the immediate payment from each company of $10,000, threatening in case of refusal to close in the wells. One company, British, refused to pay him this tribute, whereat he closed in the famous Potrero well, which thereupon burst and has since, on account of its condition, turned to water. [illegible] Mr. Lind advised the company to immediately pay the money demanded, which the company did and saved its property.

General Aguilar has since been Minister of Foreign Relations in the Carranza government and is now Governor of the State of Vera Cruz. Pelaez has pursued exactly the same tactics, and if the oil companies have been, as Mr. de Bekker alleged, maintaining Pelaez in revolution, then they also maintained Aguilar in revolution. The cases are absolutely parallel and constitute merely the giving of money to revolutionists to avoid worse disaster.

THE ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF PETROLEUM IN MEXICO.

New York, April 16, 1919.

Callousness Explained

(From George Harvey's Weekly)

ONE of the most significant items of recent news was contained in a dispatch from Brussels, which stated that "President Wilson has postponed his trip to Belgium until after the preliminary peace is signed." In connection therewith it will be recalled that he has made only two very brief and limited excursions to the devastated regions of France, and those by no means to the places most sorely stricken.

In this, it may well be believed, is to be found the explanation of the President's extraordinary lack of sympathy with France and Belgium in their sufferings from the war. His indifference and even his callousness toward those martyr nations has been one of the most amazing features of the whole case. He has been much concerned for the welfare of Germany, that her people should be fed and that they should not be burdened with any crushing indebtedness. But for the French and Belgians, who have suffered immeasurably more than the most vindictive have ever proposed for Germany, he has had few words of sympathy and scarcely a single wholehearted and red-blooded demand for redress.

Of course, his ears have been filled day and night with the insidious pleadings and verbal camouflage of German sympathizers, who are plotting to have Germany so spared from paying the penalty of her crimes that she will soon be able to reassert herself and to renew her attack upon civilization; while France and Belgium have been silent in the dignity and pride of their unparalleled bereavement, assuming that there was no need of specially pleading their cause to any tribunal of humanity.

We might have thought that the President's first impulse on going to Europe would be to see for himself what Belgium and France had suffered. As the former head of a great university, he should have looked upon the piteous ruins of Louvain. As the self-proclaimed champion of the people, catching, as he himself has so eloquently said, "the voices of humanity that are in the air," he should have made his earliest pilgrimages to the scenes where humanity had suffered martyrdom. He was to be a member of the international court which was to adjudge reparation to the injured. Should he not have seen for himself how great the injury had been and therefore how great the reparation should be? Is it not a practice of jurisprudence for the jury to view the scene of the crime?

He did not do so. He would not do so. He had time to travel about the Continent haranguing the multitudes, leading brass bands and throwing kisses to crowds which were acclaiming him as the "god of peace." He had time to argue and to insist that Germany should be permitted to enjoy the generous terms of what would be practically a negotiated peace. But he had no time to visit Belgium. His purpose was and is to pass upon the claims of Belgium without inspecting the grounds for those claims. After he has settled the matter, after he has said to Belgium and France, "You ask too much. Poor Germany could not pay so much without serious deprivation and suffering!" he will make an excursion to Flanders fields, where the poppies grow amid rows of crosses, to see what all the pother has been about.

Perhaps it is wise. Perhaps it is discreet. If he saw what is to be seen in some parts of Northern France and in Belgium, his equanimity might be disturbed. His sympathies might be excited. He might actually feel a righteous indignation against Germany, so that he would join the majority of the civilized world in demanding that the fullest possible reparation be made to the innocent victims of that incomparable criminal, even though the whole race of Huns be bled white for a generation to come.

But it would not do for the President, listening to "the voices of humanity that are in the air," to be thus roused to passion. It might sway his judgment against the Huns, and tempt him to abandon the doctrine of "no indemnities" and even to repudiate his own demand for "peace without victory." So he will prudently postpone his visit to Belgium until after the terms of peace have been prescribed and the treaty has been signed.

And then, what will it matter whether he ever goes thither at all?

When the Saloons Go

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: [illegible]

[illegible]

New York, April 14, 1919.