

New York Tribune

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

TUESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office, 410 Broadway, New York.

Subscription Rates—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Foreign Rates—Daily and Sunday, Daily and Sunday.

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

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.

The Lie.

When Woodrow Wilson on February 12 told the German government that the United States would hold it to "strict accountability" for any infraction of international law resulting in the loss of American life, he said what he did not mean, and he said it to a government which knew he did not mean it.

When the German submarine, acting in obedience to the orders of the German government, sank the Lusitania, taking more than a hundred American lives, it did more than commit a crime; it exposed the sham and the lie of the "strict accountability" note.

After this had happened Mr. Wilson declared that the country was "too proud to fight," and Mr. Bryan hastened to inform the Austrian Ambassador that any words used by the President would be for home political consumption and not for foreign credence.

This is the simple, direct and complete history of American diplomacy with a single exception. In addition to telling Germany what was not true Mr. Wilson continued in his notes to insist that America was defending humanity and vindicating neutral rights.

A very large number of Americans believed this to be true, and for a long time accepted Mr. Wilson's declarations as sincere. Germany never believed it, always knew it was a pretense and always acted in accordance with this belief.

There never was any hope that Mr. Wilson's policy would escape exposure after the Lusitania Massacre, because he had made what was a sham at the outset a reality in the end, if he had dared to act after the Lusitania incident. But this was the last hour of hope for him or for his policy.

When the British fleet had succeeded in disposing of the submarine pest in the British waters Germany used Mr. Wilson's demands as a pretext for covering up a failure. The Germans presented Mr. Wilson with a "moral victory," taking their personal profit in the excuse to their own public that it gave them.

It looked then for a few weeks as if the lie had been mighty and had prevailed. But when it became profitable to the Central Powers to resume submarine operations in the Mediterranean, then all the sham "moral victory" collapsed, and one killing succeeded another.

Meanwhile Austria was perfectly prepared to give Mr. Wilson a verbal victory, an epistolary "moral triumph" at any moment. The Austrians, like the Germans before them, never for a moment considered giving up the practice of submarine murder so long as it was useful, but they were always willing to give Mr. Wilson's plea for abstract rights abstract indorsement.

And the essential thing to remember is that there is not and never has been any reason why the Germans should believe Mr. Wilson desired anything but a "moral victory"; they had his word that he was "too proud to fight," Bryan's assurance that our notes were for home consumption, and they had months of words without action to prove that Mr. Wilson's policy was wholly insincere.

But there is truth in the world; there is justice; the sham and the lie cannot persist; last of all can they endure in a world like our present world in which millions of men and women are giving life and more than life for the truth that is in them and the faith to which they hold. To pretend that the United States was prepared to hold Germany, in arms against half the world, to strict accountability, to hold her by words alone, this was a sorry thing, a foolish and a fatal farce.

One may believe that Germany is right; one may believe she is wrong, but does any one suppose that the nation which broke its faith and backed its way through Belgium to get at a foe would be restrained by words, by weak, futile, insincere words, from striking at Britain by her submarines?

Mr. Wilson gambled with fate, with honor and with American lives. He gambled without other concern than the effect upon his own political fortunes. He spoke bravely to Germany, because he thought brave words would carry, but lest German-American votes might be lost, he and his Secretary of State told Germany, one from the platform, the other privately, that the words had no meaning, save to deceive Americans.

And now the whole cowardly, dishonest, contemptible sham lies in ashes and dust. There is left for American honor abroad neither respect nor regard. Men of all other countries believe that what Mr. Wilson did was representative of what the American people desired. They believe we are all cowardly, selfish, sordid, that Mr. Wilson's dishonest and dishonoring policy was thoroughly representative of America and Americans.

manity, mankind, has sought to maintain neutral rights, or even to defend American lives, is to say that it is utterly false, wholly untrue, a plain, undisguised lie. Only so far as words could do these things have we ventured to do them, and our President and our Secretary of State have told the Germans and Austrians in advance that the words were harmless.

Mr. Wilson's policy has now collapsed. There is left no one save those whose political commitments or pacifist sentiments are controlling who retains the smallest confidence in the courage, the sincerity or the force of American foreign policy. Another note would go beyond even the preposterous and touch the very depths of shameful folly.

It is a matter of very small consequence now whether Mr. Wilson decides to make war, to win back lost national sympathy and support, or decides to continue the course of letter-writing which he has so far pursued. He can neither rescue his own political fortunes nor national honor by either course. His political fortunes are bankrupt. National honor can be regained only when the repudiation of his policy by the whole nation demonstrates that he misrepresented his country.

On the morning of the Lusitania a great and noble opportunity came to Mr. Wilson. He had only to make good his own words to rank with the few Presidents who in great crises have risen to the heights of real patriotism and true statesmanship. But he had not meant his own words, he knew that they were false altogether, and the knowledge left him paralyzed.

We may have more "moral victories," like those of the Arabic and the Ancona, but who will believe them now? Our title as defender of humanity may be written in new Austrian communications punctuated by further killings, but who will trust them? Who in Europe? Who in the United States?

Never in American history has insincerity, sham, selfishness been more remorselessly, fatally exposed than in Mr. Wilson's case. Opportunity, not for service to Americans, but for service to all mankind knocked at his door. He had the power and he had behind him public confidence and public support. What Abraham Lincoln lacked, a united nation, he possessed. His voice could have commanded the millions, and those who refused to follow would have been overwhelmed by those who did.

There was asked of Mr. Wilson not greatness, but honesty, simple sincerity, that he should say what was true and that he should stick to the truth that he said. There was demanded of him only that with simple courage and steady will he should follow the example and the precedent of his great predecessors, who had made America not first, but right.

Instead Mr. Wilson listened to the politicians, who told him that the American people were selfish, that they desired peace at any price, that they would be satisfied with empty pretences and that to keep them out of war would be to win an easy reelection.

Because Mr. Wilson believed this, because he listened to these advisers, Mr. Wilson has brought his country to its present position. This lie has brought the fruits the lie always does bring in a world where men and women continue to give their lives that truth may prevail. The whole episode has been humiliating, saddening, sickening, but apart from the transitory shame it has been a wholesome, an enduring lesson.

Armed Merchant Vessels.

A questionable conclusion has been drawn from one passage in the dispatch received on Sunday from our consul at Alexandria. It is assumed in some quarters that if the Persia was furnished with a 47-inch gun she forfeited whatever immunity a merchant vessel is supposed to be entitled to nowadays. This opinion undoubtedly prevails in Germany, for more than fourteen months ago the German Foreign Office protested against any such provision for active resistance, alleging that it was "contrary to international law, because in a military sense a merchant vessel is not permitted to defend herself against a warship." The point, however, is not so clearly established as the German Foreign Office would have it, and custom is altogether opposed to this assumption.

The confusion is apparently attributable to the existence of two orders of armed merchant vessels. The status of the mercantile auxiliary is, of course, unquestioned. A vessel of this order has been hired or bought by the state, is commissioned as a naval vessel and commanded by naval officers. Sundry vessels have been taken over in this way by the British navy. Obviously the armed auxiliary has no better title to immunity than any other war vessel. But the armed vessel engaged in trade or passenger service belongs to another class, provided the guns are carried only for her own protection.

More than a year before the present war began the sea lords of the British Admiralty decided to advise ship owners to arm their vessels for protection, and this decision was duly announced at the time in the House of Commons. There was some opposition to the proposal from German agents in England, and a few critics smiled derisively at what they regarded as another example of the insane dread of the German boogey. But some ship owners were glad enough to avail themselves of the Admiralty's offer to lend them guns and train their crews.

About the same time there was a meeting of the Institute of International Law at Oxford, and the Germans present protested strongly against what they professed to regard as a dangerous innovation. They were outvoted, however, and, indeed, historical evidence was entirely against them, for in the naval wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was no means an uncommon custom to arm merchant ships for self-defence. It must be remembered that in those

days compulsory convoy was usual. At the outset of every war acts were passed forbidding ships to sail without convoy, and heavy penalties were imposed on those who defied the rules imposed on ship owners. Occasional exceptions were made in favor of armed merchantmen, and there can be no doubt that after compulsory convoy fell into disuse many vessels mounted guns for their own defence. This practice was approved in 1813 by Chief Justice Marshall of the United States Supreme Court and has never been officially condemned in this country.

There can be no doubt that an advantage of a knot or two of speed and one or two quick-firing guns in the stern would save many a vessel from destruction nowadays, and only among Germans is there a common agreement that such self-defence is "not permitted."

The Less Deadly Automobile.

According to the Federal Census Bureau, the deadliness of the automobile is decreasing. In the period 1909-'14 the number of motor cars in use in this country increased more than twice as rapidly as the number of fatalities they caused. For the five-year period there was an increase of 775 per cent in the number of machines, while the fatalities increased 315 per cent. This is due in part, the Census Bureau believes, to the fact that the average annual mileage is being reduced; but "the figures still appear to furnish ample justification for the conclusion that the automobile to-day is being driven with more care and more regard for public safety than it was a few years ago."

That is devoutly to be desired, especially in this city, where death lists mount month by month. Recent compilations of figures indicate that even here the ratio of fatalities to number of cars in use is falling a little, but the total number of deaths in a year is appalling. If the automobile drivers are indeed becoming more careful, their pace in acquiring this regard for the public safety should be accelerated rather than the speed of their machines. Blame for a fatality cannot rest wholly on the driver in every case, but the cases are few indeed where a death would result if the automobilist were driving carefully, with his car under perfect control, and duly obeying all details of the laws.

A Sweeping Victory.

Now confirmation of an old proverb is always welcome, and Mrs. Anthony Cugno has first-hand testimony that "a new broom sweeps clean." But, better still, she has added through her valor and efficiency to the romance and dignity of housework, and for every ennobling of the chores of life the race owes an extra portion of gratitude. The simple story runs about as follows:

Mrs. Cugno, whose husband is described as a well-to-do real estate owner, was nevertheless herself engaged in the preparation of their evening meal. A noise outside the door of their Bronx apartment attracted her attention and she peered into the hallway, to find that three robbers were attacking and badly mauling her husband. She snatched up her new broom, with its stiff straws, and, using both ends indiscriminately, she brushed and jabbed and poked and belabored his assailants into precipitate flight, they stumbling over one another in their mad efforts to reach the street. Mr. Cugno escaped with the minor loss of two teeth.

One hesitates to picture what his loss might have been, however, up to and even including his life, had his good wife, instead of presiding over the gas range, been on her way, say, from the motion picture theatre to the delicatessen store to get a ready-made dinner, or, innocent of the use of such excellent domestic weapons as a new broom, had she been dressing for dinner while an indifferent maid servant spoiled the meal. As it was—but the moral requires no extended search. It reads that one can never know at what moment he may owe much more than a good digestion to the wife who is neither too proud to cook nor to fight.

Anti-German Obstnacy.

It is a cause of great grief to many learned men in Germany that their colleagues abroad are so unreasonable. Some examples of this unreasonableness are dwelt upon with sorrow in a recent medical monthly by Professor August Martin, who confesses that when the war began he was foolish enough to hope that at least among scientific men friendly relations might be maintained. He was mistaken. Even his old colleague, Professor C. Jacobs, of Brussels, had turned against Deutchthum and written at length about atrocities in Belgium and thus contributed to the "incomprehensible agitation against Kultur."

What apparently puzzles Professor Martin is how a Belgian who knows the delightful character of his German neighbors can possibly believe them capable of such villainies as he thinks he witnessed. The same Belgian met many Germans at various international congresses and made many friends. How, then, can he accuse such charming people of doing wrong? That is what Professor Martin cannot comprehend, and it is no answer to say that Professor Jacobs was a medical officer in the Belgian army and wrote only of what he himself saw. Professor Martin is willing to accept the official German denial; why, then, should the Belgian professor continue to believe things he saw when they are questioned by "the highest ecclesiastical authority of Belgium, even the Holy Father himself?"

Reorganization First.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Congressional programme of the "Anti-Militarism Committee" appeals to me as a sound policy of military preparedness. It may be quite American and yet foolish to spend a huge sum of money on an already extremely costly and inadequate establishment, without thoroughly investigating and reorganizing it. I'm sure that it needs reorganization more than enlargement. We do not want to multiply the defects that now exist.

With this preliminary work thoroughly and honestly done, the country would willingly spend any sum for defence that the situation plainly called for. T. J. LLOYD, Bloomington, N. Y., Dec. 23, 1915.

INTELLECTUALLY INSINCERE

A Critic Who Says Americans Are Fired of Cant.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your recent editorial "Where Mr. Wilson Has Failed Us" did not convince or please me. In fact, it has my hearty disapproval. But do not let that worry you. In the language of Dufrenoy, you cannot please every one.

The reason that this sort of declamation ruffles me is that it is obviously insincere. Not morally insincere, but intellectually insincere. You do not come out and say what you want. You obscure the issue with a fog of fine words.

Do you want the United States to go to war with Germany?

If so, declare yourselves!

Do you want us to make war on Germany because you think Germany should be beaten to a frazzle, and because your heart is with the Allies?

If so, state your motives! Don't try to befuddle any one into the notion that the United States is justified in going to war with the Central Powers for the protection of neutral rights. You are too intelligent to believe that. See here! Has our neutrality been interpreted in any way that has offered aid or succor to the Central Powers? Is our neutrality anything but highly "benevolent" toward the Allies? By our stupendous shipments of munitions of war and by our loans of money, we have not left a single German unconvinced that the United States is a virtual enemy of his country.

What more do you want? England has, in a legal sense, invaded our rights as flagrantly as Germany and Austria. Of course, you condone England's invasions as resulting in merely commercial and economic damage. But don't forget that the Fathers, whom you laud so highly, fought the Revolution over a stamp tax. You have read Mr. Edwin J. Clapp. Well, has the administration called England and France sharply to account? Have you heard any threats when England killed our trade, opened our mails, seized our citizens? Have you heard of any prosecutions of British agents for recruiting in this country? Contrast our supine attitude toward the Allies with the relentless hounding of Germany agents for every little technical violation of neutral rights, and with the grand thunder of our important violations. Every time the British have trampled on us the administration has said:

"My dear fellow, can't you see that you are quite wrong?"

Every time the Germans have trampled on us the administration has said:

"You damned ruffian, quit that, instantly!"

What more could you ask?

What do you want, anyway? A diplomatic break with Austria and Germany? If a break occurs you will lead it to-day, and to-morrow condemn it as ineffective and futile. If you want action, real action, you want war. Why not say so?

And your reasons are as important as your object. If we go to war over neutral rights we shall have to fight both sides at once. That means preparedness in earnest! Or we shall fight by the side of allies whose interpretation of sea law is no more acceptable to us than that of our foes. In any event to go to war over our "rights" would be non-sensical. It would accomplish nothing at what a cost! The one big point about neutral rights is simply this (a point you do mention): that neither side has offered an honest offence. We have simply been caught between the firing lines, and we have been both covered by fear, blinded by hate. They are every weapon against each other they can, legitimate or not, legal or not. Neutrals are simply innocent. Neutrals must be neutral, not be dancing perpetually on the edge of war.

So leave American rights out of it. If you want us to intervene in a European war, it is because of your opinion of the European situation, not because of it. They have sicken of "humanity" at every breath. My main objection to your manner of argument is that you are too whipliner Wilson. You are tremendously ethical. You prate about justice, democracy, liberty, ideals and civilization. Get off that stuff!

Americans are tired of big words, of grandiose bluster, of cant. They have sickened of the moral pose of either side. As you know full well, the vast majority of Americans who live more than ten miles from the Atlantic Ocean have concluded that this is a selfish imperialistic war from top to bottom, and no concern of theirs. If you differ from them, say so straight from the shoulder, and tell precisely why you differ. With your fanatic Anglophilic prejudices I cannot expect you to be fair. At least be candid. ROLAND RUGINS, Ithaca, N. Y., Dec. 31, 1915.

A Break Would Help.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In the early part of the war I wrote a letter, which appeared prominently in The Tribune, calling attention to the unpreparedness of America in regard to her defenses and calling on all Americans to awake to the situation.

Since that period a great many prominent people have come forward and expressed themselves, but it is my belief that the situation is so critical that every one should speak out who has the interest of our country at heart.

Uncertainty is the greatest enemy of peace. While Congress is "shilly-shallying" the kneel of America may strike. Something should be done to bring "the ball to a head." Like all other true Americans my heart and soul have beat and seethed for, it seems, an eternity under results and wrongs, too numerous to mention, from the "Lusitania affair" to the "Ancona sinking," before and after and in between.

If Congress gives intimation of hesitancy in regard to preparedness for defence of America at this crucial moment, for the sake of America it is not better to break off "diplomatic relations" with any nation or nations hampering us, which would give us two safe years to prepare for our defence.

This would simplify the matter and we would get defence automatically, and not waste a hundred million dollars to offset for sign money spent like water to block off planes or pay tribute and blackmail to alleged Americans—secondaries in this country, who will hold us up in an out of Congress. It is not better to grasp the nettle firmly and be done with it, instead of being stung to death by "tailless" handling of the situation. GEORGE L. UPHUIE, New York, Dec. 20, 1915.

Reorganization First.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Congressional programme of the "Anti-Militarism Committee" appeals to me as a sound policy of military preparedness. It may be quite American and yet foolish to spend a huge sum of money on an already extremely costly and inadequate establishment, without thoroughly investigating and reorganizing it. I'm sure that it needs reorganization more than enlargement. We do not want to multiply the defects that now exist.

With this preliminary work thoroughly and honestly done, the country would willingly spend any sum for defence that the situation plainly called for. T. J. LLOYD, Bloomington, N. Y., Dec. 23, 1915.



DISHONORING GREELEY

A Protest Against Removal of His Statue to Battery Park.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I read with warm sympathy the eloquent and touching appeal of Mrs. Gabrielle Greeley Clendenen against the proposed removal of her father's statue from in front of the Tribune Building to Battery Park.

I agree with her that such removal would not only dishonor the memory of a great man but would be a public misfortune.

The statue of Horace Greeley should remain in or in the near vicinity of Printing House Square. If it is in the way of traffic in its present position it could be moved across the way into City Hall Square, in the neighborhood of Franklin's statue. As the memorial of a great and representative American, to say nothing of its value as a work of art, it deserves the best place New York City can give it. To take it out of its present appropriate environment and relegate it to an obscure and unrequented park seems like vandalism.

Who has a better claim on the affectionate remembrance of his fellow countrymen than Horace Greeley? His daughter modestly disclaims for him a place in the Hall of Fame, but, according to any true criterion of greatness, who is more worthy of being enshrined in the American pantheon? In intellectual power, in nobility and generosity of soul, in the unselfish consecration of all his energies to the service of his fellow men, in the mighty influence which he wielded in his day in moulding the opinions and shaping the lives of his countrymen, what American can claim precedence over Horace Greeley?

In my boyhood Horace Greeley was revered as one of the greatest and best of men. I never believed that I should live to see a day when his memory was dishonored and his services were forgotten. PORT JERVIS, N. Y., Dec. 28, 1915.

A Music Lover's Protest.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: As a lover of music, please allow me to express my heartfelt protest against the conditions prevailing in our most venerable musical institution, the Metropolitan Opera House.

I have not the means to spend more than \$1 for a seat, and as the cheaper seats are gobbled up by speculators days ahead of the performance the only way left open is to wait in line more than an hour to buy an admission. So I did at the last performance of "Marta." I had taken a vintage position in the family circle, but I did not know the usher was to be paid an additional fee for allowing me to view the performance. I was insulted and threatened to be thrown out of the theatre, and was finally forced to leave my place for another.

Does the management of the Metropolitan Opera House know of these disgraceful conditions prevailing in their playhouse? It is about time that adequate means were taken to do away with these despicable methods. A STUDENT OF MUSIC, New York, Dec. 29, 1915.

Honor Systems Fail.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In answer to the letter of inquiry about the honor system in colleges, I beg to state my disagreement with the popular idea that it is a success. I am a graduate of a small college for men in Eastern Pennsylvania, where the honor system was tried and discarded. As editor in chief of the college weekly and secretary of the student council I was able to note the workings of the system in our own and other colleges.

Our experience was that the studious ones were not benefited by it, and the ignorant took advantage of the opportunity for unfair work. Informing about "cribbing" was unfashionable and unspportsmanlike. The honor system was revoked at the request of the better element of students after several years' trial.

In some colleges (such as Lehigh) various classes or groups in a department take examinations under the honor system. Each class determines its attitude on the matter separately. OF THE SUCCESS OF THIS METHOD I am uninformd. WILLIAM L. WERNER, Pottsville, Penn., Dec. 14, 1915.

Lusitania Already Forgotten.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In your leading editorial to-day you say that the President may be trying to "force the people into forgetting the Lusitania deed." To my mind this would be entirely unnecessary. Those dead are long since forgotten by the mass of the people, especially those away from the coast. Where they are remembered it is as victims of a belligerent when passage on a neutral ship was obtainable, and unpatristically risking the dragging of their country into war for the sake of avenging their injury.

Ask the average citizen whether he would be willing to enlist in a war to avenge the sinking of the Lusitania, and he will probably ask you what the United States is an international police force? No. The Lusitania is being gradually forgotten, and the President is truly representative when he refuses to involve us in war over an issue for which the great mass of us care nothing.

If the Americans lost had been millions, would the protest have gone even as far as it did? The memory of a munitions newspaper is singularly long on these matters. WILLIAM L. WERNER, Pottsville, Penn., Dec. 14, 1915.

A Guard's Complaint.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: With regard to the recent increase in pay for Interborough employees, it would be very interesting to know why the company advanced every man in the service 10 cents a day except the guards, who, having served the company faithfully for a period of from five to fifteen years, receive only 5 cents a day, while new men just entering the service get 10 cents increase.

This caused great dissatisfaction among the older service men. It might also be interesting to know why a guard of five or more years' service with the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company is worth 25 cents a day more than a guard of the same service with the I. R. T. The highest I. R. T. pay is 23 1/2 cents an hour, and the B. R. T. pay is 26 cents an hour.

This question is left open for us to guess, and we must assume that it is all needed to pay large dividends, while the subway guard sets his ribs shivered through his backbone. NEW YORK, DEC. 30, 1915. A GUARD.

Will Republicans Bootlick Kaiser?

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The writer, who preaches and preaches America first, is a Democrat. I am little interested in whether "they" want Roosevelt or not. But as one who has a fair knowledge of history and political currents I want to predict that no man will be accepted by this country eleven months from now who does not declare that to him the Lusitania is not a "closed incident."

Fleeing his pledge to these "American" men, women and children who deserve the sympathy and support of a united nation, some far what they were, others in spite of what they were—Mr. Wilson mistook his compromise with murder.

(1) It must be reiterated from the "Vossische Zeitung," of Berlin, that the sinking of the Lusitania leaves no stain on German honor.

(2) The last ultimatum that was sent in July is still unanswered.

(3) The note to England was published the day on which twenty German professors issued a statement defending as honest and upright the unspeakable Lusitania atrocity.

As yet only the recognized leader of the dull Moose has expressed his sentiment concerning the Lusitania murders. The Democratic leaders have kept silent, in deference to their should-be spokesmen. Will the Republicans continue to lick the Kaiser's heels? A. G. ARTHUR, Brooklyn, Dec. 21, 1915.

"THE BOURBONS."

What Every True Republican Should Know Now.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I am a regular reader of The Tribune, and I would not be true to my better instincts if I did not send you a few words of commendation for the admirable Americanism expressed in your editorial columns. In these days that try men's souls it is refreshing to pick up one newspaper that is so sane, so courageous, so truthful and voices with such precision the deepest convictions of all true Americans.

It would be hard for me to make a selection from your editorials and label them "best"—all of them are excellent. However, I want to point to only two which are especially timely and convincing: "Do They Want Roosevelt?" and "The Bourbons." In the former you have told a glaring truth, which thousands feel but have not expressed, except in a closet, with the door shut. For months there has been a growing mistrust of Wilson and his administration. Men are becoming ashamed to be called Americans. It is fearful to gaze on the Stars and Stripes and see that it is soiled by being dragged in the trail of Wilsonian stupidity and cowardice. Thoughtful men are wondering what the end will be. They are looking around for some one who can lead us through the troublesome days that are before us, restore our self-respect and reestablish an America that will pristin the admiration of the world and not its contempt. I heartily agree with you that America has one man that can do it—Theodore Roosevelt.

In "The Bourbons" you have said what every true Republican must know. I feel sorry for men who never learn anything, even from bitter experience. The men who went into the Progressive party in 1912 had some justification for their disgust with the Republican bosses. Thousands of those who stayed in the old party were as much disgusted, but thought best not to pull out their noses. How must Progressives, how must true Republicans, how must all thoughtful men of all parties feel when they see this heavy of political buzzards lighting in Washington to lay plans for further preying on the vitals of the people? Can the Republican party offer anything to America with such men as the party's head? Can any self-respecting man stand with them? Can the Progressives repose on the huzardly bosom of the men from whom they fled in 1912? We think not.

I hope Providence will spare you many years in which you will continue your noble work of keeping America free from foreign corruption and venom and from domestic stupidity and weakness. H. T. EINSTEIN, New River Depot, Va., Dec. 18, 1915.

Boy Scouts and Education.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I understand that an organization is trying to raise a sum of \$200,000 toward the Boy Scout movement. The majority of the Boy Scouts are between nine and fourteen years of age. In time of war they would not count a snap of benefit.

If the \$200,000 could be spent toward educational institutions, every grown-up would be fit for military duty, regardless of the fact that he did not hold a gun at the age of nine. While the Boy Scout movement is an honorable one, yet it does not maintain any fundamental education. STIMUND REICHTHAL, New York, Dec. 28, 1915.

Will Republicans Bootlick Kaiser?

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The writer, who preaches and preaches America first, is a Democrat. I am little interested in whether "they" want Roosevelt or not. But as one who has a fair knowledge of history and political currents I want to predict that no man will be accepted by this country eleven months from now who does not declare that to him the Lusitania is not a "closed incident."

Fleeing his pledge to these "American" men, women and children who deserve the sympathy and support of a united nation, some far what they were, others in spite of what they were—Mr. Wilson mistook his compromise with murder.

(1) It must be reiterated from the "Vossische Zeitung," of Berlin, that the sinking of the Lusitania leaves no stain on German honor.

(2) The last ultimatum that was sent in July is still unanswered.

(3) The note to England was published the day on which twenty German professors issued a statement defending as honest and upright the unspeakable Lusitania atrocity.

As yet only the recognized leader of the dull Moose has expressed his sentiment concerning the Lusitania murders. The Democratic leaders have kept silent, in deference to their should-be spokesmen. Will the Republicans continue to lick the Kaiser's heels? A. G. ARTHUR, Brooklyn, Dec. 21, 1915.