

New York Tribune.

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

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 125 West Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside New York City.

Foreign Rates: Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$ 7.50; 3 mos. \$ 21.00; 6 mos. \$ 39.00; 1 year \$ 72.00.

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

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety...

Conscription in Britain.

The national registration bill introduced in the British House of Commons by Walter Hume Long, the President of the Local Government Board, is not admittedly a forerunner of military conscription.

Mr. Long said in the House of Commons that his bill was designed to provide the machinery which could procure the maximum output at a minimum cost.

This prejudice against the compulsory utilization of a nation's resources in labor or in fighting material is peculiarly British. It is in no way an outcropping of the democratic spirit struggling against an over-centralization of power in the hands of the government.

There is, of course, a certain amount of objection to conscription from a purely military point of view. Mr. Hilaire Belloc, a very competent military critic, has clearly stated the arguments against as well as in favor of compulsory enlistment.

But if it is conceded that the war may continue for two years longer, then the entire military resources of the kingdom are likely to be severely taxed and it would be only wise foresight to call out every man, within certain age limitations, who is fit to bear arms.

Germany has been successful so far because she has utilized her strength to much better advantage than the Allies have as yet been able to do. In order to defeat Germany the Allies will have to take war as seriously as she has taken it—which means that each of the allied governments must assume absolute control of all disposable resources in men and material.

When Prizefighters Are Bad.

Superintendent Riley of the State Prison Department has ordered Warden Osborne of Sing Sing to prevent the Slugging Ching—Battling Ryan prizefight, scheduled for July 4, from being held.

prizefighters and shares in their gains to the extent of 5 per cent of the gross receipts of each fight. If prizefighters are good, healthful, moral entertainment for the general populace, why not for the men in Sing Sing, who can enjoy a baseball game just as much as men outside the walls? If prizefighters are too bad for convicts, are they not too bad for the young men who do the useful and honorable work of the land? There appears to be a puzzle here. Maybe the Constitutional Convention, which has before it Mr. Quigg's proposal to ban all prizefighters, can settle the question.

The Sinking of the Armenian.

With the meagre information now at hand it is impossible to tell how nearly classifiable with the Palaba and Lusitania cases is the sinking by a German submarine of the steamship Armenian.

The Armenian was a British vessel carrying a cargo of mules from Newport News to England. Some American citizens were employed to look after the animals, and if they were not on a vessel chartered by the British government and operated by it as a military transport, they were entitled to the same protection from our government as the American passengers on the Lusitania were. Mules are contraband of war. But the Lusitania also carried contraband. That fact alone could not affect the obligation resting on the commander of the attacking submarine to observe the ordinary rules of search and to abstain from sinking the vessel until the lives of the non-combatants on board her were safeguarded.

If the Armenian was not a genuine unarmed merchant ship but a transport in the military service of Great Britain, the principles insisted on by the United States in the Lusitania and Falaba cases would not apply. She would be subject to attack under the same conditions as any other enemy vessel in actual military use.

Another obscenity in this case needs to be cleared up. If the Armenian was an unarmed merchantman, and, nevertheless, failed to heed the submarine commander's signal to stop, she could be lawfully torpedoed without further warning. The report of the American Consul at Bristol contains a sentence which says that the Marconi wireless room on the Armenian was destroyed at the second shot—presumably of a rapid fire gun on the submarine. This may indicate that the Armenian tried to run away instead of heaving to for search.

The case may or may not dangerously aggravate our present diplomatic dispute with Germany. But it emphasizes the necessity of obtaining direct and conclusive assurances from Germany respecting the rights of Americans passing through the "war zone" on merchant ships flying the flags of Germany's enemies. The sponsor we obtain such assurances the better. And the ampler the preparation we make to defend our rights, if they are trampled upon, the more impregnable and self-respecting our position as a neutral will be.

O'Donovan Rossa.

Ireland to-day has no rebels who can properly be likened to O'Donovan Rossa. He was of another generation, living and fighting under the conditions of his own time, and the type he represented is extinct. It is true that a few parasitic creatures of those days survive in this country, but it would be an affront to the memory of the valiant and desperate old revolutionist to associate his name with the blatant, noisy, but essentially mean-spirited little group of quasi-Irishmen who still endeavor to work up the symptoms of a dangerous patriotism without in any manner endangering their own ease.

It is difficult to determine precisely to what extent O'Donovan and his associates influenced the history of their country, but if for a while they made it hard for the more discreet sort to bring about better conditions by reason and persuasion, it can hardly be doubted that they did much toward stirring the English out of that easy complacency with which they were wont to treat all matters relating to the government of Ireland. O'Donovan had no faith at all in parliamentary activities: he was for dynamite and all manner of violence. "England has proclaimed war against me," he said, "and, so help me God, I will wage war against her until she is stricken to her knees or till I am stricken to my grave." If he did not fulfil his threat it was doubtless because he was shrewd enough to see that the farm of agitation in which he was engaged for a great part of his life could not conveniently be carried much further.

It is at least certain that he was never beaten or in any way cowed by his enemy. The impotence of the government was shown in a succession of attempts to silence him and break his spirit. We have seen something of the same kind since then in the case of Mrs. Pankhurst and her followers. In both cases those in authority were helpless, and extremely, almost ludicrously, perplexed. O'Donovan Rossa was not to be disciplined and his sojourn in prison was turned to account by his friends in such sort as to lead to something in the nature of a public scandal. In the event the authorities were glad to release him on the understanding that he would spend the remainder of his days in foreign parts. It is not unnatural, perhaps, that his emigration to England came to be a sort of obsession. When he was shot a few years later by an insane English woman nothing

could persuade him that she was not an agent of the British government. Similar delusions of persecution have been manifested by other fanatics, as Sir Roger Casement, for instance, in recent days, and there are always some simple folk who share in them.

When O'Donovan Rossa went back to his native country, not many years ago, he found that popular sentiment had undergone a vast change. It is said that on his return he confided his disappointment to one of his cronies, declaring that Ireland was "going to the bad." He found, of course, that the conditions he had known were virtually obsolete, and doubtless he was too old to adapt himself to the new conditions. The tradition he understood is still carried on in travesty by clownish weaklings in this country, but every day the breach grows wider between the real Irish and the professional Irish-American.

New York's Bond Issue.

New York City must pay more for the money which it borrows because Europe is at war. This seems to be the rational explanation of the comparatively low price received by the city for its issue of \$71,000,000 in bonds. The city's credit has not suffered materially from the attacks upon it by those whom Controller Prendergast calls "municipal vampires"; indeed, it may be considered to have been strengthened relatively by the weakening of European credits. But the world's reservoir of capital is international. The belligerents are tapping it to the tune of \$50,000,000 or more daily, and even so good a security as Father Knickerbocker offers encounters, therefore, a reduced price.

The almost simultaneous offer by the British government of a flat rate of 4 1/2 per cent on its huge new war loan naturally impels one to compare the two situations. We find New York paying 4.437 per cent, .073 per cent less than Great Britain, although last November the latter paid only 4 per cent, while in the previous April New York had paid 4.18 per cent. In other words, the rate at which England has been borrowing has been rising much more sharply than in the case of New York. And as the price of New York bonds is considered a good index of the prevailing rate of interest on capital throughout the United States it may be inferred that in general American credits are strengthening by comparison with British.

The discrepancy seems bound to grow. When, presently, the British government enters the money market for another billion it may be compelled to pay 5 per cent. The interest rate on this side will probably rise in the interval, too, but, provided the United States remains neutral, at nothing like the same rate. For, while the unprecedented destruction of capital impoverishes the whole world, its loss will fall more lightly upon the peaceful than upon belligerents, in partial proof of the prophecy that "the meek shall inherit the earth."

HAS BRYAN STEPPED INTO OBLIVION?

Chauncey M. Depew in the Current Issue of 'Leslie's Weekly.'

For the two years and a half during which Mr. Bryan held the office of Secretary of State at Washington our government showed itself singularly indifferent to the rights of American citizens in foreign countries and, in a way, hostile to their moving in other lands and establishing themselves there in business. What little encouragement had been given to these enterprising Americans by previous administrations was contemptuously styled "dollar diplomacy."

I do not want to do any injustice, but I have been told by several who have appealed to the State Department that they had been received coldly and practically informed that the place for an American was in his own country and that when he went to a foreign country and established himself there in business he did so at his own risk. Unless the old Roman doctrine becomes the established rule of the United States and unless the American flag means as much to the American citizen who is doing business in foreign countries as the British or the German flag does to the subjects of those countries in foreign lands, our congresses and conventions with the representatives of those countries for the purpose of promoting trade and intercommunication have no practical value, but are only interesting and entertaining opportunities for exhibition of the rainbow and Aurora Borealis of international oratory.

Now comes the resignation of Mr. Bryan. When one has reached my time of life and been active in affairs from the time he reached his majority, precedent and historical parallels grate in his mind. In the Mexican War, in the war between the states, in the Spanish War, the actions and sentiments of the people have always been the same. They rally round their President. They do this without regard to party affiliations or approval or disapproval of his other policies, measures and administrative acts. The President represents for the time being the honor and integrity, the rights and safety of the country. The people trust him absolutely on this question of the war and rally with unanimity, patriotism and heroism to his support. They brush aside with impatience and anger any effort, even from their greatest idol, which they think may embarrass him. I remember as if it were yesterday when Horatio Seymour, one of the ablest and most brilliant statesmen of his period, who had carried the State of New York and been elected Governor, declared against Lincoln's emancipation proclamation and other drastic movements to prosecute the war. Governor Seymour believed the policies of Lincoln subversive of the Constitution, of the American flag and of the liberty of the individual. He was defeated for Governor and subsequently for President. The views which he advocated had been the doctrines taught him by a Democratic father and which had practically governed the country almost since its organization. But in the minds of the people they were obstructions to what they believed to be the President's purpose.

So now, when American ships have been torpedoed and sunk, and American men, women and children are fighting and dying on the ocean have been killed, the reasons given at length by Mr. Bryan for his resignation have no weight. They are carefully but regrettably read. Peace and platitudes, side-stepping the facts, other possible considerations, near or remote, do not for a moment obscure or divert American opinion. It goes directly to the mark like a bullet from the side of a frontiersman of the Revolution. The President has stated the American position and the American demand, and impatient of argument or delay the people solidly support the President.

'NEUTRALITY ORGANIZATION'

Its Inspiration and Purposes Not Strictly Neutral.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Referring to the letter of Miss Marion Kingsbury in your issue of the 22d inst. under the caption "Not Subsidized," it is only doing the ladies who are engaged in the peace propaganda simple justice to exonerate them from the charge of mercenary motives; but there are many sides to this question which they either completely ignore or view only from that particular angle of observation which offers the most agreeable perspective.

While the subscriber would like to be chivalrous and give the women of the society which is euphemistically but inaptly styled the "Neutrality Organization" credit for good intentions, he cannot be convinced that this movement is wholly altruistic or even inspired solely by a love for peace per se; for if we glance at the names of those most prominent in the agitation to place an embargo on the sale of arms and ammunition we find the preponderating majority bearing patronymics that are undoubtedly Teutonic. The head of the organization known as the American Humanity League is a German woman who makes no secret of the motives which prompt her to lead this society of pseudo-philanthropic pacifists; for she expressly declares that "as Germany is bound to win, it is not better that she should win in a year or two sooner?"

The smug complacency with which our Teutonic friends predict the triumph of the central empires is quite in keeping with the absurd and extravagant claims which their compatriots at home have been making since the outbreak of this conflict, while their attempts to put a "moral" complexion on the embargo movement is the most audacious proposition yet injected into a contest made horrible and bitter not only by the magnitude of its scope and the frightfulness of the methods employed but by the attitude of many German-Americans, who would, as it were, capitalize their citizenship in order to pull Germany's chestnuts out of the fire, incidentally depriving thousands of men engaged in manufacturing arms and ammunition of a form of employment which, if a legitimate form of industry in times of peace, cannot by any recognized process of reasoning be made unlawful now simply because a greater quantity is needed; but it would appear useless to argue with people so invincibly and hopelessly prejudiced that they refer to their "brave" soldiers as the victims of American munitions, just as if bravery or heroism were a German trait exclusively.

If the movement to stop the sale of arms and ammunition had been inaugurated while Germany had several warships patrolling the seas, and in a position to harass the Allies and capture a large quantity of the ammunition which England is obtaining here, the "Neutrality Organization" might be credited with pursuing a disinterested and even humane policy, but as England has practically engaged Germany hors de combat as far as naval engagements are concerned this movement to place an embargo on the shipment of ammunition, although ostensibly started in the cause of humanity, is in reality an attempt to overcome the handicap which Germany is laboring under. It is amazing that a people who claim such a large number of intellectual men as belonging to their race should at the same time be so woefully lacking in perspicacity or intuition as to fail utterly to realize that a very large proportion of our citizens are, by God's benignity, still in full possession of their mental faculties.

It has been said by way of extenuating the atrocities in Belgium that Germany is "fighting for her life," a statement which is true in a sense, for having violated every law both human and divine she has made of herself a pariah among the nations, and holds the unenviable position of being in a national sense what a Biblical character was in a social sense, his "hand against every man and every man's hand against him."

First Aid to Merchant Marine.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: A few days ago I read in The Tribune that the Pacific Mail Steamship Company was about to go out of business, because it could not compete with the subsidized steamships of Japan. This would mean that the Stars and Stripes would disappear from the Pacific Ocean.

Something must be done by the people of the United States to avert this disgrace. The flag of the United States must not disappear from the Pacific. Since our government has been remiss in this matter, I would suggest that 200,000 citizens subscribe \$100 each, the total amount to be devoted to the interest of the shipping industry of this country. As far as dividends on the \$20,000,000 thus subscribed are concerned, I think the subscribers would waive all claims to same, provided the Stars and Stripes could be kept on the oceans of the world. GEORGE W. WAGNER, New York, June 28, 1915.

Thumbs Down for Caveat Emptor.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I trust that the holy blows which the Intrepid Adams is giving to caveat emptor will prove fatal to that anomalous relic of the Middle Ages. Society has outgrown that doctrine, just as it has outgrown the laissez faire doctrine, also of the Middle Ages, with reference to the activities of the state. It was this latter proposition, you will recall, that formed the bone of contention between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Wilson in 1912, the latter still holding that it was applicable to present conditions, while the former clearly saw its inapplicability. As a lawyer, I have often come in contact with the miserable results of the free operation of the doctrine of caveat emptor, and the campaign that you are conducting is surely worthy of the high aims of the founder of your great party.

Congratulations.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Please accept my mother's and my congratulations on yesterday's (Sunday's) Tribune—congratulations upon the unexcelled beauty of the Graphic Section and your editorials, all sympathy, all truth; congratulations upon securing the last story from Mr. Needham's pen, "The Great Guns of France and Orchids"; congratulations upon the splendid criticism of "The Follies of 1915," wherein your critic, in the broad-minded Tribune way, in Mr. Bert Williams, who is a member of my race, commented: "If any one doubts that a negro cannot be an artist, let him see and listen to Bert Williams." The above mentioned features and many others too numerous to extol, all combined into one harmonious whole, made The Tribune of Sunday, June 27, 1915, a rare source of enjoyment. WILLIAM C. MORRIS, New York, June 28, 1915.



MAKING THE CITY PAY CASH

The Pay-as-You-Go Policy Warmly Commended.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I think Mr. Bruer's article on the condition of the city's taxes is the simplest presentation of the matter so far. From Mr. Marsh's letter, in your issue of to-day, however, it would seem that the article did not appear so lucid to him. But the gist of it all is clear: An effort is to be made to destroy the shackles of perpetual interest by managing, so far as possible, the big finances of the city as the individual in private life manages his, to dodge the private burden by paying cash. Mr. Bruer brought out very clearly, without the introduction of personalities or scurrilous attacks, the future relief this scheme will bring to the city; and the temperateness of his exposition will go a great way toward giving taxpayers the point of view which will enable them to perform their duty willingly.

There is nothing calamitous in the admission that the pay-as-you-go policy was suggested by the city bankers. To me, the suggestion of the bankers does not signify that we are in control of privileged interests; it merely stands as the legitimate outcome of common council. It is the people's duty to secure and retain all possible power toward choosing the man they think most capable to represent them, but not one step should be taken, after he is chosen, to substitute their brains for his own. Mr. Marsh says that the people should determine policies. With civic interest as it is to-day, how could this be done when we consider the statement made a few days ago by a gentleman before the Board of Estimate, to the effect that, although he had been familiar with figures all his life, the annual statement of the city was most difficult to understand? Able men who will work for the people can solve this problem correctly; our duty is to choose them. THEODORE MICHEL, Brooklyn, June 27, 1915.

Flattening Out Zionism.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Reading between the lines of your item on the Zionist convention now being held at Boston, may I, as "one who knows," be permitted to briefly give a critical review of the phase at which the Zionist movement has arrived at present? Mr. Brandeis, a quite recent acquisition to the Zionist ranks, whose personal knowledge of the history of Zionism, ranging now over nearly half a century, is necessarily limited, declares that Zionists, like Americans, were striving for the principles of "brotherhood, democracy, social justice and liberty." Granted this to be so, it must strike the impartial mind as a rather pretentious performance for a body representing, at most, 50,000 American Jews to pose as the guiding spirit for the hundred millions composing the American people. Dr. Friedenwald's rather apologetic pronouncement that "Zionists, in seeking to return to Jerusalem, mean no disloyalty to this beloved country of our birth" should take an intelligent audience somewhat by surprise, powerfully suggesting as it does the question why such a protestation and defence in public of Zionist activities should have been called for. Mr. Lipsky's report speaks of the "accumulated possessions of the Zionists" organization in Palestine, "making the uninitiated believe that the practical Palestinian colonization work of the last thirty-five years has been chiefly that done with the advent of this beloved country of our birth" should take an intelligent audience somewhat by surprise, powerfully suggesting as it does the question why such a protestation and defence in public of Zionist activities should have been called for.

Indictment of England.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Are you sufficiently unbiassed to print the following? Who furnished the South with arms and ammunition during the Civil War? Who furnished the South with blockade runners during the Civil War? Who tried hard to separate the North from the South? Who furnished the South with gunboats to destroy American commerce? Who was jealous of American commerce and used the Civil War as a pretext for the destruction of said commerce? Who wished for the independence of the South, so that she could dictate to two small, weak powers instead of bucking one powerful nation? Who kept the Union ship Kearsarge from making the sailors prisoners who lost their Southern ship Alabama? Who sent out a convoy to rescue the crew and officers of the Alabama when she went down, so that they would not be captured by the Union sailors? Who dictated in this present conflict that she would not allow America to buy ships from belligerent countries? Who dictates to America in the present conflict and prohibits America from sending foodstuffs and cotton to Germany? Who dictates to America and demands our ammunition? Answer to each and every question, ENGLAND. I am a Civil War veteran, a Grand Army man, and defy any one to attempt to contradict the above statements. JOHN W. ROWLAND, New York, June 28, 1915.

Academic Freedom, U. P. Brand.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I know Professor Scott Nearing personally, and there isn't a more deep-minded, hearty-hearted, lovable and useful social scientist between here and Arden. He would be an honor to any university, as he is to the human race, and it is an honor to your paper to have so well championed his cause. I know the University of Pennsylvania too. I am only surprised that the trustees did not rid themselves of this voice of progress long ago. The hesitation can only have been due to lack of courage on the part of the trustees, who in this matter have not had the backing of their consciences, but only of their and the university's pocket-books.

Academic freedom, in the U. P. at least, is still quite a limited thing, a professor of economics not being allowed to say what he thinks about economics. Further interesting dismissal cases may be expected from the same source, for that university, particularly in its Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, has a faculty which is "rife with sedition."

Senator Burton's Conversion.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: It is rather amusing to read in the morning papers the interview given out by ex-United States Senator Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, who has just returned from South America. In this interview he refers to the great necessity of establishing fast lines of steamers between the United States and several South American ports in order to build up our trade with South American countries. The joke is that there never has been a much more bitter opponent of building up the American merchant marine in the United States Senate than this same Theodore E. Burton. H. L. ALDRICH, New York, June 26, 1915.

They Have Easy Work but Seldom Meet Its Highest Demands.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I deem it high time that our public school teachers be sat upon heavily and permanently squelched. They have been so humored by state and city authorities, have been granted so many unwarranted concessions, that they seem to think any demand they may make, no matter how extravagant and unreasonable, should be receded to forthwith. I understand it is proposed to require them to take turns in teaching in the summer schools, and I presume they will fight this curtailment of their vacation, using as an argument what your Canning Tower contributors might term the "old wheeze" of arduous and exhausting work, necessitating a long period of rest to restore their "efficiency." They entirely ignore their month-long holidays during the regular school term—all of Saturdays and the Christmas and Easter recesses—not allowed to other subordinate city employees. Their work probably is less fatiguing than almost any other kind of labor. In conversation the other day with a university professor, who has taught in all the public school grades, he remarked that teaching was a "pleasant, fascinating and mentally invigorating occupation to those who took a real interest in it and who purposed making it a career."

THE LEADER WITH THE TORCH.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: What a travesty upon justice! Here is Siegel, convicted of robbing the very poor of over \$2,000,000, about to compromise his crime by ten months in jail, where he expresses the hope he "will not be treated badly." And Siegel is not only a monstrous thief but a murderer as well, for several of his wretched victims, in despair because of his wrongdoing, have taken their own lives. Is there any wonder that all reasonable men are fast becoming Socialists when things like these are allowed to happen? Is there any wonder that the proletariat is fast approaching a revolutionary mind, lacking only the leader to light the torch? JOHN Q. A. CLARKE, New York, June 21, 1915.

SQUELCH SCHOOL TEACHERS

They Have Easy Work but Seldom Meet Its Highest Demands.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I deem it high time that our public school teachers be sat upon heavily and permanently squelched. They have been so humored by state and city authorities, have been granted so many unwarranted concessions, that they seem to think any demand they may make, no matter how extravagant and unreasonable, should be receded to forthwith. I understand it is proposed to require them to take turns in teaching in the summer schools, and I presume they will fight this curtailment of their vacation, using as an argument what your Canning Tower contributors might term the "old wheeze" of arduous and exhausting work, necessitating a long period of rest to restore their "efficiency." They entirely ignore their month-long holidays during the regular school term—all of Saturdays and the Christmas and Easter recesses—not allowed to other subordinate city employees. Their work probably is less fatiguing than almost any other kind of labor. In conversation the other day with a university professor, who has taught in all the public school grades, he remarked that teaching was a "pleasant, fascinating and mentally invigorating occupation to those who took a real interest in it and who purposed making it a career."

In their numerous letters to the newspapers—couched somewhat in the "English as she is spoke" style of composition—these teachers refer to themselves as "the educated class." Strictly speaking, education embraces both moral and intellectual training. A friend of mine, a college graduate, is employed as collector for a large corporation, and in the course of a year calls upon thousands of families. He says that of the children he meets he can readily differentiate the public school pupil from the private school student by the former's rude manners and rough behavior. A baker in business uptown, in the immediate vicinity of a public school, recently introduced a "lunch counter" in his store, in the hope of securing large patronage from the schoolboys. On the first day of this luncheon feature these boys did flock to his place. They came in great numbers and stole all the pies and cakes and sandwiches he had piled up unguarded on his counter. Some months ago "The New York Times" published a long article descriptive of a "ladies' barroom" established by a restaurateur in the city. The writer of this news item stated that at the time of his visit to the place many "ladies" were present, among them "several high school girls, who tossed off cocktails and whiskey straight with all the gusto of regular roulers."

Do not these facts indicate that these "educated" teachers make no attempt, by precept or example, to inculcate sound moral principles in the minds and hearts of the children entrusted to their care, not even instructing them in ordinary good manners—their pupils are indifferent to the conduct of their pupils out of school, their only aim being to maintain a certain degree of order in the classrooms? L. V. C. New York, June 24, 1915.

THE LEADER WITH THE TORCH.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: What a travesty upon justice! Here is Siegel, convicted of robbing the very poor of over \$2,000,000, about to compromise his crime by ten months in jail, where he expresses the hope he "will not be treated badly." And Siegel is not only a monstrous thief but a murderer as well, for several of his wretched victims, in despair because of his wrongdoing, have taken their own lives. Is there any wonder that all reasonable men are fast becoming Socialists when things like these are allowed to happen? Is there any wonder that the proletariat is fast approaching a revolutionary mind, lacking only the leader to light the torch? JOHN Q. A. CLARKE, New York, June 21, 1915.

THE LEADER WITH THE TORCH.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: What a travesty upon justice! Here is Siegel, convicted of robbing the very poor of over \$2,000,000, about to compromise his crime by ten months in jail, where he expresses the hope he "will not be treated badly." And Siegel is not only a monstrous thief but a murderer as well, for several of his wretched victims, in despair because of his wrongdoing, have taken their own lives. Is there any wonder that all reasonable men are fast becoming Socialists when things like these are allowed to happen? Is there any wonder that the proletariat is fast approaching a revolutionary mind, lacking only the leader to light the torch? JOHN Q. A. CLARKE, New York, June 21, 1915.

THE LEADER WITH THE TORCH.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: What a travesty upon justice! Here is Siegel, convicted of robbing the very poor of over \$2,000,000, about to compromise his crime by ten months in jail, where he expresses the hope he "will not be treated badly." And Siegel is not only a monstrous thief but a murderer as well, for several of his wretched victims, in despair because of his wrongdoing, have taken their own lives. Is there any wonder that all reasonable men are fast becoming Socialists when things like these are allowed to happen? Is there any wonder that the proletariat is fast approaching a revolutionary mind, lacking only the leader to light the torch? JOHN Q. A. CLARKE, New York, June 21, 1915.