New York Tribune.

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

SUNDAY, JULY 4, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden M. Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Secretary and Treasurer. Address Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES DAILY AND SUNDAY		CANADIAN RATES DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.07	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY		DAILY ONLY	
Six months	3.33	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY		SUNDAY ONLY	
One month	1.26	One month	.25
One year	15.39	One year	4.50

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. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Crush Out German Terrorism!

The man who shot J. Pierpont Morgan and who set off a bomb in the Capitol at Washington acted in both cases under the same incitement. He was in both instances the agent of the same propaganda—of the same spirit of truculence and violence which the world has come to associate with German military policy.

Here is another flawless demonstration of the lawlessness and ferocity which have characterized Germany's attitude toward other nations and toward individuals who have stood in her way since the day she tore to pieces the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. Everything must yield to the alleged necessities of her military programme. Belgium was invaded and ravaged, Louvain was burned, savage outrages were committed on Belgian non-combatants, Rheims Cathedral was shelled, undefended cities were attacked and women and children were killed by gunfire and Zeppelin bombs, poisonous gases were used in trench warfare, the inhuman under-sea system of warfare on unarmed merchantmen was instituted and the Lusitania, with its heavy complement of neutral passengers, was sunk—all in pursuance of the same policy of ruthless indifference to treaty obligations, to the restraints of international law, to the promptings of conscience or to the dictates of humanity.

Now the example has spread. German partisans in this country are beginning to take their cue from the barbarity and lawlessness of the German government. They are trying to practise the terrorism inculcated by the German military code and are beginning to remove by violence those who hinder or are supposed to hinder Germany's success. Individuals are committing here in Germany's cause the same crimes which have been committed on the other side of the Atlantic by soldiers and sailors who wear the Kaiser's uniform and carry out his orders.

The assailant of Mr. Morgan and the bomb-planter in Washington has confessed his motive. He was undertaking to carry into criminal effect the vicious logic of the pro-German agitation against the export from this country of munitions of war. That agitation seeks to place responsibility for the killing and wounding of German troops on the individuals here who, with perfect legality and propriety, sell arms and munitions to belligerent governments wishing to purchase them.

It also seeks to put a similar responsibility on the government of the United States, which declines to interfere with a traffic sanctioned by international law and usage and on which it would itself have to depend in a large measure for self-protection were it to become involved in conflict with any first class military power.

This agitation is the more vicious in that it is almost entirely hypocritical. If the Teutonic allies had free access to our munitions market, there would be no reckless, passionate demand for an embargo on exports of arms and ammunition. The only protest heard would come from a few ulta-pacifists, who abhor the manufacture and use of arms for any purpose.

But the government is now being assailed, and individual makers and forwarders of munitions are being vilified merely because the export of munitions helps one set of belligerents and to that extent operates to the disadvantage of the other set. Those who are making themselves heard loudest in this vicious campaign are the most ardent partisans here of the Teutonic alliance.

The right of American citizens to engage in the munitions traffic is unassailable. The attitude of the government toward that traffic is based on international law and on sound public policy. Arguments against it cannot appeal to reason. They must appeal, therefore, to prejudice and passion, and that appeal is now bearing its dastardly and criminal fruits.

Mr. Morgan, a private citizen, was attacked because he was conspicuously engaged in purchasing and forwarding military supplies to Great Britain. But where is the campaign of intimidation and attempted murder to stop? The man who tried to blow up the Capitol could have found an equal incitement in the war supplies embargo agitation to attempt to assassinate the President and the members of his Cabinet.

The latest issue of "The Fatherland," dated July 7, contains this notice, served on the administration: "It is proposed that the same set of resolutions (those adopted at the recent meeting in Madison Square Garden) be adopted in a chain of mass meetings from coast to coast, in order to make clear to the administration beyond the possibility of misunderstanding that the country will not tolerate pro-Ally war propaganda in the newspapers or in the Cabinet, and that the traffic in murder must stop."

That betrays the perfect arrogance of the German manner. But the editor of "The Fatherland," Mr. George Sylvester Viereck, goes even further, and attempts in a poem to fix on President Wilson personal responsibility for the slaughter of German soldiers. Here are the lines:

Man, hast thou no ears?
Upon thy White House falls a streak of red
From Europe's carnage. In the long night-tide
Canst thou not see them marching side by side,
The mute accusing army of the dead?

This is an incitation to violence which may easily fall on willing ears. The munitions embargo agitation has, indeed, long passed the stage of a genuine political discussion. It has reached the stage of incendiary appeal, of dangerous suggestion. It ought to be suppressed in the interest of law, order and domestic tranquillity. The spirit of outrage manifested by pro-German partisans should not be allowed to stalk any longer behind a pseudo-political propaganda. The whirlwind of indignation which swept the country after the destruction of the Lusitania will be a zephyr compared to the storm which must overwhelm the introducers to our soil of the German methods of crime and savagery which have just manifested themselves in the Morgan assault and the bomb operations in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

Independence Day.

The United States has been an independent nation politically for 139 years. And for many more years than that Americans have possessed their own individuality of type, their own point of view and way of doing things—their fundamental independence. The Declaration of Independence may seem to some, therefore, no longer a vital document, no longer a needful iteration of an obvious condition.

And this would be true if now, as on July 4, 1776, we had but one mother country to impress with our ability and desire to shift for ourselves. England many years ago very wisely curbed her inclination to regard us still in the light of colonials. She learned her lesson early, and we have got along with her amiably for the most part ever since, as grown-up children always do with the parent who settles back to a non-interfering observation of their idiosyncrasies.

We have in the mean time, however, acquired half a dozen more parent nations. And at least one of the newer ones appears strangely inclined to dictation. It is the Fatherland, as some term it, the thought of which to-day should galvanize into life for Americans that famous old declaration signed, sealed and enforced so many years ago, a declaration not only of political liberty but of Americanism which brooks no hyphens, of nationalism which excludes those colonial at heart. Let us have no more colonials in our midst.

America as Mediator.

We publish to-day in the Special Feature Section of The Tribune an ardent appeal for American mediation in the European war by a British Radical leader, Mr. E. D. Morel. Mr. Morel has Socialist affiliations and belongs to the small anti-war group of British politicians in which Mr. Ramsay Macdonald is a leading figure. He speaks, therefore, for an inconsiderable minority of the British people and rejects the view, held by most French Radicals and Socialists and shared by the majority of Radicals in other countries, that in a fight to a finish against German militarism lies the only hope for Europe of lasting peace and democratic progress.

Mr. Morel urges President Wilson to stop the war by ascertaining on what terms the two groups of belligerents are willing to make peace and then trying to act as intermediary in conducting peace negotiations. Yet at the same time he admits the difficulty—if not the impossibility—of this mediatory task by saying that the peoples of Europe now at war are not ready for peace—that "no force which either the belligerent peoples or their governments can evolve will arrest the madness which is destroying civilization."

But if this is so—if peace must now be imposed by influences from outside—it would seem that the time for mediation is not yet ripe. As The Tribune said the other day, it is much easier to go to war than it is to restore peace. To give up war often requires enormous sacrifices which no nation is willing to make until it reaches the point of exhaustion, at which it ceases to care very much about the terms on which peace can be purchased.

The European belligerents have not yet reached that stage, and even if they were to agree to restore the *ante-bellum* status they would have to maintain and enlarge their military establishments with a view to determining later the still unsettled question of superiority. A peace on such terms would be far more costly to Europe and to the rest of the world than a continuance of the present struggle till one group is decisively beaten.

It is clear that mediation on our part is not now desired by either set of belligerents. We have had too sharp a controversy with Germany to be accepted unhesitatingly by the German government as a peacemaker. Even in France and Great Britain there is no great disposition to command our services.

In a recent article in "Le Figaro" M. Gabriel Hanotaux, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, discussing the last American note to Germany, wrote:

> It is said that President Wilson is preparing for the hour when he will be able to present himself to the belligerents as an arbiter, and that he is keeping on terms with both parties because he wants to assure himself at that moment of their common confidence. Well, if that is his goal I fear that he is turning his back on it. Without taking into account that the intervention of neutral powers at the end of a conflict so terrible is hardly probable, it is not an excess of feebleness and finesse that will give any power the authority and the prestige necessary to speak decisively and to make the right prevail.

Our services are not being sought by the powers at war, and there is no good reason why we should attempt to thrust our good offices upon them. We may be called upon eventually to do a great work for humanity by ending the war. But it would be folly to try to end it before the combatants themselves realize that it is time for them to stop fighting.

Porfirio Diaz.

Some Mexicans used to call Porfirio Diaz "the Aztec," just as to-day they speak of Villa as "the bandit." That habit grew upon them during those twenty years or more of almost constant warfare of the sort that Pancho Villa and Zapata and Carranza are waging to-day, which ended in 1876 when Diaz rode into Mexico City at the head of 12,000 men.

But Diaz did not spring from the disinherited Indian millions, like Villa and Zapata. He belonged to the small middle class of mixed blood to which Carranza belongs, and throughout his long and turbulent rise toward power he espoused much the same programme of nationalism and reform with which General Carranza has identified himself. He called himself an "advanced liberal"; he was a Constitutionalist and an anti-clerical. When he assumed the reins of government, however, like all Mexican patriots, he became a dictator, but the best and most successful dictator in Mexico's list.

The thirty years of Porfirio Diaz's reign constitute Mexico's golden age, the only period of consequence during her century of independence in which commerce and mining and agriculture and the other arts of peace have been permitted to pile up wealth for the distracted country. He invited in foreign capital which built him railroads. With their help he regularly strangled in their infancy the revolutions which just as regularly came into feeble being against him here and there. He made Vera Cruz a healthful port, he established a rather imperfect system of free schools for the people and he protected the propertied interests.

The swiftness with which Mexico has reverted to anarchy since the "strong man's" downfall is proof to the world of what a strong man he really was, perhaps the mightiest of all Latin-Americans. No doubt in the years of his retirement in Paris he mourned over the spectacle of his country's turmoil, but at the same time there must have been some satisfaction for him in the thought that no other man has since been able to stick in the saddle of government where he sat so securely for so long.

If only he might have broken in for all time the bucking steed of state!

Senator McCarren was not so provident as many other bosses, for a report from his executor declares he left larger debts than the total of his million-dollar estate.

The Federal government's food investigators have issued a warning against "watered macaroni." It must be made in Wall Street, where the watered stocks float.

The Germans are cutting the politeness out of their business correspondence. They cut even the decencies out of their warfare long ago.

The burglars who blew open a safe, to find there only fifty pennies, need no arguments to convince them that business is bad.

So far as national preparedness is concerned, "watchful waiting" is equivalent to inglorious loafing.

The American Note.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh,
my country, now to stand
With the grave, inspired, earnest brothers,
breast to breast across the sea?
See, they bear the bloody burden, breathless
—what a holy band!
Fighting, battling, wounded, dying, that the
future may be free!

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh, my
country? Days shall come
When your golden mines and forests and
your mighty wealth shall seem
Far less glorious, far less precious than the
steady marching home
Of the men that went to battle for the
glory of a dream!

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh, my
country? When they say:
"Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a
cloud from coast to coast,
Fire by night and smoky column up against
the sky by day,
Heirs of men who fought for freedom—
mighty and ideal host!

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh, my
country? Sometimes peace
Means but death, and gain and welfare
gather where corruption lies.
Hark, they call, whose glorious warfare
means forever war shall cease!
Will you lose the chance, my country, oh,
my country? Wake and rise!

MARIE VAN VORST.

INSPIRING MUSIC

Disgrace for This City To Be Without Summer Concerts.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Since your paper has been a champion of music, I wish that you take into consideration that it is truly a disgrace to a city of 5,500,000 inhabitants like New York not to have any better summer music than the screaming pandemonium of a street organ. Music is and remains one of the most vital æsthetic mediums to refine and uplift society. Without any exception most of the towns and cities of continental Europe long ago introduced summer music in the city parks, as they realize the great spiritual influence that it exercises upon the masses. Neither in Germany, Scandinavia, Italy nor Russia can you find a single town above 25,000 inhabitants that does not have a nice band or orchestra playing in the city parks during the summer months. Even towns of 4,000 inhabitants have their park orchestras.

My Russian estates are near the town Werre, the Russian Baltic provinces. That town has hardly more than 4,000 inhabitants. Yet it has an orchestra of fifteen instruments, strings, wood and brass, playing evenings in the park. In average, 10 per cent of the city budgets of Russia is spent on music and art. In the Russian army there are 50,000 musicians, kept merely for that purpose, which is nearly equal to the United States standing army. The New York City administration is saving money by abolishing the summer music in the parks. But in actuality it acts against the welfare of its inhabitants.

The previous administrations of New York made slight attempts to establish some kind of summer music in the parks. Arnold Volpe laid a good foundation in this matter, as his orchestra gave first class music—at least, in the Central Park. The former Park Commissioner Stover was sympathetic to the idea, and the effect was satisfactory.

It is truly terrible to observe in our public parks that the people working hard during the week do not have even a chance to enjoy a few minutes' music during the Sundays. Music is more than a religion. It inspires the mind to loftier aspirations. I have seen that the thousands of the New York inhabitants who come to spend their Sundays in the Bronx Park find it silent and dead like a grave. Where do you find such a park in Europe "dead" during the summer months? When the city administration can spend millions on its various departments, it is a shame that it cannot spend a few thousands on music. Saving money on music is spending money foolishly at the expense of people's nobler qualities.

There are thousands of poor musical artists in New York, and hundreds of them are starving. Every one of them would be only glad to earn a few dollars and give such a joy and inspiration to the thousands of hearers. The New York rich man naturally does not care for the summer music, as he lives out in the country. Besides, he feels burdened enough through the excessive taxes. For that reason it is the duty of the city to look after the vital matter.

How ignorant our city fathers are in questions pertaining to music is proven by the fact that they refused to support the 15,000 of the New York singers of twenty-three foreign nationalities when they wished to give a large music festival in this city last summer, to commemorate the tercentenary of the city. What a pity that our New York politicians are deaf musically! The city even would not give space and grant protection for the men who would be willing to secure music for the people. That this is a fact I can prove by my own experience. Some steps ought to be taken in this matter immediately.

IVAN NARODNY.

New York, June 30, 1915.

Arms Embargo Unneutral.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There has recently been quietly posted in a number of places—notably in clubs of women—a document inviting subscribers to a petition to the President of the United States to prohibit the sale of munitions of war to belligerents.

This document is headed "Organization of American Women for Strict Neutrality," and is signed by a number of ladies of Baltimore.

The majority of readers of this document would not be likely to perceive that such an injunction would not be neutrality at all, but a very distinct pro-German movement. President Wilson pointed this out some time ago, when the Germans were openly clamoring for such a move on the part of the United States government.

Neutrality consists in a government not taking sides with belligerents. If it interferes with the business of private individuals it departs from neutrality and allies itself with one or other of the belligerent parties. In this case it would be very plain which.

Germany has announced that she does not need munitions of war; that she is plentifully supplied from her own internal resources—indeed, with England's effective blockade she could not get them over; therefore any enactment to "prohibit sales of munitions of war to belligerents" would mean cutting off supplies to the Allies only, thereby playing directly into the hands of the Germans.

One does not doubt the good faith of the ladies of Baltimore, but in these troublous times one is led to search deeper for causes. Who is the deus ex machina behind this and kindred ripples of excitement?

The document puts forth its plea "for humanitarian reasons," but at few lines below the cloven hoof peeps out in the statement that "Germany did not permit her citizens to sell arms or munitions of war to Spain during our war with that nation." In point of fact, the Spanish war was too brief and rapidly over for any one to go abroad for supplies.

Will you not take this matter up editorially?

Germany has perpetrated so many tricks upon America—the passport fraud the latest—that it is as well to be upon one's guard. In any case, it is expedient to point out to possible signers of such documents that every person who signs commits him- (or her-) self to the advocacy not of neutrality but of a very great breach of neutrality.

War is horrible, and we all wish it ended, but Americans should remember that the cause of the Allies is the cause of America; is the cause of humanity, because it is the cause of the liberties of the world. J. D.

Winchendon, Mass., June 30, 1915.

Sympathy for the Invaded.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The writer of the letter dated June 28 and signed John V. Rowland does not seem to understand that the United States is in sympathy with the Allies because the Germans have invaded Belgium and France for no good reason. The Belgians and French are fighting for the existence of their countries. England is helping them. If the Belgians and French had invaded Germany then the Germans would have the sympathy of the United States. What has happened in past times has nothing to do with the present war. I think that Americans should keep off the ships of nations at war.

ROBERT M. ANDRUSS.

New York, July 1, 1915

IN THE NAME OF KULTUR.

A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Urged by American Jews in Memory of Haym Salomon.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A blot has been resting on the American nation for almost 140 years (since 1776)—the ingratitude of ignoring the services of one of the greatest patriots of the Revolutionary period, who financed and backed the government in freedom's cause, the great Polish Jew, Haym Salomon, of New York and Philadelphia, banker and patriot of the first order.

Not a school book in the United States has even mentioned Haym Salomon, not a poem was written in his honor by any author or historian, except John Fiske. George Bancroft, Isaac Markin and President Madison's correspondence to Randolph and in the Congressional Records of Washington. While song and praise is devoted in most historical books to far lesser figures of the Revolutionary period, Haym Salomon's name has been forgotten. He died at the age of forty-five, in Philadelphia, leaving a widow and two small children, and all his papers and the government's obligation to him were lost in those troublesome days of the Revolutionary period.

We American Jews from all over the country demand of Congress the right to recognize the services of this great Jewish advocate in the cause of freedom, not by a stone monument, which uselessly fills our parks or public squares. Our plan has the indorsement of ex-President Taft, ex-Senator Root, Governor Francis Burton Harrison of the Philippine Islands, Senator O'Gorman, of New York, and Senator James W. Wadsworth, of New York.

The plan is, as Haym Salomon's loan to the United States was over $660,000 in 1776, and interest and compound interest amount to over $150,000,000, from part of that interest a national university in Washington should be erected and named the Haym Salomon National University; this to be the clearing house for the intellect and culture of the American universities and colleges, and for research work in all branches of human thought that are at present carried on "philanthropically" by our rich men's foundations. This institution should be carried on by the United States government; its professors would not be muzzled nor be compelled to deny the truth or to be under the rule of a "petticoat" like many of our universities that are supported by some of our millionaires.

A national university in Washington has been a dream of every President and every statesman and every man of letters from the time of George Washington up to the time of ex-President Taft, who a few months ago, in a speech at Cincinnati, advocated most strongly a national university at Washington for post-graduate courses for the American students.

I call the attention of every Governor in the United States and every member of the Senate and Congress to this move, and especially urge the Governor of Pennsylvania and the Mayor of Philadelphia to do their duty to a man of their city—Haym Salomon, who was the founder of the Bank of North America, the founder of the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia and several other good institutions, who was the leading spirit of the American Revolution and by whose bounty Madison, Jefferson and Randolph lived for years when the government machinery was stationed at that historical city, Philadelphia.

I trust that every intellectual person of the United States, every university, every scholar, every diplomat, from the President to the city mayors, will indorse this move and make next Fourth of July subject to their orations and arouse true patriotism by correcting the history of the United States and give Haym Salomon the honorable page that he so deserves from the American nation.

LOUIS FRIEDMAN.

New York, July 1, 1915.

Stands Up for School Teachers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Have just finished reading the learned production in to-day's Tribune entitled "Squelch School Teachers," and desire to compliment the writer on his bravery in making his attack over the initials "L. V. C."

Your correspondent having had the misfortune to be the son of a poor Methodist clergyman, was some forty-five years since one of the unfortunate boys who could be "readily differentiated from the private school pupil by my rude manners and rough behavior."

It is really too bad that we could not all have had the advantages that "L. V. C." has had, in being trained by teachers who could turn out such striking examples of real, true courtesy and gentlemanly manners as are indicated in his production.

For one I say, God bless the public school teachers! F. MILTON SMITH.

New York, July 1, 1915.

Ireland and the Allies.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In reply to the letter of "Longshoreman" I wish to say that he takes a very narrow view of the situation in regard to Ireland's participation in the war in Europe. The troubles of Ireland are not be compared with the terrible effect among nations of broken treaty rights, the tearing to pieces of international obligations, the invasion of Belgium and all the horrors that accompanied it, as well as all disregard for the rights of non-combatants travelling on board merchant ships, but "Longshoreman" seems to forget all these in trying to make out a case for those Irishmen who refuse to participate in the struggle that England and her allies are waging for the cause of justice and humanity.

In regard to Ireland never having received a free and generous concession from England, it is only necessary to mention such laws as Catholic emancipation, disendowment of the English Church in Ireland, fair rents, free sale and fixity of tenure for the tenant farmers, laborers' cottages, old age pensions, an elective franchise for all male householders and lastly, the Home Rule bill, which "Longshoreman" belittles, but which will no doubt when in actual operation prove a great boon to Ireland's national existence.

If we consider the attitude of the British government in relation to the religious side of the question we will find that all the resources of the United Kingdom are being used for the purpose of freeing Catholic Belgium from the despotism of the military government of Germany. Therefore, no Irishman need be ashamed to give his wholehearted sympathy to John Redmond and the members of the Irish Nationalist Party, who have pledged their support to the British government in its determination to continue the war until those who are responsible for the horrors perpetrated in Belgium and the devastation of the fair fields of France are driven back within their own borders and are made to realize that international laws are not to be lightly turned aside, and that treaty obligations are not to be broken with impunity. J. J. B.

New York, June 30, 1915.

No Militants Here.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Is it quite fair of the antis and the press to refer to the activities of any suffragists in America as "militant"?

According to the Century Dictionary, militant is derived from "militare," meaning to serve as a soldier, and means "fighting, warring, engaged in warfare, pertaining to warfare or conflict and having a combative character or tendency, warlike."

As no American suffragist has ever been known to use lawless, destructive or violent methods, the word "militant," except in its metaphorical sense, does not apply. And especially since the recent use of the word as applied to English "militants" refers to their acts of destruction and not to their radical political policies.

The Standard Dictionary defines "militant" as "engaged in or pertaining to fighting, as the church militant." But it is fair to assume that in so describing suffragists our opponents do not use the word in this exalted sense!

Looseness in terms leads to confusion in ideas, and the public has been seriously misled. The great mass of people who are uninformed on the subject may believe that in some parts of the country there have been violent acts which have led to the use of this word "militant" as applied in America. Happily such is not the case.

IDA MOODY PALMER.

New York, July 1, 1915.

STATE EDUCATION.

Uniform System Should be Administered by State, Not Localities.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Have we any public servants? Or is the public the servant? Are these queries conundrums? Does the Police Commissioner run the Police Department or do the police associations? Does the Board of Education run the public school system, or do the teachers' associations run it? If there is a conflict between these, who usually decides it? Who fixes the salaries of these employes—the city or the employes?

These eventualities were foreseen when a system of civil service was demanded many years ago. If anybody rebels and refuses to concede their demands, who controls? If the teachers or police want a reform they can combine with the other employes in the city and carry any election of city officials and members of the Legislature and so accomplish their object. In other words, the people be hanged! The people pay the bills but they can't discharge the employes. A combination of city servants can control any election. This fear secures political co-operation.

Can the Gordian knot be cut? How may the public be released from this bondage? Are the public funds unnecessarily wasted by the Board of Education? Should we pay for what we call fads? What should the system of public education consist of? Should it be merely the rudiments, the essentials or should it be trades and professions, extras, as we call them, or should the public system fit the scholars to earn a living on graduation? Or is this a private function only for private schools?

The Germans consider this a public function, and so it happens that on graduation the government finds them employment in the trade or business they were educated for. By reason of this system it is said that only 2 per cent of the people are unemployed. It is no wonder that such a system should establish a precedent and set a pace for other countries to follow. Is this paternal government socialism? Should the public educational system be uniform all over the state? If not, why not? Why should not the country boy and girl have the same educational advantages as the city child? Clearly, they should. Recognizing the duty the state has lately committed itself to the project of teaching farming, but only in certain localities. If public education is a state function (and it is) why should not the state take full control of it? Clearly it ought to. To create a state educational system is not at all a difficult affair. Any graduate holding a certificate of graduation should be entitled to teach in any public school in the state. Who should administer such a system? Why not the Board of Regents?

A state system would and should mean equal pay to all the teaching force alike for equal services. This is but just. This would dispense with all local boards of education and probably greatly simplify our local educational system, eliminating some unnecessary wheels in the machine. Would a state system be more efficient? Certainly it would establish public confidence and remove all local jealousies or causes of friction, something devoutly to be wished. For this would eliminate all political and religious influences from localities. Is not this essential to success?

So long as localities control public education they will lack public confidence, no matter how able the members of the board may be. Sometimes the conduct and discussions of our local board have made the public blush and pray for relief. Why should the city government control the local public educational system? The city is only part of the state. It should be called upon to bear only its share of the expense of the educational system and no more per population or per school population. Extravagances would be prevented. Will the Constitutional Convention cut the Gordian knot and provide that the state shall hereafter control and administer the public school systems as a state system? If not, why not?

Brooklyn, July 1, 1915. J. L. M.