

New York Tribune.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 100 N. York St., New York.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. 1.00; 3 mos. 2.50; 6 mos. 4.50; 1 year 8.00.

Foreign Rates: Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. 1.50; 3 mos. 3.50; 6 mos. 6.50; 1 year 10.00.

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.

Where The Tribune Stands.

We have received the following: To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Several days ago you printed an editorial article saying that Warden Osborne should go. Do you still think so? Have you seen a new light since then? If so, shouldn't you tell the readers on the basis of "the truth—first to last?" READER.

The question is a fair one and The Tribune will try to answer it squarely. It has not changed its mind. It believes that Mr. Osborne should be removed. It believes that if he continues at Sing Sing the cause of prison reform will ultimately suffer grievously in consequence.

The Tribune based its original statement on two things—information it believed and believes accurate as to present Sing Sing conditions, and knowledge of Mr. Osborne's previous record in the public life of this state. This record, it was satisfied, perfectly demonstrated his temperamental unfitness for his present place, as it revealed his course in wrecking other reform movements.

Believing the situation intolerable and the end inevitable The Tribune said what it felt. Its conviction remains unchanged. It is satisfied that Mr. Osborne will have to go. It is convinced that he should go, and it fears that when he does go it will be after a long series of incidents which will so weary and disgust a public, too little tolerant anyway, that there will be a swing back to old conditions and the application of ideas which are abhorrent.

The difference between The Tribune and many of those who have criticized it lies in the fact that it does not believe Mr. Osborne essential to prison reform and does not believe he is the man on whose personal fortunes should be staked the fate of a wholly admirable movement.

This is the truth as The Tribune sees it and believes it. It is therefore glad to answer its correspondent with the frankness he desires.

In the Matter of Barnes.

William Barnes, of Albany, is closing an interesting and instructive public career. He is closing it characteristically.

The Tribune does not purpose wasting time attacking Mr. Barnes. This would be to emulate the heroism of the small boy who attacks stuffed lions in the taxidermist shop.

But as a Republican newspaper The Tribune ventures to remind the Republican leaders in the Constitutional Convention that even a remote suggestion that their labors were acceptable to Mr. Barnes would damn the labors and the laborers at the fall election.

Not all of the citizens of this state were able to sit on the recent Syracuse jury, but those whose good fortune it was to serve were highly representative and have been indorsed by their fellow citizens.

William Barnes has fought his fight with the people of the state. He has made his effort to thwart, to retard, to destroy all efforts at progress. He has demonstrated his view of the people. Happily the jury at Syracuse were able to complete the picture.

The last political act of Mr. Barnes may be to drag down the product of the present Constitutional Convention. It begins to look as if this were possible. If the people of the state did not believe they were done with Barnes they would make almost any effort to complete the task.

Do the eminent gentlemen spending this mild summer period in the state capital quite grasp the extent of the popular suspicion the reports of their endeavors are beginning to excite in other districts of the State?

A Man of Action.

Sheriff Eugene F. Kinkead of Hudson County, N. J., the man who conquered the oil strike in Bayonne, is contemplating a trip to the front in France, but, alas! as a war correspondent, not as a soldier. It seems a thousand pities, because the Sheriff would prove such a brilliant recruit in the line.

In a recent discussion of what constitutes the finished soldier the quality of resourcefulness was put near the head of the list. In actual campaigning nothing ever turns out as one accustomed to textbooks and drills and manœuvres is led to expect. There are a thousand details demanding attention which are not included in rehearsal. The man who can rise to emergencies, who can break the rules to meet the facts, who can change his tactics to square with every crisis, makes the best soldier. Obviously, the part fits the doughty Sheriff as if moulded to his measure.

It is true, of course, that resourcefulness must belong to the war correspondent, too, and in so far as the Sheriff, in his own inimitable manner, is able to command the field marshal's automon-

ble to get his copy to the nearest wire, to make messenger boys out of colonels and keep abreast of operations from an aeroplane, he will be fulfilling admirably many of the requirements of his new rôle. But, unfortunately, action is by no means the whole of correspondence, and we simply cannot bring ourselves to a contemplation of that fine, round and radiantly streaming countenance pondering the sequences of sentences, sickled o'er with the pale cast of thought. What a martyrdom for a man of action!

Peace and the Professors.

No American seeking a correct estimate of German purpose in the present war should overlook the document prepared by German professors and setting forth their views of proper terms of peace. It is an admirable disclosure of what is in the German mind and was there when the war began.

Germany, says this excellent academic document, should annex Belgium and all of France north of a line drawn from Belfort to the mouth of the Somme River. This, with certain unfixed indemnities, is the price France is to pay to Germany.

Now, exactly what does this mean in terms of human beings and of territory? Before the war Belgium contained 7,800,000 inhabitants living on about 11,000 square miles. The French territory to be annexed amounts to 27,000 square miles, which, before the war contained 4,700,000 people. Germany, then, the professors reason, is entitled to take over 12,500,000 French and Belgian people.

In other words, and the point should be fixed in American minds, 12,500,000 people, four times as many people as there were in the Thirteen Colonies that fought our Revolution, are to be placed under an alien rule, deprived of the right to choose their own nationality, speak their own language, to do anything—as one general German professor puts it, in discussing the lot of 4,000,000 Poles similarly held—except "to be looked upon as Helots," and "allowed to pay taxes, to serve in the army and to shut their jaws tight."

Such a proposal patently runs squarely counter to all ideas that just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed; it is purely and simply a proposal to subject more than 12,000,000 of human beings to intellectual, moral and economic slavery. Now, to what end is this thing to be done?

"To insure the true expansion of German culture, industry and commerce." Was there ever a clearer, cooler, more perfect demonstration of the German idea, the German spirit? Ought not those Americans who are busy agitating for American effort to bring about peace in Europe to consider this German idea of peace? Is war, with all its horrors, more terrible to the 12,000,000 people of France and Belgium than the prospect of peace with slavery held out by the German professors?

Peace that does not restore liberty to French and Belgian populations now held in captivity, peace that does not insure the liberties of those already free, but included in the German plans, as revealed by their professors, would be the hollowest of mockeries.

There can be no peace until the spirit and the purpose declared in this document are disposed of. Americans will be false to all this country stands for if they give the smallest countenance to any effort to bring about a European peace based upon the slavery of millions to a master whom they hate and a race which is alien to their own in everything.

Spanish Sympathies.

The Tribune published last Sunday a curiously interesting letter from a correspondent in Madrid who undertook to analyze the popular mind in Spain and to show why the Spaniards, "in a very large proportion," are on Germany's side in the present war. The explanation was not flattering to the understanding of the Spanish people. To accept it, it was necessary to believe that in the main the Spaniards are extraordinarily superficial, callous to an almost incredible degree, ignorant and superstitious, naturally slavish in spirit, and altogether incapable of abstract thinking. Without assuming all this it would be difficult to believe in what Mr. Geoffrey called "the fundamental point of view of the Spanish mind."

But, supposing he has hit on some of the essential weaknesses of the rabble, is it possible to believe that the more enlightened part of the population are of the same mind? In short, are the more thoughtful Spaniards really pro-German? The counterblast lately published in reply to the famous manifesto of the German Intellectuals justifies a doubt on this point. It is signed by more than seventy of the most illustrious of Spanish philosophers, men of science, medical men, men of letters and artists, and is as strong as any of the similar protests from France, Russia, Portugal, Rumania and Brazil. All Spanish political parties are represented among the signatories, and not a few of the names are of men who have been highly honored in Germany.

They express the hope that when peace comes it will be through the triumph of a just cause, which "will destroy the riot of egoism, domination and devilish brutality which led to the catastrophe, and will lay the foundation of a new international fraternity in which force will be directed towards its true object, namely, the preservation of reason and justice." They protest against the pusillanimity of Spanish politicians and the unreasoning passion of "mercenary writers and newspapers," and, speaking as men given to "quiet lives devoted to the pure activities of the mind," they declare themselves thus: "We stand firm on the side of the Allies, inasmuch as they represent the ideals of liberty and justice, and therefore their cause coincides with the highest political interests of the nation."

It is probable, then, that the "very large

proportion" referred to by Mr. Geoffrey does not include the more thoughtful among the Spanish people.

Dr. Marshall Speaks.

A good many master minds individually and collectively have made attempts to diagnose Mexico's ailment. But the riddle remained unguessed until on Wednesday Dr. Thomas Riley Marshall, Vice-President of the United States, disposed of it. He was speaking to a Chautauquan audience at Peabody, Kan., every member of which seriously sought light on the pressing problems of the day. At least such is the jealously guarded reputation of such audiences. And he informed it that the real trouble in Mexico was the lack there of a vice-president. Presto! the problem vanishes amid cheers of gratitude, our Vice-President bows himself off as the band strikes up, and the stage is made ready for the Swiss yodelers.

While Mr. Marshall was thus earning in Kansas the handsome fee which makes it possible for him to remain in Washington in the winter, Mr. Wilson was hurrying on his special train to the national capital to deal as best he might with Mexico in the throes of her vice-presidential famine. The contrast simply illustrates the eternal fuss and pother some men make over the most elementary tasks. Diplomatic conferences, the dispatch of battleships, the alarms of war, and a beautiful vacation mutilated—the President does, indeed, devote the nightly prayers of his unruled running mate. But a greater help than prayer, now that Mr. Marshall is so close to the Mexican border, would be an offer on his part to fill the aching void below the Rio Grande. On this side we could endure the deprivation in the sacred cause of peace.

Penal Reform.

The news columns within a day or so contained this item:

In Starkville, Miss., two negro murderers were hanged. The authorities gave a barbecue for the crowd of spectators, at which homemade and watermelon were served to about 5,000 farmers, while speeches were made by political candidates. Watermelon was served to the murderers just before they were led to the gallows.

There is little need to dwell on the utter barbarity of the proceeding except to point out that with all its hideous and grotesque features it represents one community's idea of penal reform. The two negro murderers were not lynched, it will be noted. They were hanged by due process of law, in itself a decided concession to an aroused public sentiment. And that the hanging might be further robbed of its inhumanity, watermelon, dear to the palate of every dork, was served beforehand to the condemned.

No one will quarrel with the oft repeated assertion that the practice of lynching is a blot on American civilization. The Tribune has very recently indicated in unmistakable terms its share in this belief. But in some respects, at least, a lynching, with its grim, retributive setting and seemly dispatch, must be considered preferable to this Roman holiday, however legal, embellished with maudlin generosity.

Let us by all means have penal reform, whether in Starkville or in Sing Sing, but let us have the sort that cannot cause public nausea.

It is reported from Newport that the latest fad among the idle and fashionable women of that resort is the carrying about of little birds in cages. Its appropriateness approaches the poetic, provided only the cages are gilded.

Chicago wants an army camp for her business and professional men nearer home. Will she promise to send her Mayor to it?

Mahomet's descendant approves Manhattan's skyscrapers—as places for prayer!

Russians Reach New Line—Headline. The point is, did they reach it first?

Bethmann-Hollweg and Tirpitz.

The quarrel between the German Chancellor and the Secretary of the Navy, whatever may become of it just now, is an old one. It is believed by close political observers here that Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg was against the ultimatum which ushered in war and that von Tirpitz was one of the chief architects of war. The Chancellor, again, it is believed, has never been enamored of the submarine warfare against merchantmen, while the maintenance of this warfare is the only thing which prevents von Tirpitz's reputation from vanishing. Intelligent persons in Germany realize that von Tirpitz's naval policy was the tap-root of the Anglo-German hostility, and that his navy was a mistake. Von Tirpitz slavishly imitated the British navy, conceived to suit the needs of this country, and never worked out a navy adapted to the specific needs of Germany. He put Germany's money into dreadnoughts and would not listen to the critics, like Admiral Kirohoff, who advocated submarines. Von Tirpitz's dreadnoughts, while provoking the conflict with this country, have been quite useless, and, on the other hand, when war broke out Germany found herself with too few submarines for her needs. It was only after war began that von Tirpitz became converted to the submarine, and he is now its most ardent advocate to cover his past blunders and to persuade the German people that the German navy is really giving them something for all the money and the international bitterness it has cost them. He is against any concession to the United States, because his professional reputation is fatally involved.

Jam-Pot Bombs.

The official prohibition of tins for sending foodstuffs to British prisoners of war in Germany is intended to cut off not merely a supply of tin to the enemy, but also ready-made material for hand bombs. The British troops at the front themselves make good use of the tins in which they receive foodstuffs. Jam tins especially are all used up for bomb-making, and a story recently sent home from Ypres shows that they cause the enemy so small annoyances. The jam tins all bear the name of a well known firm of British jam-makers let us say, Spooner, though that is not the real name. Sometimes the jam tin bomb fails to explode, and the Germans promptly pitch it back into the nearest British trench. A week or two ago one such jam tin bomb was returned with a label attached to it, and on the label was written: "Gott strafe Spooner!"

HYSTERICAL ANNOUS

All of Those at War Must Be Treated as Emotionally Unstable.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The philosophical observer must feel that a dangerous form of hysteria, approaching dementia, has afflicted Germany, and that a tendency toward the same mind-becoming disorder is manifestly growing in England. We cannot effectively argue with one in the grasp of hysteria or of dementia. Such a one is obsessed by one or more fixed ideas, by lack of any sense of proportion, and is utterly unamenable to reason. He is like a child or weak-minded person, whose only reply to question or argument is: "Because," "Because I wish it," "Because I will have it." But hysteria generally passes away and the mind becomes unclouded and reason resumes her sway.

When a member of one's family is hysterical neither reason nor force has any efficiency. Infinite tenderness, patience and consideration long continued may be and usually are helpful.

England and her allies and Germany and her allies are equally fixed in their ideas as to the object of the war and the rights involved, and both deem the United States to be unfair in its diplomatic demands and unwisely and unreasonable in insisting upon an immediate recognition of the rights claimed for Americans.

We Americans are but a greater England. In company with the older England we have the same language and literature, the same Bible, Shakespeare and Milton; the same customs, habits and common law, and largely the same religion. In all high essentials we are one and the same race and people. These vital facts have not been materially changed by the large admixture of other races. Language, law, customs and religion, all the dominant factors of race, have made us essentially an English people. And so it is that I, of English descent and a careful student of this war and its conditions, am body, heart and soul in full sympathy with England as against Germany. But I am not able to agree fully with Sir Edward Grey's last remarkably fine note.

Hysteria may be contagious. A universal epidemic prevails in Europe, and there are symptoms of its presence in America. Bryan, a few Irish and most Germans have hysteria in its worst form.

Our President and Mr. Lansing have thus far escaped it. But is it not now the part of the United States to treat both England and Germany as "hysterics"? Should we not—not sacrificing any vital right—temporize with and humor them as spoiled and angry children, temporarily too afflicted for effective reason?

Our differences with England do not involve "life" or "honor" and relate solely to questions of property and legal construction. Surely such questions do not require immediate settlement. Why may they not stand over for, say, one year, and be submitted to suitable legal action? Is not the same idea applicable to the German notes? Except that "life" being involved by German actions, no postponement should lie in that regard. Would not full German assurance that no merchant or passenger ships would be destroyed without ample provision and time for lifesaving justify the United States in postponing the final adjustment to a more convenient season and to settlement by the forms of legal proceeding?

Where too grievous hardships might occur by delay in payment of the claimed debt, advance relief might be provided by our own government.

Cash in hand is not a necessity so long as we stand firm for our rights. So close is our kinship with England, so many worthy Germans are fellow citizens, that it seems to the writer that America may go as far as is honorably possible in the exercise of patience and tender consideration to our great and good friends, the English and German peoples, while they are the victims of hysteria. When this clouds go by we may all of us better see what is fair and right.

JOSEPH CLIBERTSON CLAYTON, Brooklyn, Aug. 7, 1915.

For Peace at All Costs.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It was with great satisfaction that I read the letter in to-day's Tribune by Miss Cleghorn. It seems as if since the outbreak of the war a great multitude of the people of this country have completely "lost their nerve" and are becoming frantic in their advocacy of "preparedness." The countries of Europe, including Belgium, have had "preparedness," and are now reaping the fruits thereof. This country has never been adequately defended, and no country has been freer from foreign wars. Let us arm, as we are advised, and we shall shortly have war. The doctrine that a large army and navy are an insurance against war is, of course, exploded. The men who formerly were most emphatic in their expression of that belief have nimbly shifted their position, and now tell us that we must maintain a great army and navy, not as an insurance against war, but to be ready for war when it arrives. These men having been so utterly and woefully wrong in their former assertions, dare we give ear to their present utterances?

Emerson says somewhere that the people are always ahead of institutions. The countries of the world, society at large, have more slowly than the individuals that comprise them. Nations, still tight; individuals gave it up long ago. There was a time when, if a "gentleman" received an affront, there was one way to wipe out the stain on his honor—fight! Gradually men with sense began to realize the utter stupidity of such conduct. They perceived that it settled no quarrels, but intensified them; that it could not prove who was in the right, and that even to the victor it was a costly and dangerous proceeding. Then, one by one, men arose who had the courage to stand up to the crowd, and to refuse to fight, and so duelling passed out. To-day the man who stoops to fight with pistol, sword or fists is looked upon as a ruffian. We need men who have the courage to take the same stand with regard to our nation's affairs—men who realize that there is only one way to stop fighting, and that is, to stop fighting; men who can see that it is better for the ultimate destiny of our country and of the human race that we refuse to fight, and that we should lose a little prestige, a little territory perhaps, a little trade, rather than engage in the slaughter of the men of other nations and the sacrifice of our own.

Let us bring up our children in the belief that there is no modification or qualification of the commandment "Thou shalt not kill." Let us teach them that there can be no justification whatever of the willful killing of a human being. Let us keep before them the words of our President: "There is such a thing as being too proud to fight." Let us, in other words, bring them up in the teachings of Jesus—not the theological dogmas of the Church, for they, fortunately, are fast decaying, have already decayed, but in the simple teachings that came directly from the lips of the Man of Nazareth, and which in modern times have been bravely repeated by men like Tolstoy, the teachings which are summed up in the words, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." And, finally, let us keep before them (and us) the truth that Jesus was a believer in and a preacher of peace.

JOHN MEDFORD, ANY PLACE, 188 Prospect Place, Brooklyn, Aug. 2, 1915



THE PROGRESSIVE HEGIRA

Opportunity for Them Now to Work with Republicans.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Progressives of New York having been reported as favoring, by a distinct majority of their leaders, maintenance of their separate party organization, notwithstanding that many of their most prominent members and former workers and leaders favor disbanding and returning to the Republican fold, the ground of the determination to "stand pat" becomes interesting. The implication is that both the old parties are boss-ridden, allied to ancient and worn out ideals which Progressives have repudiated and, on the whole, that they lack substantially all the virtues that the Progressives claim to have largely monopolized; virtues a new catalogue of which seems not yet to have been made up but which is promised soon, as Colonel Roosevelt is reported to be engaged on the fabrication of a new platform.

With the assumption of superior virtue, vociferously proclaimed in 1912, the general electorate of the land is familiar; that electorate obviously has appraised and measured it with some care, and the result has been, as Senator Root just about a year ago declared, "the most remarkable desertion by Progressives of a party and realignment with the party they had temporarily deserted that the history of political parties in the United States had ever exhibited. But three years have elapsed since the construction of the Chicago Progressive platform, the first two planks of which pledged the party to advocacy of direct nominations and nation-wide Presidential preference primaries. Multi-tudes will recall that the most vigorous opponent of Governor Hughes's policies along these lines was Lieutenant Governor Woodruff, and that, notwithstanding that hostility to what those planks proclaimed, Colonel Roosevelt, in the face of his own declaration that every Progressive must accept each and every plank of that platform, accepted and eulogized Woodruff because he supported him, and let the planks go, as mere rubbish, together with other planks of the same sacred platform! And this suggests another contrast—from the fact that during the last legislative session State Chairman Tanner, before the County Committee, declared his strong opposition to the then pending Argetsinger bill, the object of which was to restore the old convention system which the new primary law had displaced. Mr. Tanner asserting that in his view those who had advocated and secured the passage of the new law were entitled to have it practically tested and judged by its results. No one announced that a single well known Progressive opposed the Argetsinger bill. We know it never became a law and that Republicans improved the primary law and made it more effective.

That Mr. Perkins should desire the continuance of the Progressive party should surprise no one. A man who has put scores of thousands of dollars into an enterprise naturally revolts at seeing it come to naught. But a significant part of his speech has a practical bearing—that in which he advocates the establishment of a non-partisan tariff commission, empowered to gather facts on which tariff legislation may be based. He says a plank advocating that was in the Progressive Chicago platform. That is true, but he—suppose designedly—ignores the fact that before the Progressive party was born President Taft had fought for and secured legal authority for just such a commission, had appointed one, with a distinguished Yale professor at the head of it, and that that commission had gathered voluminous statistics available for the action of Congress. In all his advocacy in the 1912 campaign of such a commission Colonel Roosevelt persistently ignored—as Mr. Perkins now does—this great achievement of Mr. Taft. But the question is bound to recur—and it is especially significant for Mr. Perkins, in view of his obvious belief in the importance of a platform.

Finally, does not this 1915 exigency present to Progressives a great opportunity—an opportunity which also is a test of judgment and patriotism? Whatever ambitions certain of them may have had, the great majority must have been actuated by worthy motives and must desire to see those principles which

AMERICA'S ATTITUDE

Too Much Neutrality, Regardless of the Fate of Liberty.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Who can doubt that a triumphant Germany as soon as she had rested would make short shrift of the South American republics, and would soon seek to impose her will upon the United States itself? It is as much in the interests of the United States that German despotism should be brought low as it is in the interests of the British Empire, and the United States will benefit without firing a shot or sacrificing a man.

Why, then, should the United States seek to hamper and cripple the efforts which the British fleet is putting forth to strangle the mad dog which is now running amok in Europe? Were it not for the British fleet the whole world would at this hour be at the feet of Germany. If the United States view were accepted by England not only would the war be prolonged, but it would cause the additional destruction of hundreds of thousands of the best lives in Britain, France, Russia and Italy. In view of all the circumstances surrounding this war, is it inspiring to see a great country like the United States insisting on the adoption of its view, even if it were technically correct?

The root of it all is, I think, to be found in the feverish desire of the United States government to remain absolutely neutral in the great struggle for human liberty, even though liberty be forever silenced. The government desires to go according to the bond and exact its pound of flesh from all the belligerents as far as it can, making no distinction between a humane man fighting for his neighbors as well as for himself and a murderer, who is endeavoring to kill every one who stands in the way of his desires. Look at the invasion and devastation of Belgium and the massacre and rape of its inhabitants! Look at the bombardment of the sea and sky of defenseless cities and the murder of women and children therein! Look at the atrocities committed on the sea that would cause to blush the most brutal pirate who sailed the seas under the seal and crossbones in the days of old!

It is difficult to understand the despicable balancing of neutrality which has been displayed by the government of the United States since the war began. It is certainly bloodless in more ways than one. The best minds in the United States are opposed to it, and the other day your greatest living light in literature renounced his citizenship because of it. Few people had any desire for the government of the United States to join the Allies in the stupendous struggle in which they are engaged. But every one did expect that it would have placed on record its abhorrence of Germany's methods of warfare. The other neutral nations lying at Germany's door are so small and weak that they dare not utter a sound, but it is not so with the United States.

The attitude of The Tribune and other papers is equally puzzling. The Tribune is wholeheartedly on the side of the Allies, but it has never protested against the silence of the government in regard to international atrocities. Then, when American citizens, The Tribune and other New York newspapers, exhausted the vocabulary of righteous indignation in denunciation of Germany's action, it would always with the qualification that it would not lead to war, as if a nation like Germany would pay any attention to a remonstrance unless it knew that it would be backed up by force if necessary.

Again, the other day, The Tribune had a splendid article on how the United States was as much concerned as were the Allies in the destruction of German militarism. In other words, the Allies were pouring out blood and treasure beyond computation in the struggle, and if they win the United States, without losing a man almost, will gain as much as they, but in the meantime American trade must not be interfered with or restricted. It, therefore, comes to this—that the United States is willing to leave to other nations the battle for human freedom and to reap the benefit, but it is not willing to sacrifice any trade in order to hasten victory.

H. DROMAIRE, Ottawa, Canada, Aug. 7, 1915.

Cold Blooded.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Mr. Andrew Colvin may have travelled extensively in New York State, as he says, and he may think by so doing he has gained the opinion of the majority of the people. If so, they are, like him, pretty cold blooded Americans. If Mr. Colvin had lost some of his own dear ones on the Lusitania he might not be so calm over it.

His wonderful assurance about foretelling elections ought to make him a very valuable newspaper editor. JOHN GREENE, New York, Aug. 9, 1915.