New York Tribune.

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

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 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.		CANADIAN RATES.	
DAILY AND SUNDAY.		DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.34	One month	$ .75
One year	22.00	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	2.25	One month	.50
One year	6.00	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.20	One month	.25
One year	15.00	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.

Those Who Celebrate.

On Tuesday two political machines in New Jersey combined forces to defeat the constitutional amendment permitting women to vote. There was no concealment of the purpose or the activity of the professional politicians; not the smallest effort was made to disguise the fact that every party member, Republican or Democratic, who was responsive to the lash or the word of the boss was "instructed" in his duty.

The machine vote was not the only vote cast against the amendment. It is open to some question whether it was the decisive fraction of the total vote. But what is interesting and instructive to note is that all that the political boss could do he did: that he recognized in the woman vote a peril; that he saw in the extension of the franchise a danger to himself, and he acted on this perception.

Thousands of men who do not believe women should vote expressed their conviction on their ballots. The question is one on which there is honest different of opinion, and it is neither accurate nor fair to describe the opponents of suffrage as boss controlled or to insist that the result was merely machine made.

But the women have, in their New Jersey battle, successfully demonstrated that in the ranks of those who oppose them are all the elements which have in recent years earned and received the punishment which the community has felt the proper portion of the boss and the machinist, the ward heeler and the corruptionist.

A defeat such as that in Jersey will not discourage. The very size of the vote cast for suffrage is an evidence of the popular support already enlisted. But a defeat with such foes is in itself a half victory. If the women of the country can continue to demonstrate that their cause is opposed by the professional politicians as a unit, if they can continue to show that it is the boss who fears most, that the boss fears and fights—then their battle will be won on the face of the evidence.

All over the country there must be thousands of men whose opinions are hostile or lukewarm to woman suffrage who will give the whole subject a second thought when they discover that it is the Nugents and the Jim Smiths, the precinct boss and the district boss who are their inescapable allies, and that in opposing the extension of the franchise they are serving politicians for whom they have no affection.

Not a few people will believe that the machines were responsible for the defeat of the amendment in New Jersey. For this view they will be able to adduce arguments and figures. But even if this be open to doubt, the solid fact remains that the two machines celebrate the result as their own victory, and bosses of the Nugent stripe proclaimed themselves the victors.

These facts will not be forgotten hereafter, nor will they contribute to making the decision of Tuesday enduring.

Sir Edward Carson's Resignation.

There will be many to make light of Sir Edward Carson's resignation. They will argue that he ought never to have been appointed Attorney General, that his presence in the Cabinet was from the first anomalous and that his departure cannot seriously affect the stability of the coalition government. But it is idle to talk in this way, nor will the Radical journals convince the most credulous of their readers by raking up the past and discovering reasons against his having hand in the conduct of national affairs.

No one has forgotten the part Sir Edward Carson was playing up to the very moment the war began. There was nothing hidden or obscure in his methods. He was acting, and had acted for a year, in bold and frank defiance of the government. A member of Parliament and a Privy Councillor, he had deliberately raised an army in Ireland to resist the will of the Parliament. He had openly challenged the government to coerce him. They made light of him at first as a demagogue and fanatic; they laughed at him and threatened him in turn; but never for a moment was he shaken in his purpose, and never did the government dare to discipline him, though the highest legal authority in England had denounced his conduct as grossly illegal and utterly unconstitutional.

Obviously Sir Edward Carson had no proper qualification for a place in the Cabinet. Indeed, there was something ridiculously incongruous in appointing as one of the law officers of the Crown a man who had declared his determination to treat an act of Parliament as a scrap of paper, who had knowingly violated the constitution, set himself up as leader of a band of rebels and expressed the utmost contempt for those in whose power it was to call him to account.

The Liberal papers made the most of all these shocking circumstances at the time of his appointment. Some of them professed to be unable to justify it on any reasonable ground. But, upon the whole the Liberals accepted it with wonderful equanimity, and the reason is plainly apparent. Sir Edward Carson was a man the government dared not ignore, and it was doubtless felt that as a member of the government he would be less dangerous than as a private member. Besides, his extraordinary ability was fully recognized by now even among his bitterest opponents. The man who at first was flouted as a mere noisy blusterer had proved himself, if not a statesman, at least a strong and determined leader.

If his enemies were slow to recognize his potentialities it is no wonder, for it may safely be said that none were more surprised at Carson's development than his old friends and colleagues. At the Irish bar he had not been regarded by his associates as peculiarly brilliant or in any way extraordinary. It is doubtful if the most astute of his acquaintance suspected that he would ever make much of a mark in his profession. It was not till he went to England that his undoubted abilities were made manifest, but before long he had established so great a reputation and secured so immense a practice that when he sacrificed his future to the mad enterprise in Ulster not a few of his friends thought him bereft of all reason and sense. Yet the venture that might have proved his ruin established him more securely than ever as one of the most formidable figures in British politics.

Any resignation from the Cabinet at such a critical moment as the present must be disconcerting. It is idle to pretend that because Carson is the man it does not matter. To say that he ought never to have had a place in the Cabinet is beside the point, and it is beside the point to talk, as "The Daily Chronicle's" Parliamentary correspondent talks, of his opposition to "working class opinion." The uneasiness and dissatisfaction so apparent in England will not be lessened by the resignation of one who was recognized on all hands as a strong man and a man of determination where too many are timid, vacillating and apparently wanting in any definite purpose.

That Republican Bureaucracy.

Insisting that the department reorganization feature of the new constitution is merely a Republican patronage grab, "The World," which a few days ago was positive the present Governor would establish under it a Republican bureaucracy, now admits that "this power may be discretionary." It quotes the following section of the document to back up its assumption: "At the session immediately following the adoption of this constitution the Legislature shall provide by law for the appropriate assignment, to take effect not earlier than the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, of all the civil administrative and executive functions of the state government, except those of assistants in the office of Governor, to the several departments in this article provided."

To assuage "The World's" doubts and dispel its fears, the following facts should be within its knowledge: The foregoing section refers to the enactment of new laws reorganizing department powers and duties. Its phraseology was made to conform to suggestions made by Mr. Alfred E. Smith and Senator Wagner, well known Democrats of this city. It satisfied them and the other Democrats; in fact, it was defended in debate by Democrats. Those Democrats, accepting that wording, showed their understanding that it would be sufficient to prevent any 1916 office dispensing by the present Governor, even if he had such a purpose. Perhaps the following quotation from Mr. Sheehan, a distinguished Democratic delegate, speaks sufficiently on that point: "Mr. Chairman, I assume the new Governor who takes office will not be in office till the 1st of January. That, of course, is the point of Mr. Tanner's amendment and that is the point of Mr. Smith's suggestion that the distribution of powers should take place not as a result of anything the present officers may do."

If Mr. Smith, of Tammany Hall, and Mr. Sheehan, neither of them lacking in hard political experience and neither averse to job-grabbing wherever possible, were satisfied that the Democracy was protected by this clause against Republican rapacity, even "The World" need hardly worry.

Too Good for Tammany.

Tammany Hall's decision to oppose the new constitution openly is interesting, even illuminating, in view of the events leading up to the holding of the Constitutional Convention this year. The proposal for a convention in 1915 instead of in 1917 originated in Tammany Hall when the Democrats controlled the state politically and expected to continue their control. There was much opposition to it, on the ground that such haste was unnecessary, on the score of expense, even because of the origin of the proposal. But it went through the Legislature, and the special election to decide the question was held. In that election there was flagrant ballot box stuffing in favor of the proposal, the most flagrant being in Mr. Murphy's own Assembly district. Whether as the result of such frauds or because of honest desire for the early convention, the question was carried by a slight margin.

But Tammany did not elect a majority of the delegates, as had been hoped. A political overturn occurred which put the Republicans in the majority. The convention assembled and did its work well—not to the complete satisfaction of everybody, not to the extent of producing a flawless instrument; but as well as an able, representative legislative body, working sincerely and without partisanship, could reasonably be expected to do it. For most of the changes embodied in the new constitution a majority of Democrats voted, as well as a majority of Republicans. On its chief features there was substantial agreement by the representatives of both parties when it came to the vote. The new constitution, therefore, is as much a Democratic as a Republican document.

Under those conditions, to have Tammany opposing it means just one thing—that it is too good for Tammany. What is too good for Tammany ought to be just what the rest of the state wants.

Legally Sane.

One day last week a patient from Bellevue Hospital was brought before a justice of the Supreme Court on a writ of habeas corpus. He had been placed in the psychopathic ward provisionally at the instance of his wife and his brother, who desired to have him committed to a hospital for the insane. To support their application they had the certificates of the family physician and a specialist in mental diseases, besides the expert testimony of the head of the psychopathic ward.

The judge's task as a man of law was to decide whether the patient could properly be placed in the class that bears that mysterious label "Legally insane." The fears and apprehensions of his family counted for little, and the opinions of medical men were manifestly of no importance. It is true that one who had had abundant opportunity to observe the patient in the last few days was quite satisfied of his mental unsoundness, and declared that it would not be safe to let him go. But on the other side was the testimony of one of the patient's old friends.

This witness was not a medical man, but one of those plain citizens whose good sense, as we learned from the judge who presided at the latest Thaw trial, is so much more valuable than the musty opinions of doctors whose heads are stuffed with psychiatric fancies and their mouths full of hard words. He had seen the patient and found him in his right mind. For instance, the man who was said to be deranged had a clear memory of something that happened forty years ago, and when he heard of some promising business venture he "wanted to get in on it." What further proof was needed of his soundness of mind? "He struck me as rational," said the witness confidently, "and I believe he is, no matter what the doctors say."

The soundness of this observation evidently appealed to the court more than the judgment of all the doctors together. The physician of the psychopathic ward talked knowingly of a manic-depressive condition and so forth, but when pressed he declined to quibble about the niceties of "legal" insanity, and simply declared that if the man was let loose he would probably be back again in twenty-four hours. So the judge decided that this was clearly not a case of what lawyers call lunacy, and that accordingly the jargon of the physicians was irrelevant.

When counsel for the patient's family asked timidly who was to be responsible for him while he was at large the judge, swelling with indignation, broke forth somewhat as follows: "Responsible! Pray, who is responsible for you? Let me tell you this man is an American citizen and he will be responsible for himself. His liberty may prove an important factor in his recovery."

Three days after this memorable declaration the American citizen was back in the psychopathic ward. The responsibility for this unfortunate relapse was undoubtedly his own. The judge in granting it to him as an American citizen had made him promise to be good and had sent him away with the best advice. "Control your nerves and actions," he had said, and the patient solemnly vowed he would. How was the judge to know that he could not be trusted, unless, indeed, he had given heed to the opinion of the physicians?

Of late physicians have been much ridiculed for their notion of what insanity consists in. It is plain that none of them has a clear understanding of the legal conception of that condition, but are they altogether to blame for their ignorance? One thing is certain: that if a useful reform is to be compassed lawyers as well as physicians must be included in it.

Lord Haldane's Miscalculation.

(From The Spectator.)

Lord Haldane was never a pacificist, and never willing to sacrifice the interests of his country to those of Germany. His fault was to believe in the existence of a peace party in Germany, or rather, to believe that its influence was worth a moment's consideration. To regard his miscalculation as unpatriotic is, however, grossly unjust. It is equally unjust to forget the excellent work done for the Army by Lord Haldane. It is to him we owe the Territorial organization, and also the organization of the Expeditionary Force. Again, it is to him we owe the system of Voluntary Aid Detachments — institutions without which we could not have dealt with our wounded. Lastly, it is to him that we owe the National Reserve. If he did not originate that force, he made it a living thing by his recognition and encouragement. It added some two hundred thousand men to the Army. To forget all this, and to pursue him with what Burke called "a hunt of obloquy," is ignoble—a cause of shame to all self-respecting men.

The Tax Question.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I notice in to-day's Tribune that since the millionaire is so poor as to be obliged to swear off his personal tax the proposition is made that every one with an income of $500 or more should be subject to an income tax. It strikes me the sooner the common people get together and have another Boston Tea Party the quicker this tax question will be settled. The burden will not be left entirely for the poor to bear.

Property should be taxed according to its production. For example, a house renting for $30 a month should not pay more than one month's rent for taxes, instead of three months, as we now pay. Then the salaries of all public employes should be adjusted to the tax receipts, and taxes not be constantly increased to meet salaries and expenses.

MRS. A. B. TEN EYCK.

Astoria, L. I., Oct. 15, 1915.

"THE SHAM"

A Sorry Example That Should Teach Us a Lesson.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your farsighted and unassailable leader in this morning's Tribune rings clear like a clarion call to all thinking men. The facts, so admirably stated by you, must necessarily force themselves on the minds of every student of past, passing and future events.

Are we so obsessed with our petty, prattling, everyday—nay, selfish—desire for the shams and luxuries of our commonplace existence that we forget the great place held by us in the world and the responsibilities to humanity in general placed in our hands? Surely we should be wise enough to profit by the lesson so wofully placed before us. The treasure and blood now being poured out to a heart-breaking degree as a result of overweening confidence and national cock-sureness, from which we as well as the British nation suffer, should give us "furiously to think."

The taint of "muddling through" seems to have spread itself across the Atlantic and to be taking root in the apathetic, one might almost say the anæmic, attitude of the man in the street. Is there no national leader with a soul above political party issues strong enough to voice the cry, "Wake up, America"? Shake off your apathy and apply some of the clearness of vision so apparent in your business matters to the appreciation of the dangers besetting your supine attitude.

Patriotism means sacrifice, not the mere salutation of bunting, and should be a sacred and inner consciousness, prepared at all times to give free-handedly of its best in thought and deed.

Pray accept from one of your readers a sincere appreciation of the clear and clever exposition of the dangers haunting us, while we are "creeping, like a snail, unwillingly to school," though the lessons, bitter ones, but imperative, are shown clearly, as a writing on the wall, that he who runs may read.

V. WINTHROP NEWMAN.

New York, Oct. 20, 1915.

Sham and Shame.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Please let me express my deepest admiration, assent and thanks for the enlightening leader in your journal of this morning.

Rarely does an editor attain such insight into basic truth and transfer its light so effectively to duller vision.

Your parallel between British and American falsity and blindness is as deadly as it is "awful."

The sons of Sham and Shame, both in England and America, are among the chief assets of the "three Turkeys," and to them, as much as to Teutonic battalions, will be due the victory of Wilhelm—if the Omnipotent shall visit the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah upon the miserable lands whose sons continue to lap up lies and wallow in the mire of cowardice.

When we contrast the organized efficiency and absolute solidarity of the Teutons with the wholly opposite qualities of England and America, may not a philosopher at least wonder whether or not the law of the "survival of the fittest" should not require success to Germany?

God grant us mercy, open our eyes, and give to America and to England each just one man equal in real "force" to Wilhelm!

SENEX AMERICANUS.

Brooklyn, Oct. 20, 1915.

Two Thoughtless Nations.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have often wished to express my appreciation of your wonderful editorial page, of which I am a constant reader. As a Canadian in New York, to me The Tribune is typically "American."

I write now to thank you most warmly for giving us to-day the splendid letter from "Johnny Canuck" regarding the American patriots and the United Empire Loyalists. That both bodies were men of whom their descendants may justly be proud any one who knows their history will concede.

To-day those descendants are the backbones of the two great progressive nations of the Western World, living side by side, with no thought of military defence against each other, and having the same institutions and ideals of peace and of personal freedom for the individual.

Since the differences of opinion of our ancestors have long since been settled, is it not a worthy aim to work for the highest form of harmony and sympathy between the Canadian and American people?

Wishing your great paper the utmost success,

ROBERT R. STEVENSON.

New York, Oct. 19, 1915.

The Kaiser's Prediction.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Some six or eight weeks ago reports were published in the newspapers to the effect that the German Emperor, addressing the prominent bankers of the empire, predicted peace in October.

Inasmuch as I doubted the veracity of this report I sent an inquiry to one of my German correspondents, requesting a confirmation of the above statement, and just received a reply under date of September 21 as follows:

"That the German Emperor expects the end of the war in October, and that he should have expressed himself to that effect is not known to us. We do not consider a remark to that effect very probable, because according to all appearances the war is likely to continue for a number of months, inasmuch as our opponents in their blindness and self-conceit are not as yet willing to admit that they have lost the game."

I quote the above lines just as they have been transmitted to me, and leave it to your own judgment to publish the above, should you consider it of sufficient interest to your readers.

WALTER SCHMIDT.

New York, Oct. 19, 1915.

German Savagery.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In regard to the responsibility for the shocking execution of Miss Cavell at Brussels, permit me to say that a regular court martial was held in a class at one of our army posts, where I was a visitor, to decide a supposed case like that of the girl at Liège, who used her private telephone to give the range to the fort, was tried by the German court and shot. Our verdict was that no court founded on Anglo-Saxon law—American or English—would have done more than make her a prisoner.

These executions are part of the benignant, paternal rule which Mr. McClellan discovered in Belgium.

AMERICAN WOMAN.

New York, Oct. 19, 1915.

A Bit of History.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I would like to reply to the letter in your issue of October 15, signed "Good Democrat," as follows: The last time the Democratic party was right is beyond the memory of any living person.

JAMES WILSON.

("Black" Republican.)

New York, Oct. 17, 1915.

"HOWEVER, COMMA, MY HEART BLEEDS FOR SERBIA!"

TAXABLE VALUES IN NEW YORK

The City's Financial Troubles Said To Be Due to an Unnecessary Socialistic Scheme of Government, Destructive of Real Estate.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Mayor Mitchel in a recent statement is reported to have declared that the preposterous personal tax assessments of this year were necessary because of New York City's financial difficulties, which he claimed are largely due to mandatory laws passed at Albany affecting salaries in this city. This statement of the Mayor is not warranted.

New York's troubles are not due to mandatory laws affecting salaries. They are chiefly due to regulatory laws the administration of which by single tax socialists has reduced taxable real estate values to the extent of many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Henry George, the founder of single taxism, declared that private ownership of land was a crime and that "the state must make land common property." Also that the state should "confiscate rental values." While we have no single tax law, single tax men appear to be in control of the city, and they have succeeded in confiscating or destroying rental values and taxable values to an extent that Henry George probably never dreamed possible.

Single tax socialism could be properly designated as benevolent highbrow socialism, and it is a greater menace to the community than the red flag brand of socialism, as its leaders are highly educated and charming men who are obsessed with the idea that it is their moral duty to "rob Peter to pay Paul." Peter in this case represents many thousands of industrious, frugal, law-abiding citizens who have invested their savings in real estate under laws and principles that have obtained for hundreds of years. And Paul represents a million, more or less, of shiftless, incompetent, improvident people, human parasites or sponges. As moths prefer the most expensive garments to lay their eggs in, so these single taxers and half taxers get into the very best social and charitable organizations to propagate their twisted theories.

The upstate members of the Legislature are not to blame for the mandatory and regulatory laws complained of, most of which were passed on the insistent demand of charity workers, social reformers and politicians from this city. While charity and settlement workers are very charming people and deserve the highest praise for their good work, they are not the best advisers as to public policies. Members of the Legislature, however, cannot be expected to give this fact full weight.

To say that home rule will help us out of our troubles is pure nonsense. Every section of the state is deeply interested in the growth and prosperity of New York City, and the upstate members of the Legislature realize the importance of promoting the city's welfare. For the city to continue in the power of interests and influences now in control of its affairs would be a calamity. The Legislature is a factor of incalculable value to the people of this city as a means of protection from the socialists now in power.

Two years ago the city voted for a socialistic programme and it is now paying the penalty. The people voted to put the city on a charity and social reform basis and they have succeeded. They have also put it on as nearly an insolvent basis as it is technically possible for it to be.

The relief afforded real estate owners this year as a result of the personal tax increase will be very slight, and will be greatly overbalanced by the placing of tens of millions of dollars of uncollectible personal taxes on the Controller's books, all of which must be placed in future budgets and raised by taxation.

There are three principal reasons why it is impossible to reduce the cost of government to an extent that would afford substantial relief to taxpayers: First—Short term of our elected officials. Second—Divided authority and responsibility. Third—The civil service laws. It is impossible to overcome the deterrent effect of these conditions.

And what is the net gain to a property owner who saves a few dollars on his tax bill if the selling value of his property is declining 5 or 10 per cent a year and he is called upon to reduce or pay off mortgages? The most important financial duty of the city is to protect property rights, and thereby conserve taxable values, upon which the financial credit of the city is based.

There are thousands of parcels of land in greater New York covered by overdue mortgages that under foreclosure would not sell for more than the amount of the first mortgage. In many cases the title holders stand ready to hand over their deeds to the mortgagee without a contest.

This mortgage situation furnishes further irrefutable evidence of the terrible decline in taxable real estate values. These losses represent the equities of investors, many of whom have put the hard earned savings of a lifetime into real estate, only to see it taken from them in their old age.

Governmental policies that produce such conditions must be fundamentally wrong, and there will be no permanent relief until safer and saner policies are adopted.

The Tenement House Department is the instrumentality through which the single taxers accomplish most in the matter of destroying taxable values. Experts have declared that the cost and loss of taxable values due to the operation of this department alone amount to more than $800,000,000. The department issued 190,000 orders in one year, and it is only one of the many departments that are administered by single taxers, who seem to believe that property owners have no rights.

The natural but unfortunate effect of these laws is to discourage the small investor from buying real estate. Land is being more and more forced into the hands of speculators. This is a grave governmental error. The more the land is divided up in ownership the better for the city. Tenement house officials have said that tenements housing twenty-four families were preferable to houses built for three families. That is the attitude of the Tenement House Department, and presumably of the administration, and it is detrimental to public interest. It would be far better for the city if the twenty-four families lived in eight houses owned by different citizens.

Another fact that should be taken into serious consideration by city officials is that bonds and other forms of investment have declined to a point where their yield is so high that they compete with real estate to a greater extent than ever before.

The city is not deriving the increased land values from the new $350,000,000 subways that would have resulted under safe and sane conditions. The reason is that the bad effects of the overregulation of real estate have offset the good effect of increased transportation facilities.

This overregulation, which has such a crushing effect on taxable real estate values, is to a large extent unnecessary. This statement is based upon a report made to the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, on hygiene and sanitation by Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, John S. Billings and J. H. Bergy; also upon a report of Dr. Leonard Hill, of London, who is the leading pathologist of Great Britain.

If Mayor Mitchel wants to improve the city's financial condition he can do so by taking the administration of regulatory laws out of the hands of socialists and placing business men in charge, with instructions to demand nothing from owners that is not clearly essential for the protection of public health, morals and safety.

This subject is of such supreme importance that it is to be hoped such influential organizations as the Chamber of Commerce, Merchants' Association, New York Board of Trade and Transportation, Manufacturers' Association, real estate boards and taxpayers' associations will give it their earnest consideration and unite in demanding a return to safe and sane governmental policies.

JUDSON G. WALL.

New York, Oct. 18, 1915.

A PLAGUE ON ALL

A Real Neutral Hopes All Belligerents Will Be Licked.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: This is the first time in my life that I have written a letter to a newspaper, but I have seen day after day that you like to give every one a chance to air opinions, so here goes.

One reads so much nowadays of German-Americanism and British-Americanism that one is heartily sick of it. We know or should know that there is no such thing legally as a hyphenated American. One is either an American or one is a citizen of some other country.

If every man who leans toward the Allies and every man who leans toward the Germans be compelled to take a gun and go fight you would find that they would either keep quiet or be absolutely neutral, as we are supposed to.

I noticed a statement in your paper some days ago, written by a Russian gentleman of some prominence, who claims that the societies in this city organized by citizens of German birth have on hand over 100,000 rifles, and that in case of war they would fight for their "Fatherland" and against the United States. This statement, of course, is the rankest nonsense, and only a man with a purpose or with a vivid imagination could think of such a thing.

Let us look at it in a sensible manner. Why do you suppose the Germans have immigrated to this country and become citizens? Most certainly they did not do so to bring this country under German rule. Instead, they came to escape from a country that does not give the poor people a chance to acquire wealth and position; they came here, and more will come, to secure the advantages of the greater opportunities which this country offers them; they came to escape a rigid form of government; they wanted to have a voice in the way they are governed and the laws that are enacted, and to have more freedom of speech and movement. Do you suppose that these people would fight against their adopted country? Not one out of 100,000 would fight against the United States, and the same may be said of any other race who have become Americans.

I cannot see why the real American should care which side wins. As for me, I hope they are all licked. That sounds foolish, but what I mean is that I hope by the time this war ends the countries now taking part will end with the same amount of land they had when they started, and that they will all be so exhausted that they will be unable to think of war again for the next hundred years.

Some people cry, "Help the Allies and save the country from the German horde!" Other people cry, "Help the Germans," etc. Well, if England wins old Johnny Bull will be so cocky that you won't be able to hold him, and if the Germans win the Kaiser will be so bullheaded that you won't be able to hold him. The best thing that can happen will be a draw, for no matter who wins they are going to say that the people of the United States did not treat them right anyway.

That brings up the question of preparedness, and every true American should vote only for the men who have promised their aid to a greatly enlarged army and navy, and let it be started quick, as methinks, my lad, that we are going to have a good use for a very large and able navy within the next few years. We should see that by that time we have at least the second largest navy in the world. I am an American of the sixth generation.

J. A. E.

New York, Oct. 18, 1915.

An Anti-Boss Democrat.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Mr. Salton's letter in your paper yesterday expresses my views. I am the same kind of a Democrat. I used to read "The World," but when "The World" went over to Murphy I quit it and began to read The Tribune.

I like your paper because you are unbossed and against the corrupt form of government we have in this state, which former Governor Sulzer aptly called "the bi-partisan system of graft—fifty-fifty." I am a Democrat who will continue to vote the Republican ticket until the bosses are deposed.

E. A. BAKER.

New York, Oct. 18, 1915.