

New York Tribune.

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

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 410 N. York St., New York, N. Y.

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

Foreign Rates: Daily and Sunday, one month, \$1.00; three months, \$2.75; six months, \$5.00; one year, \$9.00.

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.

Muddlers Defiant.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the scene in the House of Commons will have a chilling effect upon every American friend of the English.

There were questions which America, in a curious but far from censorious mood, looked to see answered.

But it is because Americans have suffered and continue to suffer from the "watchful waiting" impolicy which prevails in Washington that, so far as they sympathize with England, they hoped to see British administration emerge from the wholly comparable fog of a "wait and see" attitude into something approaching a frank confession of past failure as an incident to the appreciation of present and future needs.

All of this is precisely what Mr. Asquith's speech lacks, for Americans. It is well known to us all how great have been the tasks faced and surmounted by the British.

These are not the things, however, that one expected Mr. Asquith to discuss, to appeal to with pride. The essential fact is that there have been blunders, costly, stupid, far-reaching mistakes, mistakes as to munitions, as to the Balkan situation, conceivably as to the Dardanelles campaign as a whole, certainly as to details in it.

To meet this comment and criticism with cheap political phrases about "whimperers," to seek to demolish the critics by an assumption of scorn and the use of contemptuous adjectives is the obvious political device.

The result is we in America are thrown back upon the recollection of the still recent past of the Asquith leadership.

Unpleasantly but unmistakably Mr. Asquith's speech and manner in his latest speech recall a score of other similar proceedings. There is the same mastery of parliamentary weapons, the same self-assurance, approximating arrogance, and the same readiness to banish solid facts by showy words and transform difficulties into achievements or else destroy them by a few well chosen words which characterize all Liberal statesmanship in its dealing with foreign affairs for a decade.

No American who knows England fancies that the weakest ministry in the world could permanently stand between the British people and the work that is before them if the empire is to be preserved.

Nothing in the world is at once more tragic and more ridiculous than the fact that a world war came to England, the greatest, most terrible struggle in her existence, almost in the night, and found a majority, a vast majority, of the British people not merely unprepared, but in point

of fact unable to perceive immediately what it meant. For days that were precious and portentous the official policy of Great Britain was to seek, because a ministry which had lulled the public into false security was compelled to wait until something like the invasion of Belgium gave a temporary spur to British imagination and patriotism.

Now the ministry which is responsible for this has technically departed. But the same conspicuous figures, particularly Mr. Asquith and Mr. Grey, remain. There is nothing unforgivable in blunders, perhaps, although some blunders pass human understanding and tax human endurance, but when to these are added the failures and fiascos of the past fifteen months, then it becomes difficult to understand the reappearance of the same arrogance, cocksureness, impatience and contempt of criticism which characterized the same men when they were making what the whole world knows now were colossal blunders of incalculable injury to their country.

An American view of British conditions to-day is necessarily affected by the scanty store of accurate information at hand here. Criticisms are based upon dangerous half truths necessarily. But, at bottom, the feeling of apprehension not as to the ultimate outcome but as to the intermediate consequences of the present régime is traceable in no small degree to the fact that it is a similar type of political wisdom and political manipulation which has made America's rôle so contemptible in recent months. We have suffered in peace from vices which, in our eyes, are discoverable in the whole face of British affairs at this moment, and the same lack of confidence which many Americans feel in their own government inspires them with distrust of the British.

One is bound, after all, to reflect upon the incredible good fortune of the United States in the Civil War in finding and keeping a great leader. A contrast of the humility, the self-effacement, the patient wisdom of Abraham Lincoln with the attitude and action of Mr. Asquith must be a revelation.

For mistakes there was no cover and no disguise. For all aid, service, effort there was ready appreciation and an insured hearing. Through all the night of agony and despair that lasted for four long years there was no attempt to deceive by words, to trick by political manipulation. Lincoln did not resort to the shams of the campaign orator to destroy critics in whose censure there was justice and reason, however mingled it was with malice.

The recollection of our own great trial has made it easy for us Americans to grasp and appreciate much of the British situation. The failure of generals, of improvised armies, of ill-advised campaigns, the heartbreaking depression that comes when men and munitions are found and the leader does not appear, all these are easily understood by us. So also is the strength that underlies the weakness of democracies, which gives them victory in the end because it grows with danger and defeat, while autocracy and monarchy necessarily weaken in adversity.

All this Americans comprehend, but this does not yet enable them to grasp the British situation because it remains always incomprehensible that the men who are responsible for unnecessary perils, who deceived the nation with words and deluded it by empty phrases, should be able to hold on in power and continue, not chastened or taught by the past, but clinging still to the old fatal method.

No sensible person in America expects England to fail, to lose the war, to collapse, but there remains the wonder as to how much longer it will be before England is awake in every part as France has been for all these terrible and glorious months that have won for the French the right to be hailed as the true defenders of the faith that is democracy.

An Unofficial Executive Budget.

Though the executive budget feature of the new constitution has gone down with the rest of that document, the principle is to have a trial under an arrangement Governor Whitman has worked out. A special legislative committee has been making an investigation of the department payrolls. Representatives of that committee, of the Senate and Assembly Appropriations committees and a couple of budget experts are to go over with the Governor the department estimates for appropriations, which under the law are submitted to the Controller and by him submitted to the appropriate legislative committees. The Governor and his advisers will thus make up a tentative budget, holding hearings and doing the work ordinarily done by the legislative committees, but doing it at the beginning of the year instead of well along in the legislative session. This tentative budget thus prepared the Governor, presumably, intends to have introduced as the annual appropriation bill.

What the Legislature will think of this invasion of its province and what it will do to the bill thus drawn up remain to be seen. The scheme, naturally, lacks some of the features which were characteristic of the budget plan in the defeated constitution, chiefly the restriction on the Legislature's increasing any appropriation estimate submitted by the Governor. Nevertheless, imperfect as it might be and lacking in precedent and authority of law, the Governor's scheme would have advantages. It would place before the people of the state a fairly comprehensive outline of proposed expenditures and focus attention on these estimates. It would have all the merits of openness and publicity as opposed to the star chamber secrecy in which the legislative appropriation bills are conducted. What the Legislature did to the estimates thus prepared would be beyond the Governor's control, save in the matter of vetoing separate appropriations, since this budget of his would be extra-official. Notwithstanding all this and the possible antagonism of legislators, the plan is promising enough of results better than those of the present system, so that it de-

What the Legislature will think of this invasion of its province and what it will do to the bill thus drawn up remain to be seen. The scheme, naturally, lacks some of the features which were characteristic of the budget plan in the defeated constitution, chiefly the restriction on the Legislature's increasing any appropriation estimate submitted by the Governor. Nevertheless, imperfect as it might be and lacking in precedent and authority of law, the Governor's scheme would have advantages. It would place before the people of the state a fairly comprehensive outline of proposed expenditures and focus attention on these estimates. It would have all the merits of openness and publicity as opposed to the star chamber secrecy in which the legislative appropriation bills are conducted. What the Legislature did to the estimates thus prepared would be beyond the Governor's control, save in the matter of vetoing separate appropriations, since this budget of his would be extra-official. Notwithstanding all this and the possible antagonism of legislators, the plan is promising enough of results better than those of the present system, so that it de-

Nothing in the world is at once more tragic and more ridiculous than the fact that a world war came to England, the greatest, most terrible struggle in her existence, almost in the night, and found a majority, a vast majority, of the British people not merely unprepared, but in point

of fact unable to perceive immediately what it meant. For days that were precious and portentous the official policy of Great Britain was to seek, because a ministry which had lulled the public into false security was compelled to wait until something like the invasion of Belgium gave a temporary spur to British imagination and patriotism.

Now the ministry which is responsible for this has technically departed. But the same conspicuous figures, particularly Mr. Asquith and Mr. Grey, remain. There is nothing unforgivable in blunders, perhaps, although some blunders pass human understanding and tax human endurance, but when to these are added the failures and fiascos of the past fifteen months, then it becomes difficult to understand the reappearance of the same arrogance, cocksureness, impatience and contempt of criticism which characterized the same men when they were making what the whole world knows now were colossal blunders of incalculable injury to their country.

An American view of British conditions to-day is necessarily affected by the scanty store of accurate information at hand here. Criticisms are based upon dangerous half truths necessarily. But, at bottom, the feeling of apprehension not as to the ultimate outcome but as to the intermediate consequences of the present régime is traceable in no small degree to the fact that it is a similar type of political wisdom and political manipulation which has made America's rôle so contemptible in recent months. We have suffered in peace from vices which, in our eyes, are discoverable in the whole face of British affairs at this moment, and the same lack of confidence which many Americans feel in their own government inspires them with distrust of the British.

One is bound, after all, to reflect upon the incredible good fortune of the United States in the Civil War in finding and keeping a great leader. A contrast of the humility, the self-effacement, the patient wisdom of Abraham Lincoln with the attitude and action of Mr. Asquith must be a revelation.

For mistakes there was no cover and no disguise. For all aid, service, effort there was ready appreciation and an insured hearing. Through all the night of agony and despair that lasted for four long years there was no attempt to deceive by words, to trick by political manipulation. Lincoln did not resort to the shams of the campaign orator to destroy critics in whose censure there was justice and reason, however mingled it was with malice.

The recollection of our own great trial has made it easy for us Americans to grasp and appreciate much of the British situation. The failure of generals, of improvised armies, of ill-advised campaigns, the heartbreaking depression that comes when men and munitions are found and the leader does not appear, all these are easily understood by us. So also is the strength that underlies the weakness of democracies, which gives them victory in the end because it grows with danger and defeat, while autocracy and monarchy necessarily weaken in adversity.

All this Americans comprehend, but this does not yet enable them to grasp the British situation because it remains always incomprehensible that the men who are responsible for unnecessary perils, who deceived the nation with words and deluded it by empty phrases, should be able to hold on in power and continue, not chastened or taught by the past, but clinging still to the old fatal method.

Christabel's Ingratitude.

When it is considered what the Pankhursts, mother and daughters, owe to this country in courtesy and hard cash, it seems somewhat ungracious of Miss Christabel to urge Great Britain to defy us. And the pain of this ingratitude is not lessened by the thought that she could not wait for knowledge of the text of President Wilson's message to attack it. Of course, it was woman's intuition which told her what the note contained, and woman's impulsiveness which bade her act on intuition. But the smallest desire to be kind to us should have counselled patience, at least until the message could have been made public.

Is Miss Christabel so engrossed in the fortunes of the war that she forgets, if she ever knew, that our President professed his belief in universal suffrage recently and voted for it in New Jersey? What more calculated to melt the heart of a militant? Yet here, on the very eve of his nuptials, the champion of her sex is giving him an example in high relief of the uncertainty of woman, is casting his overtures in his teeth.

Ah, well, anything to get at Sir Edward Grey! That is the secret of this seeming base ingratitude. Woman, and particularly militant woman, is Prussian to the core in this respect, that neutrals, non-combatants, even friends, not to mention facts, must go down before the necessities of offence. "Hit 'em first!" is her motto. She ought to be in the Cabinet.

One wonders what George W. Perkins and Harry K. Thaw will tackle next.

Bartholdi and Bronze.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Having read the letter in this morning's "Forum" entitled "Painting the Lily," by J. W., in reference to the renovating of the Statue of Liberty, I would add my protest to his for several reasons. First, would M. Bartholdi desire his first idea changed? Second, bronze has excellent quality. And the third reason is a personal one: my father, now gone, was greatly interested in the use of bronze. He went to France to consult with M. Bartholdi about the use of bronze in the Statue of Liberty. He also met Mme. Bartholdi (the mother) and enjoyed a pleasant visit with her in her garden. My father brought home a small bust figure of the Statue of Liberty in bronze. It is inscribed "Souvenir de l'Exposition 1878 Statue de la Liberté. Copyright 30 August 1878." Perhaps it is well known that the Statue of Liberty is a model of M. Bartholdi's wife. The small model shows exquisite features. "Remove not the old land-mark" is Biblical instruction. In other words, do not change or disturb an historical piece of value. Consider whether M. Bartholdi would desire any thing but bronze. ANNA N. LAW. Pittston, Penn., Nov. 2, 1915.

LET THE UNITED STATES PAY Better to Compensate Lusitanian Claimants That Way than Accept German Gold.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: There is food for thought to be found in your news columns this morning. Probably few people were surprised to learn that the Naval Board reported that the fragments of what sank the Hesperian were those of a torpedo; had the report been otherwise no doubt it would have been made known long ago, since such a report would have closed the Hesperian incident for all time. Nor is it any surprise to know that the Hesperian will not be an apple of discord; the indications to that effect have been for some time quite clear.

The explanation suggested by your correspondent, that no affidavits or depositions were taken to establish the identity of the fragments which our board examined, might be improved; it reminds one of the traditional method of the ostrich. So, too, it was generally understood that Germany does not intend to recede from her contention that the attack of her submarine on the Lusitania was a perfectly proper act of war. We have also realized that our government has decided that so long as Germany does not repeat similar attacks we will, despite our earlier notes, allow the Lusitania incident to slip into the limbo of forgotten things.

But it is somewhat of a shock to hear that for doing so we are willing to take German gold. It is to be hoped that this transaction be not completed before the last Thursday of November. Think of the irony of offering up thanksgiving for "peace with honor" when we have in our pockets the blood money paid for our slaughtered fellow citizens!

Germany, in violation of international law and of our rights as a neutral, kills our citizens on the high seas. In face of our repeated protests she still insists that she did no wrong, but it is now said, will offer us money if we will say no more about it. Present ease and comfort may be worth much, but the opinion of posterity seems, to some of us, also worthy of consideration. To allow such an occurrence as that of the Lusitania to be forgotten, to pass it by on the assurance that it will not be repeated, because this great nation is patient, long suffering, peace loving is one thing; it may win a niche in history's hall of fame as the action of a high-spirited but kindly people. But to allow an offending nation to repudiate our assertions as to the rights of our citizens and, at the same time, accept her money is a very different proposition. If there are losses sustained by our citizens in the disaster which should be made good to them, so far as money can make them good, let us pay those losses ourselves. But may we not be spared the humiliation of having German money flung to us, not as compensation for a conceded wrong (for Germany makes no such concession and apparently never will), but as part consideration for troubling her no more with our complaints? New York, Oct. 31, 1915. E. H. L.

Honor and the Yellow Peril.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Germany, as everybody admits, is built up on a foundation of efficiency. This has led her to make greed her motive to power and conquest and to make treachery and assassination her weapons to achieve her end. Seizing an assassination of two royal persons as a pretext, she dictated to Russia, who would not and who could not submit to dictation, and immediately Germany, unmasked, began her march by overrunning Belgium to get at peaceful France, an ally of Russia. Her efficiency has had wonderful success on the battlefields up to now, but at the beginning she ran against honor which will defeat her.

The British Empire, founded on honor, standing aloof until Belgium was attacked, took immediate steps to utilize her force, her navy, to uphold her honor, and how well the navy has performed its task is as clearly seen as the noonday sun. The British navy with its fleet under the flag bearing the symbol of the cross is the power that gives us peace and security to-day and that will enable us to proceed to strengthen ourselves in our navy and army in the near future. I do not recall an instance of the British navy having a stain on its honor and I look for a union of the British and American peoples for the advancement of civilization and peace throughout the world.

Our peril is the Yellow Peril—referring not to the Japanese, Chinese or any other eastern people, but to the German race from the earth, taken to the mint and when refined and issued called the dollar; that metal that all men have advanced to the position of arbiter of settlement of indebtedness between mankind; that metal for which crimes of all kinds and degrees are committed. But I think the time is not far distant when honor will be the supreme test of manhood and credit will supplant material things. G. C. THOMAS. Brooklyn, Nov. 1, 1915.

Secret Service Methods.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: What are the Secret Service men for? Here we read in the papers that they have been on the trail of some of these German plotters and arrested four or five of them; also that they are looking for others in the conspiracy. Now, is it not a fact that these secret investigations are no business of the public until the whole plot is uncovered and the last man engaged in it arrested?

If I say the truth that he was sent here by the German government for the purpose of destroying munition works or disabling English steamers, is there any one who won't believe that Bernstorff, von Papen and Boy-Ed know all about it, as representatives of Germany? It is ridiculous to believe that the German government sent an army man here on such an errand without informing their ambassador, in this case Bernstorff, who is working so hard not to lose the friendship of President Wilson for Germany.

Dumba had to leave, and his actions were more in the open. Bernstorff stays. Why? Because he knows how to put MULLER on the back. J. WUELLER. New York, Oct. 31, 1915.

Fifty for One.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I was amused at Mr. Merriman's letter in The Tribune of October 22, in which he complains of the traditional spirit no longer being represented, the spirit which prompted his revered ancestors to read it. Mr. Merriman does not seem to realize that the fault is with himself, not The Tribune, for it was no doubt as far ahead of his ancestors then as he is behind it now, but, unlike him, his ancestors kept up with The Tribune. My ancestors, too, read The Tribune. It was considered second only to the Bible, and never was allowed on the pantry shelves. I am now proud of the fact that, like my ancestors, I can appreciate the firm stand The Tribune takes on all public questions—not see-sawing, as many daily papers do. Where one Merriman ceases to subscribe because of The Tribune's progress and the decided stand it is taking for truth and justice, fifty will be added to its list of readers. Elizabeth, N. J., Oct. 31, 1915. S. T. L.



CHRISTIANS UNDER TURKISH RULE

A Prolonged Agony, According to an Armenian, Who Denies the Existence of Any Laws Except for Moslems.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Zia Mufty-Zade Bey, in a letter published in a recent issue of a New York paper, which has not deemed it necessary to say a word about the present Turkish atrocities, irreverently ventures to place upon the Armenians the responsibility for the indescribable atrocities now ruthlessly going on in the Turkish Empire upon the unarmed and absolutely innocent Christians.

Permit me to say a few words and state some facts concerning the Turks and the defence of Armenians, who in these days of their national sorrow must at least be spared libellous accusations. Any one interested in the sad reports from Eastern Christian countries long before this war, and standing by the side of truth and justice, will admit that the cruel Turkish administration was endeavoring by all means, be it by systematic murder or by unpeaked oppression, to exterminate non-Muslim nationalities. A glance at the pages of history will convince us that the Christians were never left in peace under the Turkish despotism.

The Armenians were for many centuries destined to Moslem brutalities, but nothing could keep them away from Christianity, to which they clung more and more. The capture of Constantinople (1453) marks the beginning of a series of terrible slaughters of European Christians. They are recorded in hundreds of volumes, and can be found at the Public Library on Fifth Avenue. I would advise Mr. Mufty-Zade to "give them the once over."

The massacres of Greeks, particularly that of Scio, where out of 100,000 innocent inhabitants 900 were left; the Serbians' sufferings of fearful oppression under the rule of Turks until 1830, and Rumania's troubles with the Turks until 1877; the Bulgarian massacres in 1876, and their sufferings of brutal barbarities until 1880—it is impossible to give an adequate description of the crimes committed by these felonious Turks. It is undeniable that they carried fire and sword wherever they went, with one thought in their minds, the extermination of Christians! This was the battle cry on the lips of Turks since the year 1045, the beginning of their unrelenting invasions.

After the Treaty of Berlin for the Eastern Question, in 1878, by which Bulgaria's liberation was obtained, everything seemed to be going on quietly, but in reality the systematic murder and oppression were going on, and the Christian nations left under the intolerable yoke of the Ottoman Empire still suffered intensely. This caused among the Armenians a very natural uneasiness, which resulted in an unimaginable slaughter of 50,000 innocent Armenians (1895-96) that shocked the civilized world. Nothing was done for them, and so the sixty-first and sixty-second clauses of the Treaty of Berlin, which were supposed to have the power to stop the Turk's bloody sword, proved to be futile, or, according to the German expression, "a scrap of paper." And even after this wholesale murder, for which the signers of the Treaty of Berlin were responsible, day by day, every year, were received the reports of maltreatments and heartrending brutalities on the Armenians.

And later came the massacres of Macedonians under the very nose of civilized Europe. But all these happened before the Young Turks entered Constantinople—that is, under the bloody rule of Abdul Hamid. Some optimistic people believed and hoped that after the entry of the Young Turks party into the Ottoman capital civilization would succeed barbarism in Turkey. Alas! When in 1908, on July 24, the constitution was granted and the Young Turks took possession of the government, from all corners was heard the song of fraternity, equality, liberty. The Christian nations rejoiced, for at last they thought they would breathe in freedom. Right after these celebrated events 20,000 innocent Armenians

FOR A TARIFF COMMISSION

Agitation for Its Creation Is Bearing Good Fruit.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: You will be interested to know that the Tariff Commission League has met with a most enthusiastic response in all sections of the country, and that the overwhelming majority of editorial opinion favors the tariff commission principle. This applies to papers representing all shades of politics and tariff policy.

It is particularly desired to emphasize the fact that the Tariff Commission League has not been organized for the purpose of stirring up trouble. The league has active supporters in all the leading parties. The fundamental reason for our existence is to be found in the phrase of one of our advisory committee, Mr. Thomas A. Edison, who has stated that the greatest problem now confronting the American people consists in proving that a democracy can be efficient. If the present tariff were working perfectly there would be no Tariff Commission League. In our opinion, however, the proof that the present tariff, which we believe to be one of the most conscientiously drafted we have ever had in this country, is not working perfectly is the fact that the very men who made it are now proposing changes in it. From all over the country we are receiving reported statements of Democratic members of Congress who have one or more amendments to propose at the coming session.

It may as well be said at once that the men who are giving their time and influence to the work of the Tariff Commission League are not so deluded as to believe that the purely political questions of protection, or tariff for revenue, or free trade, can ever be so sterilized as to render them non-political. It will always be the duty of the representatives in this country to elect Representatives in Congress pledged to some particular form of tariff, either high, low, or in between. These are political questions. Men who have grown up fighting over free trade or protection are not going to relinquish their fundamental beliefs or intrust them to a government commission.

When the country has stated its preference, however, who is going to carry out this preference according to orders? The carrying out of the decree of the people is not a political question, but a scientific question. That is where the tariff commission proposition comes in. Senator Owen, who is a member of the most important committees in the Senate and one of the ablest Democrats in public life, stated in my hearing only a short time ago that it was impossible for a committee of Congress to produce a really adequate and scientific tariff. The reason for this is that a Congressman is required by his duty to his constituents to cover an enormously varied list of subjects and to perform an almost innumerable variety of unrelated services. It is absolutely impossible for him, in the brief time at his disposal and on the basis of the often unreliable evidence which is presented to him, to work out a fair relationship between the many thousand items of duty, on the one hand, and the commerce, the industry and the income of the nation as a whole, on the other.

It took the German Tariff Commission more than ten years to go over the tariff once and work out a well organized system on the basis of which the Reichstag could act. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, after a careful investigation of the matter, has stated that it considers the well rounded policy of Germany to have contributed very largely toward German commercial strength. The men who are behind the Tariff Commission League are very earnest and very enthusiastic about the principle. The only thing they desire is that every man who has a part in shaping public opinion should know exactly the principles upon which we are working. We believe that the tariff commission principle has never had a fair trial in the United States on the basis of a board made up of the best men available in the country, with ample time to cover the ground thoroughly. GUY EMERSON. New York, Oct. 27, 1915.

No, Ma'am!

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Did you not make a mistake in the caption of to-day's cartoon? Didn't you mean Canned Name not Quand Mème? New York, Nov. 3, 1915. ANTI.

How It Struck Him.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your leading editorial to-day on "Germany Is Beaten" reminds me of a little boy whistling in the dark to keep up his courage. LEONARD FUCHS. East Orange, N. J., Oct. 29, 1915.