

New York Tribune.

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

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 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. Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.

Foreign Rates: Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$3.50; 6 mos. \$6.00; 1 year, \$10.00.

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.

Pitiless Publicity.

Steadily, remorselessly, each new detail wrung from the shaken survivors of the Ancona massacre exposes, demolishes, the whole fabric of Mr. Wilson's great diplomatic triumph over Germany, and makes plain beyond peradventure the delusion and the sham of the foreign policy of the United States and the betrayal and sacrifice of American lives by politicians who could utter splendid words, but were incapable of even insignificant action.

Looking back now over the recent months, the most disgraceful and shameful in American history, it is possible to grasp the whole sequence of events, to understand what some have suspected, more have feared, but the majority of the nation is only now beginning to appreciate.

When Germany proclaimed her submarine blockade Mr. Wilson told the Kaiser's government that any infraction of international law by the Germans to the injury of American citizens would mean that the offenders would be held to "strict accountability."

To this Germany replied by the quibble for which it found inspiration in the semi-official statements issued from the State Department that the Lusitania might have been armed, suggestions that fell to the ground on the instant.

Then we have a third and a fourth message, answered by the Arabic. The American women and children of the Lusitania had perished in early May; in September the American government, in the face of new murders, was still writing notes.

But the sinking of the Arabic raised a new point. The Wilson administration was still perfectly satisfied to continue to talk while the Kaiser's government continued to murder. It felt that its words, each of which was measured in American life, were cheap at that price, and that pretty phrases, written in blood, not ink, were all that could be required of it.

Therefore we have the beginning of drastic action, drastic to the point of talking of breaking off relations with Germany. What then happens? The submarine campaign in British waters has failed. All but a very few of the German submarines have been sunk or captured.

But what are the American people told? Does any one tell them that, thanks to Mr. Wilson's weakness, the Germans have been able from February to October to put into operation their submarine campaign, imperilling American lives?

of all the shameful days of last summer. We had proclaimed our "strict accountability" policy, and it had been answered by open, undisguised, unvarnished assassination. But this did not move Mr. Wilson. All through the summer he sat supine while one outrage followed another, hoping that some way might open for him to escape with seeming honor from the duty of capturing his words into effect.

Only the collapse of the German submarine campaign saved Mr. Wilson two months ago when the American people were at last roused to the shame of their course. Only the fact that the Germans were seeking an excuse for abandoning a campaign that they could not pursue, an excuse that would satisfy their public, which they had fed up on the stories of the havoc to British shipping of the submarines, prevented the complete bankruptcy of the policy of "watchful waiting."

If the German campaign had been successful there would have been no "victory." The proof of this is found in the fact that until the Germans were sure they had failed they utterly refused to pay attention to Mr. Wilson's words. They heeded them only when it served their purpose.

Such was the character of Mr. Wilson's great moral triumph of a few weeks ago. But where does the Ancona leave this? Just the moment that there is again profit for the German cause or imaginary profit in new massacres, we have this massacre. Let no man be deceived by the showing of the Austrian flag. Austria has become an appendage of the German Empire; all Austrian military and naval campaigns are "made in Germany."

And in the face of this latest crime is there left any American who fails to penetrate the sham and the smug hypocrisy of American policy in recent months? The sham revealed in the fact that whenever there was the smallest profit for them in murder the Germans murdered Americans without hesitation, the hypocrisy in the pretence that there had been a victory won when American protests were used as the cover for the retreat of German naval power overwhelmed by British.

The Wilson administration has followed the coward counsels which the politician always supplies. It has endeavored to win native approval without offending the hyphen vote. It began by talking big to Germany in the belief that words of sufficiently sonorous character would intimidate the German people, in arms against the world.

We got into the German mess precisely as we got into the Mexican. Our troops were hurried to Vera Cruz in the mistaken notion that this moral demonstration would terrify the Mexican and gratify the American. But when the Mexicans met us with rifle fire the whole policy collapsed, and we lingered in Vera Cruz until the coming of the Great War fixed public attention elsewhere, and then under cover of the night we slunk out. We got into the German mess because Mr. Wilson believed strong words would terrify, and after we got in we stayed there until the German need of a pretext for abandoning the submarine campaign in British waters supplied Mr. Wilson with a great moral victory.

Yet in a grim way Americans may well rejoice that the tragedy of the Ancona has come, because its coming has served to strip the last vestige of cover from the naked shame of the Wilson foreign policy and reveal the sham, the cowardice and the hypocrisy which might otherwise have escaped the attention of a careless and forgetful people, easily lulled into contentment at the thought that all perils had been escaped.

For some Americans the failure, the collapse of the policy itself, is only a minor thing. Other policies have failed; in the great crisis in world history no diplomacy has shown itself great, no statesmen supreme wise. But the sham of the thing is what sticks and hurts. We have proclaimed our championship of noble ideas and ideals, we have affirmed our devotion to civilization and to truth, we have flaunted our superior virtue in the face of men and nations who are giving all that they have or hope to have in the name of civilization and honor, and in the same moment we have turned our backs upon American women and children sinking under cowardly assassination; we have steadfastly refused to hear the voices of our own dying children clamoring for aid, while we have smugly pretended to the world that we alone were the true defenders and the appointed champions of civilization.

A month ago it seemed as if this course had been crowned with success. It seemed as if the sham victory and the tinsel triumph were to endure with a semblance of reality, and those who felt bitter and most humiliated by the spectacle of American shame were silenced by the sneering comment, "Well, it has succeeded, hasn't it?" But that was a month ago, and the sham having endured that period, long for shams, has fallen of its own weight, collapsed into nothing; the trumpets of victory have been silenced by the voices of the little children of the Ancona and of

those other children of the Lusitania whose bodies are still tossed about on the Atlantic, forgotten by an American government, but not yet quite forgotten by an American people.

"Pitiless publicity" was once the favorite phrase of Mr. Wilson. It was a pretty phrase; but in so far as it was true it has returned to plague its maker. Pitiless publicity we have now for the policy of the administration in all the long days and weeks of the past when American lives were at stake and the thing that is more than life to any nation, race or tribe was in the balance. And in the light of this publicity, what is there left of the policy which he adopted, the policy of impolity, of watchful waiting, which consisted in eager search for a safe escape from a dangerous duty and a specious defence for an indefensible skulking?

What we are beginning to know about ourselves now the world has long believed. They have been sneering in Berlin at American policy ever since we sent our first note last February. They believe that American policy is the rhetoric of cowardice and the pretence of "dollar democracy." They are satisfied that Americans prefer profits to principles, and will rather endure any injury than risk their business or their comfort on the field of battle. They believe this because in no other way can they explain our course in the face of their policy in recent months. Believing this, they have killed our citizens whenever their ends were thus to be served, and are still pursuing this course.

And in England and France, who can mistake what is felt there? To the people of those countries we seem in some still inexplicable way to have turned our back on all that America has meant for us and for them in other years. With the Germans they have come to believe that it is only money that counts, and that there is no insult that will move a nation "too proud to fight" to defend life or principle. They believe, as do the Germans, what is not true; they believe that in all his long and shameful course Mr. Wilson has been truly representative of America and Americans. This is the gravest wrong that Woodrow Wilson has done his country and his countrymen; this is the injury that will endure and in the years to come will cost us dear, not alone in honor, but in safety.

Nothing is more certain than that the nightmare of cowardice in this country will pass, is passing. Nothing is more inevitable than that a nation which is sound and brave and honorable at heart will repudiate the false, the sham, the cowardly, when it once recognizes them. Already there are unmistakable signs abroad in the land. We shall not be tricked, deceived, shamed much longer with our own consent, but how long will it be before the world will understand that America is still the America of 1776 and 1861, and that, like all democracies, it has merely passed through a period of blindness and self-absorption as an incident in its long and honorable life?

Mr. Churchill's Resignation.

Mr. Winston Churchill's resignation from the British Ministry has been likened to his father's sudden retirement from the Chancellorship of the Exchequer some thirty years ago. The comparison is far-fetched, nor is it likely that Mr. Churchill expects, as Lord Randolph probably did, to wreck the Cabinet. If the Prime Minister on the former occasion was not utterly dumfounded at the action of his colleagues it is unlikely that the present Prime Minister was even taken by surprise. In fact, the news cannot have been wholly surprising even to the public at large, for it is obvious that Mr. Churchill could not be satisfied for long in a subordinate place.

There is a certain ambiguity in the letters that have passed between him and Mr. Asquith, but the main point is clear enough. Mr. Churchill evidently felt that unless he was allowed to bear some responsibility in the conduct of the war he could by no means remain in the Cabinet. When he accepted the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster many of his friends expressed great astonishment that one who had lately been First Lord of the Admiralty should consent to take so inferior an office. It was plain, however, that he could still be of great service to the Ministry. The office in itself was virtually a sinecure, and he was able to give up much of his time and thought to the problems that concerned him as First Lord; indeed, many of his enemies probably thought that he continued to have too strong a hand in the counsels of war. It is certain, at least, that they continued persistently to badger him, endeavoring on every possible occasion to put him out of countenance or to draw admissions from him touching his responsibility in the Dardanelles and at Antwerp.

If patriotism was his motive in deciding to remain in the Cabinet on the readjustment of the government, patriotism is no longer compels him to remain to-day. If his resignation carried with it any manifest danger of breaking down the Ministry the case would be different, but as it is, he can plead with justice that since he is not to be taken into the small war councils lately formed, his real services, those special services which presumably made him indispensable before, are obviously no longer required by Mr. Asquith and his associates.

It is hardly doubtful that pique has to some extent influenced him in his decision. He probably felt that he was entitled to a place in the war council, and in his letter he takes occasion to remind the Premier that a place was promised to him six weeks ago. "I make no complaint," he adds, "that your scheme should have been changed," but it is sufficiently plain that he thinks himself ill-treated, for what else can he have in mind in drawing the Premier's attention to his counsels? Perhaps the obscure points will be cleared up in the House to-day, but the probability is that he will purely defend his actions in

office and be as careful as Sir Edward Carson to avoid embarrassing the government, however gratifying such embarrassment would be to their enemies. Without any further explanation his decision is at least understandable.

Booker T. Washington.

Booker T. Washington, who died yesterday, will pass into history as the ablest negro leader of his generation. Here in the United States the negro race has produced greater men than he—men of larger mould and more extraordinary native genius. Frederick Douglass was one. Born and brought up a slave, the latter overcame even greater obstacles than Mr. Washington had to overcome in arising to leadership. Douglass excelled as an orator. His appeal was to the emotions, to the sense of justice of a ruling race which had put shackles on the black man and had denied him the ordinary rights of a human being. He pleaded for emancipation, believing that the negro's future here would be assured once he had the chance to be his own master, to acquire education and property and to sell his labor in an open market.

Mr. Washington's task was different, because conditions made it different. The negro had become a citizen and had received a partial measure of economic freedom. But he was dazed and not a little embarrassed by what had been thrust upon him. He did not know how to use his new powers. Mr. Washington saw that the next appeal would have to be made to the negro himself if the full fruits of emancipation were to be realized. He has been the foremost negro missionary, not to the white race, but to his own race. He has preached self-help, self-discipline, self-salvation. It has been evident ever since Reconstruction days that the negro must work out his own status as a freedman, and that just in proportion as he shows himself industrious, capable, thrifty and self-controlled his position in the community in which he lives will be improved.

By his example as well as by his teaching Mr. Washington set the negro race in this country on the true path toward betterment. His ideals were intensely practical. His gospel was the gospel of self-respect, which is the foundation of all moral growth. He respected himself and won the respect of the country by his courage, his sincerity, his patience and the admirable singleness of his point of view.

He accomplished much and, better still, his work will live after him through what he has inspired others of his race to accomplish. He was a builder not for to-day only, but for the future—a leader of breadth and tenacity whose work has contributed not alone to the welfare of his people but also to the welfare and progress of the United States.

Every spy must be a diplomat, but hitherto the reverse has been considered neither necessary nor good form.

Midnight fight in moonlit sea—Headline. Who said the moon was made for lovers?

Profligate weather for the Yale clubhouse warming.

"REMEMBER THE LUSITANIA."

Americans Waiting for Chance to Hold Administration Responsible.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your editorials so clearly state my views and attitude that I seldom see anything to comment on, but in your editorial this morning you ask: "Is it not possible that some day those who are responsible for this betrayal of America . . . may be overwhelmed . . . ?" My contact with plain American citizens leads me to write that they are waiting for a chance to hold this administration responsible.

The American people do not prefer prostitution to virtue, and if ever the honor of a nation was prostituted it is in our foreign policy of the last fifteen months. As one who voted for electors for Seymour, Greeley, Tilden, Hancock and Cleveland, I can put a feather on which is inscribed "I am a Democrat" in my hat and wear it unblushingly, while I would at the next Presidential election use my influence and cast my vote against a party so opposed to defending the country's honor as the present ruling powers seem. Would that the election were not so far off! G. C. THOMAS, Brooklyn, Nov. 13, 1915.

Good Reading for Everybody.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I have been much impressed with the editorials in The New York Tribune for the past few weeks and only feel sorry that every American citizen in the United States should not have had the opportunity of reading them. Your editorial in to-day's Tribune particularly impressed me.

I should like to be one of a number of people to make up a subscription to publish in some small pamphlet form a large number of copies of either this one alone, or in addition four or five previous editorials on the same general subject.

It would seem to me that there are enough people having the same views who would be willing to join in creating such a fund. I should think that not less than five million copies would be needed, perhaps even ten million. Indeed, there could not be too many. WALLACE T. JONES, Brooklyn, Nov. 13, 1915.

"Forceful and Timely."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your editorial "Remember the Lusitania" is a fine, manly, forceful and timely presentation of a most serious situation. Every American with red blood in his veins ought to hang his head in shame when he beholds an administration of the government of the United States which can only be described as weak, inefficient and cowardly in its attitude toward crime of every nature, both at home and abroad. Keep on with your good work. J. ADAMS BROWN, New York, Nov. 13, 1915.

"Right to the Point."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I congratulate you on this morning's editorial "Remember the Lusitania." It is right to the point. If the administration keeps up its present policy we surely will have war. ARTHUR S. ALLEN, New York, Nov. 13, 1915.



THE DIPLOMAT.

"WHERE THE BRITISH GO WRONG"

A Discussion of the Proper Attitude Toward the So-Called British Blockade of Germany—History and International Law to the Rescue.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: As one who has just read the striking editorial "Where the British Go Wrong," printed in The Tribune of yesterday, will you permit me to ask whether the United States went wrong during the four years of the Civil War in which the government, in its commendable determination to maintain the freedom of the seas, captured no fewer than 1,149 and destroyed no less than 355 neutral trading vessels, causing a total loss to British owners of at least \$30,000,000?

The world has moved since 1861-65; modern inventions and modern conditions have modified the practice of blockade, so that now the effectiveness of a blockade must in each case be a question of fact (as stated in the decision of the Supreme Court in the Olinde Rodriguez case, 174 U. S., p. 510) "to be determined by evidence and with regard to all the circumstances." To-day, as in 1861, the place of landing may be many miles distant from the ultimate destination of the goods, and the ostensible destination of a neutral port is no guarantee that the ultimate destination of a cargo is not the country of a belligerent. This condition was felt during the Civil War and received the attention of the Supreme Court of the United States in the often quoted case of the Springbok.

She was a British ship on a voyage from London to Nassau, and was seized by a United States cruiser and sent in for judgment on the ground that she was carrying contraband with the intention of breaking the blockade and allowing the cargo to be transhipped at Nassau and sent thence into the Southern States. In this case the Supreme Court held that the evidence showed the cargo was not intended for Nassau, but was intended to be transhipped there and thence carried on to rebel ports in violation of the blockade. Therefore, the voyage was, both in law and according to the intentions of the parties, but one voyage—from London to the blockaded ports—and the cargo was liable to seizure during any part of that voyage (4 Wall, p. 1). The Supreme Court of the United States rendered decisions to the same effect in the cases of the Bermuda, Stephen Hart and Peterhoff. Great Britain protested against these decisions and made them the subject of a claim before the American Claims Commission, which was appointed under the Treaty of 1871, but her claim for the value of the confiscated cargo was unanimously rejected. Professor Bluntschli's "Droit International Codifié," par 818, reads: "If the ships or goods are consigned to a neutral port only in order to facilitate their delivery to the enemy, they will be contraband of war and their seizure will be justified."

In so far as I have been able to follow the matter Great Britain puts forward no claim to interfere with goods which are bona fide destined for the use or consumption of a neutral state, but only with the commerce of the enemy passing through neutral states, and, as Sir Edward Grey has stated it, "if a blockade can only become effective by extending it to the enemy commerce passing through neutral ports, such an extension is defensible and in accordance with principle, which have met with general acceptance." This, as the case of the Springbok shows, is the doctrine established by the Supreme Court of the United States. The representatives of the United States at the conference that was held in London conceded that blockaders might be several hundred miles off a hostile coast.

Anent contraband: Did the North go wrong when during the War of Secession it declared cotton to be contraband because, as Mr. Bayard wrote some years later, "cotton was to the Confederacy as much a munition of war as powder and bullet, because it furnished the chief means of obtaining these indispensable articles of war?" It may be remembered that this declaration paralyzed the cotton goods trade of Lancashire and for two years compelled the mill operatives to live on public charity. But England never questioned the right of the North to declare cotton contraband. Did England go wrong in doing this?

In these days of Ezekiel, what has become

AN XMAS FUND FOR BELGIANS

Shoes and Clothing a Special Need of Sufferers from the War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Twelve months ago I made an appeal to Americans in behalf of the Dollar Christmas Fund for Belgians—one of the many efforts made here and in Europe to avert the threatened starvation of a nation. The response was prompt and generous. Not alone the rich contributed, but even many of the very poor, with the happy result that we were able to send to Belgium a Christmas ship laden not only with Christmas good wishes, but with food and clothing. Those were the days when every shipload meant lives saved. Some of our best friends were newspapers, and even little children in Sunday schools gave freely from their penny banks in behalf of other children less happy than themselves.

To the American Commission for Relief in Belgium has been left the task of solving the food problem, and though the future of Belgium in 1916 is beyond prophesy and must apparently depend to a larger extent than ever upon American help, one may feel reasonably assured that the prospect of famine for this year at least, has been definitely removed. One-third of a soldier's ration is enough to keep body and soul together; a now served daily to all necessitous persons in Belgium.

The task now undertaken by the Dollar Christmas Fund is to collect money for shoes, boots and clothes, which are most urgently needed, and for which special money must be provided. The necessity is appalling, because at the present time there are, roughly, 5,000,000 destitute people in Belgium, and the number increases as the winter approaches. The Belgians are unable to buy shoes, boots and clothes for themselves; many even of the former wealthy are now in the daily bread line.

This year, as last, our fund has the warm approval and valued co-operation of a committee of representative citizens, including Colonel George Harvey, Dr. William T. Hornaday, Victor F. Lawson, Adolph S. Ochs, Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn, William C. Reick, Melville E. Stone, Oscar S. Straus and George T. Wilson. All our workers are honorary and all money collected will be expended by the American Commission for Relief in Belgium. No better guarantee can be given that every penny subscribed will be wisely spent. Percy Bullen, of 66 Broadway, New York, has again undertaken the office of secretary.

If, as many have forecast, Belgians face heights of sacrifice and martyrdom so far as unattained to scale this winter, we can at least insure that the old men, the frail women, the little children—many of them "orphans of war"—shall not go unshod and without your aid, as we know, the barefooted in Belgium this winter will be the rule rather than the exception. I ask, therefore, with great earnestness that you send along your dollar bill—and send more, if you can! All contributions should be addressed to the treasurer, and each will be promptly acknowledged. HENRY CLEWS, Treasurer, Dollar Christmas Fund for Destitute Belgians, Broad Street, New York.

"Keep Up the Good Work."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: At least one New York newspaper seems to have attained the state of complacency and horse sense, and I offer you my congratulations and trust you will continue to din into our heads the fact that one Woodrow Wilson has staid our national honor by playing politics with the high seas. Your editorial of this morning, "Remember the Lusitania," should be read by every man and woman in the U. S. A. "Sand" seems to be a thing totally lacking in Americans, as a general rule, this day and age. Turkey-trotting, vernoncastling and other pieces of asininity seem to have robbed us of whatever principles there might have been in our make-ups, principles for which our fathers died. Keep up the good work and perchance a gleam of national honor once more may assert itself in the American people. H. E. CROPLEY, Groton, Conn., Nov. 12, 1915.

New York, Nov. 13, 1915.