

New York Tribune

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

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 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, 1 mo. \$3.00; 3 mos. \$8.00; 6 mos. \$15.00; 1 year \$28.00

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.

Allied Terms.

The suggestion of "The London Morning Post" that the Allies reduce their terms to writing must be accepted with a perfect appreciation of the attitude of "The Post" itself.

The main lines of Allied peace conditions are not difficult to foresee. Despite all the rhetoric wasted in Parliament and elsewhere about crushing German militarism, every sensible Englishman realizes that no terms of peace can impose upon Germany conditions which are not satisfactory to the people, and that German militarism can be abolished only by the act of the German people.

What, then, are the Allied terms of peace, based on present determination and future expectation? Probably they would be formulated somewhat as follows:

- I. The evacuation of Belgium and Luxembourg, the payment of an indemnity to Belgium and recognition of Belgian annexation of Luxembourg.
II. The evacuation of French soil and the retrocession to France of Alsace-Lorraine.
III. The cession to Great Britain of German colonies in Africa and German possessions in the Pacific and German acquiescence in the Kiaochow situation.

The reorganization of the Balkans and Asia Minor by the Quadruple Alliance would unquestionably carry with it the right to compel Bulgaria to evacuate Serbian territory, to force Czar Ferdinand to abdicate, to crush Turkish resistance and enable Russia to occupy Constantinople.

Such terms as are thus set forth represent the minimum not the maximum of Allied demands. To these would be added, if the Allies had the power to enforce their demands, the surrender of the German fleet, the payment of great indemnities and conceivably the restoration to Poland of the Slav inhabited districts on Prussia's eastern frontiers.

It will be argued that the foregoing terms would leave Germany nothing to show for her victories and her sacrifices. This is true, and there is no intention in Allied minds to-day to permit Germany to profit by the present war either in Europe or out of it.

Objection will be made that no nation, still victorious as Germany is, could consent to such terms. This is probably true and this is why peace is unlikely. But if, as the Allies believe, hunger is working for them and attrition operating in their favor, then it will be increasingly difficult for Germany to persuade her people to continue a war which is a war for expansion, when peace is to be had at the cost of evacuating conquered territory and giving back Alsace-Lorraine.

No one in London, Paris or Petrograd expects peace now or in less than a year. Conceivably twelve months hence, if their calculations as to German numbers and food supplies prove erroneous, the Allies will be prepared to modify their terms and abandon the hope of regaining Alsace-Lorraine for France, rescuing the Slavs in Austria and checking Teutonic expansion to the east, which threatens the British and Russian empires. But this is at least a year in the future.

Meantime the terms outlined cover about what Allied statesmen expect to get from Germany. They represent for Great Britain and France the minimum of safety—for Russia the guarantee of her future. They would leave Germany territorially practically intact, they would take from Austria 11,000,000 Slavs and a few hundred thousand Italians.

with the lines unchanged and the food question aggravated by more months of shortage? The question can only be answered by the result. But the terms indicated are the best Germany can get now or hope for within a year at the least, unless she is able to dispose of one of her three great foes—Russia, France or Great Britain. Even Italian defection would not modify the situation save as Italy and Austria were mutually affected.

"Criminally Responsible."

Thanks to the vigorous presentation of the case by District Attorney Crosby, the coroner's jury considering the Williamsburg disaster handed in no equivocal verdict. It found the Diamonds, owners of the building, and two tenants criminally responsible for the deaths which occurred, and they have been held for the action of a grand jury. It also censured for neglect state officials whose duty it was to enforce safety regulations.

No action this jury or any other could take would bring back to life the victims of the locked door and the unprotected stairways; but assuredly the evidence Mr. Crosby spread on the records deserves consideration by a body with power to hand up indictments. There has been since this horrible fire great outcry against the present laws designed for the protection of factory workers. If they are inadequate, it is eminently desirable for the community to know it.

What stands out as the result of the coroner's inquest is that these laws were violated, were flouted, and that officialdom either had not the ability or the desire to enforce them to the letter. For the locked door, for the remedial orders uncompleted with, there should be some reckoning.

The laws are more stringent than they were when the Triangle owners were tried. It is to be hoped that their provisions will be used to the extreme now, even if they were not before the fire, so that the public may know whether the system erected by them is to prove as ineffective for punishment as it has for prevention of tragedy.

Purification at Home.

With an action pending to protect the residents of the West Side of Manhattan from the noxious odors which travel across the Hudson from Edgewater, N. J., the Health Department has turned its attention to our own odor-generator, Barren Island. It promises this week to begin action against the New York Disposal Company for discharging dust and odors into the circumambient atmosphere.

This action will be a reason for joy in the Rockaways and sections of Brooklyn, where the breezes blowing across Barren Island have not been welcome for many a month. The Health Department had begun similar action last spring, but withdrew it when, following action by the Board of Estimate, the company put into effect several changes recommended by an expert. The improvement which resulted did not, however, eliminate the nuisance, according to Health Department officials, hence the decision to begin this new suit.

Pure water and pure air are prime requisites for health. The dwellers in the metropolis need to have their air as little defiled as the scheme of things in a great city will permit. In endeavoring by every means at its command to abolish these nuisances the Health Department is certain to have the approval of every citizen.

Financial Aftermath of the War.

In an article in "Scribner's Magazine," now reprinted in pamphlet form, Mr. Alexander D. Noyes, concededly the ablest of American commentators on financial questions, both domestic and foreign, has set forth some interesting conclusions as to the financial condition of Europe after the war. Mr. Noyes does not dramatize or indulge in the cryptic wisdom which most financial experts affect. His views are based on common sense and are arrived at by ordinary logic. They are all the more welcome, therefore, to the lay reader.

One way to judge of the strain put upon the chief belligerents is to compare the capital being put into war loans with the capital ordinarily available for new investments. The war loans placed in Great Britain, amounting to \$1,750,000,000, have been at least twice as large as the largest sum ever previously invested in the English market in a corresponding period, in all securities combined. Germany's war loans of \$6,300,000,000 are five or six times as large as her largest total investment in all loans for a corresponding earlier period. These excessive borrowings for war purposes have been made possible only by the stoppage of ordinary investment and by the diversion of all floating capital to the national treasuries.

The yearly cost of the war to all the nations engaged in it is now between \$25,000,000,000 and \$30,000,000,000. Much of this capital is worse than wasted, since it is not even employed to minister to pleasure or to luxury. It is being employed directly to destroy life and to diminish wealth. On this misused capital vast interest charges will have to be paid for a generation, probably for many generations.

However the war turns out, therefore, Europe will be very poor when it is over. Crushing taxes will have to be collected and industry will be disorganized by the necessity of turning back the laboring population from the munitions and war supplies factories into the pursuits of peace. Capital for reorganization will be lacking. Laborers in the war industries are earning high wages, and the shock of any return to the old lower scale of wages would be cruelly severe.

which would come with partial repudiation. But domestic distress will sorely tempt unscrupulous politicians, just as in this country we suffered for many years after the Civil War from a vicious agitation for the payment of the national debt in greenbacks instead of gold.

If the European nations attempt to alleviate their hard situation by regaining their lost foreign markets, we may have some reason to fear a saturation of our market with cheap foreign goods. Before the war ends Congress will probably try to do something to check the importation of "dumped" goods. Yet Mr. Noyes does not feel at all certain that Europe will be able to undersell us in our market to any great extent. European industry, sadly damaged by the war, will have to be reestablished before it can again threaten outside markets.

Besides, it is not clear that the war wage scale can be suddenly reduced. The laboring class, so far as it can, will resist a reduction, looking to present rather than future results. Labor will have much more political power in Europe after the war than it has now. It may, in its own interest, decide rather to shut off home markets than to attempt to invade the United States by producing cheap goods at ante-bellum wage rates.

Irritation and Pettiness.

Secretary Garrison failed to live up to his reputation for tactfulness and fair-mindedness when he accused ex-President Taft of trying to make partisan capital by criticizing the Wilson administration's policy in the Philippines. To intimate that in a matter affecting the good name and honor of the country Mr. Taft's partisan zeal had not been restrained "within the bounds of truth, decency and fair dealing" was to risk a thoroughly deserved reproof. This the ex-President has delivered with a force which loses nothing because of its dignity and moderation.

Mr. Taft has been singularly considerate in his criticism of the Wilson administration. He has almost gone out of his way to avoid the charge of partisan bias in his comments on administration policies which are open to attack and which have been freely attacked by others. It is, therefore, a serious tactical error on Mr. Garrison's part to insult a generous and friendly critic like Mr. Taft just for the sake of convicting him of a trivial blunder, that of having mistaken the character of an unscrupulous ex-Philippine official.

Writing an introduction for a pamphlet containing charges against the present Philippine administration, which are supported by many other credible witnesses, does not expose Mr. Taft to the charge of knowingly using evidence furnished by an adventurer for the purpose of misrepresenting conditions in the Philippines. The ex-President's record in office was one of unselfish devotion to the Philippine people. Their welfare was one of his pet enthusiasms, and every word or act of his bearing on their fortunes has been inspired by the truest friendliness and the highest disinterestedness.

It is Mr. Taft's sincere belief that the policy of the Wilson administration is hindering progress in the Philippines, is creating unrest there and is raising false hopes as to the duration of the apprenticeship through which the Filipinos must pass before they become capable of self-government. His views are the fruit of a larger experience in the Philippines than has been enjoyed by any other man in public life. They are entitled to respect, even if they jar with the superficial judgments of men like Governor General Harrison, Representative Jones and the other Philippine experts now in favor at Washington, who have imbued practically all the wisdom they possess sitting at the feet of the Hon. Manuel Quezon and other native Philippine politicians.

Mr. Taft has led the opposition to the vicious Jones bill, and in so doing he has performed a proper public service. He realizes what a demoralizing effect on the Filipinos the passage of that bill must have, coming on top of the damage already done by the Harrison administration. But this criticism has been fanned and aboveboard. It has not been tinged by partisan bias. Many Democrats doubt the advisability of pledging independence to the Filipinos in terms which they will interpret one way and the people of the United States are pretty certain to interpret in another way. There can be nothing false, nothing partisan, nothing unpatriotic in an attempt to dissuade Congress from doing something which will manifestly make the accomplishment of our duty to the Filipinos more rasping and difficult.

What the administration resents is Mr. Taft's criticism of its mistaken Philippine policy, not his endorsement of the O. Garfield Jones pamphlet. That pamphlet will have few readers; but Mr. Taft's views, expressed in speeches and before committees of Congress, have gone all over the country. He is really being censured for exposing a programme of error. But that need not worry him nor any other critic of the Jones bill and the Harrison regime. The country is perfectly able to discriminate between the fine spirit which Mr. Taft has always shown in dealing with the Philippine problem and the irritated pettiness which underlies Mr. Garrison's impeachment of his fairness and patriotism.

The saddest thing about the close of the football season is that it ushers in the season of winter baseball.

The end is in sight!

An aeroplane has sunk a submarine. The "wasp of war" has become a kingfisher.

Not Necessarily.

Should the United States sever diplomatic relations with Germany? It does not necessarily mean war, does it? Taxpayers take different views of this matter. Which is correct? A. E. CORTIS, New York, Nov. 25, 1915.

MR. WILSON IS CONSISTENT

From the Outset He Has Been the Protagonist of Humility.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In your criticisms of President Wilson you appear to forget that his course has been perfectly consistent from the day he took office. He has been a student, a teacher and a writer of history who has always noted that as surely as republics become rich, powerful and aggressive so surely do they begin to decline. He determined, therefore, that as long as he was in office he would prevent the government from ever taking a single step which would add to its wealth or aggrandizement. His first opportunity came to him in Mexico and he seized upon it at once, and has so successfully carried out his plans that he is now using his small army to prevent Villa and his gallant band from marching over and shooting up San Antonio, El Paso and other Texan towns. The sniping of our troops across the border is a regular pastime for any Greaser who can borrow a gun, and is a much safer sport than hunting deer in Maine. There has not been an incident in connection with our Mexican policy which could give any of our citizens the undue pride or elation which goeth before a fall.

His great opportunity came when Belgium was overrun and torn to pieces by the Germans, and by totally ignoring this incident he prepared the way for the torpedoing of the Lusitania.

Perhaps the most noteworthy achievement of his administration has been the final laying aside of the Monroe Doctrine. After the European war is over either England, Spain or Germany, or for that matter Japan, can seize the whole or any part of Mexico, knowing that the only protest on the part of the United States will be a polite note written either in English, Latin or Greek, as may be preferred.

In all this course of action the President has received the languid support of the people of this country. As a people we do not enthuse over anything pertaining to our government. We were not at all interested in the Spanish War and we care very little whether the Germans or the Allies win this war. Whatever may be his failings as a statesman, Mr. Wilson has satisfied the majority of his fellow countrymen as far as any one is able to discover, by showing the whole world that we are sufficient unto ourselves and care nothing for what other nations may think of us. If business was as usual who would care what flag floated over the White House or what kind of a pacifist occupied it? All we ask is to be let alone. N. X. Floral Bluff, Fla., Nov. 25, 1915.

Rhetoric and Deeds.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Rhetoric asserts, in well chosen language, the rights of humanity and the duty of our country in service to mankind.

Rhetoric asserts the inhumanity of the ordered murder of the Lusitania victims. Rhetoric asserts that the continuance of such murders will be considered "unfriendly." Rhetoric invites diplomatic discussion of the reason for and explanation of those murders and awaits the answer, with a measured intimation that the answer must be satisfactory.

Rhetoric, when the answer comes, merely adds more well chosen phrases and invites further discussion. Oh, for an hour of a man who would add action to words, would substitute deeds for rhetoric, would make living and real the idea of service to mankind, would stand in "the imminent deadly breach" in active defence of human rights, in place of the vain words "Vox et preterea nihil," of scholastic and pedagogical utterance!

Then these United States would be proud of the administration to which its political fortunes have committed it, instead of being called upon daily to blush for it in shame. On this Thanksgiving Day we of the United States ought not to thank God that we are not involved in the horrors of war, but that we have been enabled to demonstrate the blessings of a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and that we are strong enough and willing enough to defy the powers whose ultimate purpose is that such government should perish off the face of the earth. WILLIAM G. WILSON, New York, Nov. 25, 1915.

"Supine Passivity."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: With many others, I have asked myself in regard to our policy concerning the present European war, "What can I do about it?" What can I do to help make what Dr. Morton Prince calls "sentiment of Americans American sentiment"? I know of no way to help practically, and it is with blind trust that one more sentiment publicly expressed may create and increase the formation of "American sentiment" that I write. I wish to think in what light our noble and higher ideals are placed—for I believe America still has ideals—for the administration in its supine passivity. If it is "too good to fight" it is also too frightened to speak above a whisper. Our individual interest, sympathy and generosity are lost in the road little by little to school-child attitudes of those who are so much in the world.

I am not alone in the bitter grief of knowing that for the first and only time—and pray God it may be the last—our country has earned a repeat, earned—the name of coward. I speak as one who loves her country, who is proud of being an American and who would choose to be one were America the lowliest among nations. Feeling thus, I would have her national morality of such a type that we can say: "We, them that are strong should be the intimates of the weak and not to be despised, and that with Taft we can justly feel that we are 'wonder the mind is not with fear and the head is held high.'" AUGUSTA E. CAMPBELL, New York, Nov. 28, 1915.

Also Consistent.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In to-day's Tribune there is an editorial referring to a certain New York newspaper which has recently referred to Theodore Roosevelt. "The Staats-Zeitung" and The Tribune as having thrown mud at President Wilson. In quoting this New York paper, during our troubles in 1904 and commencing on them, you do not refer to it as the "jewel" it really is. It is said that "consistency is a jewel." Do you not agree with me that this paper, in condemning the actions of Abraham Lincoln and approving the actions of Woodrow Wilson, has proved itself the soul of consistency? A. E. CORTIS, New York, Nov. 26, 1915.

Our Disgrace.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Can nothing be done about it? Mr. Irving Putnam says very truly in your Sunday issue that Mr. Wilson is filling millions of Americans with shame for our do-nothing policy. Twenty-eight weeks, as "The Sun" says, since the Lusitania outrage, and nothing has been done. There is no way of bringing to bear upon the President a force of opinion that shall drive him to action? If he cares nothing for the disgrace he brings upon himself by this cowardice, we do care. AN AMERICAN WOMAN, New York, Nov. 25, 1915.

AGAINST A STONE WALL.



A TARIFF COMMISSION

A True Agency of Progress in Industry and Commerce.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Secretary of the Treasury made a speech in Helena, Mont., a little while ago which has not received the attention that it deserves from men who are following closely the attitude of the administration toward matters of very vital importance to our national prosperity. On that occasion, in stating that the administration is trying to take certain fundamental questions (among them the tariff) out of politics, Mr. McAdoo said: "There has been no real prosperity in the United States in ten years. I don't care what the politicians say. It is not a partisan matter, but an economic one, and I don't believe in attempting to make partisan capital out of either economic or moral questions." Political parties have gone up and down the country telling us that their particular party could bring prosperity. First it was the Republicans, then it was the Democrats. The politicians have been playing this game of see-saw to get offices, but their predictions and promises are all bunk. We have had no real prosperity in the United States for ten years, because our business outgrew the clumsy financial system which we have been talking about correcting for thirty years, but which we did not get until President Wilson insisted on Congress taking it up as soon as the tariff bill was out of the way.

Forward-looking Americans have realized for many years that the tariff was not being handled in this country as it ought to be handled. Now, when you come right down to fundamentals, what is the trouble? Are politicians to be blamed for waging campaigns on the basis of protection, or tariff for revenue, or free trade? It does not appear that this is an unnatural or improper course to pursue. Protection and free trade are inherently political issues, and as long as we neglect to establish a definite tariff policy these matters will always be the subject of agitation.

But does the real trouble lie here? Is it not true that the American public has repeatedly registered its views with regard to the tariff, only to find after a number of years that these views have not been carried out, but, on the contrary, that the expressed will of the people has been covered up by a complicated and unintelligible series of sections and sub-sections of various tariff acts, so that the average man could not possibly tell whether he got what he voted for or whether he had got something totally different?

The real point is that it is not now so much the tariff as it is tariff making that we want to take out of politics. How are tariffs made? The matter could not be better summarized than in the words of Professor Seager, of Columbia University, who describes the process as follows in his "Introduction to Economics": "To fully master any one of these schedules and determine what uses of duty would afford adequate protection without unduly burdening consumers would require years of study of the industries affected, both at home and abroad. To fully master all of them, with the three thousand-odd different articles to which they refer, is a task beyond human capacity. Needless to say, Congress in drafting tariff bills makes no such ambitious attempt. Instead, it contents itself with taking the testimony of interested persons as to the amount of protection their businesses require, and accepts their statements as the guide in apportioning protection to different industries."

The Tariff Commission League believes that the country will significantly arouse itself to bring about the appointment of a tariff commission made up of men of the very highest ability. Such men would very soon come to be relied upon by the President and Congress for information and advice in tariff matters. Even the short-lived tariff board of Mr. Taft gained considerable strength in Washington, and it may be stated as a fact that its investigations, so far as it had pursued them, were very fully availed of by the members of the Ways and Means Committee who framed the present tariff act.

Men of influence in the community are coming in a very striking way to realize that the absence of a dependable tariff policy in the United States is certain to be productive of real and far-reaching dangers as we enter more extensively into international commercial affairs. Both in connection with our foreign trade, and also, as every one realizes, in connection with our domestic business affairs, the failure to put the tariff on a scientific basis has contributed powerfully to accentuate that greatest of all business dangers,

Not a Parasite.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Secretary Law of the Tenants' Union, in his communication on untaxing buildings, has set forth some conceptions of land values which are, to say the least, questionable. That a land value tax will aid tenement house sanitation, fire protection and city planning, or that it will lower rents, seem to me groundless assertions. The fact that land values alone are subject to taxation will not decrease the amount of revenue which the city must raise. Since land values must be depended upon for the whole tax and the building on the land is not to be taken into consideration, all inside lots on the same street will be taxed alike. A lot has no value except for its income-bearing possibilities. The first lot owner who builds on a certain street erects a six story tenement house, using every foot of ground the law allows and getting the greatest possible income out of the land. If the tax assessor capitalizes this builder's income and assesses adjoining lot owners accordingly, how can they build anything but similar six story tenements? This is exactly what has happened in the past. The first few builders have dictated the character of an entire neighborhood. They have made it profitable to cover a district with buildings of a type, and if congestion with all its attendant evils followed it was a natural consequence. Not the land owner, but the city, with its lax tenement house laws and their inefficient enforcement, with its lack of a city plan, was at fault.

As to the assertion that untaxing buildings would lower rents: in what way? Granting that owners of vacant property would be forced to build and to rent in competition with existing buildings, how long would it be before older buildings were left untenanted? These would, beyond a doubt, be a tremendous building boom, and it would just as certainly be followed by a tremendous crash. All the old-fashioned tenements would soon belong to the city, taxes would have to be raised on the buildings remaining in private hands, and rents would be raised, not lowered. And should taxes be raised so high as to confiscate, would that help the city? Could the city manage property more economically than the landlord, who must pinch every penny because he has not, like the city, a reservoir of debt into which he may fall?

Land speculation is no bonanza. For every lot owner who has won there are ten who have lost. The land speculator is as little parasitical as the corn or wheat speculator. Both are go-betweens in the balancing of supply and demand and both are performing useful functions. We cannot well afford to wipe out either of them. The plan which Mr. Law fosters is indeed a "threatening experiment." E. M. ROSENSTOCK, New York, Nov. 27, 1915.

Conceptions of Neutrality.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: May I ask whether we do not always preach most of our neutrality when we wish to go behind or beyond our position as neutrals? As neutrals we are undoubtedly within our rights when we offer to supply the requirements of both parties without distinction of b. o. b. at any American port, but when we insist that one of these parties should allow the goods belonging to the other party to pass through their own fleets, without let or hindrance, to their own detriment, is not this taking a step on our part beyond or outside of our position as neutrals?

As an American long resident in Europe, I seem to see both sides of a question, whereas from letters I am in the habit of reading from stay-at-home friends so many of us seem only to look at an argument from one side only—the side which interests ourselves. A TRAVELLED AMERICAN, London, England, Nov. 10, 1915.

SUBWAY COURTESY AGAIN

How a Woman Views Male Conduct Regarding Seats.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I had long contemplated contributing a few remarks on subway courtesy to The Tribune's page. The letter on this subject in the number of November 26 puts the spot to my intention. I, too, came a few years ago as a stranger to New York, and transferred my unbiased impressions.

The New York man has a method all his own of sitting in the subway. By spreading out his lower limbs at acute angles as he sits reading his paper or meditating, he occupies the space of several persons. When some woman hangs on a strap in front of him his absolute unawareness is a fine art. To condense his anatomy into more compact form, to gather his limbs together and move along never occurs to him. Almost always two or three times, conscientious women near him huddle together their already cramped proportions in a desperate endeavor to make place for their sister sufferer.

Occasionally—oh, how rarely!—a man does rise and courteously offer his seat to some woman. My observation records that this politeness is usually gratefully acknowledged by an audible "Thank you" or by a nod of the head. If in any case a woman does not acknowledge such courtesy it is doubtless because she is so astonished at its unexpectedness as to be speechless. Almost paralyzed by this extraordinary masculine attention, she sinks breathless into the proffered seat.

But the average middle-aged or young New York woman, in my opinion, neither expects nor desires a man in the subway to offer her his seat. She only asks that he, instead of occupying the places of two men, or of three women, bring his widely diverging knees together, thus giving to other passengers the space which by right belongs to them. New York, Nov. 28, 1915.

From New England.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Like "Van," I, too, came from a New England town, and like him followed the practice of giving my seat to a woman whenever I saw one standing. Unlike him, however, I have found in the majority of cases that women do show their appreciation of an act of courtesy with a nod, a smile or a word of thanks. I regret to say, however, that in some cases women do neglect to acknowledge in any way the courtesy extended to them. We should not condemn all womanhood for what the minority do.

There is another side to this subject of "Courtesy in the Subway," and that is the lack of courtesy on the part of our young men. Frequently I blush from shame when I see a lone woman standing in front of me, or a young man sitting, not one of whom is courteous enough to offer his seat. Perhaps this same woman, if offered a seat on another occasion, would be so surprised for the moment that she would lose power to speak or to otherwise show her appreciation. Let us therefore continue to relieve all women of the fatigue of standing and of withstanding the lurches and jolts resulting from the sudden starting and stopping of the trains. Furthermore, let us start in getting our own homes to promote courtesy by teaching our sons to give consideration to women of all times and by teaching our daughters to be appreciative of any consideration shown them. A. A. D., New York, Nov. 26, 1915.

He Finds Them Appreciative.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: During sixteen years' residence in New York I have given up my seat perhaps a thousand times to women in elevated, surface and sub-surface cars, and have never experienced a case where no word, smile or nod of appreciation was given. What is the answer? Do I choose the more appreciative to favor, or have my manner and appearance something to do with it? Neither of these hypotheses explains it to me. I am not a psychologist in nature or training, nor a Chesterfield in manner, nor a James K. Hackett in appearance. H. C. C., New York, Nov. 25, 1915.