

New York Tribune

First to Tell the Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1916.

Published daily by The Tribune Association, Inc., New York corporation. Office: 410 Broadway, New York City.

Subscription rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, Outside of New York City. Daily, 10 cents; Sunday, 5 cents.

Foreign rates: Daily, 15 cents; Sunday, 10 cents. Single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class 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.

The Warning.

There is precisely one thing that every American should recognize in reading the account of what has happened in Ireland. The incidents which have taken place in Dublin may be repeated in Chicago, in Milwaukee, in New York City at any moment.

There is no element of surprise in the Irish rebellion or mutiny or insurrection—the name does not signify. Months ago the certainty of just such a thing was unmistakable. English public men knew it. The evidence was in their hands, the truth was patent to every one who visited Ireland.

It is a truth known in Washington that six months ago the State Department was even permitting the fact to leak out that there was going forward actively in this country of ours the work of sedition, the organization of treason, the manufacture of anarchy.

Great Britain and Ireland are now to pay the price of folly and cowardice. That which might have been settled by the courts will now be disposed of by machine guns; scores, hundreds, perhaps thousands, will die because those who direct British affairs did not dare to deal with the peril when it was only a peril, and must now kill when they could have disciplined.

The situation will not be different here on that day, long threatened, long planned, when other instruments and agents of sedition and treason follow the Dublin example and seek to stab in the back their own country in the moment of war or even of acute international crisis.

We have lived in this country of ours amidst disorder, violence, outrage, organized from without, directed to serve alien ends and skilfully grafted upon every form of local disturbance and disaffection. We have had dynamite, arson, crime, but so far in widely separated places and in relatively minor incidents.

There never has been a time when the American peril could not have been disposed of had our rulers dared, had they possessed the courage, the will, the strength to face the situation. The same is true of the Irish trouble. But there has been no such courage, no such vision, no such patriotism.

We are coming to the end of this. We shall presently have to face the facts that no department can longer hide, no elected official disguise in futile speech or suppress in official archives. We are going to know as Dublin knows, as London knows, because the end of all toleration of treason is the outburst of that fire and slaughter which treason and anarchy breed.

The whole world is filled with terrible lessons that are being taught to the selfish, the cowardly, the blind. Half the planet is ravaged because the men who direct the fortunes of countries would not or could not tell the truth, face the facts, act in the light of their knowledge and in the strength of their patriotism, but forever saw only votes, office, popularity—and all these only for the moment.

Democracy has broken down in all democratic countries because the men it has set in office have failed, have neither dared nor troubled nor cared, because little men of no faith and of no vision have thought that it was sufficient to suppress what was unpalatable, ignore what was uncomfortable and flee from what was dangerous.

The most tragic corner of this earth to-day is England. It is tragic because day by day all that is best in England of lives, all that is the highest and noblest in the race, is being sacrificed, thrown away in defeats, in disasters, in blunders that have no excuse and result in no service.

Half England is in mourning, yet with the sacrifice there is no dignity, no grandeur, because it is a waste, an empty, terrible waste. No man in Eng-

land knows what new agony and loss tomorrow may bring.

This is the price Britain is paying for its leadership. This is the price that Britain is paying for the Asquiths and the Greys and all the rest of the "wait and see," Gallipoli, Mons, Mesopotamia. What is known is terrible, and neither the press nor the public men of England dare tell the British people the half of all the shameful and terrible mistakes of this war.

To defeat and disorder abroad there is now added revolution at home. The cause is the same. Those who would not see the storm of war that was coming refused to heed the signs that were on every hand of the approach of domestic strife. Those who lied about Germany lied about Ireland, and the truth has found them out once more, writing its message in the mobs that machine guns must disperse and bullets quench.

England of to-day is the America of tomorrow. Our blindness is the same, our folly, our weakness. We, too, shall send our best to die in ditches and in swamps as we did in 1898, because no one would prepare. We shall see all that was noblest and best in our race wasted, because the men who had the power to prevent it lacked the courage, the honesty, the faith. We shall see what England sees and feels to-day, the bravest and noblest lives wasted, thrown away, because those who were titular leaders would not lead and those who followed would not reckon where they were going.

The Dublin insurrection is one more of those warnings to the American people that should not be mistaken and will hereafter be remembered. No element of all that marks this madness is lacking here in this country; the same open threats and only half secret admonitions have long been heard—and never yet heeded.

The machine gun will dispose of the mob. It is doing it in Dublin, it will ultimately do it anywhere. But it is a waste, a folly and a madness. It is the terrible price democracy pays for its present leadership. If the American people will not be warned, cannot learn by example, they are going at no distant time to learn as the English are learning. Treason cannot be ignored, anarchy cannot be left unpunished or unexpressed. We have treason and anarchy here. Unless they be dealt with now we shall have insurrection and machine guns hereafter.

Clean Coney Island.

If the "hot dog" man and the boiled corn vender at Coney Island this summer do not wear white gloves when dispensing their wares, the Board of Health will be displeased. If the bartender doesn't have a stream of hot water ready to wash the empty glasses, an inspector of the Bureau of Food and Drugs is likely to get after him and hale him into court.

This is a commendable extension of the work the Health Department has been doing rather unostentatiously in the hotels and restaurants of the city for several months—causing the physical examination of cooks, waiters, bus boys and others who handle foodstuffs, to guard against the spread of infectious diseases, and preaching cleanliness for health protection. It is more needed in the summer resorts than in the all-year-round establishments.

The holiday makers and pleasure seekers who frequent Coney Island are not disposed to be hypocritical. Nevertheless, they are entitled to protection of this kind, and will welcome the Health Department's activities.

Feminism in Eden.

It is difficult to place the John Martins in any single age of our acquaintance. Much of their joint volume on "Feminism" clearly hails from the Garden of Eden, at a period when the apple was as yet untampered with and Adam's rib still tingled with recollections of her start upon this planet.

But the meanest intelligence quickly discovers that both Mr. Martin and Mrs. Martin have witnessed far later doings of the human race. Both are aware that women, many women, have worked in factories; that even colleges have undertaken the task of educating women; that married women have in some way received the right to own property; also that the bandaging of feet has stirred Chinese women to revolt.

Just how far Mrs. Martin would go in her acceptance of what Feminism has already accomplished is not made clear in her half-naturally, the second half—of the volume. But Mr. Martin outlines a personally invented Humanism as a foil to Feminism which is specific. For one thing he would accept from Feminism, without credit, all the modern efforts to protect women in industry. When it comes to education he is more conservative. Nothing much in the way of brain strain permitted for the nineteenth century, which he allots to child bearing and rearing. But coming to the "Autumn of Life,"

he is distinctly handsome. He urges that the universities make special provision for the culture of our ripened matrons. In them he sees the real leisure class, in a "strategic position" to dip into literature, science and art, that "as the forest in autumn glows with its brightest colors, so their autumnal minds may glow afresh in the sunlight of new learning."

It takes a deal of patience to read Mr. and Mrs. Martin to the end. And that is a pity. Modern Feminism in the more than fifty years since George Meredith and the rest sent her triumphing on her course has grown many-viewed enough to stand a mass of criticism. Being nothing less or more than the freedom of women, body, soul and spirit, Feminism has struck off down a dozen diverging paths. Some are straight, some crooked. Down some she has marched carefully, steadily; down others she has wandered aimlessly. The general progress has been uneven, inexact and unplanned as all freedom. But it is a great movement, a real movement, and it is not to be competently discussed by philosophers who are persuaded in advance that every fresh turn is only another vicious divergence from the safe and beautiful hypothesis of the rib.

Seeking a Labor Monopoly.

The main point of difference—practically the only remaining one—between the Pennsylvania coal miners and the operators is the question of maintaining a "closed shop." The miners want an agreement that all workers shall be members of the United Mine Workers and that their dues shall be retained from wages by the employers—the so-called "check-off"—and paid into the union treasury. This would force about 70,000 non-union men into the union. The operators have agreed to make substantial wage concessions, but are unwilling to accept the closed shop and act as collecting agents for the union.

It would be distinctly unfortunate if on this ground alone the miners chose to precipitate a strike, with all its disastrous consequences for the general public and for themselves. With the purpose and ideals of the union there will be general sympathy. But there never has been, and there is not likely to be, any general sympathy in this country with the extreme anti-unionism which would debar a non-union workman from obtaining and holding a job. The ordinary individual does not wax more enthusiastic over the prospect of a monopoly by labor than over one by capital. A labor trust may be as inimical to the general welfare as any other kind of a trust.

Since the divorce of the anthracite mines from railroad ownership—even though that divorce may have been more technical than actual—there has been a gradual improvement in coal mining. Living conditions are better. For this constant work by the union may be held largely responsible, yet the operating authorities are now showing a different spirit toward the mines and the men employed there than they used to. It is greatly to be doubted whether a closed shop would help along this improvement. The miners ought to be able to do more for themselves and for their union by a continuance of the gradual recruiting of members which has placed the union employes in the majority in the anthracite field than by the display of a spirit as autocratic as that of the operators used to manifest.

The March for Preparedness.

One of the proofs of the growing public sentiment in favor of supplying this nation with an adequate army and navy comes in the announcement of the executive committee having the affair in charge, of their desire to "limit" the Citizens' Preparedness Parade, to be held in New York City on May 11, to 50,000 persons. So many bodies desired to participate in this demonstration that it was feared that it would be impossible for them to pass a given point in the hours between daylight and dusk. It is felt that the effect will be quite as impressive if the number is so limited that the parade may be reviewed in a single afternoon. Hence the present plan is to have the procession about half the size of the famous sound money demonstration in 1896, and the Taft parade in 1908, when the number of paraders totalled almost 100,000.

All of this is the logical result of the campaign of education which has been carried on so intelligently during the last few months. The hearts of the people are in the right place, and all that was needed to convince them that this great and prosperous nation should be in position to take care of itself in times of need was an appeal to their reason.

It was said the other day that there are 80,000 chauffeurs in New York State alone, or twice the mobile strength of the United States Army. When we consider the enormous number of men in many other occupations, it is hard to understand why there should be any dispute regarding the wisdom of creating a comparatively small army of 200,000 men or so.

Long-Lived Soap Bubbles.

The soap bubble which Sir James Dewar blew at the Royal Institution on February 17 has come to an untimely end, aged thirty-seven days. Its demise was due to the vibration set up by the liquid air machinery which was employed to produce liquid air for the purposes of Sir J. J. Thomson's lecture on Saturday afternoon.

But some other interesting companions withstood the disturbance. Among them is a bubble which is entirely black, and shows no color whatever. It was blown with hydrogen on March 16, and has since then been completely black. It is 1 1/2 centimetres, or about 5/16, in diameter and the thickness (or thinness) of its walls is of the order of one hundred-thousandth of an inch, or, say, four ten-millionths of an inch. Yet it is strong enough to support a drop of soap solution that hangs from its lowest point.

Another bubble, 8 centimetres, or 3 1/2 inches, in diameter, which was blown with air on February 23, had not become all black until March 12, thus taking much longer in the process than the one which was blown with hydrogen. After it had been allowed to stand for two days an experiment was made to see whether it would contract without bursting. When its interior was allowed to communicate with the external air it contracted to nearly one-half its previous diameter, so that by theory its walls should have been four times thicker; but the upper three-quarters of its surface remained black, while the lower quarter was of the second order of colors on Newton's scale, showing silver and nothing else.

OVERDOING DANIELS

No One Could Be as Black as We Paint Him.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The editorial in The Tribune of Sunday, April 23, headed "How Mr. Creel Feels About It," is the cause of serious misgivings on the part of at least one of its friends as to The Tribune's capacity for straight thinking.

The editorial gives us to understand that Mr. Creel is one of those intensely disagreeable individuals—men with one "point of view" and of existing facts and opinions to conform with that point of view.

To this characteristic the editorial attributes Mr. Creel's defence of Secretary Daniels. Now, as I understand it, Mr. Creel was not talking about the Secretary of the Navy when he made his alleged remark concerning the flag before the Labor Forum. The name of Secretary Daniels is lugged in by the writer of the editorial. It is this significant fact that causes a reader of the editorial to wonder what has happened to a newspaper that up to a year ago, at any rate, showed every desire to keep its editorial columns free from the unreason of persecution, whether of individuals or causes.

Consider what a world the apparent abandonment of that policy has created for The Tribune and its readers. The latter are compelled to wade through columns of descriptions of the daily activities of a smug little girl who devotes time that might well be expended on the fundamentals of grammar to holding her hand to her forehead and having her picture taken. The searcher for facts about the Mexican situation is assured one day that our army is composed of incapable, inefficient blunderers and urged the next to increase their number to hitherto unimagined legions. And the bulk of the news from Washington is permeated with what one of your editorial writers thinks President Wilson will do some time. By the way, what happened to that sequel to Mr. Wilson's "paper victory" over Germany that was so confidently predicted in your Washington dispatches a month or so ago? Wasn't Germany forcing us into troubles with England or was it war with Sweden? And as for Daniels, even the sporting page must heap fresh ridicule upon his head.

Isn't it well to remember that the one idea, preparedness at any price, that now obsesses The Tribune is bound to cause precisely that distrust of its opinions on the part of its readers that The Tribune professes to feel concerning Mr. Creel's mind?

After all, no one can be as bad as Mr. Daniels is painted in the columns of The Tribune, and the bitterness of its attacks upon this official are making friends for Mr. Daniels every day in the most surprising quarters. M'ALISTER COLEMAN. New York, April 23, 1916.

Teachers Fear the Administration.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I am a school teacher. I voted in favor of the proposed pension plan. I do not, however, consider that those who voted in opposition are the greedy ones. I know the various objections to the plan. These are all sound at bottom.

Mr. Bruce on many occasions has definitely stated that a half-pension would benefit the city. The present scheme provides that the city out of its own funds provide for a quarter-pension. The teachers will be forced to contribute an amount sufficient to provide for an annuity equal to a quarter-pension.

The city is ready to pay a quarter pension. But how many teachers, say, whose salary is \$1,500, would retire on a pension of \$375? What is the best way of shelving the aged servant? What better scheme than to have the teacher do it himself? Deduct enough from the salary to provide another quarter so that retirement from service will cause less hardship. Is this a pension or an annuity?

The objections might not be valid if the deductions were comparatively slight. Do you know that approximately half of the teaching force will contribute 1/8 per cent of their salary, or almost a month's salary, every year?

Do you know that one of the great inducements held out to attract us to the city's service was the half-pension after thirty years' service? Every circular of the board of examiners of the Board of Education held out the lure of such a pension.

I personally have absolute faith in the city's readiness to stand back of this scheme. A great many, however, do not trust the bill, which emanates from an administration that has constantly proved to be opposed to the educational needs of the city. They have been told sufficiently often by our esteemed Controller that they are overpaid, underworked; that they find it hard to believe that a bill fostered as is this one, backed as this one is, can be for their interest. It is a case of "timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."

Another objection urged is that the pensions are too high. The majority of teachers receive a salary providing for pensions ranging from \$600 to \$1,000 instead of \$750 to \$5,000. Smaller pensions would reduce the cost to the city and to the individual teacher. Does this prove greediness? NATHAN N. DICKLER. New York, April 19, 1916.

Forced to Fight.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: This morning's editorial entitled "Greedy Teachers" may be justified, but if it presents the full picture of the teaching force of New York City it is a sad outlook for her future citizens, who must sit under the instruction of such vampires.

May I question the assumption which underlies your stinging indictment? You assume that all who voted for the pension bill did so because they decided that it was as much as they could hope to extract from the poor taxpayer; and that all who voted against it did so because they expected to get more.

I am myself a teacher in a Brooklyn high school, which is a large and representative one. Naturally, the pension question has been much discussed there. The general feeling was that the proposed bill was most generous, but there was also a strong feeling that it was too generous; that it was asking more than was fair of the taxpayers.

Those in my school who were from the first in favor of the bill were certainly neither impudent nor greedy. They acknowledged freely the generosity of the city and felt that they were justified in accepting it and ending an intolerable situation.

The assumption that the teaching profession of New York City is a legislative Ishmael seems to be prevalent. It is not an inspiring role; nor is its origin a credit to the record of reckless incompetence made by the present Legislature of New York State is sufficient explanation. The teachers have been forced to fight for their plain rights, and evil communications—i. e., contact with legislators—have in some cases corrupted good manners.

But the big mass of the teaching profession want to be left in peace to teach the "fellows that need a friend." They don't want to be politicians. They give themselves gladly and ungrudgingly to their work. They do their best to earn their generous salaries, look back to their own school days and tell me if I exaggerate. N. A. SMITH. Brooklyn, April 19, 1916.



THE SINN FEIN MOVEMENT

How from Relatively Small Beginnings It Gained Force When War Broke Out. Attracting Malcontents from the Several Disorganized Factions—Methods Used to Foster Disloyalty in Ireland.

In the early days of the Sinn Fein movement there were moderate men who saw in it a possible solution of some of the most formidable difficulties involved in the Irish question. It was non-sectarian and hence it was free from one of the principal dangers the Protestants of Ulster profess to discover in all national movements in Ireland—the domination of what they call the Papistry. The Sinn Fein party was indeed frankly anti-clerical and powerful enough even before the war to defeat proposals which might have been favorable to the promotion of Home Rule, but would at the same time have strengthened the power of the Church in Ireland. The Sinn Feiners were resolved to put nationalism above all other considerations, and they made great headway among Catholics who, while utterly out of sympathy with the bigots of the North, were hardly less impatient of their own sectarianism and saw a new line in the possibility of keeping national aspirations free from the complication of religious dissonance.

This purely national movement was at first somewhat coldly intellectual. It attracted many who could not heartily attach themselves to any of the older factions fighting for or against Home Rule. It is an accident of the war that it has gained so dominating a place to-day, for a very large proportion of those concerned in the present insurrection had little or nothing in common with Sinn Fein before the war began. Mr. Redmond's bold coup in placing the National Volunteers as it were at the disposal of the British Government, the subsequent suspension of the Home Rule act, the fear of conscription in Ireland, the increase in Irish taxation—these among other circumstances have all contributed in large measure to the strengthening of the Sinn Fein force.

It was evident in the early days of the war that a considerable number of Mr. Redmond's followers resented his declaration of loyalty before Parliament. Many of the National Volunteers felt that he had no right to speak in their name. Even before this event his title to leadership was in question, and now some who hitherto had stood by him loyally saw in his apparently impulsive action a serious tactical error which could not be retrieved while the war lasted. His enemies made full use of this manifest dissatisfaction and the Irish Volunteers were constantly strengthened by seceders from the armed body of the Redmondites.

In like manner all sorts of malcontents have rallied to the call of the Sinn Fein party, and among them undoubtedly many of pro-German inclination. In all probability they have had direct help from German agents. It must not be supposed, however, that the original Sinn Feiners are sympathetic with the German cause or would find themselves at home with the Irish-American element that is working so enthusiastically with the Germans in this country. They probably regard their brethren here with contempt, for nothing more clearly opposed to the spirit of Sinn Fein could be found than the fusion of the common Celto-Franksians of New York. They may find it expedient to make use of these Irishmen of the third and fourth remove, but in their hearts they must despise them.

Anything, however, that could in any way advance their cause by creating and fostering disloyalty was cheerfully welcomed. "The Fatherland," "The Continental Times," even "The Gaelic-American" served the turn of the rebels; and besides these they had many weekly journals of their own. Several of these were suppressed, but only to spring

A GERMAN BOYCOTT

Reasons for Believing Mr. Garvin's Idea Fantastic.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In The Tribune of April 15 J. L. Garvin, of London, expounds at length the cherished British idea of a trade war against Germany. In rather poetic language he explains to us how Germany will be utterly ruined by being shut out from three-fifths of the world. "Germany will be like the prisoner in Dack's grim tale, shut up in the iron dungeon," says Garvin, rather melodramatically.

The Central Powers can boast of 120,000,000 people. To talk of their being shut up in a dungeon is rather ridiculous; they have not only the vast outlet to the Orient assured, but their situation is such that they divide the two great halves of the combination of powers called the Entente. If they retaliate and, for example, bar all Russian traffic from their territory, shutting at the same time the Dardanelles, Russia will be as hopelessly shut out from all foreign trade as she has been for the last twenty months. Russia's climate and railway system make the Slav empire dependent upon the good will of its western neighbors. And only a complete defeat of Turkey can wrest the key of the Black Sea from Germany's ally.

"The Allies have in their own possession every single element, agricultural and mineral, required for modern production and exchange," while "Germany cannot do without the Allies." It would have been better had Mr. Garvin substantiated such assertions. The events of the last two years do not seem to confirm these statements. On the contrary, Germany has been able to do without the Allies. She has invented or perfected quite a number of substitutes for goods she used to draw from the markets of her present enemies. Most branches of her industry are in full swing, and even the most ardent Germanophobes have abandoned the hope that Germany's economic fabric would soon collapse. Germany's industrial organization stood the severest test possible, and it is not easy to see why it should be worse off than peace comes. The Allies, on the other hand, are still seriously hampered by lack of German products, which they are unable to do without or to replace. Dyes and fertilizer, coal and medical supplies, chemical and electrical products form some spots in the Allied equipment. Germany has really become independent in quite a number of supplies—nitrate, manganese, gun cotton, rubber, camphor, etc.—whereas the Allied countries have become more and more dependent upon foreign products. France's industry is crippled. Russia's is wellnigh annihilated. Great Britain is seriously hampered. Facts which find their expression in the enormous imports into these countries and the dwindling exports. If Germany has lost her experts she is also rich in her imports, and not much the worse for it.

After the war the manufacturers and traders of the Allied countries will find out again that Germany is not only an exporting but also an importing country. In fact, imports into Germany used by far to exceed her exports, as any statistical abstract before the war proves. That industry and trade of the United States would be affected by a economic alliance of the Entente countries and brought into a position similar to that of Germany is patent to all observers.

But even in the case of such an alliance it would be ungenerous talk to treat Germany as shut off from the rest of the world. Not only would the markets of the Near East be reserved to the German trader, but the Americas and China would offer vast opportunities to German commerce. These countries would greatly profit by international competition such as German energy will bring about.

THE HOUSE NEXT DOOR.

Disaster will befall Germany's shipping, such as Mr. Garvin's worst threat. But Allied harbors are not the only ports German ships can sail to. And in the face of the rapid destruction of merchantmen during the war, resulting in soaring freight rates, it seems very probable that Allied business interests will allow 6,000,000 tons of the best seagoing vessels to be shut out from their reach. In Germany's ships taking to the high seas again rests the hope that the freight level in the near future, or else Allied commerce will labor under a severe handicap which would prove disastrous in international competition.

Dr. R. J. OBERFOHREN. New York, April 20, 1916.