New York Tribune

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; R. H. Walds, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES.		CANADIAN RATES.	
DAILY AND SUNDAY.		DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.00	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	$ 3.32	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.39	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

"How Long Will It Last?"

For the American returning from Europe no question is more familiar than this: "How long will it last?" However impossible the question may be to answer he is confronted by it at every turn. What makes any response more difficult is that the same question was asked of him at every turn in Europe. In France, in England, the same wonder, the same puzzle is to be found. There, as here, the probable duration of the war remains a matter on which few people have even a conjecture and none a real conviction.

All this amounts to saying that the situation in France and Great Britain has undergone no superficial change in the twenty-one months that the Great War has endured. Neither in London nor in Paris does any one seriously expect peace at the end of any time that he cares to measure by months or years. For France and for Great Britain the issues of the war remain unsettled as yet. What they undertook to defend remains in danger; the principle that is in the heart of the Frenchman, who sees more clearly than any of his allies, remains involved.

The difficulty in understanding in America why there is no prospect of peace in Europe this summer is found in the fact that there has been no general appreciation in America of the real character of the conflict. No Frenchman, for example, regards the present struggle as a war in the ordinary sense. France is fighting Germany to-day as one would fight a man-eating tiger, as one would fight a wild animal, laying aside all thought of adjusting difficulties by human speech.

To understand this French point of view, and it must be understood, it is necessary to go out to the regions of France where the German has been, it is necessary to go to the villages and towns which were occupied by German soldiers in the opening days of the war. It is necessary to see and to hear what has been done there. Go to Sermaize, go to Gerbevier, go to any town in the region between the Ornain and the Forest of Argonne and see what the Germans, in this instance the Bavarians, actually did.

In this region there is no question of ordinary destruction of war. There villages destroyed by shell fire, and this is a legitimate circumstance of war. But there are other villages, towns, any number of them, where the torch was applied to please the passion or the desire to destroy wantonly. Women were outraged, children were killed, utterly indescribable defilements were visited upon nations and upon homes, and these things have passed into the common knowledge of millions of Frenchmen, because the French armies have passed this way and the places remain there.

There is no anger in the French attitude. There is no bitterness of denunciation. There is no outbreak of a desire for revenge—nothing of the sort. The Frenchman takes you to these villages and shows you what has taken place; he narrates with reference to documents and official reports what was done in these towns. They are part of the grim facts of his life; he is no more angry with the Germans than he would be with a wild animal. But these things are so; they are hard, palpable facts; this being true, what can he do but go on?

It is different only in degree in England. In London you will see where women and children have been murdered by Zeppelins; the same is true in many British cities. The women and children who have been drowned by submarines are very many. There is passion in the Britton's tone and manner frequently, though not always; but this is only an incident. The real attitude toward the German thing is the attitude of a physician toward a cholera germ or a typhoid germ. It is a thing that destroys human life; it is a peril and must be disposed of. There is no other way to dispose of it; no other treatment than that of the rifle, the machine gun and the high explosive.

In America we talk about the war and speculate and argue about it as if it were a war. Nothing of the sort happens in France or in Great Britain. Nothing of the sort happens in the case of Americans when they have seen what the German thing has meant in the countries in which it has been expressed. To see Champagne or Lorraine is to put aside the discussion of those issues which delight the historian alone. You go into a village and a story is told. The Germans took this village in August, 1914; some of it they burned; they took the women prisoners, and in September, 1914, when the French soldiers fought their way back the women leaned out of the windows and begged the men to take no prisoners. None were taken, and the reason was obvious.

No Frenchman imagines that he is fighting a war with a nation whose rival ambitions have produced a conflict. He is fighting with the people who killed the little boy in Senlis, the little boy with a wooden gun. This gun he pointed at the German soldiers and said, "Bang!" Then he was shot. The Frenchman is fighting with the people who killed the women in the cellar at Sommeilles, killed them by shameful abuse. He is fighting the people who do certain things, he is fighting them because they do these things. These things are expressed in international affairs by the invasion of Belgium, but they are expressed in the ordinary material of human life by the tragedies which have occurred in the little French villages all over the North of France.

If one is to understand why there is no talk of peace now and mighty little thought of it in France or Great Britain (and a great deal less, so one hears, in Russia), one must understand the mental attitude of the French and the British. The things that the Germans did in France are most of them unspeakable, some of them are just nauseatingly beastly, but many of them are savage and hideous. They express an idea, they express a point of view, they express a temporary or a permanent frame of mind in Germany. There is nothing to do while this point of view prevails in Germany but to fight; that fight is not for provinces or power or profit; it is a fight for existence, for the existence of what is worth preserving in human life.

The Frenchman feels that he is fighting for civilization because there is written all over France the handiwork of the German. He sees it in the defiled and ruined churches. What was beautiful, tender, weak in human form or in the architecture of his towns has been ruined because there seemed to be a certain wild joy in the German heart to destroy these things. If the German could get on into new regions he might do the same thing over again. He might make all France a desert, as he has made much of it now. Why talk about peace, then? What peace can you talk about with such a foe in the field?

If the German goes back to his own country, if the German lines rest on the German frontier, then there may be a possibility of a talk of peace next winter or next spring. Europe is terribly weary of the blood-bath of the recent months. But there is no prospect of German retirement, and there is not the smallest suggestion anywhere that any one will give over the fight until the German danger is laid. Men are fighting for their children, that these children may not have to know what their fathers and their mothers have known. They are bound to establish the essential fallacy of the German assertion that power is everything, and that the weak have neither the right to exist if they be nations, nor to follow their own lives if they be individuals.

It has cost Germany above a million lives to invade Belgium and France. It has cost Germany between three and four million casualties to burn Louvain and plunder and ravage and outrage in France and Belgium. When the Germans have learned that these things cannot be done, that they don't pay, that their cost is beyond all possible profit, then there will be a prospect of peace in Europe. Otherwise there can be no prospect of peace save in consequence of a German triumph. Germany must establish her gospel of lust and violence and terror in London and Paris or abandon it in Berlin.

There is another question that is asked of the returning traveller: "Do you still feel that the Allies are going to win?" No one can feel otherwise either in Great Britain or France. No one can feel that there is any outcome of the war possible except the destruction of this terrible German idea which has brought the world to such agony. In fact, the thing that one feels in Europe is that Germany has been beaten, that the German idea has been proven impossible, that it was proven impossible at the Marne, and that Verdun is only a later confirmation of a fact already become absolute.

But if one asks, "Will the Allies write their terms of peace in Berlin?" that, again, is approximate nonsense. France, Belgium, Serbia are going to emerge from this war as they began it, indestructible and safe. The nations and the peoples that are fighting Germany will not make peace while there is any profit for Germany in what Germans have done in France or Belgium. If it could be proven profitable to murder, to destroy wantonly, whether human life or human habitation; to rob women of their honor or churches of their beauty; if terrorism and brutality could be demonstrated to pay, then there would be an end of civilization. There would be an end of France, and the French know it.

The question of peace or war is purely and simply a question of the things that Germany asserted at the outset and the things Germany did in the opening months of the war. These shaped the whole mind and temper of Germany's enemies. These have prevented the making of peace months ago. There is nothing in material things that remains impossible to settle, to adjust. France is indestructible, Germany is a unit proven by a world war quite as clearly as was France in the wars of the Revolution. The issues of the war are not difficult to adjust—even the Alsace-Lorraine difficulty might yield to compromise—if there had been no atrocities, no burning, ravaging and violating.

But if Americans are to understand the situation in Europe to-day they must see it in the light of the facts that are written all over France in language that cannot be mistaken. They must see what the French soldier sees every day, what the French woman knows, what all French men and women know; they must see it in what all British soldiers on the Continent see in Belgium and in France. This is the fact of the war, this is the issue of the war. This thing cannot exist if nations are to endure and civilization to continue. It cannot earn dividends in territory or indemnities; it must perish or all else must perish. You can no more compromise with this idea than you can make friends with a rattlesnake. The thing is destructive of all that France and Britain love, and if they do not banish it all that they love will die, as much has already—die by a shameful death.

France has lived amidst her ruins for twenty months; she has heard and she has seen. She knows and so do her Allies. The things that Germans have done in Europe will be remembered as those of Attila. It will become an enduring memory, this German invasion, as that of other barbarians that have come down from the north. There is no question of peace or war, no question of compromise or adjustment; either the Germans will go home or France will die. But the desire to destroy Germany, the belief that it is possible to destroy Germany—this does not exist, and where it did exist it has been removed by what Germany has done in recent months.

As far as France is concerned there is universal conviction that the war must go on steadily and without interruption for negotiations until Germany accepts the common humanity that has hitherto bound all mankind that believed itself civilized. "These things have got to stop"; this the Frenchman says and this the Englishman says. "These things" are not rumors, not imaginary wrongs. Any one who wants to know about the reality of "these things" can go to France and see for himself. They are there and they will be there for many years to come; unmistakable, not to be destroyed by casuistry or abolished by words. They are a fact, the only fact in the world war to-day.

You will no longer find general or even considerable conviction that Germany is to be rebuilt to suit the ideas of conquerors. No one thinks of that. Germany's right and capacity to rebuild herself are recognized; she will be master of her own fate at the end of the war; she has proven this by a splendid military achievement and an internal solidarity that command general admiration. But she must go home out of France and out of Belgium, out of Serbia; she must concede the right of other nations to live their own lives, and above all she must recognize that rape and arson and pillage are not agents by which it is possible to dominate Europe or conquer nations.

In sum, there is no prospect of peace in Europe, but there is a plain evidence of the clearing of the way for peace. The enemies of Germany, that is, the nations which she attacked two years ago, have put aside most of the foolish notion they had of conquering Germany or eliminating her from the rank of great powers. This was the natural desire of those who had suffered from the madness of the Germany of 1914. But it is a vanished idea. Quite in the same way these same nations, all their peoples, have laid hands on the solid purpose for which they will fight until they perish or conquer. The German thing must not endure; it must not live by gathering profit in territories, in provinces, in indemnity. It must be thrown back bleeding across the German frontiers; unless this happens there can be no real peace, and all the previous sacrifices will have been vain.

And in some fashion this change and clarifying of purpose makes for ultimate peace. We are beginning to perceive far more clearly what the true issue of the war is, the issue that means to mankind enough to recompense for the sacrifice. There is a growing readiness to dismiss the question of colonies, of new places in the sun, of commercial expansion. The Allies are coming back to the perception of the principle, not the minor detail and the unessential and selfish circumstance. When Germany is ready to go home, when she is ready to recognize that the world is not amenable to her discipline or her method, and that the effort to apply it costs approximately 200,000 casualties per month and earns only a debt of $5,000,000,000 per annum, then there will be peace.

Oddly enough, however, it is hard not to feel that Germany is moving toward this end, moving toward it while the Allies are putting aside what was never possible and hardly desirable—their early impulse to destroy the Germany that so cruelly and so brutally assailed them. The German idea remains to be crushed, but it is already something far different from the idea that Bernhardi told his countrymen about a few years ago. Every one of his major propositions has been answered on a battlefield, and the answer has been conclusive or nearly so.

In so far as the opponents of Germany have fought for spiritual values they have won their fight; we are going on after this war from the point at which civilization rested in August, 1914. The law of "the Scrap of Paper" has not been established, although a million Germans have died to make it good. We are not going to accept the German idea, we are not going to accept the German principle; it has not worked; it has not brought profit to Germany, but agony and misery. On the other hand, in so far as the Allies, while fighting for spiritual values, have in addition adopted German ideas, talked and thought in terms of conquests and provinces, they, too, are likely to be disappointed. This also is a wholesome thing; it is the best thing that could be hoped for as a consequence of this world war.

Essential Truth.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your leader of this morning, "British Failure," speaks with terrific force. It may not be accurate in all points of detail. Perhaps it is somewhat overpessimistic. But the essential truth cannot be denied.

Sincerest conviction inspired that editorial and a rare courage printed it. Those are the things which give power to speech, command audience and win the reward of accomplished influence. For this kind of work you put the public under a genuine debt of obligation. FREDERICK P. LATIMER.

New London, Conn., May 1, 1916.

NO LIQUOR ADVERTISEMENTS

Views of Readers on The Tribune's Closing Its Columns.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Right glad am I that one of our great dailies has taken a stand positively against the saloon.

How any paper can enter into alliance with the saloon, and such it does when it advertises its business, and respect itself I cannot understand. The saloon desires to reach the people; the paper advertising the saloon is the willing medium, herald of the saloon. This is coöperation. The paper enters the home as the ally, the companion of the business. If the business blesses the home the paper should share in the reward; if the business curses the home the paper must share the condemnation before both God and good men.

If each editor, small or large, should think ahead and weigh his responsibility in the debauchery of our youth, home and city, no money consideration would tempt him to mention the liquor business in his paper or magazine, save to condemn every phase of it.

Psalm, 50:18: "When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentest with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers." How much more so when you help him in his infamous work?

I congratulate The Tribune.

REV. T. J. WHITAKER.

Brooklyn, April 7, 1916.

What About Tobacco?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: That you or any other of the better class of newspapers should shut out the advertising of alcoholic beverages is in line with the eternal fitness of things. So far as I can observe, however, comparatively little money is spent upon such advertising.

Now, what about tobacco? What position do you take in the face of the volumes of facts proving it to be a dangerous race poison?

If you contend that opinions differ (equally true of alcohol or opium), why not make a serious investigation and publish the results?

The advertising patronage of the tobacco interests, it is true, is very large, but you surely will not let patronage stand in the way of your widely heralded principles.

Such "cleaning up" should result in much moral and physical improvement. Keep up the good work and continue to put up the gates to an increasingly large number of evils. Perhaps, if you keep on, we shall some day have a New York paper whose advertising columns are guaranteed against any kind of harmful merchandise.

F. K. THOMPSON.

Woodhaven, N. Y., April 12, 1916.

From the W. C. T. U.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Permit me to add my word of appreciation in representing nearly 600 women of the first county in the Empire State, the capital city itself. You are to be highly commended upon the advance step in journalism which you have recently taken in removing from the pages of your splendid paper the advertisements of the most un-American, unpatriotic product that this blessed country knows anything about.

When the billboards make a clean sweep of both beer and whiskey ads, and when the press ceases to accept liquor ads at any price, the dawn of the millennium will be seen on the horizon. God speed the day!

Under separate cover I send a printed list of the 840 dailies that refuse liquor ads. This does not include 60 magazines.

CAROLYN P. LINDSAY,
President Albany County W. C. T. U.

Albany, N. Y., April 12, 1916.

A Powerful Influence.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Allow me to congratulate you very highly on your stand against liquor advertisements. I believe such action by reputable and self-respecting journals will have a powerful influence in diminishing the trade in strong liquors which is so injurious to public morals.

I hope that you will continue to maintain this high standard and that a number of other great dailies which are greatly in need of purification may be induced to follow your example. J. HAVENS RICHARDS, S. J.,
Rector Church of St. Ignatius Loyola.

New York, April 11, 1916.

Liquor Business Indefensible.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to congratulate you upon the stand you have taken. The liquor business is the most unreasonable, indefensible and reprehensible of any in the world.

I do not believe any individual, firm or paper will suffer loss through refusing recognition or support to a trade that is first, last and all the time only pernicious.

LYNN P. ARMSTRONG.

First Presbyterian Church, Richmond Hill, N. Y., April 7, 1916.

Pleased in Every Way.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Allow me to congratulate The Tribune most heartily on its attitude on April 1, 1916, in barring from its columns all liquor advertising. I have for three years been looking for a paper dependable in every way, and when I read about your stand for clean advertising I knew I had found the right paper. In appreciation of your stand I sent in my subscription, and I have been pleased in every way.

E. BOHNE-ECHOLT,
Methodist Episcopal Church.

Phœnicia, N. Y., April 10, 1916.

Tremendous Forward Step.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I beg to say that the discontinuance of liquor advertisements in your great paper seems to me a tremendous forward step, and one that should commend itself to all right thinking people. I believe, too, that you put it upon the right basis. Any support that I, in my humble position, can give is gladly yours.

I compliment you and wish you every success.

M. M. AMUNSON,
Disciples' Missionary Union.

New York, April 11, 1916.

Heartily Glad.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The lofy professions of some papers hardly tally with their obvious support of the liquor business. I am heartily glad you have made the move to debar liquor advertisements and wish you success in every effort to make The Tribune a greater paper.

ROBERT R. WHITE.

Faith Presbyterian Church, New York, Ap. 11, 1916.

A Recommendation.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I most heartily commend your attitude toward the liquor interests.

I have not been reading your paper, but I shall order it and give it a trial. If I like the paper in other ways I shall commend it to my people. ALFRED M. WILKINS,
Centenary M. E. Church.

New York, April 11, 1916.

"SITUATION HOPEFUL"

"BRITISH FAILURE" IN BRITISH EYES.

One Englishman Finds The Tribune's Editorial "False, False, False, from Beginning to End"—Another Sees Only Failure by Britain's Allies Which She Must and Will Repair—The Empire Which Has Lost Battles and Campaigns but Which "Has Never Lost a War"—The Moral for Americans.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am past the meridian of life. I have had experience of many countries and many newspapers. I was in Paris for some months during the Boer war, when were written the strongest articles against England that have ever appeared in France. I was in Germany several times during international political frictions, and since the present war started have read many of the bitterest attacks on England that Teutonic malice could inspire. But in all my experience I have never seen gathered together in one article so many misstatements of facts, so many misreadings of action, in fact, so many direct or indirect untruths, as appear in your article of this morning under the heading of "British Failure." I challenge you to point to one single statement in the article which is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and I defy you to produce proof of any one of your assertions. False, false, false, from beginning to end; that is the character of the article. You distort the truth to turn a point; grossly exaggerate to lend a sham force to a bad argument; damn with faint praise England's most important achievements for the purpose of giving color to a lengthy condemnation of her mistakes; cover her greatest virtues with a cloak of faults, and malign her greatest men with broad accusations without a shadow of proof being adduced in support thereof. Your article is long, and so requires much space to answer, but I will deal with your assertions seriatim and endeavor to be as brief as possible.

1. The article is based on the surrender of Kut-el-Amara, and after minimizing this affair from a military point of view you proceed to imply that it has an enormous significance as against England, and make the following astounding assertions:

"In the Near East, in the Far East, this surrender before Bagdad is a greater fact than the Russian victory at Erzerum or the French at Verdun. What the French have purchased on the Meuse, the Russians along the upper Euphrates, for prestige and influence for the anti-Teutonic alliance, has been wasted by the British in Mesopotamia and Ireland."

Where is your proof or authority for this? For I deny it absolutely, and not only so, but declare most positively that from all experience the adventures into Gallipoli and Mesopotamia, and in fact all such adventures, victorious or otherwise, have only the effect of enhancing British prestige throughout the world. For national thought runs along broader grooves than are evidently available to the writer of your article. You regard these retirements or surrenders as defeats, and tell us that England is always too late, but you do not tell us that it is just this kind of adventure that has given England her great empire, and which she alone of all countries is in the habit of making; nor do you point out that of the thousand of such adventures she has had in her wars she has been successful in nine hundred of them. Too late! Look over the map of the world and see how much is colored with the British pink. Does it look as though England is in the habit of being too late? Is not this very war mostly caused by the size of her possessions? And in her great adventures in Africa, India, Australia, Canada, let alone the thousand islands and the poles, was she ever too late? Never, but often too soon, for she dares sometimes without sufficiently counting the cost, as with Khartum, Gallipoli and Kut-el-Amara; and her soldiers and explorers die, and die bravely, knowing well that their country will adventure and adventure again till success results, as with Khartum and a hundred other places. And these adventures are in accord with British practice from time immemorial. They are the very breath of her spirit, the source of all her glory, the foundation of all her expansion, and because they are made too soon sometimes, because the imagination of her people occasionally runs ahead of their power of execution, and a daring stroke is attempted without specialized organization, you talk of ignominious defeats and loss of prestige and little politicians! Great God! where would England be to-day without her list of Kut-el-Amaras and Gallipolis?

2. You say that the French have been disappointed since the beginning of the war at what the British army has accomplished and also "because the failure of the British has cost them terrible losses." A similar statement has been officially denied over and over again, and I ask, therefore, where is your authority?

3. You say that on land, wherever England's armies "have gone to battle, they have gone to defeat, ignominious defeat." This is an appalling exaggeration. You then proceed to give details of the Marne, Ypres and Loos, which are gross distortions of the official records, without offering any proof whatever of your variations.

4. You say:

"Talk with Australians or Canadians in England or on the Continent and you will get a real and saddening view of British conditions. These men see, they have suffered, they are ready to suffer more, but there is a despair in their hearts because they feel that the British will not see, will not understand."

Now, I can only describe this as absolutely false and defy you to bring forward a particle of evidence in your favor. I lived for some years in Australia and know Australians well. Moreover, I have received many letters from them, both from the front and from England, and I have never seen in any letter or in any paper the very slightest suggestion of "saddening view" or "despair" or anything of the sort. Moreover, to those who know Australians, it is ridiculous to suggest such a condition. The average Australian loses a fortune or hangs over a precipice without turning a hair, and so far as "saddening views" are concerned the feeling of Australians is all the other way, and they would vote to a man for having another go at Gallipoli, even if the chances were a thousand to one against success. And my experience with Canadians is fairly extensive, and I find them to vary little from Australians in respect to "saddening views."

5. You say:

"A whole system has broken down in England, a system of empire, of life, of government."

Inasmuch as this is news to everybody, it is clearly your duty to come forward with your proof or authority.

6. You say:

"The whole atmosphere of London to-day is an atmosphere of unreality, of apprehension and of a nation wandering in darkness, conscious that its leaders are shams, that it has neither statesmen nor generals."

I receive letters from London every week and see many other Englishmen who receive letters, and I say that nothing more false than this statement was ever written.

7. You say that Dublin "is in ashes," while not one-hundredth part of it has been burned, and you talk of the rebellion demonstrating the "fatal folly" of the government, when you know perfectly well that the revolt was engineered in Germany and that not one-fourth of 1 per cent of the people are concerned in it.

8. You describe members of the British government as "little men," "men who fight among themselves for office," "who cling to salaries," and so on. Now, the leading members of the government are Asquith, Grey, Balfour, Law, Lloyd George, McKenna, Chamberlain, Lord Crewe and Lord Lansdowne. Which of these "cling to salaries and to prominence"? Which of them are "empty politicians"? Which of them "answer each other with words empty as the ashes of Belgium"? And what do you mean when you say in speaking of the government:

"It lied to the British people over all the years before the war came. It almost lied the British people out of the war altogether and left France to perish alone. It has been lying ever since."

As you are so fond of using the extreme word, perhaps you will allow me to say that your statement is an unmitigated lie from beginning to end. Your appalling assertions constitute a gross libel upon a number of brilliant men whose honor has never been questioned, who have gone through the most troubled time in the history of the nation with unexampled courage and who have earned for themselves the heartfelt appreciation of forty millions of people, of all these millions of people who have watched them year in and year out for something like two decades and know them and love them as among the brightest ornaments of their country's history. And "cling to salaries" when all but one are rich men and lose infinitely more than they gain in money by their services to the state! Can ignorance or malice go further than your writer? Was slander ever more unfounded than his?

In publishing your article you assume a great responsibility, and I take it that you are ready to prove your astounding assertions or withdraw them. You cannot do less.

New York, May 1, 1916. E. GOVETT.

Britain Has Never Lost a War!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Having read your editorial page for some time, always with interest and generally with advantage intellectually, I take the liberty of pointing out a few slight misapprehensions in regard to British affairs contained in your well written but erroneously conceived editorial of to-day. Your statement that British prestige would suffer throughout the Orient on account of the check in Mesopotamia would imply that Oriental respect for Great Britain is based upon a belief that British armies are invincible. If this were correct the annihilation of the ill-fated Gordon expedition at Khartoum would have been followed by the collapse of British dominion in Africa and the Orient. Long before Gordon's time the Oriental had learned that although a British army might be wiped out to-day the near to-morrow would witness the gleam of the British bayonets as her soldiers marched over the field of their recent disaster to final victory. On its military side it is the persistence of the British Empire which counts in the Orient.

But the prestige of Britain in the Orient and in Africa rests chiefly on the justness and fairness with which she governs the native races, and this feeling commands the loyalty of her Oriental and African citizens in the face of present military checks. The surrender at Kut-el-Amara will cause as little consternation in India and Egypt as it has caused in England or Canada, which is none at all, and when the final history of the great war is written the dogged stand of Townshend will be numbered among the most glorious feats of the British Empire, which has often lost battles and occasionally lost campaigns, but has never lost a war.

You also seem to forget that primarily England's duty toward the Entente Powers in case of war was to take care of the sea, while France and Russia attended to the military side of the situation. It is well within the mark to say that had France and Russia done their share as efficiently as Britain has hers the war would have been won months ago.

If there has been a military failure on the Allied front it cannot be attributed to Great Britain, though, without complaint and without criticism of her Allies, who have done their best, she will repair that failure. But you must understand that it takes time to build and equip an army, and as Great Britain has been called upon to take a hand in a field where she might have reasonably expected that her aid would not be required it is not surprising that she is sometimes slow in arriving with her army.

I am a Canadian, my near relatives of fighting age are in the army, but I wish to say that if any Canadians think as you suggest they had better take a little time and count noses and they will find that if Canada had done as well as England, Scotland and Wales there would be 700,000 Canadians under arms to-day.

Don't expect George to do it all in a war that is not directly in defence of his own interest. He will do all that circumstances may demand and will fight it out to a finish, but give him a reasonable time to do that which he scarcely expected to be called upon to perform. H. B. HETHERINGTON.

New York, May 1, 1916.