

New York Tribune

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 110 Nassau Street, New York.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. Daily, 5 cents; Sunday, 1 cent.

Foreign Rates: Daily, 15 cents; Sunday, 5 cents. Canadian Rates: Daily, 10 cents; Sunday, 3 cents.

Printed at the Publishers' Office at New York at 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.

Wilson and Bethmann-Hollweg.

A few days ago, in speaking to the National Press Club, Mr. Wilson emphasized the belief that the Great War was a piece of collective madness of all European mankind.

Mr. Wilson speaks with the authority of the President of the United States; he speaks also as one who holds to a view very generally held in the United States, both as to the nature of the war itself and as to the probability that mankind, when it begins to see reasonably again, will turn from arms to brotherhood.

But it is essential for Americans to remember now, when American and German official utterances are approaching an agreement which may tempt Mr. Wilson into some offer of mediation, some definite effort to bring peace, that the American view, so far as the President voices it, and the German view which the Chancellor utters are not in the smallest degree like the views held in any of the countries allied against Germany.

Let us examine the suggestion of fusion and federation after this war a little more closely. Two years ago nearly eight million Belgians dwelt in peace and prosperity without other ambition than to pursue their own lives, nationally and individually.

Representative Bennet may have indulged in a slight exaggeration when he said in the House the other day, in a speech on the Administration's ship purchase bill: "There are only two men in New York for this bill. One is William Gibbs McAdoo and the other is Mr. Gibboney. I do not know why Mr. McAdoo is for it. He is Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Gibboney is very plain and candid as to why he is for it. He is a hired advocate. He has the right to be."

Does any one suppose that now, when the German troops withdraw from Belgium, there will be anything but enduring bitterness, hatred, resentment among the Belgians? Does any one suppose that a generation will erase from Belgian hearts and memories the shame, the suffering, the brutality of German tyranny? Is it not patent that between the Belgian and the German a gulf has opened that will endure during the lifetime of all those now alive?

Look at the case of France: France has known war and invasion frequently in her long history. But never before has she known the thing that has written itself all over her northern departments. Scores of her towns have been destroyed, not as an incident of war, but as an expression of "terribleness." Her cathedrals, her churches, her homes have been put to the torch. Her women have been outraged, her children slain, not because of military reasons, but out of blind fury and as the expression of this same "terribleness."

No one who has been in France since the days of the invasion can fail to perceive that there has entered into the heart and soul of the French people not so much a sense of bitterness and resentment at what has been done by Germans as a cold, emotionless, enduring determination to drive the Germans out of France and to make the frontier a permanent boundary between the violence of Germany and the civilization of France. The brutality of Germany is the thing that has entered into the common knowledge of millions of French men and women: it is the fact of the war.

Take the case of Britain: More than a million and a half of British men have known in France and Belgium exactly what German "terribleness" has meant. They have seen the ruins, they have heard the sufferers, they have seen and suffered from the gas attacks, and about them have lived the women and the children who have suffered at German hands. At home there has been the Zeppelin assault, killing women and children; the submarine slaying the weak, the helpless and the innocent.

Does any one suppose that when this war is over Great Britain will be ready to meet Germany on the basis of what was before the war, that Germans will be permitted to live in England as before, that the gulf will be closed by the mere signature of a treaty of peace? To believe this is to misunderstand the whole temper and feeling of Britain. Britain, France and Belgium have only the same emotion, the same conviction, the same purpose, and that purpose is not one that points toward federation or fusion.

France and Belgium have only the same emotion, the same conviction, the same purpose, and that purpose is not one that points toward federation or fusion. For France and for Britain the conditions and character of the present war have been made by the things said and the things done by Germany when it began. The German burst upon the world with a hymn of hate. He came applying that doctrine of "terribleness" which his teachers had proclaimed for a generation. He attacked not armies but people, not the military force of his enemy but the whole structure of his life. He made war not upon the physical body of his enemy but upon the spirit, the soul. He came proclaiming that his mission was to destroy, and he applied his doctrine with a brutality and a bestiality which have not been paralleled in a thousand years.

And the consequence is clear. The Englishman and the Frenchman do not think of this as a war against a nation, against another people. For them both it is a war against a doctrine, which, if it should prevail, would destroy all they love or care for, a doctrine which, so far as it has prevailed, has written its works in shame and sorrow and ruin. Such being the case, the Frenchman and the Briton are not now prepared to compromise with the nation which preached and practised the doctrine, when it has drawn the last possible profit out of the application and would now lay aside the doctrine for the moment and take advantage of the conventions of the civilization it sought to destroy.

Americans will make a profound mistake if they do not recognize that a gulf has opened between Teutonic Europe and the Latin and Anglo-Saxon fractions. One of the most eminent of British Colonial statesmen said only the other day that a century would pass before the gulf could be closed. It is a break that is as complete spiritually as the break between the world of the Barbarian and the Greek. It is a break that goes down to the very foundation of all that means anything to the nations that are fighting Germany.

A peace based on the victory of the German idea over Western civilization would mean that Western civilization would be conquered and would have to surrender to the German idea. But that will not come now. A peace that was based on the overwhelming triumph of Western Europe over the Teuton would mean the destruction of the German idea, and Germany would enter the ranks of the nations which serve a common ideal. But this is not conceivable to-day, and may not be possible to-morrow.

If the present war ends in a draw, if there is an arrangement on the basis of the map, as the German Chancellor suggests, it will be a truce and a postponement only. It will be a new period of preparation and of armament, because the issue between the ideas and ideals of the Teutonic and the non-Teutonic worlds has not been settled, and it must be settled. One of these ideas alone can prevail in the world, and the German idea can only prevail on the ruins of Western civilization.

Fifty Millions for Window Dressing.

Representative Bennet may have indulged in a slight exaggeration when he said in the House the other day, in a speech on the Administration's ship purchase bill: "There are only two men in New York for this bill. One is William Gibbs McAdoo and the other is Mr. Gibboney. I do not know why Mr. McAdoo is for it. He is Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Gibboney is very plain and candid as to why he is for it. He is a hired advocate. He has the right to be."

There is one other New Yorker we know of who is for the bill. He is a shipping man and wrote some letters to The Tribune last year, as did Mr. Gibboney, attempting to convince us that we were wrong in attacking the undenatured government ownership and operation measure which was filibustered to death in the Senate in February, 1915.

We are willing to increase Mr. Bennet's estimate of the popular demand in this neighborhood for the ship purchase bill by at least 50 per cent. Yet when we do that we do ample justice to the size of the local following behind Mr. McAdoo in his frenzied efforts to secure a \$50,000,000 option on the funds in the United States Treasury.

Every local body interested in commerce or shipping has condemned the government ship purchase scheme. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is strongly against it. It holds out no hope of a rational or permanent enlargement of the American merchant marine. It was devised as an emergency measure in the fall of 1914, when the seas were still infested with German commerce destroyers and the merchant ships flying the flags of the Allies and even privately owned neutral ships shrank from engaging in the ocean carrying trade. There might have been some reason then for the creation of a merchant fleet operated under government auspices and protection.

But now the seas are clear and all the available ocean tonnage in the world is kept employed. Profits are unprecedented and shipbuilding is stimulated as never before. There is no emergency requiring government aid to shipping and building orders from the government would only displace the piled-up orders of private concerns.

There has never been a time when there was less economic justification for an experiment in governmental purchase, ownership or operation. Yet the shipping bill which the House of Representatives has just passed paradoxically commits the government to purchasing ships for the next five years, during which the shipping interest must continue to boom, and to discontinue government assistance just at the moment when the boom will probably be at its height and the profits of private capital will sink back to or even fall below the normal level. The House shipping bill cannot help

put the American merchant marine on a permanently sound basis. If it could do that, Mr. Kitchin and enough of his followers would have voted against it to defeat it. It is not a bill to increase national efficiency or to develop the economic resources and earning power of the United States. On the contrary, it is a bill to waste money on mere political window-dressing—to spend it just for the sake of spending it.

That is why there are so few people in this great world centre of commerce and ocean trade who can share the pleasurable anticipations of Mr. McAdoo and Mr. Gibboney. That is why few thinking Americans can contemplate with equanimity the issue by Congress of an order for \$50,000,000 on the Treasury to a Federal shipping board which Mr. McAdoo expects to control.

A Dream Come True.

It is hard that so gallant and deserving an officer as the commander of the Möwe should be obliged by his government to play the mountebank and cheer an ignorant populace by talking badgerdash like a very Reventlow. His adventures were lively enough to furnish forth an enthralling story, but the plain narrative was not enough and for political purposes he had to make more of his achievements than his own judgment as a naval officer could possibly allow.

"You can imagine," said he, addressing an audience of his fellow citizens, "what a moment that was when one day eight British captains stood before me and I was able to say to them: 'This is what the German fleet has accomplished!'"

This is what the German fleet has accomplished—the destruction of seven traders and the capture of one doubtful prize, ultimately lost because the captors dared not attempt to take her to a home port. Ten times seven have been taken as prizes by the British, but Count Dohna-Scholdien did not dwell on that point. He knew his audience. "Our voyage has proved," he said with admirable effrontery, "that the so-called blockade of German ports is only a dream on the part of the British."

If any of his audience remembered that, including all detained, seized and captured, Germany and her allies had supplied Britain and her allies with some 450 ships, and that in the whole history of the blockade the little exploit of the Möwe was unique, it must have struck them that for Germany the British dream was something of a nightmare.

The Standard Frock.

The standardized car coupling makes a strong appeal to reason, and even the familiar standardized book review of commerce has something to be said for it. But who can awake a thrill at the proposal of standardized street clothes for women, mothered by the home economics department of the G. F. of W. C.?

"It is a vital, burning, economic question, and we extend the most cordial invitation to all interested—men, women, producers and consumers—to come and help in finding out that women are in dead earnest in wanting to save time, strength and money to put on higher pleasures than clothes can give, while properly desiring to look their best." So speaks Chairman Helen Louise Johnson, and if she is planning a campaign for more sense and taste in dress and less rubbish we are with her. But standardization is her text and we fear the worst—an eruption of those strange baglike envelopes which have through long tradition become the unvarying habilitation of dress reform, lean, tall, short or fat.

Stripes that cheer and silks that rustle, texture, line and inimitable hang—it cannot be! The street clothes, above all else, must and shall be preserved. If spring ever turns the corner, we shall invite the chairman of the home economics department to walk down Fifth Avenue herself and be convinced.

The Anthracite Peace.

An increase of about 10 per cent in the wages of the anthracite miners will, as in all similar increases made in the past, be borne by the consumers who buy coal. The operators found it impossible in this day of generally advancing pay for workers in all industrial fields to deny an increase to the miners. But they did refuse very properly to declare their mines to be a "closed shop" against all but members of labor unions. That is one distinct gain for all the people of the United States. The theory of the "closed shop" has no place in free America. And another thing the operators very justly refused to do is to act as a collecting agency for a labor organization. Such a system would be a species of tyranny over independent workmen to which no employer should ever lend his support.

Perhaps the most satisfactory of all the elements in this anthracite settlement is the agreement which will last for four years. That means that until spring of 1920 there will be no more threats of general tie-up of coal and coal supply. Taking from \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 from the purchasers of anthracite to put into the pay envelopes of 175,000 miners and mine laborers may seem rough on the consumer, but wages in all the large industries have advanced, and in every instance the consumer roots the bill. Who else, indeed, is there to foot it?

The "Shaveteria."

Chicago has invented the "shaveteria." Boon, blessing to mankind that it is, the shaveteria abolishes the smeary fingers of the barber shop and the awkward environment of the home bathroom. It is an establishment, having many small, boothlike lavatories where the customer may step in and shave himself with every comfort and luxury ever invented. The Chicago place advertises, "No barbers, no tips, no waste of time—step inside." And who wouldn't step inside for a cool, cleanly shave, with no loquacious hand to irritate the soul, as in a shop, and no lurking suspicion that the blade had been put to some untechnical domestic purpose, as in the home. Efficiency—that's the word.

NO PUSSY-FOOTING

The Republican Party Must Adopt Straight American Policy and Fight Hard.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The necessity of the union of Republicans, Progressives and independent voters behind a candidate who will best represent the cause of Americanism, genuine preparedness and the preservation of our national self-respect is keenly felt in this part of the country.

In a campaign which may be fraught with weal or woe to the future of the Republic the personal aspirations or interests or the personal prejudices of any individual should count for very little. The nomination of a candidate who can best cement all patriotic Americans into a compact political unit and deliver the country from the inefficiency of the present Administration is most important.

We may as well face the situation squarely. All voters who claim affiliation with the Republican party are not in favor of a platform of vigorous Americanism. All Republicans are not in favor of a party declaration for real preparedness. Large numbers of Republicans are obsessed with the notion that a "middle of the road" policy would be advisable; that no platform should be adopted which can possibly give offence to any hyphenated voter. They also insist that the candidate to be nominated should be one who has taken no pronounced stand on the great questions which have been thrust upon us by the Great War.

There are many evidences that such sentiments exist among Republicans of the Central Western states. For example, one need only refer to the victory of Henry Ford in the State of Nebraska, his large vote in the State of Nebraska, the public utterances of Minority Leader Mann of the House of Representatives, the votes cast by Republican Senators and Representatives against the Chamberlain army bill, including the Wadsworth amendment, and the declarations of many clergymen and college professors against any material increase in our military or naval equipment. All of these indicate that the Republican party is not a unit on the grave national questions.

A similar condition confronted the Republican party in 1896. A very substantial element in the silver states split from the Republican party and supported Mr. Bryan. In the Central Western states Republican politicians were inclined to "pussy-foot" on the question of the gold standard and to insist that the issue of the campaign was the tariff. Mr. Hanna saw the campaign must be fought on the question of the gold standard, and as a result hundreds of thousands of Gold Democrats and Independents supported the Republican candidates and the gold standard was firmly fixed as a national policy.

So in 1916 the Republican party must adopt a straight American policy and present that candidate who typifies the issues of the campaign and who can attract to his standard several million independent voters. A "middle of the road" policy or an attempt to attract "all elements" by the nomination of an untested candidate would be equivalent to an endorsement of President Wilson and would insure his reelection.

In the early days of the campaign of 1896 there was a dearth of popular interest on the free silver question. It required the most strenuous campaign of education ever carried on in this country to arouse the electorate of the nation to their duty. So in 1916 the whole peoples of many states do not yet appreciate the crisis which confronts our country to-day. These voters must be aroused to the national peril. They must be welded into a homogeneous unit for adequate preparedness and the maintenance of national self-respect.

Let no Republican comfort himself with the delusion that this campaign will be easily won. As a result of the unprecedented demand for American products by the European belligerents and the lack of competition in other foreign markets we are enjoying an unprecedented prosperity, utterly regardless of the present tariff law. The coming campaign cannot be won under spineless leadership. It will require skilful leadership, strong personal popularity and dynamic energy in the candidate selected if a victory is to be won not only for the Republican party but for the cause of Americanism.

ABNER P. HAYES. Waterbury, Conn., May 22, 1916.

Labor Prejudiced Against Mr. Hughes.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: My chief feeling is earnest hope for the defeat of Wilson, which can come only through Republican success. I consider Justice Hughes unavailable because of labor's objection that he has urged and not understanding my belief in his high qualifications and fitness. I have been a journalist, but have been for two years engaged as salesman for a small metal specialty which brought me in contact with workmen and their leaders in most of the states. Stating simply what I have observed to be a fact, labor would be largely against Hughes, not at all because of personal dislike, but simply because he holds a judicial office and participated in certain decisions which they have been educated to think were wrong and vitally prejudicial.

Labor is, as you know, still seeking Congressional legislation. A special grievance is the last Loewe-Lawler decision, in which Hughes participated. It will be said that this attitude is unjustified, and that I admit; but there you are. Nor is this all. Mr. Hughes has urged and his largely for labor in 1908, and that was largely because he had vetoed or prevented the passage of certain labor measures. Many may have forgotten that, but the labor leaders supporting Hughes have not, and are sure to make the most of it. Democratic labor leaders are laying for Hughes, but not saying much.

Can the Republican party afford to throw away forty or fifty thousand labor votes in each of the pivotal states of Connecticut, New Jersey and Indiana, and from eighty to one hundred thousand in New York, not to mention other close states? ZEBULON MURRAY. New York, May 22, 1916.

A Superb Speech.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I wish to thank you for your complete report of Mr. Roosevelt's Detroit speech. If this speech could be placed in the hands of every American voter we would see the army of hyphenated Americans dwindle to a mere handful.

The speech itself was superb, but the accomplishment of the speaker was greater. What he did was far greater than what William J. Bryan did twenty years ago at a Democratic convention; he hypnotized a lukewarm audience by eloquence and appeal to the emotions. Roosevelt captured a hostile audience by reason and appeal to common sense. "AMERICANISM." Shelter Island, N. Y., May 22, 1916.

"Why Germany Cries for Peace."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I read the editorial in The Tribune this morning. An hour ago I met an American who arrived this morning from Paris, after a residence of five years there as the representative of an American concern. I asked him what the feeling was about peace in Paris.

NOT PEACE BUT VICTORY.



"NIBELUNGENISM"

Germany's Madness Is a Reversion to the Religion of Thor and Wotan.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Apologists who assert that because art is universal the performance of "Walkure" at the Yale Bowl transcends any bearing upon the proprieties of patriotism miss their opportunity to point the truth that lies at the very root of the present war. Yale—if it is American—is unfortunate in its choice of an opera. For "Walkure," as part of the "Nibelungen" trilogy, is part of that philosophy which is the antithesis of Christianity, and which as an idea is the very thing which the world has striven to overcome.

The Ring is, moreover, the most provincially German, the least universal and the clumsiest of Wagner's works. In these operas he is not the Wagner of "Tannhauser" or "Tristan." The entire theme is the epic of theft, lies and trickery. In it the redemption of a dishonored Olympian is effected by the betrayal of youth and virtue, and it is the adroitness of barbarism that appears at last the gold lust of vaporous demons.

As a religion this primitive thing imparted the lowest morality and the sickliest sentimentalism to a childish race which today exhibits its true ancestral qualities, despite seventeen centuries of Christianity. The nobler stock of the Norse peoples (among whom this religion originated) outgrew its evils.

Grafted upon the races of the Rhine, the nebulous religion of thunder, fear, brute strength, cunning and deceit made permanent growth. It is the bone and the blood of the blood of the German stock. No one knew the true quality of the Nibelungen religion better than Wagner. The vision of Christianity which looms over the engulfed Valhalla in the last scene was his own prophetic intuition.

Curiously, the aesthetic love of the trilogy has gone hand in hand with the return to its philosophy in Germany. Thor and Wotan returned; Nietzsche was their prophet, Bernhardt their apostle. Strength, linked to treachery, lust and dishonor, have become the gods of German idolatry and the Christendom which converted Germany from her paganism is now, after nearly two thousand years, under the necessity of punishing her for her infidelity.

There are true Americans students who appraised the German long before the sin in Belgium revealed the truth of their appraisal; scholars who knew that Germany had betrayed her Luther, her Goethe and her Schiller, had gone mad in material efficiency perfected under an exquisite tyranny. Some of us in America, as in France and (at last) in England, had learned to fear the German bearing gifts (an exchange professors with their smug philosophies).

The whole world has awakened to what a barbarian the Prussian is, however, and America will, in her turn, deal with him. The treaties of Christendom and the cathedrals of God are not violated and blasphemed in vain. Nor will the children of Antwerp and the children that perished from the Lusitania be forgotten of a God that is slow to anger.

Let it be dwelt upon, however, that this war was begun because a Christian people reverted to the very Thor, the same Wotan of might from which it was once rescued. The lust which was the twilight of the gods is bringing down the twilight of the German peoples. Their second rescue will be by punishment—the punishment that is being meted out by France and England, and in which America will yet take a righteous hand. The time to celebrate the "Nibelungen" theme (for the sporadic beauties of Wagner's score) is not the present, when Christendom is united in beating down the barbarism which it imparted to a race in remote time, and to which that race has reverted, to its eternal shame and dishonor. New York, May 19, 1916. W. R. H.

Why Not Use It?

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In his letter to Senator Culberson President Wilson said that he had often received most excellent advice concerning public affairs from Mr. Brandeis. If this be so, one is tempted to ask why Mr. Wilson did

NOT PEACE BUT VICTORY.



"THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH"

The Statement of Fundamental Principles at Issue in the War Is Approved.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your editorial in the May 18 issue entitled "The President's Speech" is worthy of deep thought and wide circulation. I congratulate you on stating so clearly and forcibly the fundamental principles at issue in the present war. You have also placed in so enviable prominence those who hold to the theory that America has nothing to do with the questions for which the nations at war are contending. Any casual student of history must be compelled to admit that in a conflict where nearly the whole world is involved there must be something deeper and something more vital at issue than can be found in any previous war. None of the ordinary causes of war will fit the case. Boundary disputes between France and Germany are not of such vast importance to England, Russia, Turkey and Serbia that they would be willing to become involved in such a life and death struggle. Again, every one of the combatant nations absolutely denies that it is fighting for larger territory or for the property of a neighboring nation. The nominal cause of the war, the assassination in Bosnia, is altogether too trivial a reason to account for such a world crisis.

But when we come to consider these underlying principles in the evolution and development of which are involved the ideals which mankind holds most dear we have found a cause deep enough and broad enough to be responsible for the war. In all the long, weary struggle of the races from barbarism to civilization liberty of conscience and liberty of action for the individual have remained one of the ideals for which men will cheerfully pay the ultimate price. This ideal is the cornerstone of democracy, and on it is founded the structure of our national life. With the falling of this ideal will fall that which is best in our civilization, and with the maintenance of this ideal will be the "land of the free and the home of the brave." Therefore it is reasonable for us or any other nation to fight for such a principle. Not to be willing to fight for it would be equivalent to confessing ourselves unworthy of liberty and fit for servitude only.

This is one of the principles plainly at issue in the present war. Germany is contending for the German theory, and officials have not hesitated to make plain their opinion that their ideals of governing should be dominant throughout Europe. Surely what is best for Europe will be best for America! Should Germany establish her ideals there the same conflict would eventually be transferred here, for the aggressive is one of the clearest factors in the German character.

Does Germany hold such theories? If you have lived for any length of time in Germany you will need no help in answering the question. The individual is merely part of a great mechanism. The welfare of the state is considered of prime importance, the individual is important only as he fulfills his obligations to the state. Such a theory of government is absolutely antagonistic to the subversive of every principle of individual liberty. Therefore Germany and America are contending their civilization along lines that parallel but at right angles. A conflict between the two ideas as represented by the two theories of government is unavoidable either in the near or distant future. Since both nations are strong, vigorous and growing, it is needless to say that the future is ominous. Now, if England, France, Russia and their allies are engaged in a life and death struggle with Germany to determine whether liberty or oppression shall stand pat is it to the credit of America to stand pat and take no active part in such a struggle? Have we any respect for a man who will look on with indifference at scenes of brutality and bloodshed when by his intervention and help he might end such crimes? America is helping on with apparent indifference while the nations of Europe are wounded, bleeding, perhaps dying, for those principles of liberty and justice which we so loudly proclaim as our most cherished and valued ideals. The consideration of these truths should bring a glow of shame to every patriotic American. Your editor deserves the gratitude of your readers for his excellent exposition of facts not pleasant to read but important to remember. J. W. JOHNSON. New York, May 20, 1916.

A Believer in Americanism.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: As a firm believer in "Americanism" in every sense of the word, I feel it my duty to express to you my gratitude for the pleasure which I have derived from reading your editorials since the war began. They express the sentiments of the unhyphenated citizen of the United States without a doubt, and the fact that many of them, such as "British Failure," etc., have called forth vigorous protests from English and German sympathizers, whose sole occupation seems to be to stir up sedition and discontent among the American people with their country, merely enhances their value. They ought to be gathered in book form and published, so that future generations might have a clear idea of the affairs of to-day.

I also wish to protest against those weak-hearted "semi-Americans" who call this a "mongrel nation," bewail the deplorable conditions existing, and are dissatisfied with everything in general, from the President down to the very dust beneath our feet. They seldom seem to suggest anything, but to use a not uncommon expression of the day, simply "crab" everything that comes along. JOHN G. F. SPEIDEN. Garden City, N. Y., May 19, 1916.