

New York Tribune
 First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.
 TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 125 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y. President, G. Verner Rogers, Vice-President, Richard H. Wells, Secretary, F. A. Sizer, Treasurer, Address, Tribune Building, 110 Nassau Street, New York, Telephone, BR 6000.

Subscription Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, 60 cents for three months, \$1.50 for six months, \$2.50 for one year. Single Copies, 5 Cents. Delivery by carrier, 10 Cents per copy. Advance payment in full is required. All subscriptions outside New York, N. Y., include postage.

Foreign Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, 60 cents for three months, \$1.50 for six months, \$2.50 for one year. Single Copies, 10 Cents. Delivery by carrier, 15 Cents per copy. Advance payment in full is required. All subscriptions outside New York, N. Y., include postage.

Canadian Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, 60 cents for three months, \$1.50 for six months, \$2.50 for one year. Single Copies, 10 Cents. Delivery by carrier, 15 Cents per copy. Advance payment in full is required. All subscriptions outside New York, N. Y., include postage.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter, July 11, 1916.

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.

Nothing Left But a "Pork Barrel."

The Wilson-McAdoo ship purchase bill has been denatured once more. It was fearfully and wonderfully transformed in the House of Representatives in order to meet the objections of Mr. Kitchin, who still boasts that he is an old-line Democrat. Now it has been trimmed, pared, sawed and surgically remodelled to please the even more exacting tastes in government ship purchase ventures of Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas.

Mr. Clarke prevented the passage of the original Wilson-McAdoo bill at the short session of 1915. The Arkansas Senator knows very thoroughly what he wants, and is seldom satisfied until he gets it. As a spectacular climax to the denaturation ceremony in the Democratic caucus last Saturday, Mr. Clarke advanced to the foreground and shook hands with the Hon. William Joel Stone.

Mr. Stone has been an ardent advocate of the Wilson-McAdoo scheme in all its fading-away phases. He won fame in Missouri politics a generation ago through what was aptly described as his ability to suck eggs and then hide the shells. He is still able to control his features, and he must have looked more solemnly cheerful than ever when he grasped the hand of his Arkansas colleague in celebration of the final annihilation—so far as concerns principle—of the government ship purchase and operation plan.

The shipping bill was originally an emergency measure, pure and simple. It grew out of temporary panic conditions in the fall of 1914, when it looked for a while as if there would not be tonnage enough available to carry the exports which we had hitherto been sending to Europe and to other parts of the world.

The panic subsided when it was demonstrated that we were actually able to sell and deliver a much larger total of exports than ever before. Extraordinary profits stimulated shipbuilding and pressed even discarded sailing vessels into service. But through the emergency quickly passed Mr. Wilson and Mr. McAdoo became so enamored with the idea of permanent government participation in the ocean-carrying trade that they besought Congress to pass a bill putting the United States into the transportation business indefinitely, not only as a rival of foreign subsidized lines, but also of the shipping enterprises of our own citizens.

That grandiose scheme passed the House, but failed in the Senate. Now, merely to avoid admitting failure, the President and Mr. McAdoo are urging the passage of almost any old bill carrying a ship purchase title. They are demanding an appropriation of \$50,000,000, to be raised by the sale of Panama Canal bonds, and if they can only secure that pride-saving authorization they are willing to accept limitations on the life and freedom of operation of the enterprise which will make it practically worthless for the economic purposes which they say they have in view.

The life of the corporation which is to build, purchase or operate ships has been limited to five years from the termination of the present war—hardly time enough for the government to get started in the ocean-carrying business. Most shipyards now have building orders ahead for two or three years. Building will be too slow a process. But the amendments to the shipping bill just ordered by the Democratic Senate caucus forbid the proposed shipping corporation to buy any ships registered under the flags of the nations which are at war, ships now engaged in American commerce or ships which through use have fallen below 75 per cent of their original efficiency.

There is no great dearth of shipping now, and there will be no dearth at all in a year or two. American shipyards have built 1,030 vessels in the last twelve months. Government aid in the way of stimulating construction is the last thing our merchant marine needs. Within five years some assistance may be required. But that assistance can be given effectively only by helping our merchant ships to sustain the competition of carriers under foreign flags—many of them subsidized—which can be built and operated on a cheaper labor basis.

The only feature now left of the original government ownership and operation scheme is the appropriation clause. Fifty millions are to be spent merely to satisfy the vanity of the authors of the "emergency" measure of 1914. As it stands, the shipping bill is simply a misuse of Treasury funds for purposes of trifling national benefit.

the notion of real government participation in the ocean-carrying trade. He is for it now when it means only another friendly distribution of "pork."

Cool Thoughts for Hot Days.

It is one annoyance of our fidgeting, changeable weather that philosophic preparation to meet its follies is very difficult. To shiver under two blankets all night and find at one's office the atmosphere of dank, sweltering tropics destroys all possibility of looking ahead and laying plans. Whatever you wear is certain to be too hot or too cool. As for refreshing trips to spots of white surf or outdoor gardens, you are likely to end in the forlornest state of all, a-shiver in your Palm-Beach suit amid icy breezes, paying potted-palm prices for discomfort and a head cold easily obtainable in your back yard.

What can we fall back upon? Not in any too hopeful a mind, we suggest long, cool thoughts, to be pasted in one's memory and summoned at will. Try this on your imagination, for example:

Dark aisles, new packs of cards, Mermaids' tail, cool swarms, Dawn dews and starlit seas, White marbles, whiter words—To live, I think of these!

To be sure, it was a poet of much imagination and much experience, with even more extreme suffering than summer sweltering, who wrote these lines, "Made in Hot Weather." But if William Ernest Henley could take comfort from them, why is the system not worth our humble trial? As you sway in the midst of sticky subway humanity, why not shut eyes and dream of taking a long, cool header into a salt, blue wave? Or of a lazy picnic day under pines on a Maine islet? Or—by each victim had best draw on his own past for the most soothing matter. If it can include dawn dews and mermaids, so much the better. But if it is only a Tom Collins on a roof garden, by all means try it—in your imagination.

Exit Dr. von Mach.

Now that his own infallible government has repudiated his emotional flights of fancy, Dr. von Mach will perhaps cease to waste his breath in sobbing over the sorrowful plight of Germany's babies. Only a few weeks ago he wrote to The Tribune lamenting the "enormous figure" to which the rate of infant mortality had been forced by the British Order in Council of March 11, 1915, not knowing—or perhaps fancying The Tribune did not know—that the "enormous figure" he quoted was considerably below Germany's shameful average in time of peace. He spoke tearfully of the "thousands and perhaps millions" that would perish unless America came to the rescue, and if he stuck at billions it was only because he was sensible of "the marvellous power for organization and heroic willingness of every German to subordinate his personal comfort to the welfare of the whole people."

This incidental compliment to the efficiency of German government has not saved him from a well deserved rebuke. In an official report, published here "by authority of the German Foreign Office," the fables about starving children are dismissed unceremoniously as "without truth." There was already evidence enough to justify Lord Robert Cecil in denouncing the condensed milk propaganda in this country as a peculiarly contemptible exhibition of hypocrisy, but if only for the sake of silencing the Machs, Ridders and their like it is well to have the assurance on official German authority that "instead of there being any truth in the statement that the infants of Germany are suffering from lack of milk, the very opposite is true."

There is nothing for Dr. von Mach to do now but to reconsider the advice proffered to him in a perfectly disinterested spirit several months ago. Let him return to his original occupation of prattling harmlessly about art. His conclusions in this field cannot be so easily refuted. He may not be very profound and his aesthetic speculations may seem childish and silly to some of his readers; but at least they are innocuous, and he will have the great satisfaction of knowing that he can give a free range to his exuberant fancy without any danger of incurring the displeasure of an ungrateful, if infallible, government.

Canned Art.

The news that Grieg's "Peer Gynt" suite and Liszt's "Hungarian Rhapsody" are proving to be the best sellers of the talking machines, topping even the "End of a Perfect Day," may not be an unequalled victory. Judging by the vagrant music that floats in to one's pillow these summer nights, the current melodies are still doing an excellent business. And rightly, we suggest. Current music, like current fiction and current news, is the small talk of life. It would be a rather solemn world if we fed our souls only on Beethoven, Shakespeare and Plutarch's Lives.

The important point is that the better music is being bought and played on a large and increasing scale. In many ways mechanical music is the most interesting aid democracy has invented. Just as modern printing presses made newspapers feasible and thereby enabled a widespread nation to think collectively, the talking and playing machines are diffusing musical ideas upon an unprecedented scale. It will be interesting in the retrospect, a thousand years hence, to look back and see how science has made possible each step ahead in modern human progress. Movable types made the Reformation possible, it can be argued. And certainly without the telegraph, the railways and the rotary printing press, modern democracy would be a very different and probably a far less successful experiment.

The democratic ideal of art has been slowest to win its way. Walt Whitman portrayed it in his "Democratic Vistas" years ago. He foresaw a new literature, a new architecture, a new music springing from the people—not the luxury of a favored class but the necessity of all. It was Whitman's greatest achievement that he himself, in his own work, personified

this ideal. Yet lineal descendants have been scarce enough, and democratic art in America has little to boast of. Perhaps it was a sense of this elusive quality which made the "Spoon River Anthology" stir us as deeply as it did.

Now the question arises whether by way of music the democracy of art may not find fresh beginnings. Not simply by reiterating This to be the End of a Perfect Day, we concede. But music, much music, is at any rate in every home. Simulated taste as a thing of special culture, learned by note from a fortunate few, cannot be gained in this way. But may not real taste as the product of individual ear, learned by much listening, repeated blundering and many comparisons, lie exactly on this road? Already the returns from the sales counter give a favorable answer. And we are inclined to think that individual observation supports this view. It is one joy of true art that you do not tire of it; whereas every Perfect Day has its inevitable end when you feel impelled to hurl its accursed disk out the window. We have seen this happen. Enough such artistic decisions driven home, and taste is surely around the corner.

The "Dominating Factor" in Ireland.

In discussing the future of Ireland in the House of Commons yesterday afternoon Mr. Asquith insisted at length on the urgency of establishing a settlement that would insure the successful conduct of the war. "The dominating factor," he said, "which made us all willing to become parties or sponsors to this measure is the war."

He is doubtless right in believing that but for the war speedy conciliation could hardly have been hoped for. Yet it is precisely because of the war that some Unionists are so vehemently opposed to the present proposals. Lord Hugh Cecil has lately stated their case plainly. In the first place he can see no reason for the belief that the proposed settlement will insure tranquility in Ireland if there is danger of a further rising it is the Sinn Feiners and Irish Republicans who are most to be feared. The settlement will certainly not satisfy them, for they are open and declared foes of Mr. Redmond and the Nationalist party. In their eyes, therefore, it will be but a sign of weakness in the imperial government, and it may well be to their interest to wreck it. This would not be a difficult task. Lord Hugh Cecil imagines they will adopt the following policy:

"They will continue their agitation; they will spread the membership of their societies far and wide; if any one resists them, the old wicked machinery of boycotting and outrage will be put in motion against him; the Sinn Fein organization will rapidly become dominant in every part of the country, 'the law of the league' superseding as formerly the law of the land; the German submarines will be able to smuggle in arms to them, or to leave in their charge stores of petrol; drilling and preparation of rebellion will go on with little concealment; ostentatiously impudent defiance of the connection with Great Britain will abound, until, if the war lasts long enough, things are ripe for a second rebellion."

The consequences may not be serious if peace comes soon; but while the war lasts the Irish Republicans under the proposed settlement will evidently gain ground, for it is highly improbable that they will be dealt with more rigorously than in the past, highly improbable that Mr. Redmond's government will be stronger than Mr. Birrell's. This is the ground upon which the irreconcilable Unionists continue to oppose the new measure, their contention being that the supposed contention fails to take into account the only party which is a serious menace to peace in Ireland.

The Nail Statue Nuisance.

A curious Teutonic craze is commented on by Professor Pazarek, of Stuttgart, who complains in the "Vossische Zeitung" of what he calls the "nailing nuisance." He says it all began in Vienna with the erection of the "Warrior in Iron." Thence it spread like wildfire over the two empires, especially in Germany. "The Brave Swabian" in Stuttgart, "Smoked Leg" in Gmund, "Iron Harry" in Altona, "Roland," the patron knight of municipalities, was seen in a score of towns; "St. Michael" in Hamburg, Crefeld and Breslau, "Charlemagne" in Salzburg and Osnabruck, and various genre statues in many other places, chiefly in the Rhine country. But the culmination was reached with the raising of the monstrous "Iron Hindenburg" in Berlin.

Professor Pazarek says there are twenty-six tons of alder wood in this figure, and that when its ugly surface has been covered with metal there will be thirty tons of nails stuck in it. He holds up his hands in horror at the hopeless degradation of taste manifested in these mailings of the images of living men. The professor is an "eminent authority on aesthetics," which seems to account for his distaste of these strange figures. But may they not be frowned on by the utilitarians also as representing a futile waste of good iron and wood?

Picardy.

Last night I dreamed of Picardy. There shone Across the land a glory, and Romance Rode armed like Jeanne who bore the stately lance; Swart halberdiers and morioned men of the Rhone Swept by in shining files, and trumps high-blown Went crying down the listening waves of France. I was an emperor, and I came by chance Upon the little village of Peronne. And then I said: This land hath been of old A glory, and a glory ever shall Brighten her pointed towers, and there shall be A time far off that yet the Fates defend In their gray web, when like God's seneschal A star shall blaze again in Picardy! EARL SIMONSON.

WHY RE-ELECT WILSON?

His the Credit Neither for War Prosperity Nor for Germany's Backdown.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your correspondent of the 7th, signing himself "A Naturalized American," gives two reasons for the reelection of President Wilson:

First—"The country is in a prosperous condition, and will remain so if we keep President Wilson at the helm."
 Let us analyze this prosperity. What kind of prosperity would we have had under the Underwood tariff but for the war in Europe? To the war is due all the prosperity we are enjoying as to industrial and exports. Does any Democrat claim that Mr. Wilson is entitled to credit or is responsible for this war? If not, then this claim falls to the ground and must be dismissed as a "scrap of paper." On the other hand, but for the war this country would have been flooded with the products of cheap European labor, paralyzing many of our industries and creating such a condition of unemployment as the country had not seen since the last Democratic administration, 1892-96. Verily the war was a godsend to the present Administration. Let us hope that we may be spared the experience of the prosperity the country would have had under peace conditions. Already the Democratic Congress is talking of casting an anchor to the windward to prevent Europe from dumping its cheap products into our country with the return of peace.

Second—"He has steered us clear of the slaughterhouse of Europe."
 Has he? Have we not suffered the loss of many valuable lives by the submarine war on vessels on peaceful voyages when firmness and decision at the proper time would have prevented it? When the submarine war began Germany had respect for this country, and if the Executive had had a policy and demanded compliance with international law, even the first of these tragedies would not have shocked the world. When Germany saw that the worst she had to fear was "notes, notes," with no intention of backing up words with action, she lost all respect for our country and pushed the submarine war until England found means to render it unprofitable. No credit to Wilson that she suspended it for the time.

How about Mexico? Has he kept us out of war there? Had Wilson recognized Huerta when other nations did this country would have had no Mexican problem. His excuse that he "would not recognize an assassin," when he had no positive knowledge of the manner of Madero's taking off, was no justification, for it is not our business to teach morals to other nations. We have been and are now paying dearly for this spirit of virtue based on an assumption.

This was not enough; He assumed to dictate to a sister republic who should govern them, and when he demanded that Huerta should abdicate and let some other, weaker and less fitted for the job, take his place he intervened and would have given no greater cause for antagonism against this country if he had marched an army across the border. He has had no policy in regard to Mexico; his flirting with first one bandit and then another, his vacillation and weakness have brought on an actual state of war, and the flower of our manhood is called to go down there—for what? Simply to bring Carranza to a state of mind that would make negotiations possible, when a firm policy from the first would have rendered all this pomp and ceremony of marching troops and parading them along the border, while the newspaper columns are laden with the cry of families left without support, unnecessary; and the longer this state of affairs continues the greater this suffering will become.

Had Wilson "looked before he leaped," had he evolved a policy of firmness, and taken counsel with army officers and begun at once to prepare for eventualities, the present deplorable condition of affairs would not now exist. He sent the navy to Vera Cruz for a salute to the armistice away without it. He is keeping Pershing's handful of soldiers in the country far from the border, when but for the fear of the political effect they would be withdrawn to a position of safety, as they should be, for if the present attitude of Carranza should take a sudden turn, as it is likely to do, the entire expedition could be wiped out before reinforcements could reach them.

Does this not dispose of your correspondent's second reason why Wilson should be re-elected? D. W. DIGGS. New York, July 10, 1916.

A Fair Deal for the Militia.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The present unsettled conditions existing between Mexico and the United States have caused the mobilization of certain bodies of militia, and these men are assembled as representative citizens and various business concerns have placed themselves on record as being willing to pay these men from their establishments their wages. Good for their spirit! But it would appear the sentiment of most citizens and taxpayers would favor that these men who have families dependent upon them should be paid a sum enough to protect the family.

This is not more than a fair deal. Those of us who stay at home ought to see to it that we are suffering for want of wages is entailed upon the "boys in khaki" whose families may be dependent upon them. This is, and ought to be, a national matter provided for at once. BENJAMIN HAMMOND. Beacon, N. Y., July 7, 1916.

That Fighting Mood.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: This note is not intended to convince "Argus," who sent his contribution from Helena, Mont., on June 30, but it may help some one who is looking for the truth. It is true President Wilson stated he was in a fighting mood, but the same press dispatches explained that his fight was a fight for justice—a fight to subject the special interests which are trying to plunge us into a degrading war, a fight to give reason a chance to rule, and a fight to chastise the prejudiced minds which are trying to make political capital out of misrepresentations of fact.

"Argus" inferred that the fight of our President is an effort to stave off political defeat, and therein he revealed his smallness. It is because America is awake, with a real leader in the White House, that the rantings of a few biased minds are having little effect. New York, July 10, 1916. CITIZEN.

Inspection of Waste Paper Bags.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In the discussion of various measures needed to control the epidemic of infantile paralysis now prevalent in greater New York, one thought that has occurred to me is that you do not think it would be well to call the attention of the health authorities to the danger existing in the burlap bags provided for the collection of waste paper? The Street Cleaning Department passes these bags from house to house with apparently no attempt at disinfecting or cleaning same, and it might easily happen that bags taken from infected houses may be distributed to districts where the disease has not yet taken hold.

ARCHIBALD KEMP. New York, July 8, 1916.

THE NEED OF TWO NATIONAL PARTIES

A Progressive View Assigns the Republican Party an Ineradicable Character of Sectionalism—But the Present Transcendent Necessity Is Held to Require the Re-establishment of Americanism Before All Else.

(From The Philadelphia North American.) A great many Progressives find it impossible to reconcile themselves to the abandonment of the party organization. For the most part they commend Colonel Roosevelt's course as patriotic and necessary under the circumstances, and they admit that they cannot suggest a rational alternative; but they still feel that the elimination of the party is an irreparable loss to the nation.

A far greater number deplore it because of the effect which they are assured it will have upon a considerable group of patriotic citizens in the South. The Progressive party was in truth a national party, and for that reason it had possibilities for service which one of more limited appeal cannot possess. Before its creation only one of the parties—the Democratic—was of national scope; it carried the South and could count upon substantial support in the North. But the Republican party, since the Civil War, has had only a sectional status; it never has carried the South and never will.

The result is that there are many Southerners whose political beliefs are the same as those of men in the North, who yet find it impossible to vote with them. Most competent observers hold, therefore, that the need is for two national parties, one of them liberal, progressive and constructive, the other conservative and non-constructive. And they insist that the Republican party never can become either, because it cannot become national.

During its brief existence the Progressive party, they say, gave striking proof of the soundness of this view. In 1912 it polled a strong vote throughout the South, yet as a whole the attitude of that region was one of reserve. Since then, however, the movement has steadily gained in vigor there; more and more there has been revealed a desire among representative citizens of the South to shake off their sentimental allegiance to Democratic tradition and cast their ballots with Americans in the North and East and West with whose views regarding economic and constructive policies they are in sympathy.

The views we have summarized above, we believe, sound; and we agree that the Republican party, because of its ineradicable character of sectionalism, will never be able completely or effectually to serve the needs of the nation in its coming expansion. Its inadequacy, in our judgment, will become clear in the not distant future. The Republican party for years was able to overcome the handicap of "the solid South" because of the reservoirs of support it could command in the opening West. That region was developed by pioneers of whom a large part were soldiers of the Civil War and other citizens from Republican states in the East, and the party solidified its power during the period of industrial expansion stimulated by the Republican tariff.

Yet even with these sources of strength the party found it necessary to create states from sparsely settled territories in order to maintain its control in the Electoral College and in Congress. Now the pioneering of the West is over and the impetus of its early development has subsided; the great expansion during the next quarter of a century is sure to be in the South. Hence the balance will sway against the Republican party. And, if there is ever to be a real contest against Democratic ascendancy in the South, it will be necessary to have a national party in opposition, which the Republican party never can be.

The argument that eventually there must be a division into political groups representing policies of liberalism and conservatism is supported by the experience of all history. It is by these standards that political thought in all enlightened countries is classified, and the same separation inevitably will replace here the unnatural, illogical and obstructive division based upon sectionalism.

Much Criticism of "the Foreign Element." To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I understand military training is compulsory in New York State. If this should become a national law it seems to me the citizens of foreign birth would be giving something for the benefits derived from this country.

However, I would like to see all foreigners compelled to be naturalized when they have been in the country long enough, otherwise deported; and then would suggest that all males between the ages of eighteen and forty-five be compelled to do military duty for three years.



LOVE FOR FRANCE

A Good American Supports His Affection with Facts.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I beg leave to send you a letter which I have just received from a former pupil of mine, Mr. John H. Cahill, vice-president of the New York Telephone Company, with a hope that you may kindly publish it in your most excellent paper, The Tribune. RAPHAEL D'AMOUR, M. A. Officer d'Academie. Adelphi College, N. Y., July 9, 1916.

It is not strange, American as I am, that I should love France. Was she not our friend when we most needed friendship? Does she not represent our ideals and fight for them? Is she not worthy of emulation? When I consider her and what she is doing, it would make me regret that I were not French if I were anything but an American. In any case, I will say: France is unique. On the face of the entire globe there is none like her. Owen Johnson, in his book entitled "The Spirit of France," writes: "It is the fairest land and the friendliest to man on the face of the earth. To the humblest peasant each Frenchman is conscious of its beauty. He loves it with the memory of his fathers that have died to hold it. It appeals to the deepest flights of his poetical imagination. It is the true source of his passionate devotion to the beautiful and the free in the world of ideas and in the world of the rights of men."

Of all the anecdotes I brought back to me to remember most an incident which a sergeant told me of the first days of mobilization. He was passing through a small city in a railroad section, where every line was groaning under the passage of troops, in a scene of frenzied preparation, trucks arriving and discharging, vans being loaded to suffocation. In the midst of this turmoil children were standing by a freight car, the oldest, a little tot, scarcely seven, writing in chalk a message destined to traverse a land of embattled heroes. He approached and read what a child's hand had written at a moment when men of genius were seeking phrases: "Aime la France!"

With that child I agree. I love France. I love her for what she has done, what she is doing, what she always will be. VIVE LA FRANCE! JOHN H. CAHILL. North Scituate, Mass., July 9, 1916.

Slackers on the Stage.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: During the last several weeks the correspondence columns of the leading New York newspapers have obtained many letters on the subject of the "foreign invasion" of the American dramatic stage. These letters have been not only from American readers, but a number of London correspondents have been represented. It was brought about by the recent departure of George Relph, a well known English actor, who was familiar to American playgoers, who sought his release from a moving picture company in order that he might return to London and join the army. To accomplish this desire he sustained a serious financial loss, as he was under a long contract at a very handsome salary.

Much Criticism of "the Foreign Element."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I understand military training is compulsory in New York State. If this should become a national law it seems to me the citizens of foreign birth would be giving something for the benefits derived from this country.

However, I would like to see all foreigners compelled to be naturalized when they have been in the country long enough, otherwise deported; and then would suggest that all males between the ages of eighteen and forty-five be compelled to do military duty for three years.

Why should the United States be the haven for people who want education, want public office very often, in fact want everything, but give nothing? It is principally the foreign element who create the strike conditions and disturbances, who leave conditions that are unbearable, come here and make the lives of others unbearable.

The cloakmakers' parade on Thursday consisted of 100 per cent foreigners, every one of whom was making more than was ever dreamed of in his own country and under better conditions, yet they strike and intimidate the employers—their own kind—and others who are willing and glad to make the workers, and all the workers look forward to being employed; then they will cry out against the unions and the arbitrary demands of the workers. AN AMERICAN. New York, July 8, 1916.

At this time we are about to engage in a war ourselves. This is a bad example to be set for our own men, and the fault lies with the American managers who engage these men and encourage them in their disloyalty. Is it not proper that the attention of American managers be called to this condition? If our own men were guilty of this discredit-able reluctance, they would be held up to public scorn, and how much more creditable to our own managers who foster this spirit by encouraging these "slackers!" They are not themselves manifesting that spirit of loyalty expected of our own people, and the example they set for our men is pernicious. AMERICAN. New York, July 8, 1916.