New York Tribune

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

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation: Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice President; Richard H. Wilde, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: Beekman 3000.

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. DAILY AND SUNDAY		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.85	One month	$ .75
One year	22.00	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	1.25	One month	.50
One year	2.50	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.75	One month	.50
One year	15.25	One year	4.50

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.

The Berlin Conference.

A few months ago, at the moment when the attention of the world was fixed upon the battle in the Verdun sector, there met in Paris the representatives of the armies and of the governments of the Allied countries. At that time and under the immediate direction of General Joffre there was begun the great work of coördinating the operations of the armies fighting the Central Powers. While questions of economic interest, particularly after the war, were also discussed, it was the military department of the Allied conference which was of real interest and of immediate practical value. Already we have seen the results in the several Allied campaigns.

To-day the representatives of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey are meeting in Berlin to discuss similar problems. We may fairly assume that the actual work of coördinating operations will consume little time because there has been, so far as the Central Powers are concerned, an absolute coördination dating from the hour when the German General Staff was called upon to repair the damage that flowed from the collapse of the Austrian military establishment in the first campaign in Galicia in 1914. Since then the headquarters of all the armies of the Central Powers has been in Berlin and all the armies of all the Central nations have followed German direction.

The main question that must come before the conference at Berlin is posed by the developments of the war since June 4, when Russia began her great drive in Volhynia and Galicia. The difficulties of the Central Powers have been accentuated since then by the entrance of Rumania. As it now stands Germany is holding very large areas of French, Belgian and Russian territory, but the case that her allies have to submit to her rests on the fact that very large areas of their territory are occupied by the enemy and the very existence of Bulgaria is threatened by the new situation in the Balkans.

To put the question baldly, Austria and Hungary must now say to Germany: "It is true that you hold much of France and Belgium, but all of Bukovina, some thousands of miles of Galicia, a daily growing amount of Transylvania are in the hands of our enemies, together with the territory Italy has recently gained along the Adriatic." In the same fashion the Turk can point out that he has lost Erzerum and Trebizond, most of Armenia and a portion of Mesopotamia. He is threatened now with isolation from the Central Powers if the Allied operations in the Balkans succeed.

In sum, the allies of Germany must now put to the German General Staff the blunt question: "Can you defend our territories and at the same time hold your long lines in Russia and in France?" If Germany cannot reply in the affirmative then it is clear that the next step must be the shortening of German lines to release the troops necessary to free Austro-Hungarian territory, defend Bulgaria and prevent the ultimate invasion of Bulgaria and the incidental destruction of the Bulgarian bridge between Constantinople and Berlin.

The German answer may take a form that many recent incidents suggest. The Germans may persuade their allies that it is a wiser thing, regard being had for the general situation, to hold Russian, French and Belgian territories, even at the risk of further losses in Austria and Hungary, but not in Bulgaria, until the end of the campaign of 1916. Then Germany can endeavor to make the territories she holds the basis for a peace negotiation, not of the sort that has been made in the past, but a real peace negotiation based on the retrocession of all occupied lands, the sacrifice of colonies and conceivably the sacrifice of some territory, of Metz in the West and a portion of Galicia and Bukovina in the East.

Such an answer may satisfy Germany's allies for the moment, but it will satisfy them only if they are convinced, as the Germans seem to be, that the enemy is willing to make peace on any "reasonable" basis. The fact, of course, is that France will not make peace without Alsace-Lorraine, Italy will not make peace without Trieste and the Trentino, Russia will not make peace without Galicia, Constantinople and a restored and enlarged Serbia. Rumania has the pledge of her new allies that they will not make peace until she has both Transylvania and Bukovina.

Following the conference at Berlin we shall see one of two things: a fairly rapid withdrawal in the West to shorter lines, either at the French frontier, on a line from the Meuse at Mézières to Antwerp, covering Brussels, or a complete withdrawal behind the Meuse from Verdun to Liège; or we may see only the necessary yielding of minor areas and a desperate effort on the part of the Germans to hold on until the weather changes, with the express purpose of making peace before the spring comes.

If the Germans shorten their lines in the West, not a little but very greatly, they will release several hundred thousand of their best troops. By transporting these to the East the Germans, temporarily at least, will overcome the consequences of the Rumanian entrance and the earlier disasters of Austria in Galicia. They may be able to push the Russians out of Bukovina and Galicia, Rumania out of Transylvania, and they will certainly be able to relieve Bulgaria from any immediate peril of invasion from the north or the south.

But in doing this Germany would have to surrender all the real hold she has upon France, she would have to evacuate all but a thin sliver of French territory, she might have to evacuate most of Belgium, and she would have nothing to bargain with, so far as France and Britain are concerned, if her success in the East, assuming she met with successes, did not put Russia out of the war.

It is an exaggeration to say, as is being said now, that the position of Germany is desperate. It is frankly bad, and it has been getting worse for many months, ever since Verdun eliminated half a million first line troops. Complete German defeat in the future cannot be avoided unless the Germans are able, as Frederick the Great was able, to break up the alliance which was on the point of destroying him. But Germany can keep on for many months yet, possibly for two years, if her economic situation is as measurably sound as her military. Germany cannot by keeping on hope to win on the battlefield. This phase of the war has resolved itself into a slow but steady grinding up of German manhood by the vastly more numerous Russian, French and British troops.

If Germany shortens her lines in the West she may be able to conduct one more great drive upon Russia. This drive may put Russia out of the war, it will relieve Germany's allies for the time being; but this is the last chance, and it leaves the French and the British in the West free to pile up guns and munitions for a new drive in the spring made this time not in Picardy, but in Lorraine and on the edge of German territory, for it must be remembered that the moment that French territory is free the French will turn their attention to Alsace-Lorraine.

We shall probably get little real light in the immediate future as to the decisions of the conference in Berlin. We may or may not see early changes in the battle fronts, but there is no mistaking the fact that at a grave hour Germany and her allies are taking account of stock. They all know now that the war is lost, in the larger sense; actually the conference is to decide how the defeat can be restricted. It can only be restricted if the Allies, now that victory is in sight, surrender a cohesion and mutual trust hitherto not surrendered in the darkest hours of the war.

"Doubtful States."

As illustrating the fearful and wonderful political information which is being passed off on an unsuspecting public we quote this interesting judgment from the news columns of "The Evening Sun," delivered by a writer supposed to be in touch with Republican national headquarters:

> Two distinct results have followed the Republican victory of last Monday in Maine. One has been to evoke a decision on the part of the Republican campaign committee to confine its attentions in the future principally to the states having the larger electoral vote and which are believed to be good fighting ground. The other states are not to be neglected, but, viewing the result in Maine as an indication that the Progressive vote will be found in the Republican column, it has been decided to concentrate efforts on such states as California, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri and New York.

Now, if this means anything it means that the states thus grouped together are "good fighting ground" because something more than a practically complete reunion of the Republican and Progressive voters will be required to carry them. But that assumption holds good in the case of only a single one of these seven states—Missouri.

Accepting Maine's verdict as to the success of the Republican-Progressive unification, the other six states should be safely Republican next November.

Let us look at the figures. In Missouri in 1912 Mr. Wilson's vote was 330,746. The combined Taft and Roosevelt vote was 332,192. Taft carried Missouri in 1908 by 629 plurality. But in 1914 William J. Stone, Democrat, got 311,573 votes, against a total of 285,270 for his Republican and Progressive opponents. On this showing Missouri might be properly classed as "good fighting ground" for the Republicans. They have an outside chance to win, but hardly anything better.

Now take the other states. In 1912 California gave Roosevelt eleven electoral votes and Wilson two. The Republicans were unable to get the names of Taft electors printed on the official ballot. In revenge probably from 50,000 to 100,000 Republican voters shifted to Wilson. Roosevelt's top vote was 283,610, Wilson's 283,436. Taft got 3,914 votes. On this abnormal showing California might be called an extremely close state. But in 1914, when the Republicans had a ticket in the field, normal party alignments were again disclosed. Phelan, Democrat, was elected United States Senator, getting 279,896 votes. His Progressive opponent got 255,232, and his Republican opponent 254,159. Their combined vote was 229,495 greater than his. Johnson, the Progressive candidate for Governor, got 460,495 votes, the Republican candidate 271,990 and the Democratic candidate only 116,121. Governor Johnson is now running as the Republican-Progressive candidate for United States Senator. Mr. Wilson's cause is absolutely hopeless this year in California.

In Ohio the Democratic vote for President in 1912 was 424,834. But the vote for Roosevelt and Taft combined was 507,979. In 1914 a Republican Governor was elected. He received 524,625 votes and the Progressive candidate received 60,971. Governor Cox, running for reëlection, got only 493,867. To win in Ohio Mr. Wilson will have to get not 10 or 20 or 30 per cent of the Progressive vote of two years ago, but more than 75 per cent of it.

Mr. Wilson ran third in Michigan in 1912. The Roosevelt and Taft vote combined exceeded his by 216,077. The state is overwhelmingly anti-Democratic on national issues in spite of the fact that a Democratic Governor was elected on personal grounds in 1912 and reëlected in 1914.

In Illinois conditions are very similar. Wilson carried the state in 1912, but his vote was 235,023 short of the vote for Roosevelt and Taft. In 1914 the Democratic candidate for United States Senator fell 220,285 short of the combined Republican-Progressive total.

Indiana has been Democratic since 1910. But in 1912 Wilson's vote was 31,379 below the combined Progressive-Republican vote, and in 1914, for United States Senator, the shortage was 63,108. Even in Indiana Mr. Wilson must get nearly 30 per cent of the Progressive vote of 1914 to carry the state.

New York cast 655,475 votes for Wilson. Yet the combined Roosevelt-Taft vote exceeded Wilson's vote by 189,974. Two years ago the Democratic total fell short of the Republican and Progressive total 191,093 on the Governorship and 139,079 on the United States Senatorship. To win in this state, accessions and losses to the two parties from other causes equalizing one another, Mr. Wilson can attract 100 per cent of the Progressive vote cast in 1914 for Governor and still be in a minority of 100,000. If he gets 100 per cent of the Progressive vote cast for Senator in 1914, and all the Democratic votes, he will still be in a minority of 6,000.

Figuring on the basis of the Maine vote, there is hardly a doubtful state now left on the political map, Maryland, Kentucky, Nevada and Arizona excepted.

New York's Community Chorus.

The American who is not a professional musician, or at least an amateur with deep love for the art, does not take readily to choral singing. Creditable choruses—some of them of genuine excellence—abound, it is true. But the rather lamentable effect when an impromptu attempt is made to sing "The Star Spangled Banner" or "America" at a public gathering, and the so-called congregational singing in churches, even of the most familiar hymns, show how little the work of the trained bands of musicians really represents the ability or disposition of the people at large to express themselves in group singing.

For Mr. Barnhart and his Community Chorus, therefore, to have stirred a big gathering in Central Park to a point where the people actually sang songs because they wanted to—even such widely known favorites as "Old Black Joe" and "My Old Kentucky Home"—is a distinct achievement. To be sure, the circumstances surrounding the experiment were such as should have produced a mingling of souls in song if ever such a mingling were possible. Nature contributed a marvellous moonlight night, enhancing the park's beauty and softening the defects for which vandal man is responsible. The many colored lights, the lanterns, the singing of the Community Chorus, gave a sense as of a festival occasion.

If it were physically possible to sing, most persons would have wanted to do it on such a night. And to New York's credit be it recorded, thousands on thousands of those who were present forgot the self-consciousness, the conservatism, the fear of ridicule, or whatever inhibition ordinarily prevents them from lifting up their voices, and joined together in a burst of song which must have uplifted and inspired each individual component part of the vast chorus.

It is to be hoped that this will not prove to have been a single, sporadic outburst of enthusiasm, to be taken a little shamefacedly. This great city is inclined to fight shy of so-called community activities. Yet gradually that is being overcome in community centres, community games, neighborhood pageants and the like. Perhaps the future may even see the New Yorker singing as freely and spontaneously at public gatherings as the German or the Italian now does.

Disillusioned Guardsmen.

(Gerard, in The Philadelphia Ledger.)

This bootless journey to the Rio Grande will disrupt for good and all the State Militia throughout the country. Such is the opinion of ex-Mayor John Weaver.

"But our Pennsylvania Guardsmen," said the man who once stood the Philadelphia Republican organization on its head, "have behaved splendidly. Those boys are becoming real soldiers."

The ex-Mayor visited the camp in Texas for three weeks. His own son is among the volunteers who went to the border to do our country's fighting if any need be done. Mr. Weaver told me yesterday that he believed 90 per cent of the Guardsmen would resign as soon as they got home.

Better pay and better cooks to prepare food were two necessities, in his opinion, to keep a volunteer army intact. Sandstorms, dust and rattlesnakes are the chief physical drawbacks on the Mexican border. One young volunteer said to our former Mayor in the midst of blinding dust:

"I thought we were to fight Mexicans, not to eat Texas."

Then and Now.

(From The Boston Traveler.)

Although the cruiser Boston, now at Portland, Ore., is to be sold for junk, there will be no loud protest from this city over her demolition and destruction.

Boston has no direct concern in her fate. As a unit of the famous white squadron, when our later navy was in the making, she was a thing of grace and beauty, but no modern war vessel is a joy forever, and the leader of to-day is the derelict of to-morrow. They are still using the Texas, half submerged in Chesapeake Bay, for a target, and other ships, still more important in naval history than the Boston, have gone and are going into the junk heap and oblivion without protest.

Meanwhile, we have Old Ironsides, a survival of the era when the American navy was used to protect the rights of this country against all attacks upon them. In that respect, words have taken the place of warships, without beneficial result, and it is well to preserve carefully the Constitution as a glorious memento of red-blooded, outstanding Americanism.

A DEADLY ARMY

Apostles of Wilsonism Attack the Country Insidiously, Spreading Cowardice.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If there is one thing more than another in the mouthings of the present Administration that is revolting to any man with a vestige of idealism left in his being, it is the constant boasting of the fact that America has been kept out of war. There are those in this country, happily for its future, who can find little solace in that reflection, little cause for the nation to congratulate itself. Is it not rather to the eternal shame of the American people that they have permitted themselves to stand by supine in the face of the most atrocious wrong, unprotesting, when all law and the most sacred instincts of humanity were violated? Are they to heap felicitations upon themselves that they have peace a-plenty, while their government seeks not to avenge the wanton murder of their women and children, but rather complaisantly shakes the hand of their murderer?

Peace with honor is a desirable thing. Peace with dishonor is a humiliating thing—galling to the spirit of a free people.

The apostles of Wilsonism form an army the most deadly this nation has to combat. They are like an unseen enemy. Their methods are subterranean. Their false preachments and well turned paragraphs and honeyed words are injecting into the soul of the people the virus of cowardice. The moral fibre of the race is being softened by them. The silly glorification of peace, the placing of material prosperity above national honor and a disregard of all the fine feelings and ideals of humanity—all are so many elements of an insidious and powerful poison, which is permeating every tissue of the nation's body, and which, unchecked, will lead to decay and dissolution.

Continuing to take to heart the dishonoring tenets of the creed of poltroonery, intent on her fleshpots, soft of body and timid of soul, America will find war forced upon her. Then mayhap the sword so long disdained will be her salvation. It has happened, when the doctrine of materialism, the demand for peace at any price, the slothful love of ease and luxury, the disdain of honor, have taken hold of a people, that that people can only be regenerated and restored to their pristine nobility by immersion in the seething cauldron of war.

It appears to the writer that the moment is a crucial one. It behooves every American who loves his country, regardless of party affiliations or anything else whatsoever, to exert himself to the utmost, to use his every ounce of energy, in the task of dethroning the present Executive, in repudiating his actions and in demolishing forever the structure he has raised of false and pernicious doctrines.

A. D. R. DU REST-BLANCHET.

South Orange, N. J., Sept. 12, 1916.

New Freedom or New Slavery?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the early part of President Wilson's Administration he wrote and said a great deal about the "New Freedom."

When I read the Adamson bill, passed by Congress and signed twice by the President, I thought, and still think, he entirely abandoned the idea of freedom, and was placing the nation under a new slavery. When I read the explanation for that remarkable piece of legislation I was impressed with the thought that the entire business and comfort of the people are in the hands of four combinations of railroad employes, whose word is to prevail whether their acts are just or not. "Freedom" seems only for those who are selected by the President, and not for the people.

I was in the gallery when Congress was in session about three years ago, and Congressman James, of Kentucky, was pointed out to me, and I heard him use these words: "I am opposed to monopolies." Yet, as United States Senator from Kentucky, he voted for that bill which placed in power a combination which is a gigantic monopoly and uses its power in the most cruel manner. If the distinguished Senator addresses Democratic meetings, will he explain why he supported the Adamson bill if he was opposed to "monopolies" and also if that was the new "freedom" that President Wilson was giving the country? O. J.

Washington, N. J., Sept. 12, 1916.

In Accord.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Please allow me to express my satisfaction in reading your editorial of the 10th inst., entitled "Magyar Anger," and particularly with respect to its closing paragraph, as follows:

"German 'necessity' has been above the law for two years, but the law and not German 'necessity' is prevailing. What is now happening is worth all the waiting that we have had, and it is only a first faint promise of what is to come. Even our own murdered women and children of the Lusitania will not sleep forever unavenged, although their fellow countrymen may be the only considerable fraction of civilized mankind whose fears restrain them from participating in the necessary work of bringing justice to Germany."

I look each day for your leading editorial immediately after reading the headlines on the first page. It is a little unusual for one to seek out a column and a half article, such as it frequently is, and I take it to mean that The Tribune is getting back to the old days of Horace Greeley, when the most important thing about the paper was his editorial. You voice from day to day exactly my feeling in regard to public matters.

CHARLES E. MANIERRE.

New York, Sept. 12, 1916.

A Stanch Republican.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am a live Republican in Texas. I have voted the Republican ticket for James Garfield and all Republican Presidents since. I shall hail the day when our State Department will be moved from London back to Washington.

I am one of two million men who would gladly give up his life rather than submit to England's confiscation of our mails and hampering our commerce.

Thank the Lord, there will be a change after November 7! Hughes will get a fine complimentary vote all along this frontier from El Paso to Brownsville, as we are the people who have suffered at the hands of the Mexicans. G. R. GOLDBECK.

Uvalde, Tex., Sept. 8, 1916.

Free Trade "Disgraceful."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I think "Pro.-B." is quite right as regards killing the goose that lays the golden egg if the United States hits back at the blacklist. After the war, I feel sure, never again will the same freedom of trade be permitted by the British people; and although I am only a woman and a poor letter writer, yet tariff reform, I believe, would be the greatest blessing for England, and the disgraceful system of free trade should have been done away with years ago. TINA.

Brooklyn, Sept. 10, 1916.

THE FIRST BREAK.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH THE GUARD

Its Maintenance on the Border Unnecessary and Harmful.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I was very glad to see on the front page of to-day's Tribune the first indication of real live journalism, which has been conspicuous by its absence in all the papers, in regard to Wilson's treatment of the National Guard as a political plaything. Your dispatch from Washington exactly fits the practically unanimous opinion of all the 105,000 National Guardsmen on the border, their many relatives and friends and a large portion of the public.

When a man joins the National Guard he considers the possibility of active service, but he has always understood that he would not be called to the colors on such service unless there existed a national emergency, and when we took the Federal oath last June we believed that through three years of blundering the crisis had at last arrived, and were, therefore, willing to do our bit without questioning the justice or good sense of intervening in Mexico.

We had not been in Texas a week before we realized that we had been tricked—that the public had been fooled, and also the press. There was no emergency last June, when the Guard was called, except Mr. Wilson's political emergency. There is no emergency now. The Guard was mobilized to make a grandstand play for preparedness, with politics as the ulterior object. It has been held on the border for no other reasons than the political ones which concern Mr. Wilson's personal fortunes, and it will not be sent home until the political situation is ripe for such a movement. When thousands of men are sacrificing their business, and in many cases undermining their health, and the country's money is being absolutely wasted, but with large portions of the public believing still that the militia was needed on the border, we have to admit that Mr. Wilson deserves the title of "the greatest politician of them all," the politician's job being, of course, to fool the people.

Let us omit all criticism of the medical corps of the army and National Guard, whose performance has been atrocious on the border; all criticism of our antiquated War Department systems and red tape, and all odious comparisons of regular army treatment of the Guard, i. e., anything is good enough for the militia, as compared with their efforts for the comfort of the regulars.

The fact remains that the money has been wasted and that the militiamen's time is still being wasted on the border, contrary to the popular belief that the militia will come home trained as they have never been trained before, physically fit, hard as nails, etc., etc., after a long tour of duty with the regular army on the border. As a matter of fact, after being down there eight weeks they had acquired less knowledge along military lines than they absorbed in eight days' manœuvres last summer at Camp Whitman, when they really were working with regulars, and less than they obtained during any of the manœuvre campaigns such as were held in recent years in Connecticut and Massachusetts. Instead, they have qualified as ditch diggers, subway laborers, street cleaners and road makers, all of which is "hardening" work in the hot Texas sun, but of no military value, and which the United States army regulations prescribe shall be done by hired labor whenever possible.

The various units on the border had their first hike but two weeks ago, and their first combat exercise only several days ago. It is admitted that the military training outside of close order drills has been practically nil. There has been practically no target practice and very little actual patrol work, and even such military exercises as were gone through with lost a great deal of their value through the absence of so many men on the ditch-digging details.

The "wonderful conditioning" of the men will vanish after they have been one month in New York. But the public likes to be fooled, so they will believe what they are told by Messrs. Wilson and Baker and the censored dispatches from the border. The Mexican situation has nothing whatever to do with the length of stay of the troops. It is the political situation that has everything to do with it, and therefore their chances of returning much before election are very small. But if Mr. Wilson counts on the votes of the Guardsmen and their relatives and friends through a "wave of enthusiasm" engendered by the return "of the boys" just before election, he is very much mistaken. The ingrowing soreness which rankles in the minds of the above-mentioned voters will not be played out by brass bands and chlorofermed by cheers for the colors flying at a Presidential review. They will register their feelings at the polls just as nine hundred Guardsmen of all ranks in life and various political tendencies registered theirs in a cutting, icy, deadly "silence" at an outdoor picture show recently on the border when the face of their political "commander in chief" was thrown on the screen, even though the Mexican orchestra unsuccessfully tried to stir up a lone handclap by playing patriotic airs.

More power to you on such articles, which are "real inside stuff" in regard to the incompetent and amateurish handling of the army and National Guard by our pussy-footing, political superiors in Washington, who serve up to the public everything favorable and who have established a censorship over all newspaper men which surpasses that of the German Press Bureau.

"Pitiless Publicity" seems to have been discarded along with a number of other catchy phrases, but the thousands of National Guardsmen who are the unwilling victims will rejoice at seeing the thoughts and convictions of their own minds and hearts in print. NATIONAL GUARDSMAN.

New York, Sept. 11, 1916.

"Rousing Our Antagonism."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There were a hundred-and-odd American men, women and children murdered by command of the German government in the Lusitania. There has been absolutely no apology, disavowal or reparation for this act. There was a German Ambassador who advertised a warning of this premeditated murder in American newspapers, which was more than a flagrant breach of diplomatic etiquette; it was an insult to the American people. We had members of the German Embassy, whose status in this country is one of courtesy, engaged unquestionably at the instance of their government in plots on American soil against legitimate American trade and against the law and order of the land, of all of which the Administration had complete and specific evidence. Did the President seek retaliatory powers from Congress against these hostile acts?

Lately the Allies placed on a blacklist German firms in America controlled by Germans whose policy and whose business plainly are to assist the Allies' enemies, and the President rushes to Congress and obtains retaliatory powers against this perfectly legitimate measure of self-protection. Will any of President Wilson's apologists make plain his psychology in these matters?

Americans of apparently similar psychology are saying "the Allies do not realize the mistake they are making in rousing our antagonism by this blacklist." Let these gentlemen seriously consider the consequence of rousing the antagonism of the Allies. In a year or two the world is going to be made over by the Allies. When the Allies have settled more serious matters they will turn to these gentlemen and say: "Now, sirs, we are ready to deal with you," and these heroes, with their present valiant chief, will be found "under the bed," leaving the American nation to foot the bill. C. G. CAMPBELL.

New York, Sept. 11, 1916.

Innocent No Longer.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: With no more effort involved than in being a political party adherent, the Bystanders could organize by ward and district a formidable majority, pledged to stand by our city government in protecting the right of every citizen to proceed unmolested in the performance of his daily tasks. The malcontents who ruthlessly ignore all rules and let fly their kicks, no matter where they land, should have their violence met by our citizenry, the Bystanders, who, having laid off the innocent, proceed to lay on what will bring the most good to the greatest number. It's cure or endure—everybody join!

A BYSTANDER.

New York, Sept. 11, 1916.

An Unconfirmed Report.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Would you kindly let me know if The Tribune has not published the official news of the capture of the merchant submarine Bremen by the English? If so, kindly let me know the day of capture, the day of said publication and name of place where incident occurred. MRS. H. MAESTRO.

New York, Sept. 11, 1916.

THE AMERICAN AMBULANCE CORPS

A Letter from a Driver on the French Front.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I beg to send you for publication, if you so desire, an interesting letter just received by me from Mr. Philip O. Mills, of this city. Mr. Mills is now serving in France as a volunteer with the American Volunteer Motor Ambulance Corps, which my brother Richard commands. He is a son of General Samuel L. Mills, of the United States Army, now deceased, and is very well known in the best society in New York.

ELIOT NORTON.

New York, Sept. 10, 1916.

France, August 14, 1916.

My Dear Eliot:

The other day I had a sad experience that has had a most depressing effect upon me. It is not often that we have the time to give much personal notice to the wounded we carry, as our job is to keep going and go back again and then again to the Poste de Secours for more wounded to bring to the hospitals.

At some distance from one of our advance stations there lies a splendid battery of big French guns, cleverly concealed in the woods as only the French can conceal. This battery has been inflicting heavy damage on the Boches for weeks, and they have searched and searched for it, splaying the whole woods with shells and sending aeroplanes over to spy—which, by the way, the French always promptly chase home on the run. Well, after weeks of effort, finally, by chance, they dropped a shell near enough to the battery to do a little damage. We brought to the hospital two wounded artillery men, and as the brancardiers tenderly lifted one of the big fellows out of the ambulance he stretched out his hand to shake mine and thank me for the ride, though his face was gray with pain.

The médicin major, a fine, skilful surgeon, had his coat off as we came into the hospital, and everything was waiting; directly to the operating table the wounded man went and was stripped and every wound washed and properly dressed. The best New York hospital could not have done it in a quicker or more efficient manner. As he was being moved to give place to the next this big, fine fellow, who hadn't even groaned during it all, asked for his little card case that had the photograph of his little children in it, and when it was laid on the stretcher beside him he smiled at every one about him. Then we took him on to the main hospital. The next day I had a call at the main hospital to take three wounded, nearly recovered, to the train, and I asked after my friend. The orderly said in his simple way: "Too bad; he has already gone away, but the other one will recover."

Of the three convalescent men I took to the train one was a Boche, and he was treated just the same as the French. The hospital orderly shook hands and called "Good luck!" to each one.

No sooner were we well on the road than all were laughing and calling out the side windows. One fellow was sitting up, enjoying the ride, and the other lad, whose head was one roll of bandages, had rolled over on his belly and had his head half out the front window. Singing and laughing, they greeted the hospital train waiting on a side-track to take its load to Paris. Ever yours,

P. O. M.

Clean Public Telephones.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: When the subject of public health is being so carefully considered one comparatively great menace has been overlooked by the Department of Health—that is, the public telephones.

Many people who cannot have a private telephone must rely on those installed in stores, and in this way disease can spread.

Of course we must have public telephones. But why not keep them clean?

The Department of Health could divide the city into certain districts and hire one man to go around at least twice a week to the stores in his district in which there are public telephones and disinfect them. If this task should prove to be too great for one man in each part of the city additional men could be supplied, and in this way the public could be assured that they could use the means of communication without any danger of infection.

MALCOLM H. SANGER.

New York, Sept. 12, 1916.