

New York Tribune

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

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1916

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation...

Subscription Rates—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York...

Foreign Rates—Daily and Sunday... Canadian Rates—Daily and Sunday...

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter

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

Questions and Answers

We have received the following letter from Mr. Ellery Sedgwick, the editor of "The Atlantic Monthly":

Sir: Will you allow a New England voter to look to you for correct information?

Since the present campaign began it has been my privilege, in common with most of my fellow-citizens, to listen to many discussions as to the advisability of electing the Republican or the Democratic candidate. Like most men, I have come to regard such quadrennial disputations as a very valuable part of my political education...

The candidate's frequent adoption of the terms "correct policies" and "Americanism" as defining his own position seems to many observers to intensify the convictions of his followers without corresponding enlightenment. It will be granted, I think, that the coalition supporting the Republican ticket is made up of large bodies of men who think very variously upon these subjects, and the voter of independent mind is not unnaturally confused as to the all-important question of Mr. Hughes's own convictions.

Under these unusual circumstances, is it not fair that The Tribune, a paper of distinguished antecedents, which has on many historic occasions preached correct Republican doctrine and which, during the present campaign, has shown great vigor and firmness of conviction, should answer clearly and tersely a few questions not designed by their phrasing to catch or trip, but to elicit genuine and much-needed information?

1. Mr. Hughes declares that he favors a "new and consistent" policy toward Mexico which shall protect American lives and property. His most prominent supporter, Colonel Roosevelt, who has an acknowledged genius in shaping the issues of a political campaign, makes a passionate demand for the employment of force in our dealing with the southern republic, and certainly creates the impression that in so doing he is voicing the determination of the Republican party.

2. Regarding our foreign policy, Mr. Hughes has broken through his usual reticence by making a flat statement at Philadelphia. "We do not propose to tolerate any improper interference with legitimate commercial intercourse. No American who is exercising only American rights shall be put on any blacklist by any foreign nation."

3. What is Mr. Hughes's programme with reference to the Adamson law? Mr. Hughes has aptly said: "You cannot repeal a surrender." The Adamson law goes into effect on January 1, 1917, and expires by its own limitations some time between August 1 and November 1, 1917. It would have run three months before a Republican Congress could be assembled in extra session to repeal it. Moreover, many of the President's recommendations regarding the problem of regulating railroad wages and hours and preventing strikes remain to be acted on by the present Congress at its next session. No one can foresee what the situation will be after March 4 next.

4. Mr. Hughes has arraigned Mr. Wilson's measures for aiding the American merchant marine. Does Mr. Hughes believe in ship subsidies? 5. Mr. Hughes has spoken disparagingly of the Federal Reserve law. How does he wish that law amended? 6. Mr. Hughes accentuates his own "Americanism." Does that "Americanism" imply compulsory military service?

The list of queries might be extended to greater length, but I will not make further demands upon your space. I simply submit it is extraordinary that after he has made several scores of speeches such general doubt

can exist regarding Mr. Hughes's policies. If you will answer these questions as fairly as they are asked you will do a service to hesitating voters. ELLERY SEDGWICK. Boston, Mass., Oct. 24, 1916.

The Tribune takes pleasure in answering Mr. Sedgwick's questions, it being understood that it speaks only for itself, its views of what Mr. Hughes stands for being based solely on the latter's public utterances: 1. Under existing conditions does Mr. Hughes believe in active intervention in Mexico? Mr. Hughes has said with utmost emphasis that he believes in protecting the lives and property of American citizens at home, on the high seas and in foreign countries. The Republican platform, on which Mr. Hughes stands, said regarding Mexico: "We promise to our citizens on and near the border, and to those in Mexico, wherever they may be found, adequate and absolute protection in their lives, liberty and property." The Democratic platform of 1912, on which Mr. Wilson was elected, said: "Every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must receive the full protection of the United States government both for himself and his property."

This latter declaration has now been repudiated by Mr. Wilson, who has set up—so far as Mexico is concerned—the contrary doctrine that Americans go into a foreign country at their own risk. That they, as "adventurers" and trouble makers there, are not entitled to the protection of our government, and that no protection ought to be given to them which may interfere in any way with the successful progress of the Mexican revolution. This doctrine has been frankly outlined in Mr. Wilson's speech accepting a renomination from the Democratic party and in Dr. Charles W. Eliot's recent article in "The Atlantic Monthly" for October.

Mr. Hughes is certainly pledged to go as far as it is necessary to go to protect the lives and property of Americans in Mexico. We have had "active intervention" in Mexico for the last three years and a half. Mr. Wilson has intervened diplomatically, and also by force, for purposes of his own (though not for the protection of the lives and property of Americans). He has twice made war on Mexico. He is now conducting war against Mexico, according to the official ruling of the Judge Advocate General of the Army. The present policy of the United States is one of very "active intervention." Mr. Hughes may be obliged to continue it. But in so far as he continues it he will do so not under the empty pretext of "serving humanity," but with the entirely legitimate purpose of protecting American interests and maintaining American rights.

2. If Great Britain continues her present policy of blacklisting of American merchants and putting illegal restrictions on American commerce, will Mr. Hughes attempt to coerce her by placing an embargo on munitions for the Allies? The present Administration has protested very strongly against British violations of the rights of neutrals engaged in commerce. It has protested specifically and emphatically against the British blacklist. But it has secured so far practically no concessions from the British government, for the reason, evidently, that the British government does not believe that Mr. Wilson means what he says.

Mr. Hughes is known as a man who does mean what he says. How far he would have to go, if elected, to secure a modification of the annoying and oppressive methods to which Great Britain has resorted, it is manifestly impossible to guess. Mr. Hughes has stated his purpose. It would be manifestly unfair to ask him to commit himself in advance to the details of its enforcement.

3. What is Mr. Hughes's programme with reference to the Adamson law? Mr. Hughes has aptly said: "You cannot repeal a surrender." The Adamson law goes into effect on January 1, 1917, and expires by its own limitations some time between August 1 and November 1, 1917. It would have run three months before a Republican Congress could be assembled in extra session to repeal it. Moreover, many of the President's recommendations regarding the problem of regulating railroad wages and hours and preventing strikes remain to be acted on by the present Congress at its next session. No one can foresee what the situation will be after March 4 next.

4. Mr. Hughes has arraigned Mr. Wilson's measures for aiding the American merchant marine. Does Mr. Hughes believe in ship subsidies? 5. Mr. Hughes has spoken disparagingly of the Federal Reserve law. How does he wish that law amended? 6. Mr. Hughes accentuates his own "Americanism." Does that "Americanism" imply compulsory military service?

The list of queries might be extended to greater length, but I will not make further demands upon your space. I simply submit it is extraordinary that after he has made several scores of speeches such general doubt

does not hold that the increase in wages asked was unreasonable. He does not know whether it was or not, any more than the President knew or Congress knew. He objected rightly to legislating under coercion and in the dark. What he promises—and all he can promise—is that if he is elected and a similar situation arises it will be met in a manly and rational fashion. Investigation will precede action, not follow it.

4. Does Mr. Hughes believe in ship subsidies? The Republican platform of 1916 contained a declaration in favor of liberal postal subsidies and other legislation to foster an American merchant marine. A subvention is subsidy. Mr. Hughes undoubtedly favors the policy of subsidizing American deep-sea carriers. That policy has been applied with success by all the great maritime nations. It is economical and effective, because every million spent by the government encourages the outlay of many millions by private investors. It is preferable in every way to the costly and ineffective government ownership scheme fathered by Mr. Wilson and Mr. McAdoo, which sets the government up as a competitor with and destroyer of shipping ventures sustained by private capital.

5. Does Mr. Hughes wish the Federal Reserve Law amended? He may wish to see it amended. We do not know to what extent. The system is still in an experimental stage. The law was amended in various particulars at the last session of the present Congress. The President signed an amendatory act on September 7 last. Many people think that in boom times the present law contributes too powerfully to an inflation of credit.

6. Does "Americanism" imply compulsory military service? The principle of universal military liability has long been embodied in our laws. All citizens of the United States of military age not serving in the regular army or the organized militia are included in the unorganized militia, over which Congress exercises full control.

Few people seem to know that the principle of compulsory military service was actually applied in the Hay army reorganization law passed at the last session of Congress. It is in operation to-day—with Mr. Wilson's approval. Sections 78 and 79 of the Hay act provide for the creation of National Guard reserve battalions, to feed the battalions called into the service of the United States in time of war. According to the official ruling of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, we are now in a state of war with Mexico. Section 79 of the Hay law provides that under such conditions one reserve battalion shall be organized, either from the enlisted reserve or from the unorganized militia, for each regiment of infantry or cavalry, or each nine batteries of field artillery or each twelve companies of coast artillery. When the members of three or more regiments of the National Guard of any state, territory or district shall have been brought into the service of the United States the reserve battalions of such regiments may be organized into provisional regiments and higher units. And Section 79 says:

"If for any reason there shall not be enough voluntary enlistments to keep the reserve battalions at the prescribed strength, a sufficient number of the unorganized militia shall be drafted into the service of the United States to maintain each of such battalions at the proper strength."

We already have "compulsory service"; for the President now possesses ample power to draft the unorganized militia into the National Guard after the National Guard has been called into the first line, as was done by Presidential proclamation last June.

Mr. Hughes stands for a real first line army and a real army reserve. We believe that he purposes getting them. The main point is to get them, whether we depend on volunteering or call into use the undoubted power of the national government, exercised already in the Hay law, to draft as many of our citizens as may be needed for military duty.

A Raid with an Obvious Purpose

It has been suggested that the recent German raid in the English Channel was probably conceived as a diversion to cover the escape of commerce destroyers from the North Sea. It is hardly necessary, however, to look for an indirect object, considering the obvious usefulness of interrupting or hampering the cross-Channel transport service. If hither-to the Germans have failed to interfere effectively with the passage of troops to the Continent it is not because they have thought it superfluous to do so; and to suppose that the enterprise must have been merely a feint is unreasonable, not only in the light of the partial success achieved, but also because of the improbability of facilitating a secondary ally by such means. Whether the attempt was really justified by the event is another question. The German official report is too indefinite to be of any use in estimating the importance of the affair. It speaks of two or three British destroyers or torpedo boats and

at least eleven other vessels "either sunk or damaged," a circumstance enabling the German newspapers to make headlines about "twelve British ships sent to bottom." There is no reason to believe, even on the strength of the German claim, that more than two destroyers were lost, the other "ships" being probably small craft employed as lookouts. On the other side the British profess to have sunk two German destroyers. This is denied, but it is difficult to accept the denial. The statement that the flotilla returned "without loss" is no more trustworthy on the face of it than that which was given out after the Battle of Jutland and subsequently amended by the admission that a battle-cruiser and two light cruisers must be added to the list of losses.

There is naturally some disappointment in England at the successful escape of eight of the ten torpedo craft engaged in the raid. It is true that only one transport—an empty one—was sunk, but it is the possibility of making a raid of this kind at all that is disconcerting. For more than two years troops have gone regularly back and forth across the Channel with such evident immunity that people had ceased to think of the perils of the service. The risk run by the Germans must have been great, and they deserve credit for extraordinary daring. It is unlikely, however, that such raids will come to be a matter of routine, for supposing two destroyers were lost the result was not sufficiently encouraging to justify the risk run.

More Money for the Policemen

Police Commissioner Woods's plea to the Board of Estimate for additional members of his force and for pay increases for first grade patrolmen, captains and inspectors ought to be granted if the authorities can possibly scrape up the necessary money. The Police Department deserves much at the hands of this community. It is now by long odds better than it has ever been, cleaner, freer from graft, more efficient. It has recently done notably good work in the transit strike. That service has received much praise, but praise pays no grocery bills. The men deserve substantial recognition, in negotiable coin of the realm, if it be within the possibilities.

There has been no increase in the numbers of the Police Department, save for the men put on temporarily during the strike, since 1913. The regular roll this year is some 200 men short of the number on the roll in 1914, for there were budget cuts in 1915 and 1916 which caused the Commissioner to carry unfilled vacancy in the force. He wants to add 235 men to the patrolmen at present available. That is an eminently reasonable request. If it were granted the city, considering its population, would still be under-policed according to the scale of police to population in most of the large cities of this country and Europe. If New York, in proportion, had as many policemen as Philadelphia, the force would number 13,588, instead of some 10,000; while if we had as many guardians as London, there would be an army of more than 16,000 bluecoats.

Nobody contends that this city is over-policed at present. The manifest fact is that it never before has had so few policemen for the work they are required to do. The growth of the city and the growth of the demands on the department have outstripped the growth of the force. The force has stood still for three years, but the need for police activity has not by any means. Traffic regulation, to take only one phase of the department's work, has demanded for a couple of years more men than ever before. Obviously these men, on duty all day, cannot be used at night for a protection against law-breakers.

The patrolmen meet the proposed increase. They, like all other salaried men, are victims of the tremendously augmented cost of living. Their nominal salary of \$1,000 a year is not their real salary, for they have to pay for bedding and equipment, which means about \$100 a year. It is years since the higher officers of the department—captains and inspectors—have had any salary increase. These men do a highly responsible work, exacting in its demands, vastly important to the community. They are underpaid even by comparison with other employees of the public—the higher officials in the Fire Department whose jobs roughly correspond with theirs.

These requests of Commissioner Woods have been denied by the subcommittee of the Board of Estimate—not, it is understood, with any prejudice to their merit, but because there is a general policy that the city may not spend more money this coming year for "personal service" than was allowed in the current budget. The holding down of expenditures is a policy with which no taxpayer will quarrel, to be sure. Nevertheless, the policing of this city is one of its major activities, affecting every resident. It would be a penny-wise, pound-foolish system to maintain for a considerable period a force manifestly inadequate for its job, and then to discourage the members of it by underpaying them. It is to be hoped the Board of Estimate will be able to reconcile itself to meeting the demands Mr. Woods puts forward for the men who have done such excellent work for the public.

More than two weeks ago the British steamer Stephano was proceeding from Halifax to New York. She carried ninety-four passengers, including women and children, and a crew of sixty-seven men. She contained no contraband and was not destined to any part of a belligerent country. Many of her passengers, including women and young children, were American citizens. They were dining in the saloon at 8 o'clock on Sunday evening, October 8, when the captain suddenly appeared and instructed them to embark immediately on the lifeboats of the vessel, which was about to be sunk. One hundred and sixty-one persons, all of them non-combatants, were within fifteen minutes hurried into six lifeboats, leaving behind them nearly all their personal effects. As one of the survivors said: "Women with infants in their arms were lowered into the boats with ropes, while others were obliged to climb down the rope ladders." The boats, in the darkness of the night, thereupon put out upon the open sea, which was still being roused by a storm, and a few minutes later the Stephano was torpedoed and disappeared in the depths of the ocean. The boats thus cast adrift upon the high seas were at least sixty miles from the nearest mainland, but just before the captain gave his notice to the passengers a number of torpedo boat destroyers of the American navy appeared upon the scene, and two of them—namely, the Ericsson and the Balch—picked up the crew and passengers after they had been about twenty minutes on the surface of the water.

A Pickwickian Assurance

Many of these passengers were American citizens, and they had taken passage in the merchant vessel upon the assurance of their President that "the lives of non-combatants cannot lawfully or rightfully be put in jeopardy" and that this government would enforce the unqualified rule of international law that to subject non-combatants to a merchant vessel "is the piracy of the sea in small boats" is thus putting them into jeopardy and would not be tolerated by this government.

It is true that the disembarkation of these passengers took place within hailing distance of American warships, and the doubtful question whether the Stephano would have been sunk if these warships had not been near can only be answered at present by the fact that simultaneously the same submarine sank four other vessels on the West Point, the Hoostradyk, the Knudsen and the Stratheden—and it is not suggested that warships were within sight of all five vessels. In any event the proximity of the warships palliated but little this fresh violation of neutral rights, for the obvious reason that if the sinking of the Stephano would have been unjustifiable but for the proximity of the warships, then it inevitably follows that the same would be true for the same reason as to sink these merchant vessels. To prostitute the American navy by making it a mere auxiliary of German submarines in commerce raiding ought to be unthinkable.

It is not the business of American warships to facilitate any nation in the destruction of the merchant marine of a country with which America is at peace. To do so is to make it virtually an accessory after the fact. What the American commanders should have done and doubtless would have done, had they not been serving under an Administration only consistent in its weakness, was to serve notice upon the captain of the submarine that as will hereafter indubitably appear, a clear and unequivocal stand that submarines could not lawfully be used as commerce destroyers, if it attempted to drive the passengers of the Stephano to the open sea on small boats, the guns of American warships would at once open fire in defence of the undoubted right of American citizens to travel without undue jeopardy upon the high seas.

The captain of the Ericsson, however, could not act as his sense of honor and humanity undoubtedly prompted him, for he had reason to know, as so many of us have, that no safe dependence can be placed upon the official utterances of President Wilson, which have now for more than a year proved mere "scraps of paper." Therefore, he did not feel free to vindicate the undoubted position of this government that the use of the submarine for the destruction of an enemy's commerce is of necessity utterly incompatible with the principles of humanity, the long established and the so-called immunities of non-combatants.

More than two weeks have passed since this outrage was committed in the very teeth of the repeated warnings of this government that this mode of warfare would be tolerated. Holland's Protest Holland, a small nation, existing in the very shadow of Germany and threatened with destruction if Germany should prevail in this conflict, was, nevertheless, not slow to express its condemnation of this latest activity of the submarine. As one of the vessels which was sunk was a Dutch vessel, Mr. Louden, the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Holland, at once made a public statement in which he expressed his confidence that Germany would disavow the act of her commander and tender reparation for this absolutely unjustifiable act.

Holland has also promptly forbidden the entrance of belligerent war vessels into her territorial waters, except under stress of weather or damage, while Norway, also a little state, promptly followed the exploits of the submarine U-53 by issuing an edict, dated October 15, 1916, which forbade the entrance of any submarine into her waters unless it remained on the surface and flew its flag.

While Holland and Norway were thus bravely asserting the majesty of international law the greatest of neutral nations remains silent, unless we except the semi-official statements that have come from Shadow Lawn and from the State Department to the effect that the Wilson Administration is not disposed to regard this act of the German submarine as in violation of Germany's pledges.

It is therefore surprising that Herr Alfred Zimmermann, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs for Germany, took occasion, on October 16, 1916, while deprecating the action of Holland and Norway, to express publicly his satisfaction with the attitude of this government with respect to the admission of German submarines to our ports, where they can replenish their stocks of fuel and food and obtain the necessary information to enable them to proceed again to sea and destroy merchant marine and jeopardize the lives of our citizens.

This public acknowledgment followed a visit which the German Ambassador made to President Wilson's summer home after the sinking of these five vessels, and on leaving Shadow Lawn Count von Bernstorff made the highly humorous and tactful remark that "Germany keeps all its pledges everywhere," a remark which is calculated to excite some amazement and derision in Belgium and elsewhere. Count von Bernstorff might well smile and Herr Alfred Zimmermann might well indulge in public expressions of gratification, for President Wilson, as will hereafter appear, had said on April 16, 1916, in explicit language, that if Germany should again sacrifice or jeopardize the lives of non-combatants by the use of its submarines the German Ambassador would be given his passports.

If the question is put on no higher plane than dollars and cents, it is amazing that with continuing losses to our commerce of many millions of dollars the United States does not venture to do that which Holland and Norway have done—namely, to restrict the unlimited access of submarines to our harbors and territorial waters.

Extra-Territorial Rights Limited

The extra-territorial rights of foreign warships in our waters exist only by courtesy and the comity of nations. America, without departing from its policy of neutrality, could at any time forbid the entrance into its territorial waters of any warships, provided that the prohibition applied equally to all belligerents. The right of total prohibition being clear, it would be equally within the competence of the United States as a sovereign power to forbid the entrance of any particular class of warships, and as the submarine is a comparatively new method of warfare and its exact status under international law has not yet been clearly established, it is within the power of the United States to deny access to its harbors of all submarines.

THE CASE OF THE U-53

By JAMES M. BECK Author of "The Evidence in the Case."

shall be subject to visit and search by the warships of another belligerent, and if upon such search it is found that such ship is carrying contraband of war, said ship may be seized and detained... until such time as her case may be determined by a prize court, which shall decide whether or not such vessel is a lawful prize.

Previous to the present war, the possibility of any such course of conduct as has been since followed by German submarines was not discussed by belligerents or courts, because it was regarded as an unthinkable possibility. To sacrifice or jeopardize the lives of non-combatants was regarded as pure piracy and was believed to have forever ended when the Mediterranean and the last of the Spanish buccannery ceased to ply the profession of the "skull and crossbones" upon the so-called Spanish Main.

For five months after the present war began no one suggested as a thing possible that the lives of non-combatants could be sacrificed or jeopardized. The first intimation to the contrary was the authorized interview by Admiral Tirpitz, given to the world on the eve of Christmas, 1914, in which he stated that it was the intention of Germany to torpedo every merchant vessel belonging to the Allies, and directing his challenge specifically to America, he asked: "What will America say?"

We took up the challenge, and on February 10, 1915, called the attention of the German government to the very serious possibility of such a course, which we then stigmatized as an indefensible violation of neutral rights, for which the government would be concerned to hold the German government to a strict accountability, and to take any steps it might be necessary to take to safeguard the American lives and liberty and to secure to American citizens the full enjoyment of their acknowledged rights on the high seas.

The German government showed its contempt for this threat of "strict accountability" by sinking, on March 25, 1915, the Falaba, the Gulfstream, a few weeks later and the Lusitania on May 7, 1915, when more than 1,000 men, women and children were fed to the fishes.

The First Lusitania Note

On May 13, 1915, President Wilson sent a note in which he stated that the government of the United States desired to call the attention of the Imperial German Government, with the utmost earnestness, to the fact that the objection to their present method of attack against the trade routes of neutral countries is the destruction of employing submarines in the destruction of commerce without disregarding those rules of fairness, justice and humanity which all modern opinion regards as imperative.

It is virtually impossible for the officers of a submarine to visit a merchant man at sea and examine her papers and cargo. It is virtually impossible to insure a vessel against a submarine attack and if they cannot put a prize crew on board of her they cannot sink her without leaving her crew and all on board of her in the mercy of the sea in her small boats. These facts, it is to be regretted, the Imperial German Government frankly admits.

We are informed that, in the instances of which we have spoken, time enough was given to the crew of the Lusitania to save their lives, and in at least two of the cases cited, not so much as a warning being received. Manifestly submarines cannot be used against merchantmen, as the last few years have demonstrated, without a violation of many sacred principles of justice and humanity.

An Untimely Notice

At any time such a notice would have been gratuitous, for obviously any belligerent that accidentally sank an American submarine would acknowledge liability and make reparation. Why, then, with the cries of American women and children who were obliged to be lowered by ropes into a boat and committed to the mercies of the sea still ringing in his ears, did the President take this special occasion to warn the warships of the Allied powers that they must not in their attempts to save the lives of their citizens and our citizens from sudden death through submarines make any mistake as to the nationality of the submarine?

While such caution must be exercised, yet the time selected for this unnecessary announcement seems most unfortunate and only too well calculated to give the erroneous impression to foreign nations that this government was more intent upon protecting German submarines than the lives of its own citizens upon the high seas.

Safety for Non-combatants

When the war broke out no principle of international law was more clearly established than that no one should be so conducted that injury, death, or undue jeopardy should be spared to non-combatants, so far as was reasonably possible. Applying this rule to the question of commerce destroying in naval warfare, it was held that a neutral vessel could not be destroyed, even though it carried contraband, unless its continuance in some way imperilled the attacking vessel. While the right to destroy the merchant ship of a belligerent was clearly recognized, yet it was subject to the condition that provision must be made for the lives of passengers and crew. This could be accomplished, according to the then existing practice, either by the war vessel putting a prize crew on board the merchant ship and taking it into port to be adjudicated a lawful prize, or by taking the passengers and crew upon the warship and transporting them to a place of assured safety. If neither of these conditions could be observed the warship was then obliged to permit the merchant vessel, with its passengers and crew, to proceed on its voyage after the contraband cargo, if any, had been effectually removed or destroyed.

Germany carried the rule to the extreme of holding that the crew of a belligerent merchant vessel could not be regarded as prisoners of war, and in 1870 protested against the action of the French government in detaining as captives the crew of a German merchant vessel.

assurance to the world, and nothing more just. Mr. Wilson's demand in the Sussex note was that Germany should not immediately declare in effect an abandonment of its present method of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels.

What were the "present methods" which were thus to be abandoned? The "present methods" thus denounced did not consist exclusively in sinking vessels without warning and without giving non-combatants opportunity to escape, but also in sinking vessels without any search and without giving to non-combatants any greater security for their safety than lifeboats. While the expression "present methods" standing by itself, is somewhat ambiguous, yet it must be considered in the light of Mr. Wilson's previous warning that a submarine could not be used as a commerce raider because of the obvious impossibility of putting a prize crew on board.

No Vindication Yet

The idea that our government vindicated the majesty of international law in the temporary adjustment that followed the sinking of the Sussex is disproved by the fact that in the month of June, 1916, submarines sank 57 vessels, five of which were neutral; in July, 42; in August, 106, and in September, 76. Nor has the destruction of the lives of non-combatants ceased, for 84 lives were sacrificed on the 27 merchant ships thus destroyed. It is humiliating to reflect that it is unlikely that Mr. Wilson's chances of reflection will be appreciably lessened by his apparent acquiescence in a method of warfare which he and this government have repeatedly denounced. Those who seek to reflect him on the ground that "he has kept us out of war" will continue to rejoice that he has again preserved the peace, without stopping to consider the lasting injury to the fair fame of America, as well as to the reputation of Woodrow Wilson, of this policy of inaction.

The Contempt of Europe

The writer, having been recently returned from Europe, where he had exceptional opportunities to gauge the opinion of men of all classes, returned with the sad but unescapable conclusion that Mr. Wilson at the present hour has the most ignominious personality in the public life of any nation.

That his reelection should even be a possibility constitutes one of the most humiliating chapters of American history. The harm that Mr. Wilson has done to the prestige of America in the civilized world will not end as long as any man now living still survives. "Too proud to fight" is the most contemptible phrase now on men's lips in any part of the world.

PEARY SEES "WOFUL LACK" OF U. S. FLIERS

From Washington to Wilson, from the great Virginian, who said that there is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld if not absolutely but by the reputation of weakness, to the little Virginian, whose one consistent policy has been in being "too proud to fight," what a gulf!

If the great Virginian had revisited the glimpses of the moon, and with the knowledge of the last two years confronted his successor he would give him such a look as he gave Charles Lee on the battlefield of Monmouth.

Aerial Defence Weakest Branch of Service, Says Explorer

Weak in all branches of the service, but "most woefully lacking" in aerial development, is Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary's description of the present state of preparedness in this country. The explorer, who is chairman of the National Aerial Coast Patrol Commission, explained the military needs of the United States yesterday to a large audience in St. Louis.

Admiral Peary defined the three fundamentals of preparedness for immediate action as: First, a fleet of six and battle-cruisers capable of 33 knots and a lower rate of speed than eight 15-inch guns; second, an air service commensurate with our national importance and sufficient for our national protection; and, third, a system of universal military aviation similar to the Swiss or Australian systems.

MERCHANTS TO DISCUSS RAIL TERMINAL MOVE

The Merchants' Association will hold a meeting at 233 Broadway this afternoon to discuss the move made by the New Jersey State to transfer the terminal of the trunk railways to the west bank of the Hudson and to consider the proper means for opposing such action. Members of the association and persons connected with other commercial organizations have been invited to attend.

WIDOW AND BABIES IN WANT

A man thirty-six years old had just begun to make a comfortable living working on a window cleaning route for which he was paid \$240, borrowed from his relatives, who had given up all their savings to put him on his feet. By September he had repaid \$50 to his wife, but he was unable to insure his day's work, fell from an awning and his widow and three babies are left destitute, her friends unable to assist her until such time as she receives compensation if the suit goes in her favor.

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Merchant ships upon the high seas, belonging to a belligerent power...

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this

Nothing could be plainer than this warning, nothing more clear than this