

# New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements—Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28, 1918

Published daily by the Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Office: 410 N. York St., New York City. Telephone: 2-1234.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, including Postage in the United States, Outside of Greater New York, \$10.00 per Annum in Advance.

Third to Eighty Zone Inclusive—More than 100 Miles from New York City. Daily only \$3.00, Sunday only \$1.00.

Canadian Rates: Daily and Sunday \$1.50, Sunday only \$0.50.

Foreign Rates: Daily and Sunday \$4.00, Sunday only \$1.50.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1879.

Guarantee: The Tribune with absolute safety for its circulation in the event of any fire or other disaster.

Member of the Associated Press: The Associated Press is authorized to use the Tribune's news for its own publication.

## The Brest-Litovsk Infamy

The statement of the Entente governments defining the purposes of their intervention in Northern Russia contains a historical conclusion of great importance. It says categorically that the Brest-Litovsk treaty was "traitorously signed by the Bolsheviks."

Exactly what does this mean? It means that one theory of Lenin's and Trotsky's motives must be abandoned—the theory that they were honest men, willing to sacrifice the Russia of the past if only they could retain a little corner of territory in which they could set up their proletarian absolutism.

In this country credence was too long given to the notion that Lenin and Trotsky were simply crack-brained Utopians. Our own government hesitated to treat with them except as the more or less legitimate heirs of the Russian revolution, although they never had a mandate from the Russian people and had ruthlessly strangled the Constituent Assembly, the only body having such a mandate. We spoke softly of the Bolsheviks—and to them. We seemed to have no true idea of what they were doing when they betrayed Russia and Slavdom.

The Entente Powers now say that Lenin and Trotsky were not self-declared fanatics. When they ratified the Brest-Litovsk treaty they were not acting for Russia, or even for the proletarian Soviet government. They were German agents, masquerading as Bolshevik dictators, doing their employer a service which had already been sold and paid for.

It is no secret that the United States government has been for some time in possession of documents which show the sinister relation existing between Trotsky and Lenin and the custodians of Germany's foreign corruption fund. Such a fund has long existed. Dr. Mühlner refers to it frequently in his book and also to the lavish efforts of the German Foreign Office to buy up foreign newspapers and politicians.

Lenine was sent home to Russia under a German safe conduct. He was supplied from mysterious sources with funds with which to conduct his agitation against the Kerensky government. It seems clear that the Entente governments have copies of the same documents which the United States recently secured in Russia. When they say, therefore, that the Brest-Litovsk treaty was "traitorously" signed, they mean that it was signed for a price by German tools, who, having earned their blood money, have now fled Moscow and sought refuge with their protectors and accomplices.

It is well that the infamous character of the Brest-Litovsk treaty should be thus officially proclaimed. It was a compact criminally made. It possesses no sanctions binding on Russia or on the parts of Russia severed from the former empire. The Allied nations cannot respect it.

## The End of a Word Strife

The controversy over the "work or fight" amendment to the new conscription act was a tempest of phrases. Mr. Gompers and Mr. Morrison got excited over certain extraneous implications which they read into the language adopted by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. Mr. Morrison even spoke of the Thomas amendment as a "deceptive method of conscripting labor."

The "work or fight" rule conscripts nobody. It can apply only to men who have already been conscripted. It merely regulates the assignment of conscripted men to the deferred classes. It provides that if draft registrants obtain deferred classification because they are employed in essential industries they shall lose that classification when they cease to be so employed.

There is no discrimination in this against any class of labor. It has been said that the Thomas amendment is virtually "anti-strike" legislation. But, as Secretary Baker subtly pointed out, it is not that sort of legislation unless it is used that way. Senator Cummins has now undertaken to remove all uncertainty by offering a substitute for the Thomas amendment, which provides that men in essential employments who strike for higher wages or better conditions of labor shall not lose their deferred classification if they return at once to work.

pending a submission of their grievances to the War Labor Board.

We take it that Mr. Gompers and Mr. Morrison do not want to see the right to strike exercised in war time under any other conditions than those. They therefore cannot object to Mr. Cummins's "work or fight" formula. Nobody else will object to it. What the government rightly aims at is securing the continuous service of drafted men, either under arms or in essential employments.

That is all the "work or fight" question amounts to. The Cummins substitute, which the Senate adopted yesterday, is commendable, because it clears up a misundersanding on the part of labor leaders and leaves no basis whatever for complaints that labor's normal rights are being infringed on or interfered with.

## Still the Victorious Tank!

Correspondents at the front continue to chronicle the remarkable exploits of the tanks. German prisoners taken all testify to the terror inspired by this new weapon of warfare. Apparently its range is wide, for Perry Robinson says in *The World* it has taken part in the battle on something like twenty-three miles of front. This is after the Germans officially announced, a few days ago, that the British army tanks "had been smashed to bits."

Whereas, on their first introduction, when only very slow going tanks were used, the casualties were high, Mr. Robinson reports that in eight tanks which were stopped by German field guns in an attack on Le Quesnel the only casualty of the personnel was one man wounded. Nor was there greater fatality to the tanks themselves. Even when a tank has been apparently knocked out or crippled, it may be very far from done for; and all the machines in the attack on Le Quesnel are either fighting again or will be soon.

Mr. Joseph W. Grigg likewise cables to *The World* that German officers among the captured tell of the fear inspired in the men by the tanks. Gomecourt was taken in the moonlight by tanks and less than a battalion of men.

Besides hating the tanks, it appears that the German officers profess to "think it ungentlemanly to employ a machine to which they cannot surrender." The tanks, apparently, are not only crushing to dignity, but to the men themselves, since the smaller ones get over the field faster than the fleetest can run and men have literally been buried under the rapidly moving machines.

Apparently, underestimating the tremendous advantages of the tanks, the Germans have made one of the greatest blunders of the war. The military critic of the semi-official *Vossische Zeitung* declared only a few days ago that "the Western front has been made impregnable by machine guns," but, as the cables have borne abundant witness, the tanks have mowed down the machine guns even as the machine guns mowed down men. But will Germany be long in trying to correct her great tactical mistake?

Her man power waning, will she not go in for tanks on a large scale? Let us assume that she will and resolve ourselves to build an unlimited number. It is such a job as we can handle.

## The Holy Rage of the Expert Draftsman

We extend our sympathies to any patriotic American who has given his valuable time to an endeavor to penetrate the wild and bewildering maze which surrounds the aeroplane situation. Such a one will owe some thanks to Mr. Frederick Upham Adams, a mechanical engineer of standing, who has investigated these questions first-hand for *The Times*. In an article in that paper Mr. Adams possibly sheds a larger ray of light on this inexplicable tangle than perhaps any other "expert" to date.

Mr. Adams writes on "the mania for tinkering" and by way of preface cites the case of the famous French "75" field gun when it was brought to this country for reproduction in quantity. The samples fell into the hands of a corps of draftsmen and "presumed artillery experts in Washington." And six months were lost. At the end of this time the original gun was put into production.

"The pernicious activities of these corps of official draftsmen and experimental experts have spelled calamity in nearly every field of war material production. Up to the present date the draftsman's pen has proved more powerful and deadly than the German sword in staying our progress in this war."

Mr. Adams tells in detail just how it works out. "I am," he says, "a draftsman and a sort of rule of thumb mechanical expert, and on this familiar with all of the nesting instincts of this sort. The supreme joy of a draftsman comes to him when he is given a chance to pull to pieces a device designed by another; to dissect it; pick flaws in it; redesign it mentally; trace the new plans on paper; watch over the production of the new parts; test out their working; locate faults in your own design; make new drawings and parts with which to correct these faults, and then, perhaps, abandon the whole project with the silent admission that the original design was good enough."

"This is a delightful though expensive occupation in times of peace, and good may come from it after the endless expenditure of time and money, but it is not the method to be pursued in the preparation of war accessories in a period when the war is actually in progress."

And this is the sort of thing which really seems to have been at the bottom of the humiliating and all but disastrous delay in our airplane programme. There seems to have been an utter and hopeless division of authority. There was first of all, but by no means with primary authority, or much of any authority, the

Aircraft Production Board, which has had to bear the brunt of the censure.

This board was, as it were, chiefly advisory to the Signal Corps, of which General Squier was the head. Attached thereto, but with seemingly almost coordinate authority, was the Board of Aircraft and Navy technical experts. And under them was the long line of militant, aggressive, and, in the face of every difficulty, dauntless corps of expert draftsmen. If there was anything left undone to complete the confusion and delay, the experts did it. The total record of separate changes in the Liberty motor alone, to about July 1, appears to have been two thousand, and at the date of taking the committee's testimony they still appear to have been Johnny Walker-ing with undiminished joy.

We do not suppose it will ever be established just whose was the clear responsibility for all this calamitous situation. But it is not irrelevant to point out that the true state of affairs began to be clearly known to many observers last winter and that a strong clamor then arose for an aircraft ministry, with complete and undivided authority; and that the situation is not materially changed to date. We still have a complete division of authority, divided responsibility, and one of the three arms of this tripartite arrangement, that of General Pershing and his aids, is on the other side of the seas.

## Reighting the Somme

Rarely, if ever, has a general had a chance to try again on a battlefield identical in front and extent and under conditions closely resembling that of his first trial. Marborough once manoeuvred over what was a century later to be the field of Waterloo, but no battle was there joined. In the middle of last week, however, Haig looked eastward on approximately the same defences which had barred his way when he opened his First Battle of the Somme on July 1, 1916. From Arras to the Somme, save in a little corner about Gomecourt and another narrow area before Albert, the lines were the same.

But consider the difference now. In November, 1916, the Germans still clung to a corner of the Thiepval Ridge and to the famous Schwaben redoubt, while the British advance up the Bapaume road from Albert had not much passed Le Sars. Half a million casualties and five months of desperate and sustained fighting had not carried Rawlinson's army to the outskirts of Bapaume, and only in November did Beaumont-Hamel fall. Miramont was untaken and remained untaken until the German retreat in March, 1917.

But now, six days after Byng struck, Bapaume is reached, the Germans have surrendered Thiepval, with all three of its redoubts; Monquet Farm, Martinpach, Longueval, High Wood, Montauban, all the positions famous in the deadliest phase of the First Somme, are in British hands, and the evacuation of the whole of the old Somme battlefield is going forward rapidly and under a pressure which is manifestly disorganizing the German forces. Every day's official report narrates the capture of half a dozen positions, each of which was the scene of weeks of effort in 1916; Contalmaison, Mametz and its woods, all these have fallen, briefly.

We shall do well to recognize the change in Haig's strategy, because it is memorable, in view of the older struggle. In 1916 he struck east from Gomecourt to Fricourt and north from Fricourt to Maricourt, seeking to force the Germans out of all the long line of heights and fortified positions from Serre right down to the Somme and curving about the Thiepval or Albert Ridge, known in all reports as "The Ridge." In that battle and in the latter campaign Haig sought to turn the Germans out of the ridge positions by a flanking movement from the south, after his first thrust had been checked everywhere save between Fricourt and Maricourt.

But in 1918 he has worked at the other end of the line; he has struck toward Bapaume from north and west of the Ancre and his progress of four days has accomplished more than his fighting of five months achieved in 1916. Nor can we now dismiss the German resistance as a detail in a carefully prepared retreat. The German intended to hold Byng, for a period of time at least, exactly where Byng defeated him and drove him east.

Moreover, after the First Somme, Haig is now re-fighting the Battle of Arras. At Croisilles and northward on both sides of the Scarpe River the British are already before the old Hindenburg line; at Bapaume they are across the east line on which the Germans stood before they made the Hindenburg retreat of 1917. All the old names are turning up again, but where they stayed in the news for months they are being left behind in days, and even in hours.

## Our Huge Peace Tonnage

Secretary Daniels the other night and Chairman Hurley of the Shipping Board a short time ago drew attention to the tremendous rôle which our new shipping tonnage will play in the world's commerce when the present struggle in Europe is ended. Secretary Daniels says that we will never stop until we have enough ships to ply between this and every other port of America. The present prospects are that we shall have all these and many to spare.

In fact, the prospect is now becoming so clear that foreign ship merchants, and especially those of England, are extremely apprehensive as to what will happen. In a recent statement Sir Alfred Booth, of the Cunard company, said present values were so inflated that at the first breath of international competition "the whole monstrous edifice would collapse." It is pointed out that

the Norwegian and Japanese ship owners at present are able to charter their steamers at \$4 a ton dead weight a month. Ten years ago this was very near to the actual selling price of an ordinary commercial steamer. Quotations in 1908 fell to \$24 per ton. Of late they have been as high as \$250 and \$300.

It is not easy to realize the magnitude of our present shipping programme. If Mr. Hurley's prediction for next year could be realized, 13,500,000 deadweight tons, this would very nearly equal the total destruction caused by the submarine to date. And this in turn is equal to something like one-half the available ocean-going tonnage of the Atlantic before the submarine began its deadly work. Predictions are freely offered that this country will not stop short of a merchant marine of 25,000,000 deadweight tons. This would be fully equal and probably superior in carrying capacity per annum to Great Britain's at its height. And meanwhile Britain itself, and Norway and other shipbuilding countries are pushing their own production as rapidly as possible.

What will the world do with such a vast fleet of ships when trade is re-established? Ship owners are highly pessimistic. Is this feeling justified? There is no question that the European war has been an enormous stimulus to industry in many lines. For example, iron and steel and coal production and much else in the United States have increased by 50 per cent or more. There has been much talk about the "reconstruction" of Europe after the war. But we already know that the actual destruction and wastage of the war in the economic sense have been relatively slight. The tremendous energies loosed by the present struggle are a different matter. These will not readily lose their impetus. We think it is fair to assume that the next generation will see an industrial development over the whole earth perhaps unparalleled even by the amazing booms which have been witnessed in the United States. If this is true, we shall probably need all the vast ship tonnage in sight.

## Discourtesy

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In your excellent editorial on "Courtesy" in to-day's issue of The Tribune you make mention of "Mr. McAdoo's hope to build up a uniform custom of courtesy." This much to be desired consummation (however necessary) should not be confined to the government officials alone, and here is an opportunity for work which I fervently beg of you to undertake; namely, by any and all means in your power to endeavor to establish a "standard of courtesy" also for the rude people who travel in the cars, not forgetting those who perambulate the streets, too, from the boys who throw missiles at passing vehicles to the grown-up men who sit crosswise and occupy more than their share of seats in the cars.

If you would point out to these rude people that it is not polite to push a lady aside and it is positively indecent to knock a baby on the head in their haste to secure a seat for themselves, you would be doing good service.

As to passing behind instead of in front of anybody, or stepping aside to allow some one else to pass, that is a form of good manners seldom met with in the streets, although it comes natural at home.

I could go on indefinitely with instances of the daily discourtesies to which we are subjected and which are accepted as matters of course by the majority of a patient and long-suffering public, but shall not encroach further on your valuable time.

DAVE GRUNDY.  
New York, Aug. 21, 1918.

## A Dangerous Enemy

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In a book called "Forty Years in Both Hemispheres," written in Germany about seventy years ago by Vincent Nolte, a German who had become an American citizen as well as a citizen of the world, find this characterization of the soldiers of France, England and the United States: "The Americans in war are peculiar. In Napoleon's day the French fought for the glory of the great nation; now, perhaps, they fight for the glory of our arms; the British fight for 'King and country'; but the Americans fight for the good of our country." After the peace an officer in this war (the War of 1812, in which Mr. Nolte fought at New Orleans), the Marquis of Tweeddale, who was taken prisoner on the Canadian frontier and brought to New York, said to me: "I hope it will never fall to my lot again to fight Americans; every one of them fights his own individual battle, and is a most dangerous enemy."

H. E. K.  
Blue Hill, Me., Aug. 17, 1918.

## A Boy's Song

His voice was soft,  
Like the wandering, honest eye  
Of a wild-wood deer;  
He sang with the gladness of  
Plum trees in bloom.  
He had not the voice of a man,  
Nor a woman—  
His voice was brown  
Like the breast of a meadow-lark;  
The spirit of a lighter world  
Tinted and fluted his song.  
His notes knew something of wind  
In soaring white clouds,  
And something of pale green light  
Which enatures the moon  
When she is shy.  
For the voice of a lad  
Is a passing dream,  
And on his waking  
Rises to the stars  
Whence it came.

MARK TURBYFILL.

## Editor Shouts Please Copy

(From The Louisville Courier-Journal.)  
If the American Army could get the atmosphere of the New York subway into steel tanks and shoot it at the Germans the war would be shortened appreciably.

## HARVESTING



From The Philadelphia Evening Public Ledger.

## Sinn Fein Gone Crazy

### That Is Pro-Germanism in Ireland

By Thomas F. Woodlock

THERE are three main elements in the Irish problem, a clear understanding of which is absolutely necessary to one who desires to interpret events. I shall confine myself to a description of these elements and their relations to each other. The reader may draw his own conclusions.

The first and most important element of the three is described by George W. Russell—"A. E."—in a letter to "The Manchester Guardian" of May 10, protesting against conscription in Ireland in the words which follow. No one knows Ireland—or the meaning of words—better than does "A. E."; the reader will therefore be good enough to ponder carefully what he says.

"British authority at all periods in Irish history, as to-day, rested solely on superior power. There was never a year in the seven centuries of that domination when the vast majority of the people were not opposed to it. When overcome in rebellion they waited sullenly, silently and steadfastly for the hour of doom falling upon this as upon all empires of history. They desired to manifest their genius in a civilization of their own. That feeling has been as deep, indeed, much deeper and more self-conscious since the Act of Union was passed, and today, partly through a recovery of the ancient culture, partly by the reaction against state policy, that self-consciousness of nationality is more vivid, more passionate and dominant than any period in Irish history."

This statement of the case applies to at least 80 per cent of the population of Ireland and to a majority of the population in twenty-eight of the thirty-two counties.

II.

The second important element is Ulster. There are nine counties in the province of Ulster, five of which are Nationalist by majority, the remaining four being predominantly Unionist. Between Unionist Ulster and Nationalist Ireland the religious, political and economic differences are fundamental. Unionist Ulstermen are aggressively Protestant, aggressively British and aggressively industrial, while Nationalist Ireland is Catholic and agricultural. The gulf between the Unionist and the Nationalist points of view is as great as that, let us say, between the points of view of the Prussian von Heydebrandt and of Cardinal Mercier. Unionist Ulster will not accept Home Rule for all Ireland upon any terms, no amount of constitutional guarantees for the protection of her rights will satisfy her. She demands continuance of British rule so far as she is concerned, in point of fact, Unionist Ulster is a British colony in Ireland and has no ties of relationship with the rest of the population. Politically she is in close alliance with the extreme wing of the Tory party in Britain; religiously she is allied to the vast majority of the British people, and economically she is part of the British industrial organization.

III.

The third important element in the problem is the blundering of British statesmen in their dealings with Ireland. I do not hold with those Irishmen who explain Britain's actions in Ireland by a theory of Satanic malice and Satanic intelligence. I have a much higher opinion of British intentions and a much lower opinion of British intelligence than they have. It is not in accord with common sense to explain Gladstone, Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith and Lloyd George in terms of the Elizabethan Cecil, Stratford and Oliver Cromwell. It is my belief that the "democracy" of Great Britain has in a vague way perceived that the Irish people possess all the qualifications of a nation, and as a result of that shadowy perception, wishes in an amiable but weak way to gratify Irish national aspirations. But the wish has been what theologians call a "velletty" rather than a determination; it is a desire for the end without a willingness to take the means necessary to that end. This is the secret of the alternations of futile "coercion" and equally futile "coddling" which sum up British policy in Ireland for a generation. And the secret of that secret is Unionist Protestant Ulster. Had Nationalist Ireland been Protestant Ireland and Unionist Ulster been Catholic Ulster, there would have been, I think, a Parliament in College Green these many years.

Continuous attempts to patch up what cannot be patched, to compromise what

cannot be compromised, to settle the matter in every way except in the only way that will settle it—that is the story of British government of Ireland in modern times. Nationalist Ireland has offered to let Unionist Ulster write into the Home Rule constitution whatever guarantees it wants in protection of its rights, but no guarantees will satisfy Unionist Ulster, and Protestant England, democracy or no democracy, is not yet ready to compel her into acceptance of Home Rule for all Ireland. Political Sinn Fein in Ireland is the creation of British policy, and of nothing else—especially of British policy since the outbreak of the war in August, 1914. Previously to that date it was little more than a faction. It bears about the same relation to the national movement in Ireland that the sincere, thoroughgoing Bolsheviks bear to the revolution in Russia. After the Lansdowne-Cecil "betrayal" following the Easter week rising in 1916 it was for a time the dominant section in Nationalist Ireland. The rise and fall of its influence have closely followed the "curve" of British blundering in Ireland. Let us take the conscription policy as an example of this blundering.

When the policy of conscription was first determined upon for Britain, Ireland was excluded from its application. Why? Clearly because the British "democracy's" conscience was functioning, and would not permit it to violate in so direct a manner and vital a matter the national rights of the Irish people. For two years the matter of Irish conscription lay seemingly dead. Last spring the Irish Convention made its reports. One of its sub-committees, composed, he it noted, of three Unionist and two Nationalist representatives, recommended that conscription should be applied to Ireland only with the consent of the Irish people. Hardly had the convention reported, however, when it was announced that the government would extend conscription to Ireland.

In the twinkling of an eyelid Ireland was on the verge of armed rebellion. That this rebellion did not actually take place, that the horrors of "Easter week" were not repeated many times enhanced, was due to one thing alone, viz., the action of the Catholic hierarchy. Had the bishops and their clergy not placed themselves at the head of their people, had they not taken into control and directed what was literally a frenzy of popular resentment into the channel of "passive resistance," the consequences would have been appalling. They did this seemingly to those who do not know the elements of the problem—most desperate, most "lawless" and most unaccountable thing, and did it under the banner of Sinn Fein. By doing it they gained the time necessary for the British "democracy's" conscience to reassess itself, and there was no bloodshed. And for their warrant in doing it they had the fundamental national rights of the Irish people as against the law of the British Parliament, and they had the conscience of the British "democracy" on their side.

Sinn Fein waxes as the British "democracy's" conscience wanes and waxes as that conscience waxes. "Pro-Germanism" is in Ireland merely Sinn Fein gone crazy. The Irish soul has nothing in common with the German soul; they represent opposite poles of thought. The main thing to note about Irish pro-Germanism is that it is a direct product of British blundering. It will disappear the moment the blundering stops.

I have no guesses to offer as to what will happen in Ireland in the future. After thirty-five years of observation of Anglo-Saxon relations I feel quite unable to predict what the course of the British government will be, or how many more blunders must be committed before the end finally comes. But the end, I believe, must be either an Ireland—all Ireland—governing herself as a free nation should, or Ireland—all Ireland—inhabited by another people than the Irish.

Meanwhile, I believe that I have correctly described the elements of the problem as it stands to-day, and that these elements furnish a means of interpretation of current events—including, and especially, Ireland's relations to the war.

## For Victory

(From The Philadelphia Inquirer.)  
How many men is Uncle Sam going to send to France? The answer is easy. It is: Enough!

**Iceland First**  
A New Nation and a Permanent Neutral

By John C. Holme

THE long standing dispute between Denmark and Iceland, which during the last four years has threatened at times to culminate in a secession on the part of Iceland, thus breaking a chip of the Scandinavian union of nations, is approaching apparently happy solution.

The joint commission of Danish and Icelandic statesmen which has been in session in Reykjavik, the capital of Iceland, this summer, has made public its recommendations for a new agreement between the two countries. This proposed convention will virtually make a dual monarchy of the two countries if it is adopted. As it seems to meet with general satisfaction in the press of both countries, and has the backing of the principal political parties, with the exception of the Conservative party in Denmark, there is every reason for believing that the convention will go through.

The principal provisions of the convention recommended by the joint commission follow:

Denmark is to recognize Iceland as an independent sovereign state.  
The King of Denmark is to be King of Iceland.

Denmark is to represent Iceland in foreign affairs, but to enter into no agreement with other countries in Iceland's behalf, except with the full consent and knowledge of the Icelandic government.

Iceland is to have the right to send its own representatives abroad to handle its own foreign affairs whenever exigencies arise which in the opinion of the Icelandic government make such a move advisable.

Denmark is to recognize the right of Iceland to fly its own flag over its vessels outside of territorial waters.

Denmark is to notify all the powers that no offensive or defensive military treaty exists between the two countries, so that no matter what fate may befall Denmark in this and future wars Iceland occupies a position of "permanent neutrality," under no obligations to become a party to Denmark's dispute with other nations, or to be considered a part of the Danish monarchy, or a co-belligerent in Denmark's wars.

Danish citizens in Iceland are to have equal rights with Icelandic citizens. Icelandic citizens in Denmark are to occupy a corresponding position.

Should any dispute arise under the terms of the new convention, Denmark and Iceland are to name two delegates each to settle the matter. Should they fail to come to agreement the King of Norway or the King of Sweden is to be asked to name a fifth member to make a decision.

This proposed convention is rather old in one respect. It merely legalizes a status between the two countries which Iceland has assumed during the last two or three years. In other words, little Iceland, a subject nation, has virtually said to its sovereign power: "I have been assuming certain rights of late not provided for our present agreement. Now let us change our agreement so as to make legal what I have been doing, what I demand as my right in the future." Thus far the Danish government has shown itself a model of broadmindedness and fairness in its attitude toward the Sagna Land.

The Althing, the parliament of Iceland was in session about the time the report of the joint commission was made public, and immediately ratified the proposed agreement. Constitutional provision requires that a second session of the Althing shall ratify it. The convention then has to be adopted by an Icelandic plebiscite. Its adoption by the Danish Riksdag, which will soon convene, will give full sanction to the measure so far as Denmark is concerned.

It is expected that by December 1 the whole affair will be settled, and that one more sovereign nation will have been added to the world.

## Group Feeding

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I have been interested in the letters and editorials which have been appearing in the various New York dailies on the subject of the inauguration of a school lunch system. For the last few years a private organization, known as the New York School Lunch Committee, has been supplying lunches at nominal cost in various New York schools. There are today some fifty-two schools with equipment to serve an adequate and proper lunch to the pupils. During the summer seven city schools have been operating. The noon-day meal has been one of the most important features of the work. Through these lunches and other experiments it has been proved that in groups children will eat more readily foods to which they have not been accustomed than otherwise. Peculiarities of taste and racial custom are readily overcome through the stimulation of group feeding, and the children learn to eat the new foods with a relish. In this way they develop habits for wholesome and nutritious foods. They take back into the home the taste for the new foods and stimulate the demand in the family for an improved home dietary.

School lunches should be a part of the work of the Board of Education. The educational advantages offered through a properly supervised school lunch system are almost limitless in their effects upon the health and high living standards of our nation. Industry has for some years recognized the desirability of keeping its employes in the best physical condition, so as to obtain the highest efficiency. In many industrial plants the lunchroom and cafeteria are formally established as a part of the machinery.

ERNEST BOHM.  
Secretary Central Federated Union.  
New York, Aug. 27, 1918.

## War Names in the News

- Bagneux..... ban-yuh
- Bazentin-le-Grand ba-zawn-tan-lub-gran
- Chavigny..... shaw-vee-yee
- Fronzy-le-Royee..... fron-wah-luh-royee
- Reugnatre..... reh-yah'tr
- Lillecourt..... lill-koort
- Cegny..... gah-vee
- Montauban..... mawn-to-ban
- Oise..... wass