New York Tribune

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

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1920.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; R. E. Maxfield, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including Postage, IN THE UNITED STATES.

East of Mississippi River: By Mail, Postpaid.	One Year.	Six Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
One week, 35c.			
Daily only	10.00	5.00	.85
One week, 30c.			
Sunday only	4.00	2.25	.40
Sunday only, Canada	6.00	3.25	.55
FOREIGN RATES			
Daily and Sunday	$26.00	$13.70	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	9.10	1.45
Sunday only	9.75	5.12	.86

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTY

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.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein also are reserved.

The Test

Before America's entry into the war one test infallibly showed who were real believers in the principle of a league to enforce peace; revealed those who thought in any genuine way it was our duty to protect civilization.

The test was a person's attitude toward the war and America's obligations thereto. Any one then holding that the war did not concern us and could not affect us could not be a peace leaguer. No circumstances could be imagined more strongly demanding abandonment of international isolation. Indifference to the issues of the war showed either pro-Germanism or indifference to the principles of a league to enforce peace.

Now comes another test—not as plain, perhaps, as the former call, but still definite. It is the case of Poland. Essaying a task beyond her strength, Poland sought to establish, according to the doctrine of national self-determination, a group of loosely federated and friendly Slavic states along Russia's border—the Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia and Poland.

For assisting the Ukrainian nationalists, under the heel of Bolshevist imperialists who would re-establish the frontiers of Czaristic Russia, Poland has been attacked in overwhelming force. Poles hear again the swish of the Russian knout.

What is this country doing? The peace of the world is obviously in peril. Western democracy is again threatened. The duel is once more on. Are we going to march against gigantic wrong or are we not?

If we are not, those who are satisfied with a policy of aloofness may say many things in self-justification, but not so those who boast of strict adherence to the principle of a league to enforce peace.

Many advertise intense interest in a league to enforce peace. But they hold to their lips a bugle they do not blow. They applaud the sermon, but do not apply its doctrines. We say by acts, always more significant than words, that eulogy of the league idea is merely rhetorical exercise. Neither from Washington nor from Dayton nor from Marion has come any summons for the nation to gird itself. The idealist has visualized this country as a knight errant, ready to spring to a rescue. But the knight now sleeps.

For a failure to make performance equal profession we are not blaming any one. But let us face the facts man-fashion and temper to some extent the fury of our protestations of undying, supreme allegiance to a noble principle we do not follow.

A World of Boys

Dispatches from London indicate that the calling of an international Boy Scout conference was a happy inspiration, and Sir Robert Baden-Powell is receiving congratulations on all sides for the splendid showing of his organization. London has extended an enthusiastic welcome to the young invaders, and, indeed, it must be a thrilling and exciting experience to entertain 100,000 Boy Scouts from over all the world.

Thirty different countries are represented, each with its own language and customs, and yet all united under one character-building banner. Manliness, self-respect and consideration for others are the goal of the true Scout, whatever his country. Kinship with the world must inevitably follow national patriotism growing out of such training. The hope of the leaders that this and future conferences of the youth of all nations will play a significant part in the peace of the world may not be unfounded.

In the mean time the youngsters gathered in and around London are showing one another how they work and play at home, affording themselves and the spectators much diversion thereby. The jamboree, as it is called, seems to deserve its name. Think of 5,000 boys in an arena at one time—the Babel of language and gesture and play!

Separately, the national groups are presenting their own distinctive life, strange, instructive and interesting, so that the young Scouts will carry home with them a fund of information.

American parents, as they read of the part this country's delegation is taking, will feel a new bond of interest with other parents the world over.

Governor Allen Wins

Nobody seems to have taken the opposition to Governor Allen in the Kansas primaries very seriously, and that opposition seems to have flivvered quite according to expectations. William Allen White's Henry has won the Republican nomination in a romp.

That is as it should be, and the moral for politicians and statesmen is clear. Courage — real, two-fisted courage to slam ahead and do what seems to be right for the public, any special class to the contrary notwithstanding—is the quality least used in political life. Yet it is unquestionably the surest road to popular approval. The hedger and trimmer and compromiser and middle-of-the-road man may win now and then in an off year when the competition is not keen. He will be beaten nine times out of ten by the man who takes a chance and speaks and does what he thinks is right.

The Kansas Industrial Court was devised by Governor Allen to meet a crying emergency. It has functioned successfully and well. Its constitutionality is still to be passed upon by the courts. Doubtless it is far from perfect. No pioneer statute ever is perfect. But in denying the right to strike to labor engaged in industries directly and immediately touching the lives and health and safety of the general public it states a fundamental truth that in some form or other is certain to become a basis of industrial relations in this country. Governor Allen deserves the highest credit for blazing this new trail, and it is good to know that the Republicans of Kansas appreciate him.

One Picture and Another

Seymour Steadman, the Chicago lawyer who is the speaking member of the political firm of Debs & Steadman, in his acceptance speech delivers the customary socialistic diatribe against capitalism. He sees its early collapse and establishment throughout the world of the institutions of Bolshevism. Capitalism is at its old tricks of making the masses miserable.

Belgium is capitalistic; Russia is not. Belgium was devastated by the war; Russia proper never saw a foreign soldier. Belgium is dependent on the outside for raw materials; Russia possesses every kind. Every advantage being with the socialistic state, how goes it in Belgium and Russia with respect to the average human happiness in each?

Charlotte Kellogg, wife of Mr. Hoover's assistant, describes Belgium's present condition in the August "Atlantic." From Ostend to Brussels is again the old unbroken garden of Flanders, the loveliest in the world. Every one is at work, digging, planting, harvesting. The red-tiled cottages shine like jewels on the plotted plain, with its emerald patches of grain, of potatoes, of hop vines and its riot of blooming bulbs. Belgium in a century has not come so near to feeding herself.

But Belgium, as every one knows, is the most highly industrialized area in the world—40 per cent of her population being engaged in industrial pursuits, against 22½ per cent in Germany and 23½ per cent in France before the war. To-day Belgium's coal production is 103 per cent of what it was in pre-war days. Her railroads have more employees than six years ago. The Germans wrecked the great metal plants, carrying off the machinery. Yet they are again operating—have attained to 50 per cent of normal, and new records are promised as soon as coke comes in freely from Germany and ore from Lorraine. The smaller factories in many cases are working to full capacity. Belgian industry as a whole is employing about 80 per cent of its pre-war personnel. Belgium, next to Serbia the most devastated of the combatant nations, but the least infected with the Bolshevist spirit, went to work under the capitalistic system, and promises of all nations to make the speediest recovery.

Turn to facts concerning Russia given by John Alleyne Gade, commissioner of the United States to the Baltic States. "Never," he says in his article, "Bolshevism From the Inside," "has starvation or malnutrition taken place on so large a scale—no, not even in Indian famines." In Moscow 370,000 get one small meal a day at soup kitchens. According to official figures Russia now has but 2,700 sound locomotives, and of these 200 are discarded every month. Lomonosoff, Lenine's railway expert, said a short time ago in a speech at Petrograd that soon railroad transport would be 80 per cent below the level that prevailed before Bolshevism blessed the land.

But two trains a month come from Turkestan, and hence there is no cotton; only 5 per cent of the textile plants operate. With only enough engines and cars to carry the Red army and its supplies, grain rots in warehouses, and there is no fuel except local wood. In the Petrograd region the peasants, first allowed four horses, were reduced to two, and now may have only one—not enough for tillage.

The peasants have food, but will not accept worthless money, the only thing the cities have to offer. So a horse costs 250,000 rubles in Petrograd and a cow half as much. Bread is 240 rubles a pound, beef 450 rubles and eggs 100 rubles apiece. To live in Petrograd, 100,000 rubles a month are needed, while the maximum wages are 3,000 to 5,000 a month.

What Russia really thinks is shown by the fact that the old Czar's rubles have ten times more value than Lenine's rubles. It is also shown by the fact that although private property in the cities is abolished, houses and lots daily sell. The buyers believe private ownership will be restored and that the old titles will revive. Three-fourths of the factories of Russia have been "nationalized," and they produce about 30 per cent or what they did.

Labor unions have been suppressed, hours of labor increased, the Saturday half-holiday abolished, and men are driven to work by bayonets. Defending the new slavery, Trotzky says: "The leading classes of labor have the right to force upon the other undeveloped portions of the labor masses the laws of labor duty." When political freedom was slain in Russia every other kind of freedom quickly went to companion graves.

Does Steadman know the facts as to Belgium and Russia? He does. Do other Socialists? They do. Yet they mechanically keep up their old clatter and refuse to recognize that the waging of a class war involves all in misery—that the only way to promote material welfare is for the partners in production to coöperate, each respecting the function of the other.

Our Miscast Mayor

It's a small matter for His Honor the Mayor to be overruled by a justice of the Supreme Court, and we do not imagine Mr. Hylan will be supremely downcast by Justice Fawcett's injunction restoring the reporter of "The Standard Union" to his seat at the sessions of the Board of Estimate. His Honor is used to bumping his nose against fate. He can always smile happily, no matter how hard the collision.

What occurs to us is that there has been a mistake in estimating the qualities and aptitudes of Mr. Hylan. Enthusiastic critics have tossed their caps in the air and boasted without reservation that His Honor was the worst Mayor in the world. We cannot agree with this estimate. We think Mr. Hylan is an excellent Mayor—only, not for New York. Not, indeed, for any city run upon these new-fangled principles involving a charter and courts and public rights and corporations and all such novel contraptions.

But Mr. Hylan would make an excellent Mayor for some nice little island that belonged to nobody and that he could rule just as his ebullient heart dictated. Or, better yet, let him be created king of some amiable village, as was the famous King of Yvetot. In such a spot he could order all the busses he yearned for—drive them himself if inclination moved. Before his scepter such menials as reporters would shudder and cringe. (They could be beheaded in serious cases, though we are sure that His Majesty's kindly heart would stop short of such drastic measures.) Courts could look at the king, but they could not enjoin him. No silly charter would fetter his roving will. Fleets of yachts and flivvers flying the royal banner would report every morning for instructions.

His Honor is simply miscast in this view, and the only task that remains is to find a suitable island or an Yvetot. The city could afford to invest a handsome sum in hiring such a substitute. We hope that the carping critics will abandon their unfounded fault-finding and assist in promoting Mr. Hylan to just the right little kingship that he would fill so blandly and regally.

Let Cox Speak Out

We gladly commend to our readers the interesting letter of Mr. Hellman on the league, which we print in another column. The criticism of his position with respect to the two candidates seems to us plain.

Does not Mr. Hellman sign in favor of Governor Cox a blank check that he is unwilling to sign in favor of Senator Harding? The two candidates do not seem judged by a common standard. Governor Cox is tolerantly allowed to leave to the future a revelation of his exact policy, while Senator Harding is suspected because he asks a similar privilege. If Governor Cox may defer a statement of his precise course, why may not Senator Harding do the same?

Senator Harding has voted twice for league entry with the Lodge reservations. Would Governor Cox, breaking with the President, have voted in the Senate for ratification on this basis? No one certainly knows. The Governor stands on the San Francisco platform, one part of which indorses the President's attitude. This implies, of course, that the Governor would rather not have this country join the league than have it go into it subject to the Lodge reservations. On the record, therefore, Senator Harding seems more clearly a peace leaguer than his opponent. We are not in the league now because of the refusal of the President and a majority of his party to permit entry in the only practicable way that offered. The presumption is that we shall continue outside if Governor Cox is elected.

It is necessary for Governor Cox to repudiate the flat acceptance insistence on which prevented ratification. Here is the obstacle which must be removed before anything else can be done. But he labors not to this end. He seeks an election without saying whether he is with the President for flat ratification or nothing, or whether he stands with Senator Underwood, who voted to ratify.

The issue is not between a league and no league, but between flat ratification and qualified ratification—or perhaps the drawing of a new covenant according as future events give instruction. In our judgment those who stand out for flat ratification are in fact opposing, although they may not so intend, this country's entry into any league at all.

What the Senate, which is a continuing body, ought to do if the country elects Governor Cox may be clear to Mr. Hellman, but as a practical man he must judge of the possibilities of getting sixty-four Senators to vote for flat ratification or its equivalent. Mr. Taft is persuaded that it can't be done. Senators are representatives, but also have personal views. Moreover, they are elected by states, and not by the nation at large. There is little chance that two-thirds of the states will instruct their Senators to vote for flat ratification or its equivalent, and Senators voting against flat ratification will say they are acting in accord with the instructions of *their* constituents.

The Average Voter

Tired to Death of Democratic Rule and Wants Peace

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have just returned from a month's visit in one of the so-called most prosperous cities in northern Ohio—also the dirtiest—and while there I took particular pains to get an insight into the political feelings of the "average voter." I found him not at all interested in the Wilson League of Nations, or any other, for that matter; indeed, Mr. White, Mr. Cox's manager, was quite right in his remark.

What the average voter is most interested in is reducing the high cost of everything and bringing about peace here at home, with the emphasis on Home. Peace between capital and labor, between the buyer and the seller, between landlord and tenant—putting our own house in order, in other words. This league talk is simply kept alive by a few Wilson papers, notably "The New York Times," "The New York World" and "The Evening Post."

The following extract from a letter I have just received from a relative of mine who has a large ranch in Montana may be of interest as showing how the farmers feel:

"We have no more trouble than most farmers—poor crops and being made the scapegoat for the whole country. The laboring man is the worst profiteer, then the storekeeper, then the middleman, then the banker, and last, but not least, the grain speculators; and if the government had done half as much for the wheat farmer as it has for the cotton farmer he would feel more kindly toward Wilson. If the farmers have their way, Cox will get left. We are paying $6 a day to get men to help us. If labor does not pay some time I'll miss my guess. They bleed one to death. They have no mercy—don't know what it means. They grab, grab, grab, and keep hollering for more, more, more."

Incidentally, Mr. Gompers might think this over. Everywhere in my talk there was bitterness against the Wilson administration.

I also might add that the writer of that letter voted twice for Wilson, but "never again." The West is tired to death of the Democratic administration and its utter inability to do anything. F. E. ROGERS.

New York, Aug. 3, 1920.

"All Het Up"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: You good folks over in New York appear to be "all het up" about Jimmie Wadsworth. Well, to a looker-on across the line it would seem as though the primary were to have a pretty fair test. Last election close to a million people voted for Whitman. What right have any of them to protest if they will not take the trouble to cast a vote on Primary Day? Yet I will venture the prediction that the total vote in the Republican primaries will not exceed 50 per cent of the vote cast for Whitman. And the loudest squeals of dissatisfaction will come from those who will be "altogether too busy to vote" then. And this will be true whether the Hon. James W. Wadsworth or another is the nominee. W. G. N.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 3, 1920.

A Grammatical Plebiscite

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have always been under the belief that grammar was a consequence of language, not a cause. Also, I have known that living languages vary with time.

The chief justification for the teaching of grammar is to obtain the greatest uniformity of speech and writing, and as a consequence the greatest ease in the expression of thought.

The proper way to settle the "It is I" or "It is me" controversy is to let the illustrious students of English take a census and find out whether a majority of the people say "It is me." If they do, then the language has evolved, and it is up to the grammarians to change their grammar. C. W. K.

North Asbury Park, N. J., Aug. 3, 1920.

The Next Yacht Race

Practical Suggestions Which Would Produce Seaworthy Craft

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have noticed from your recent editorials regarding the cup races that you would welcome suggestions as to an improvement in future races.

If it is desired that future races be sailed, boat for boat (without time allowance), by strongly built, seaworthy craft this can be quite simply accomplished.

First of all it would be wrong, in my opinion, to change our present rule, for the reason that this rule develops very seaworthy shaped racing boats. For instance, it is hard to imagine a more seaworthy formed hull than that of the Resolute.

If there is any weakness it is not on account of her shape, but on account of the lightness with which she was built in order to attain her extreme speed.

Any possible weakness in future boats could be overcome by having scantling restrictions agreed upon in the conditions. If both boats were built to these restrictions it would mean that we would have seaworthy craft, able to continue sailing for many years after the races, instead of being broken up once their America's Cup experience was over.

If both boats would agree not to build over a stated rating measurement they could be constructed under our present rule and race practically boat for boat.

Risking repetition, I sum up the suggestions as follows:

1. Adopt scantling restrictions, which would insure strongly built craft.
2. Build to a given rating under our present rule, which would insure boat-for-boat racing.
3. The universal rule, developing a fine type of race boat, would not need to be altered. HARVEY J. FLINT.

Providence, R. I., Aug. 3, 1920.

"Runaways"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial of Monday, "Running Away," referring to the doctor who died a dishwasher, was admirable except for its ultimate intimation that a weakened mind explained the case. "Runaways," however, might be a polite as well as an expressive term to apply to such folk.

The instance in point came to public notice, but how many other remain unknown? During a long experience in the Bowery—when it was the Bowery—I met there, besides many expert tradesmen, a great number of professional men whose records were beyond question. There were an electrician whose patents are in universal use, to another's immense profit; an artist whose drawings were once familiar in many periodicals; an actor who starred successfully for years in his own play; the inventor of the original harvesting machine—all these and sundry more.

To account for the presence of these men in such an environment was not easy, since explanations were seldom asked or offered. Family troubles, nagging at home and the like, were to blame in nine out of ten cases, and business difficulties in the rest.

Dr. John J. Hallimond, superintendent of the Bowery Mission, which has salvaged many hundreds of these social renegades, should be in position to give some highly interesting facts upon this score, and it would appear that his view of the matter should be very profitable to every one.

JERSEY.

Paterson, N. J., Aug. 3, 1920.

Truth About the Market

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A fair-minded reader of so-called stock market comment has seldom reason to say anything good concerning it—I mean the history of the day's market as it is published the morning after.

I haven't looked at the stuff your market reporter writes for some time until to-day; at other times very intermittently.

If all of it is of an average as fair, intelligent, unshackled by the business office advertising viewpoint, then your readers are enjoying a more truthful account of the market, without any bias, save one for fact based upon truth, than can be read elsewhere in New York—such a contrast to (La) Fontaine's Fables!

This is not written for the titillation of reading it in print. APPROVAL.

New York, Aug. 3, 1920.

The Thanks of a Reader

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Allow me to express to you my admiration for the very able editorial matter you have been giving to the public.

Pithy, timely, courageous, and, when needed, exceedingly independent. You face the dangers attending the Republican party, and they are serious dangers, with a wisdom that is very heartening to onlookers like myself, who saw the inevitable disasters Mr. Wilson's fatuous egoism was bringing on the world. (I knew him at Princeton, and that was enough.) It was not always so with The Tribune. You will pardon my saying it, but to-day better work there is not done in the press, and I read it largely. Thank you specially for to-day's issue, July 29. W. S. RAINSFORD.

Ridgefield, Conn., July 29, 1920.

An Easy Riddance

(From The Pittsburgh Gazette-Times)

Why don't all the cranks turn to Niagara Falls for an outlet for their irrepressible desire of the bizarre and spectacular? We feel sure that an appeal for funds to provide barrels would meet with a hearty response from all parts of the country. It is not unlikely that plenty of subscribers could be found ready to pay the railroad fares of cranks who could be induced to go to Niagara to try their luck with the falls.

Useless Comments

(From The San Francisco Bulletin)

The third party now looks like the fifth wheel.

BOLSHEVISM THE GREAT EXPONENT OF IDEALISM

Copyright, 1920, New York Tribune Inc.

Let Harding Speak Out

A Republican Reader Urges Him to Give Definite Assurances With Respect to Present League

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: On turning to the fourth page of to-day's issue of The Tribune I experienced a sensation of sheer delight on reading the headlines, "William Howard Taft Discusses Voters' Duty on League." Here, it seemed, was an end to difficult misgivings on the part of one who has always been a Republican in national elections and who for the first time has found himself hesitant. My admiration for Mr. Taft's broad-gauge wisdom and high-visioned patriotism led me to begin his article with the conviction that all mental doubts would be stilled, and it is because the analysis of his remarks had no such happy consummation that I am now, not without reluctance, venturing on argument.

The crux of Mr. Taft's reasoning is that, even if Mr. Cox is elected, there will be at least thirty-three Republican Senatorial votes (a number sufficing) to defeat ratification of the league without the Lodge reservations, this assumption being based on the fact that thirty-three Republicans have already twice voted in this manner. But does not Mr. Taft lose sight of the fact that these previous votes were taken at times when the Senate could not with positive assurance gauge the temper of the American nation with regard to the league? If Mr. Cox is elected under the present conditions, when the mistakes of the Democratic administration, the alienating intellectual egoism of an otherwise often admirable President, the widespread belief that Republican cabinets are more efficient and harmonious than Democratic cabinets, and, above all, the inherent desire for a change of administration, after a period of economic and social difficulties, are factors strongly in favor of Mr. Harding's election, the victory of his opponent will be due to, and will have to be construed as, an overwhelming expression on the part of the American public that it will brook no shillyshallying with our entrance into the League of Nations. It is hardly conceivable that with the national will so drastically announced any considerable number of Republican Senators will flout their own people. They would be facing, if I may use a paradoxical term, moral lynching, and as a Senator represents his state and not alone his party voters all those who belonged to states that had returned Republican Presidential electors would, in the ultimate analysis, be disloyal to their people.

The Case for Cox

Democratic willingness to accept some verbal qualifications as regards Article X makes possible Mr. Cox's support by those of his fellow citizens who favor the league, but who yet are averse to the relinquishing of any rights and duties inherent in our Constitution. His absolute acceptance of Mr. Lodge's amendment is not necessary, and changes of wording are always a very simple matter. He is, therefore, it would seem, not pledged to a policy that need alienate even such a vote as Mr. Taft's, and it may be assumed that he will not evince the inexorable obstinacy of Mr. Wilson. If the American people are in favor of our entrance, not into some nebulous league of the future, but into a league wherein the greater number of the nations of the world are already associated, the chances of his election are food for the most serious thought by every one who has more faith in the Republican than in the Democratic party. And when we come down to the gist of the matter, this question of the league is one of an attitude toward the racial life. If, conscious of the selfishness permeating ourselves and others, of the prejudices and enmities among nations, of the immediate commercial benefit of egocentric individual and national action, we shrug our mental shoulders at such phrases as "the brotherhood of man" and "the progress of mankind," why, that is one way of looking at the scheme of things.

Taking a Chance

If, however, for the sake of a great object, we are willing to take a great chance, contributing at least our courage toward a plan of world betterment that has already passed from the realm of dream into the first plane of accomplishment, it is because the American people share in the higher hope. It is thus a dangerous time for a Presidential candidate to leave doubts in the minds of the voters as regards what is implied in his addresses; and that Mr. Harding has left such doubts every one knows who has discussed his speech of acceptance with other men, some of whom are certain that he is opposed to the league, while others maintain that his was a clever political speech, offending no branch of his party and allowing him freedom of action in case of his election. Some of us will, with a feeling of lassitude, vote for him on the basis of this latter assumption, and because of our oldtime faith in the Republican party; but if, accepting the assurance that there are such doubts, he will yet come forward and state categorically that, if elected, he and his Cabinet will use their endeavors to devising means by which America may, with all Constitutional safeguards, enter the league already existing and functioning, he will be adopting a course of courage and plain dealing congenial to the American public, and he may be removing the all too imminent possibility of a sweep of Democratic votes, carrying Mr. Cox into office on an avalanche of impatient national fearlessness.

Let it not be forgotten that the women are, for the first time, to vote in large numbers. I have spoken to various women, all of them wives of Republicans, and in every instance they have, on account of the question of the league, expressed their opposition to Mr. Harding. We men who have, during the past four years, contributed, whether in personal service or in money, are perhaps a little weary of international philanthropy; but there is little evidence of such reaction among women. Though they, too, have contributed to the achievement of victory, their efforts and their hopes are still directed, more untiringly than ours, toward the vision of world peace. Between now and election time it is more than likely that the majority of us, both men and women, will turn toward a candidate who makes his essential position wholly clear on the greatest issue regarding human progress that the American people have ever had the opportunity of passing upon at a national election. With all our faults, it remains true that courage, generosity and optimism are our foremost virtues, as a people, and they bid fair to assert themselves in stupendous fashion, sweeping aside all partisan and political considerations.

Even at the risk of temporary party disturbance, there are, I think, hundreds of thousands of Republicans who hope, as I do, that Mr. Harding will see his way to not playing the game too safe, never a very stirring procedure. If he merely holds out the definite hope that in his administration the country may yet join the present league, whose problems our allies in arms are now seeking to solve without that aid which they might long ago well have expected from us, he will surely leave the majority of his fellow citizens in the confident expectation that this aim will be obtained.

GEORGE S. HELLMAN.

New York, Aug. 2, 1920.

Eliminating the Jobber

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: An answer to the letter of July 30 by Mr. Macfarlane appearing in your columns, headed "What the Jobber Does."

The article in question covers some of the good points of the jobber's office in good style. Does this justify the conclusion which Mr. Macfarlane would have us draw, that the jobber is therefore essential? The same argument could have been advanced for horse cars—they had certain excellent features, yet every one admits that a better system of transportation is now in vogue. What Mr. Macfarlane forgets is that a few good features in a system do not justify it nor prove that there are not better systems. A man who makes a fortune by illegal means and then makes a small gift to some church is looked upon by its members as a saint. The case of the jobber is a parallel one—we should not draw the unjustifiable conclusion that he is essential in the business and his methods are above reproach just because of a few points in his favor.

The fact remains that before the epoch of the jobber we did not miss him, and that lower prices prevailed and we had plenty to eat, although perhaps the jobber has tactfully educated our tastes to demand more. But where the jobber has been trampled under foot by the installation of city markets, as in New York, Chicago, Cleveland and Boston, we find lower prices emerging, and better food as well. Naturally the jobber loses his commission, and still more naturally he spreads the "propaganda" that he is necessary, but his injured dignity is not drawing as much sympathy as formerly, and we find that the planets still keep in their respective positions and travel on serenely without him.

DEXTER H. MEAD.

Waterbury, Conn., Aug. 3, 1920.

An Expert Candidate

(From The San Francisco Chronicle)

Henry Ford is satisfactory to the Forty-eighters because he knows all about flivvers.