The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 1904.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at No. 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan New York.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Readers of THE SUN leaving the city can have the Daily and Sunday editions mailed to their addresses (which may be changed when necessary) for 70 cents a month. Order through your newsdealer or THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

The Myth of the Millions.

According to a Washington despatch to the *Evening Post*, intimate friends of the Hon. HENRY GASSAWAY DAVIS regard as "most ridiculous" the report that he will contribute a million dollars to the Democratic campaign fund. Any sensible person regards such a report as most ridiculous.

Mr. DAVIS has accumulated a fortune by his industry and intelligence. He is not the kind of man to separate himself from a large slice of it for campaign purposes or to lay himself open to the charge of buying the nomination for Vice-President. He is a shrewd old politician. No "heeler" can "work" him. He knows the limit of becoming contribution. His check to the treasurer of the Democratic national committee will scarcely be excessive.

Nobody gives a million to a campaign fund. The idea is preposterous. But a million has so rotund a sound, and it is so easy to pile up imaginary millions! The grossest exaggeration prevails in regard to campaign funds. It is as easy to guess them at ten millions as at one million. Thus the guessers collect enormous mythical "corruption funds," and the losers of the election save their face by wild rhetoric about the millions used in "buying votes."

The guessers or mythmakers practised prodigious multiplication on the campaign funds in Mr. HANNA's hands. They are getting ready to make as miraculous an increase of the Democratic campaign funds this year. This same despatch to the *Evening Post* contains a moderate and reasonable estimate:

"It seems probable that the campaign this year will be more wholesome than usual on both sides in the expenditure of money. This need not be due to any rising standards of public opinion, but rather because there is less to pay for. The Republicans know that they will control the Senate for the next four years anyway, and this will prevent the passage of legislation affecting any tariff schedule which is really profitable to a favored interest. By the same sign the Democrats must know that they cannot accomplish much in the way of straight party legislation, and hence the control of the House and the Presidency would be only a partial victory and not in itself sufficient to secure any of those pecuniary advantages from legislation or in Treasury administration which a party fully equipped with power has the opportunity to bestow."

If campaign managers have money enough for legitimate necessary expenses they are lucky. The notion that millionaires have a passion for sending fat checks to campaign treasurers and that these gentlemen have no trouble in collecting more money than they know what to do with belongs to the large province of political mythology.

Shooting at Automobilists.

A few days ago a deputy sheriff of Suffolk county fired three pistol shots at the occupants of an automobile which was speeding through the village of Patchogue at a rate alleged to be in excess of that permitted by law. There has been a good deal of discussion as to the propriety of this action on the part of the peace officer, but strangely enough the legal aspects of the occurrence have been totally ignored. It seems to be assumed that an officer endeavoring to arrest a person charged with any offence, however trivial, has the right to kill if need be in order to apprehend the offender.

The law, in truth, is quite otherwise. If this deputy sheriff had killed any one of the inmates of the automobile in his attempt to arrest them he would have been guilty of murder.

There is just one contingency in which it is justifiable to kill an offender who is endeavoring to escape arrest; that is when he has committed an offence of the grade of a felony and when it is absolutely necessary to take his life in order to prevent his escape.

But if any offence at all was committed in the Patchogue case it did not rise above the grade of a misdemeanor, and the law does not under any circumstances authorize killing in order to effect the arrest of a man for such an offence.

This is not a subject about which there is any doubt or question. The law on the subject has been settled for years. Nowhere is it more clearly laid down than in a decision rendered as long ago as 1862 by the General Term of the Second Judicial District, in which the village of Patchogue is situated. This case can be found reported in the fifth volume of PARKER's Criminal Reports at page 234, under the title of CONRADDY against The People.

The prisoner was a police officer and had arrested the deceased without a warrant and shot at him and killed him as he was endeavoring to escape from custody. The deceased at most had been guilty of a misdemeanor, but not a felony; and upon the trial the Court had charged the jury that the prisoner was not justified in shooting the deceased in order to prevent his escape. This instruction was sustained as correct in the appellate branch of the court. The opinion was written by Mr. Justice EMOTT, who said: "The distinction is marked between cases of misdemeanor and of felony. It is only in the latter that a homicide is justifiable by any person acting without a warrant, even when it is the only means to prevent the escape of the criminal." "When no process has been issued, a homicide can only be justified, even by an officer, by showing the actual commission of a felony and that there was a positive necessity to take life in order to arrest or detain the felon."

From this statement of the law it is manifest that there can be no possible justification for the act of the deputy sheriff at Patchogue.

In condemning his conduct, however, we do not mean to be understood that the public have not a genuine grievance against those who drive automobiles along public highways in defiance of the regulations prescribed by statute. But the remedy is not to be found in a violation of the law by officers themselves. If the Magistrates before whom these cases come would impose the severest penalty which the statute permits, we believe the ardor of law defying automobilists would soon be greatly chastened and tempered. It is simply silly to impose a fine of $10 upon the owner of a ten thousand dollar machine for driving it at a speed exceeding the legal rate. A few days imprisonment in each case in the Suffolk county jail at Riverhead would have a greater deterrent effect than all the fines which can be imposed under the statute put together.

Has Russia Violated International Law?

Three Russian vessels—two of them the Smolensk and St. Petersburg, described as auxiliary cruisers belonging to the so-called "volunteer" fleet, and the third, the Chernomoretz, a guardship belonging to the regular Black Sea fleet—have been permitted by the Turkish Government to pass through the Bosphorus from the Black Sea. The two former ships are said to have been unarmed during the passage through the Straits, but to have received their armaments later. Emboldened by the absence of any vehement protest on the part of the Powers interested in the Treaty of Paris, the Russians refrained from taking this precaution in the matter of the Chernomoretz, which when she entered the Bosphorus retained her usual armament, consisting of two eight-inch guns, one six-inch gun, seven quick-firing and machine guns, and two torpedo tubes. Whether these acts will be regarded as in themselves violations of treaty obligations sufficiently grave to justify interposition on the part of England, Germany or France remains to be seen. If the three vessels had proceeded directly to Far Eastern waters, their escape from the Black Sea might have been treated as an accomplished fact, a vehement remonstrance against which might be deemed inexpedient.

This has not been the course, however, pursued by the vessels in question. The two ships first named are cruising in the Red Sea, where they have subjected merchantmen belonging to England and Germany to coercion which it will be difficult to reconcile with international law. On July 15 the St. Petersburg stopped the British steamer Waipara and announced an intention of holding the vessel as a prize. At the end of four hours, however, a guarantee having been given meanwhile that there were neither arms nor ammunition on board, the Waipara was permitted to proceed. On the following day the same cruiser captured the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamer Malacca, on the charge that she was carrying munitions of war for the Japanese Government. A third British steamer, the Allenton, has been seized, on the ground that she was carrying to Japan a cargo of coal—which the St. Petersburg Government, it will be remembered, has declared contraband of war. We observe, finally, that on July 15 the Russian cruiser Smolensk seized and confiscated fifty-five mail bags on board the German steamer Prinz Heinrich of the North German Lloyd Company.

So far as the Malacca is concerned, she was undoubtedly liable to seizure on the high seas, if it be true that she was carrying arms and ammunition consigned to the Japanese Government. The case of the Allenton is different. Her bill of lading shows, we are told, that her cargo of coal was consigned to a British firm in a Japanese port, and was part of a large quantity of the combustible which had been contracted for long before the outbreak of the war in the Far East. If it can be shown that the coal was not intended to be used in Japanese military or naval operations, it was not subject to confiscation; for other great maritime Powers have not acquiesced in Russia's arbitrary declaration that coal is contraband of war. The seizure of mail bags on the Prinz Heinrich is obviously analogous to what took place in the case of the German steamship Bundesrath, from which mail bags were taken by a British warship on Dec. 29, 1899, in Delagoa Bay. It will be remembered that for this act, against which the Berlin Government promptly protested, Great Britain had to pay damages.

There are signs that public opinion in London, Berlin and Tokio will not permit these flagrant infringements of international law to be committed with impunity. The correspondent of the London *Standard* at the Japanese capital cabled on July 17 that the influential newspaper the *Jiji Shimpo* that day had expressed editorially the hope that Great Britain would see to it that Turkey lent Russia no further assistance by allowing steamers of the volunteer fleet to pass the Dardanelles. It added that, in its judgment, Great Britain was bound, under the terms of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, to prevent such assistance being given. The London *Times*, from the date of the first outrage, has protested earnestly against the operations of the cruiser St. Petersburg, and has called upon the Balfour Government to demand the release of the Allenton and such indemnity as shall be commensurate with the wrong. On July 18 almost all the London newspapers commented with indignation on the escape of Russian war vessels from the Black Sea, and insisted that their Government should take immediate action for the protection of British commerce in the Red Sea and neighboring waters. The *Daily Telegraph*, in an article that bears traces of inspiration from Ministerial sources, declares that there is a limit to complaisance when neutral commerce under the British flag is molested in a way to which for a century and a half Englishmen have been unused. On Sunday, July 17, there was an agreement of opinion in the Berlin press that the act of confiscation committed by the cruiser Smolensk on the German steamer Prinz Heinrich was a gross breach of an express provision of international law by which the regular mails are made immune from seizure. The Imperial Government is urged to proceed with as much promptitude and determination to secure redress for the wrong incurred by the Prinz Heinrich as it did in the case of the Bundesrath.

Some astute observers of contemporary events think that they discern in these transactions proof that Russia is "riding for a fall." They suggest that the St. Petersburg Government may have deliberately undertaken to provoke such interposition on the part of European Powers as will enable it to make peace with some show of dignity, and thus "save its face" in the eyes of its own subjects. It is certain that, by witnessing without remonstrance the passage of Russian war vessels through the Dardanelles, Great Britain is permitting a third Power to render assistance to Russia, and is thus breaking the promise embodied in the Anglo-Japanese treaty. It is equally certain that, by the confiscation of mail bags on the Prinz Heinrich, Russia has done something which Germany cannot consistently or prudently permit. The theory that Russia desires to bring about an extensive international complication is further supported by the assumption that the Russian naval authorities have discovered that the declaration making coal contraband of war is likely to have a grave retroactive effect upon themselves. For what can be done with neutral vessels captured in the Red Sea or elsewhere? Prize crews could be put on board and ordered to take the ships to Russian Baltic ports; but if short of coal, as they almost certainly would be, they could not put in at neutral ports to replenish their bunkers, for that combustible has been proclaimed by Russia contraband of war. In view of the same proclamation, how can Russia's Baltic fleet, if despatched to the Far East, stop on the way at French ports to renew its supply of fuel?

It was unnecessary for Russia to raise these questions, and it is at least conceivable that by them she intended to provide a loophole of escape from a contest to the seriousness of which she is now alive, and from which she would gladly withdraw if she could do so with a remnant of dignity.

Mr. Banta's Charge.

Mr. THEODORE M. BANTA of Kings county, a Democrat of years and experience, fails utterly to produce any evidence worthy of consideration in support of the charge made by him that Chief Judge ALTON B. PARKER of the Court of Appeals indulged in a political trick when he sent to Mr. WILLIAM F. SHEEHAN on the final day of the Democratic national convention his telegram defining his attitude toward the monetary system of the country. The sending of the telegram Mr. BANTA characterizes as an act of "shiftiness," and a "direct appeal to Wall Street for campaign funds." Judge PARKER, according to Mr. BANTA, is "unsafe" and "untrustworthy." This critic of the Democratic nominee declares his view of the thoughts in Judge PARKER's mind between 6 o'clock P. M., on July 8 and noon on July 9 in these words:

"We all knew on Friday afternoon that this action had been taken, and Judge PARKER certainly must have known of it as well as the rest of us. The time to have sent the telegram was Friday evening, before he was nominated. He undoubtedly realized that if he did this he could not be nominated, and waited until after it was too late to affect his own chances."

But Mr. BANTA does not prove his case. The nearest approach to a bit of evidence cited by him is in these words:

"It is inconceivable to me that a man whose entire future was concerned in the action of that convention, and a pupil of DAVID B. HILL, should have taken so little interest in the proceedings in St. Louis that he did not know on Friday night that the committee on resolutions had omitted the gold plank."

It is "inconceivable" to Mr. BANTA that Judge PARKER did not know that the gold plank had been elided from the platform, and this inconceivability he regards as sufficient reason for denouncing Judge PARKER as "shifty" and an immoral political trickster! Few Democrats certainly, and probably few Republicans, will care to follow the lead of Mr. BANTA. The charge he makes is a serious one. The evidence in support of it which he discloses is frivolous and foolish. Unless he is able to substantiate the charge, he ought to be ashamed to have made it, and he should apologize to Judge PARKER.

Republican Hopes in Arkansas.

Arkansas is one of the States which are set down in the "Democratic column" by both parties, as this table would seem to require beyond peradventure:

	Democratic.	Republican.
Governor, 1902	77,354	29,251
President, 1900	81,142	44,800

That is, in Arkansas the Democrats have the mastery of about two-thirds of the electorate; yet it seems that the Republicans of the State are still undaunted and are going to work in this campaign as if there really was some chance for them. There is a chance, they boast. It is to reduce the Democratic majority below the 48,103 in 1902 and perhaps even below the 36,342 in 1900 and bring down the Democratic votes from toward two-thirds to something like three-fifths.

Arkansas holds its State election in September, and already the Republicans have under way a strenuous contest. The Hon. H. H. MYERS, the badly defeated Republican candidate for Governor two years ago, is now again a candidate for that office, and he will spare no energy in the canvass. He is to speak at various towns, and it is remarkable that all his appointments are for 10 o'clock in the morning. The Hon. SID B. REDDING of Little Rock, treasurer of the League of Republican Clubs, will also be a morning campaigner, but generally he will not mount the stump until 11 o'clock. Only at four towns will the time be advanced to 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and in one case to 8 in the evening.

In 1900 the Republicans carried nine of the seventy-five counties of Arkansas, but by this strenuous morning and afternoon canvass they hope to increase the number to ten or even twelve of the counties.

The Silent President.

Mr. ROOSEVELT's decision to make no speeches in the campaign cannot have been reached without much inward wrestling. It is of the nature of renunciation and self-sacrifice. It must be hard to keep back the thronging words, to condemn to silence a mind passionately bent upon utterance and accustomed to warn, to comfort and command. It needs a strong will to break a long habit. In subjecting himself to this self-denying ordinance, Mr. ROOSEVELT shows a high stoic courage which surpasses the common physical intrepidity of the soldier.

Tactically, this locking of the lips is admirable. It is a surprise and a disappointment to the enemy. It is something new and unexpected. It diminishes the possibilities of mistake. It shows that Mr. ROOSEVELT can play for safety as well as for glory.

It would be an insult to a notable instance of prudence and virtue to say that it is more dignified for a President to refrain from campaign oratory than to indulge in it. We are living, we are moving, in a hot and lively time. Dignity is a little mouldy. Swiftness is the one thing needful.

Peerless and Invincible.

Speaking with the authority born of rarely equalled experience in that sort of political exercise, Mr. BRYAN made the ante-convention announcement that the nomination of Judge PARKER would mean a Democratic campaign that would "begin with a footrace and end in a rout."

Now Judge PARKER is nominated, and here we have Mr. BRYAN girding up his loins for the sprint. No one living is better qualified than he to lead the way over the course with which he has been made twice familiar. He knows every inch of that well-worn track. Burden him with any weight, handicap him with any adverse time allowance, hobble him, blindfold him: and with any sort of start, fair or unfair, he has it in him to set a pace along the road that leads to Democratic rout which will mean BRYAN first and all other candidates, past, present or future, nowhere. His wind is still with him. He always has it. It never fails him. He needs no training. He is even now impatient to be off. The old familiar rucky, rocky pike with joyous wreck and chaos at the end of it stretches invitingly before him. He longs for the glad crash and smash of the silver-wheeled chariot and the happy climacteric wallow in the Olympian dust and the débris.

Whatever betides, Judge PARKER can never hope to be other than left at the stake in a footrace-and-rout competition with WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN. In that field of campaign activity the Peerless One is indeed peerless—peerless and invincible. He challenges all comers; stultifies all comparisons; smashes all records.

It is a curious fact that while arctic weather was with us all the time last winter north Alaska had the mildest dark season it has experienced in many a year. Commander PEARY has received a letter from Mr. HUGH LEE, at Cape Prince of Wales, almost within sight of the Arctic Ocean, saying that there was very little ice during the winter and the temperature was never lower than minus 30 degrees. The shore of the Arctic for many miles was sometimes entirely free from ice, and the waves broke along the coast as in summer. That is the region where whalers must begin to move south early in September or run the risk of being frozen in for seven months. We drew so heavily on the Arctic for low temperatures that the home supply was smaller than usual.

Certain officious officials of the union to which musicians in this city belong have visited the President at Oyster Bay to ask him to prevent Mr. CONRIED from bringing into the country a new orchestra for the Metropolitan Opera House. They did not say that was what they went for, but there is no room for doubt that their action was caused by the persistent reports that Mr. CONRIED was to import musicians. The President promised to look into the matter. Very good. He is a musical person himself. He has demonstrated it by certain sonorous blasts on the bugle. Let him, therefore, hear some of the orchestral performances to which this town is compelled to listen because it cannot get new musicians. Afterward he may think that there are two sides to this question.

How Much to Save Out of an Income of $50 a Week.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your correspondent, "W. G. P.," who inquires what he should save out of a salary of $2,500 a year, is on the right track. That he has the idea of saving anything at all sets him apart from a large class who very literally follow the letter of the precept, "Take no heed for the morrow."

New York is much larger than St. Louis, and living expenses are naturally somewhat higher; so any advice I might give as to the exact amount he ought to save would lack the basis of full knowledge of the conditions he has to meet. But as one way of getting at the matter, I would suggest that he ascertain as fully as possible the expenses of some man who gets, say, $1,800 or $2,000 a year, and "lives it up" as he goes; then model his own expenditures on that man's.

The main thing is to save something. It is as hard to acquire the habit of saving $100 a year as that of saving $10,000 a year. No one will ever save the latter sum unless he has learned to save smaller sums first. And the way to save it is to take it out of your salary, put it away in some safe depository, and forget you have it. To lay aside a certain sum each week, then check against the accumulation every time you think you need a new piece of furniture, or clothing or some extra luxury is not saving at all. That's too womanish a plan of banking to amount to anything.

Your correspondent has a little better start than I had in salary, as I have been married several years and get just about the amount now that he does. We have succeeded in "salting down" $600 or $800 each year; but, as I said, living expenses are probably higher in New York than here.

I shall be glad to hear how he comes out in the course of a year. I hope he will be able to take a world's fair trip this summer and still save money. He can if he tries. T.

ST. LOUIS, July 17.

The Dinner Pail and the Growler.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:*

The dinner pail throughout the land
Will soon be at its best;
The growler, too, will be on hand—
It never takes a rest.

BROOKLYN, July 19. H. M. B.

HONOR IN ARMY LIFE.

The Standards of Social Honor in Army Life Discussed by an Officer's Wife.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A recent woman writer has declared that in society generally honor between man and man is an insignificant equation as compared to honor between officer and officer in the army. To illustrate her point, she said that good fellowship and comradeship exist between officers and the wives of other officers without any fear or suggestion of scandal (real or imagined) such as invariably accompanies the same relations in civil life. This, according to her, is due to an intense loyalty between brother officers.

My impressions, gathered during several years of army life, are different. This woman writer must have seen things wholly from the outside, or "through a glass darkly." There is certainly considerable esprit de corps in the army—although little, if any, regimental loyalty is nowadays discernible—but it is an allegiance to the army as an American institution rather than from one officer to another officer.

It is safe to assert, as a first premise, that our army is neither better nor worse, morally and mentally, than any equal number of men and women in more or less the same strata of life outside the army. Army officers being in the main from the ranks of the fortunate "middle class" ("upper middle," they say in England), the moral, and probably the mental, standard presents a fair average of what this country has to give; but it is a standard produced by the excellence of the unit and not due or subservient to military prestige. I mean to say, that the average well conducted army officer would be equally well conducted in any sphere of life in which he might find himself.

Possibly if we are honest—and can endure the charge of cynicism—we will admit that in the army, as in all this modern world, there is a crime forbidden by the unwritten law of the twentieth century against which Moses and the prophets were never warned. Sometimes it is called the Eleventh Commandment, and it is: "Thou shalt not be found out." If there actually is any higher moral standard in the army (which I doubt), it is unquestionably because of this crime of being "found out." It is difficult in army life to cover one's tracks; things are known and proven more quickly and easily than out in the world, and the punishment for being "found out" is more apt to "fit the crime."

In civil life, short of capital crime, men suffer only a slight discomfort as a result of their social offences—especially for offences embodied in the first section of the Tenth Commandment—and often nothing happens to them at all. In the army similar offences, if discovered, mean not only social ostracism, but also the loss of a man's career, and often his sole means of support. This is a serious matter, and the fear of it, acting like the fabled sword of Damocles, keeps many a natural born backslider in the straight and narrow path. The fear of consequences—human or eternal—is probably the strongest of all motives governing mankind; and in the army, the consequences being so much worse, possibly the standard of excellence is proportionately higher.

Man's sense of honor, when acute, is alone a sufficient safeguard against individual as against class error. Such a standard of honor is, however, no more common in the army than elsewhere, and when found is an individual trait, and not due to any sense of obligation toward the army, or toward other men, because they happen to be brother officers. If a man lacks a keen sense of honor he will not rise superior to his own limitations in his relations with his brother officers.

The writer to whom I have referred spoke touchingly of the relations between army men and women, and of the necessarily innocuous nature of the attentions of officers to the wives of brother officers. Now, this is really too absurd. In the army a man's attentions to another man's wife mean exactly what they do in civil life, neither more nor less, and are as frequently harmless in the army as out of it, but not more so.

In one sense this writer is correct. There is more *laissez faire* in some garrisons than in civil life, except among those known as the "smart set," with whom such freedom of conduct is a matter of course. In garrisons where those who compose them must often for months at a stretch rely exclusively upon each other for all social intercourse—as, for example, in the Philippines and many undesirable posts in this country—people become intimately acquainted, and a freedom of fellowship is engendered which would be impossible elsewhere.

In most garrisons also there is a much larger proportion of men than women, and as a consequence the married women receive attentions which, under different circumstances, might be more generally distributed. Such attentions have a fashion, the world over, of sometimes concentrating; and in garrison life they inevitably become marked and a subject for gossip, although often quite frank and innocent. But I contend that when such a line is drawn it is either a question of limited attraction or a sense of honor in the individual.

A man in such a relation who, while having the temptation to act otherwise, conducts himself as a man of principle and honor, does so because he is that kind of a man. He would follow precisely the same course if his dealings were with men and women not bound to him by any tie of military brotherhood. A man lacking these principles and capable of censurable conduct in civil life would be capable of exactly the same thing in the army, and the fact that a woman's husband happened also to be his brother officer would not suffice to influence him.

A man's code of honor is a curious thing, as we know from the well established fact that while a man usually finds it impossible to betray his friend he will often not hesitate to betray a mere acquaintance, or a man he has never seen. Yet, of course, the course of dishonor is quite as grave in the one case as in the other. But even this discrimination does not carry between officers, many of whom have never seen or heard of each other (except impersonally in the army register). It would be difficult to find in civil life more indifference to the aims, success or happiness of the individual than exists in our army, where, though friendships are true and strong—often born of and always cemented by propinquity—intolerance, lack of sympathy, of justice or true comradeship are as humanly frequent as in any other sphere of life.

There may be extreme cases where a man, having a limited sense of honor or of responsibility toward his neighbor as a human being, will yet belie his nature and create for himself a totally different standard, because his neighbor is his brother officer; but such cases, if conceivable, are very rare. Either a man does his duty as man to man, or as friend to friend, or he does not do it; and the fact that he wears a uniform will not protect him against his own limitations.

"Conduct becoming an officer and a gentleman!" We are all familiar with that phrase. If being an army officer were synonymous with being a gentleman, the latter appellation would be unnecessary. Precisely because the terms are not synonymous we say that the conduct must not only become a man wearing the uniform of his country's army—from whom much is, of course, expected—but must also be becoming a gentleman, which, after all, covers the whole ground.

All gentlemen are not army officers, and all army officers (I bow apologetically to any who for obvious reasons are unduly sensitive) are, more's the pity, not gentlemen; and we all know that the one is not a guarantee of the other.

When a man has it in him to be intelligent, courageous and indomitable, and honorable and well bred as well, then indeed we recognize that fine product called "an officer and a gentleman." AN ARMY WOMAN.

MONTEREY, July 10.

Shipping Alfalfa Soil From Kansas to Florida.

From the Emporia Gazette.

W. S. Williamson will ship to Aqua, Fla., in a few days a few ounces of alfalfa seed and about twice as much soil from his farm. Some time ago the Emporia papers contained a statement that Mr. Williamson had procured five crops of hay in one year from his alfalfa field. The matter was taken up by newspapers all over the country, and THE NEW YORK SUN had an editorial on the matter. THE SUN doubted whether five crops could really be harvested from one field. Since the article appeared in THE SUN, Mr. Williamson has received many requests for seed and soil from his farm.

The man in Florida wants some of the soil from Mr. Williamson's farm that he may inoculate his farm with Kansas alfalfa germs. It has been discovered that by inoculating soil with certain kinds of microbes different fruits and vegetables may produce two and three fold their ordinary amounts, and the Florida man believes if he can get the Kansas alfalfa germ started on his farm he can greatly increase his alfalfa crop.

Mr. Williamson is also a believer in the germ theory. He says that if one sowing of alfalfa doesn't do well the best way to get a good stand is to plow the old field under the replant, the theory being that the germs which have collected on one big alfalfa plant will divide themselves among the numerous smaller plants, and thus make them thrive. If your farm isn't producing an abundance of the kind of crop you desire, just discover the germ that will make it grow and vaccinate the soil with it.

A Scientific Definition.

Johnny—Pa, what is alimony?

Pa—Alimony is the pension paid to the best fighter.

IMMORTALITY.

Not General, but Confined to Those Only Who Are "in Christ."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* There is a general impression among Christian people that to deny the inherent immortality of the soul is to "deny the faith." But such is not the case. Bishop Hampden of Hereford, England, in his Bampton Lectures, delivered many years ago, said:

The notion of the separate existence of the soul has so incorporated itself with Christian theology that we are apt at this day to regard a belief in it as essential to orthodox doctrine. I cannot, however, help viewing the popular belief as a remnant of scholasticism. I feel sure that the truth of the Resurrection does not rest on such an assumption. What our Lord said, in answer to Martha's declaration, "I know that he shall rise again," when He proclaimed Himself "the Resurrection and the Life" is to the point. The Jews then entertained a philosophical belief in a future state. Our Lord tacitly reproves an assurance on such grounds by His strong reference to Himself: "I am the Resurrection and the Life; whosoever believeth in Me shall live though he die."

This, in connection with the statement St. Paul makes, that Christ "hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel," surely implies that immortality is found in Christ alone.

Dr. Stuart Perowne, now the retired Bishop of Worcester, in his Hulsean Lectures on Immortality, says: "Apart from faith in Christ immortality has no solid ground." Archbishop Whately, in his sermon on future life, says: "No arguments from reason, independent of revelation, have been brought forward that amount to a decisive proof that the soul must survive bodily death." John Foster, the eminent essayist, who was a Baptist minister at the beginning of the last century, in one of his letters writes: "I acknowledge myself not convinced of the orthodox doctrine"—meaning the common view regarding a future life.

When we go back to the early Fathers we find the same expressions, implying that "out of Christ" there is no immortality, but that "in Christ" there is life eternal. This seems to be the meaning of the original Greek of the words written by St. Paul, I. Corinthians, xv., 22: "For as all in Adam die, even so all in Christ shall be made alive."

We find similar statements in the early Christian Fathers. Ignatius, A. D. 115, says: "Watch and be vigilant, as God's athlete the reward is incorruption and life eternal." Justin Martyr, A. D. 135, says: "God alone is uncreated and incorruptible, but all things beside Him are created and perishable." Irenæus, A. D. 202, says: "Life is not from ourselves or from our nature, but it is given and bestowed according to the grace of God." Theophilus of Antioch, A. D. 412, in answer to the question, "Was Adam by nature mortal?" replied that if the Creator had made him from the first immortal he would have made him a god. Athanasius, A. D. 373, the great champion of Christian verity, says: "The Incarnation of the Logos was to endow man with immortality in the renewed image of God."

The literature on the subject of immortality is monumental, and it is not likely that we shall arrive at any more definite conclusions on the subject now that we are brought in contact with the great non-Christian world, half of which believes in metempsychosis, or the transmigration of the soul after death, and not in the personal identity of the soul through all eternity, which is the teaching of Jesus Christ. It does, however, seem to be of great consequence that the average Christian should know that a denial of the inherent immortality of the soul is not a denial of the Christian faith. B. D. OXON.

NEW YORK, July 18.

THE DESTINY OF PORTO RICO.

A Chief Source From Which to Get Our Coffee Supply and Our Tropical Fruits.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Once convince the American coffee drinkers that Porto Rico coffee is a superior product, and the ruined island planters will not have to go outside of the United States to market their coffee, for it is a well recognized fact that no people in the world expend more money or pay higher prices for living commodities than the people of this country.

Here we have the principal coffee drinkers of the world. The importation of the berry last year into the United States reached the enormous quantity of 900,000,000 pounds, and of this vast amount Porto Rico supplied about 2,000,000 pounds. As everybody knows, coffee growing is the principal industry of the island, and the 80,000,000 Americans with whom she is associated under the same beneficent flag consume as much of this article as all the other nations together.

The great republic offers, then, not only the largest but also the natural, market for the coffee of Porto Rico. The insignificant quantity sent here, however, proves that Porto Rico coffee is not known in the United States, for if it was its good qualities would surely create a large demand for it. The Agricultural Department—as it was properly stated in one of your late editorials—should "create a thirst" in this country for the Porto Rican beverage, in order that the bankrupt planters of the island may secure that share of the enormous coffee trade of America which beneficent nature and the sequel of the Spanish-American war intended for them.

The readjustment of the tariff and the suggestion of prohibitive duties against all foreign brands are out of the question, at least for the present. Many reasons have been given for the refusal to accept those remedies, and the most potent is the inability of Porto Rico to supply all the coffee drunk in this country, as the present total annual consumption in the United States is twenty times the largest crop of coffee grown in any one year in the island. The city of New York alone would be able to dispose of all the coffee the Porto Ricans can grow for years to come.

With a market for her principal product, and full American citizenship that would give moral peace to the inhabitants, Porto Rico is destined to be a grand success, because President McKinley began at the right end, the educational one. It will take a generation, but even that will soon pass by.

As an agricultural success, Porto Rico will become the hothouse for the United States, and what is drawn from the semi-tropical regions of Florida and California, and is got only at great expense from there, will some day come in shiploads from that beautiful island in the Antilles; and in return for it the United States will send them back money and merchandise which will make for comfort and civilization, which they never could have hoped to dream of under the nerveless administration of Spain.

With these must come at the same time Statehood for the island, because she will then deserve it; and thus the fruition of American rule will be the flowering out of that American conscience which Mr. McKinley bestowed as a benediction on its governors when he first sent them forth to inaugurate the policy of freedom in that loveliest of the West Indian Islands. D. COLLAZO.

NEW YORK, July 19.

Ingenious Yankee Boy.

From the Kennebec Journal.

A Belfast farmer boy is using a novel and highly effective anti-switch on the cows in his charge.

There are many devices in use for preventing cows from switching their tails while being milked, but all are open to more or less serious objections. Some require too much time for adjustment, some hurt the cows and make them kick, and others are dangerous in case of an accident.

The youth above referred to takes a worn-out bicycle tire and places one side over the cow's back just forward of the hips, the other side hanging down behind just above the gambrels.

The tire holds its circular form, is flexible enough to allow for any ordinary movement, but holds the tail firmly in place. It can be changed from one cow to another instantly, and does not annoy the animals. It takes more than an uneasy cow to get ahead of a Yankee boy.

The Body Beautiful.

Dr. Richard Cole Newton in the Medical Record.

A brilliant writer said to me the other day that the world seems to be reverting to the old Grecian love of physical prowess and admiration for the body beautiful. Of course, we are a long way from this yet. Fancy our hollow chested, pigeon toed women with their square hips and hour glass waists dressed as the Greeks used to dress. Fancy our average business man with his protuberant paunch and skinny arms posing as a Greek hero.

Sad as this thought is, there is room for encouragement. Our people, both men and women, are improving in size, figure and carriage, and will continue to improve. Whether the general intelligence and mental deveopment will ever reach as high an average among us as it did among the Athenians is quite another question.

The Sight Trust.

Argus emitted a yelp of anguish. "How would you like to get a cinder in fifty of your eyes?" he demanded.

Making a bee line for the drug store, he proved mythology isn't what it is cracked up to be.

Inference Plain.

Knicker—They say God made the country and man made the town.

Bocker—Well, then, who made the summer resort?

Philosophy.

Johnny—What does it mean to take a thing philosophically?

Mother—It's the way your paw pays his card debts, but not the butcher bill.

160 NEW POLICEMEN.

McAdoo's Draft on the Eligible List—Capt. O'Brien to Boss Traffic.

Commissioner McAdoo announced yesterday that he had selected Capt. Stephen O'Brien to take charge of the traffic of the city, a job lately filled by Inspector Donald Grant, who has been transferred to Staten Island. The Commissioner said that the captain would retain his place as commander of the City Hall station.

"His new duties," said the Commissioner, "will work in well with the old ones as head of the license squad. Certain cabmen who make a practice of interfering with traffic are well known to him."

"Will any transfers be made to-day?" was asked.

"It's too warm to speak of that," replied the Commissioner, with a bland smile.

"Will the general shake-up come on Thursday as you said?"

"I never set any day. I don't think that we will discuss the matter now."

The Commissioner said that he had called on the Civil Service Commissioners for a list of 160 men eligible for the police force. He had received an appropriation from the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for the pay of 150 new men—the other ten would fill vacancies.

The difficulty, the Commissioner explained, was to have the men schooled quickly enough. To that end, he has made overtures to secure the use of a public school in Fifth street to be used in conjunction with the school previously arranged for in Cooper Union. He said that the old school of instruction on the third floor at Police Headquarters might again be put into use, too.

"I have asked for money for 350 more men," said the Commissioner, "and the matter is now before the Board of Aldermen. We need the men. Some of the new ones will be sent to Staten Island."

At the direction of the Commissioner Inspector Kane of Queens county appeared at Headquarters yesterday afternoon to discuss the shooting of Policeman George Cameron, who was killed by a brother officer on Sunday at Furor's Park, Corona. Later Mr. McAdoo said that a thorough investigation would be made.

The commissioner announced two promotions yester ay. Patrolmen Michael Lane and Francis McCarrick were made roundsmen.

RUMANIA FEARED THE JEWS.

Failure of Secretary Hay's Efforts to Ameliorate Their Condition Explained.

WASHINGTON, July 19.—The reasons for the failure of Secretary Hay's efforts in 1902 to secure an amelioration of the oppressed condition of the Rumanian Jews are disclosed in correspondence made public by the State Department to-day in advance of the publication of "Foreign Relations," the annual official red book.

The correspondence shows that on Aug. 23, 1902, Mr. Hay instructed the American diplomatic representatives to those countries who were parties to the Berlin treaty of 1878, to endeavor to induce those Powers to persuade Rumania to consider the subject of the grievances of the Jews in that country. In a letter to Minister Jackson at Athens Mr. Hay asked him, on his first visit to Rumania, to endeavor to learn whether these Powers had made any representations to the Rumanian Government.

In his reply, Mr. Jackson said that, so far as he was aware, no action was taken by any of the Governments and that no official representations were made to the Rumanian Government.

According to Minister Jackson, the prejudice against the Jews which obtains in Rumania is directed neither against the race nor the individual, but is based upon the genuine fear as to what would result from general naturalization. Their sufferings had been exaggerated, he said. He reported a conversation he had with Mr. Sturdza, the Rumanian Prime Minister. Mr. Sturdza said that Rumania had not liberated herself from Turkish sovereignty in order to accept that of the Jews; that she had powerful neighbors and must do everything possible to maintain and develop her own nationality. He said that absolutely no question of religious prejudice was involved.

COL. PETTIT COMMENDED

For Gallant Services in the Moro Expedition—Praise for Two Enlisted Men.

WASHINGTON, July 19.—An order recently issued by Gen. Wade, commanding the Division of the Philippines, is in acknowledgment of the gallant and meritorious services rendered by Lieut.-Col. James S. Pettit, Assistant Adjutant-General, and also the bravery and conspicuous gallantry of two enlisted men.

Lieut.-Col. Pettit, while serving as Adjutant-General under Gen. Davis in the Lake Lanao expedition against the Moros, May 2, 1902, volunteered and joined the assaulting troop when in action and also cared for the wounded under fire.

Jesse Dolbier, an artificer in Company K, Twenty-third Infantry, while serving on the gunboat Napindan during a storm and heavy sea in Manila Bay, April, 1899, displayed great bravery in voluntarily entering a small boat and under circumstances of great danger fastening a towline to a derrick, which had broken away and was in danger of capsizing, thereby saving the lives of the Filipino crew on the derrick.

William M. Wheeler, a private in Company M, Twenty-seventh Infantry, is mentioned for conspicuous gallantry in action at Bayang, Lake Lanao, May 2, 1902, in attempting, under heavy fire, to force an entrance to the gate of Fort Pandapatan.

NOT DUE TO SPANISH SPITE.

Work of Claims Commission Hampered by a Difference of Procedure.

WASHINGTON, July 19.—A communication was received at the State Department to-day from the United States Legation at Madrid denying allegations made by claimants before the Spanish War Claim Commission that the unwillingness of Spanish officers to testify was delaying the work of the commission and working injury to the interests of the claimants. The reluctance of the Spanish subjects to testify had been attributed to spite and to the desire to retard the work of reimbursement as much as possible.

The denial received to-day says that such delays as have occurred in securing the testimony of Spanish subjects were due largely to natural and unavoidable causes, among them the wide difference in judicial procedure that prevails between the United States and Spain.

QUITS DUTY AT WORLD'S FAIR.

Lieut. Haight of the Army Asked to Explain Row With Exposition Officials.

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Lieut. Charles S. Haight, Fourth Cavalry, on duty at the St. Louis exposition grounds, has notified the War Department that he has tendered his resignation as an officer of the exposition, and requested that he be relieved by the department of further connection with the exposition.

Lieut. Haight will be called upon for a statement of the facts in the case. According to press despatches from St. Louis Lieut. Haight was severely criticised by the world's fair management for discriminating against a colored regiment.

Movements of Naval Vessels.

WASHINGTON, July 19.—The supply ship Glacier has arrived at Boston, the torpedo boat Worden at New York, the gunboat Dixie and the cruiser Topeka at Tompkinsville, and the despatch boat Sylph at Hampton Roads. The gunboat Wheeling has sailed from Bremerton for Seattle, the training ships Hartford and Chesapeake, having on board the midshipmen from the Naval Academy, and the torpedo boats Whipple, Hopkins, Lawrence, Hull and MacDonough, the battleships Texas (flagship of Rear Admiral Glass) and Massachusetts, and the monitors Arkansas, Florida and Nevada, comprising the North Atlantic squadron, sailed to-day from New London for the regular summer cruise.