

SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1910.

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

Subscriptions by Mail. Postpaid. DAILY, Per Month, \$1.00. DAILY, Per Year, \$10.00. SUNDAY, Per Year, \$3.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$12.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.00. Postage to foreign countries added. All checks, money orders, A. C. to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 25 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Treasurer, of the Association, M. F. Laflin, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 170 Nassau street.

London office, 11, Abchurch Lane, London, E. C. 4. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, 11, Abchurch Lane, London, E. C. 4. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, 11, Abchurch Lane, London, E. C. 4.

Paris office, 12 Rue de la Harpe. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at 12, Rue de la Harpe, Paris, France. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, 11, Abchurch Lane, London, E. C. 4.

On leaving the city for the summer you may have THE SUN sent to you by mail at the regular subscription rates, addresses being changed as often as desired.

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.

The Fame of the City.

Nothing that was brought out in the trial of the person who has been convicted in this county of procuring women for immoral purposes justifies the generalizations that were put into circulation immediately after her arrest. There was no evidence indicating the existence of "vice syndicates," no testimony involving any official of the city, State or nation in the transactions in which she had a part. It is significant that the investigators, representing themselves as anxious to obtain information, were obliged to content themselves with mature and hardened offenders.

We direct attention to these facts because the agitation that preceded this trial was marked by the most revolting charges against the citizenship and the administration of New York. This community was depicted as a sink hole of iniquity, its youth the unguarded prey of the most loathsome of creatures, its government the accomplice of criminals so vile as to be indescribable.

The effect of these assertions and allegations spread broadcast over the world cannot be entirely overcome. The evidence of their falsity will never overtake them. Yet they are untrue in general and in detail. The conditions that make possible their dissemination are combated as earnestly and as intelligently here as in any other community in the world. If the processes for the protection of virtue and the suppression of vice seem crude and ineffective it is to be charged not to the bad morals of one community, but to the inadequacy of governmental restraints in the attempt to control the elemental passions.

The Panama Canal Should Be Fortified.

A board of army and navy officers, consisting of General WILLIAM CROZIER, Chief of Ordnance; General MOORE, Chief of the Coast Artillery; General W. W. WITHERSPON, General W. L. MARSHALL, Chief of Engineers; Captain H. S. KNAPP and Commander W. J. MAXWELL of the navy, and Major W. G. HAAN of the coast artillery, has recommended after a visit of inspection and survey that \$14,000,000 be expended to fortify the Panama Canal. We note that Representative J. W. KEIFER of Ohio, who has introduced in the House a resolution contemplating a general international treaty to guarantee the safety of the canal "in time of war as well as in time of peace," is disposed to think that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty ratified in 1902 inhibits the United States from fortifying the canal. "I beg to submit," said General KEIFER in a speech in the House recently, "that if fortifications were constructed on or along the line of this canal, as I shall show, it would be in violation of existing treaties with Great Britain and Colombia."

The proposal to fortify the canal has not a secret. It is for Congress to decide, but has General KEIFER heard of any protest from Great Britain or Colombia? As regards general principles of fortification, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was patterned after the Suez convention. Under instructions the British negotiators were willing that the United States, which was to build and control the canal, should have the right to erect fortifications along the line of the canal to protect it against an enemy at war with the United States. Captain H. S. KNAPP of the navy in an elaborate and exhaustive study of the subject published in *United States Naval Institute Proceedings* concludes that "by indication, due to the absence of prohibitions in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, the United States has the right to fortify the canal." In the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty with Panama there was an express stipulation providing for fortifications. Lastly, the right is affirmed in the so-called Spooner act of June 28, 1902, which is notice to the world. Great Britain included that the United States "will maintain the right."

The only question under the Keifer resolution for Congress to consider is whether it shall declare against the expediency of fortifying the Canal. It is purely a military question, in no sense should we say, an economic question. The debate in the House developed some approval of General KEIFER'S opinion that a neutralization treaty with the great Powers would be warproof, that is to say that in the event of a conflict between the United States and another

Power, say an Oriental nation, that nation would be tempted by no exigency or opportunity of advantage to close the canal or take possession of it. We are not so credulous nor do we believe that European Powers would make war upon an Oriental nation that had violated the general treaty of neutralization. The Suez Canal does not supply an analogy, for the contracting parties are vitally concerned to enforce the obligation of neutrality and they are in a position to visit punishment upon an offender promptly.

We are aware that while many American naval officers advocate fortification of the canal, many army officers oppose it on the ground of the difficulty of protecting the canal against an attack by a fleet, that in fact protection is the business of the navy. We are not so sure that a strong garrison in the zone would have any great difficulty in defending the canal. Its length is only fifty miles, and with rapid railroad transportation the whole line could be effectively patrolled and the enemy could be met in force with proper reconnaissance. That long range coast defense guns, such as are mounted at Sandy Hook, would play havoc with an enemy's fleet approaching either end of the canal will hardly be disputed.

Captain H. S. KNAPP of the navy, who is a member of the board that recently passed on the question after visiting the zone, has presented succinctly the argument for defense by the army as well as the navy. "The writer firmly believes," he says, "that no complete defense of the canal is possible that leaves out either service, but that the defense of the canal is primarily an army function and only incidentally a navy function, and that permanent fortifications are a necessity. Not to have permanent fortifications at the canal will operate to tie the navy to the canal region in war, and that will mean partial paralysis. The navy must be free to go where it can do the most good, and without any drag upon its freedom of action due to a knowledge that in going it may have to leave open vital interests depending upon it alone. The Canal Zone needs permanent fortifications just as truly as does New York city."

Materlinck's "Macbeth."

The way of the translator is hard. MAURICE MATERLINCK tells us this with unimpaired grace in his newly published version of "Macbeth." His introduction to the play is simple and perspicacious. A loving student for many years of the English poet, he is acquainted with the vast commentary that has parasitically encumbered that giant oak; his notes reveal the depth and breadth of his reading. A literary critic asked the other day, why translate SHAKESPEARE? The answer is obvious: Because it is SHAKESPEARE. No English writer, with the possible exception of CHAUCER, is so difficult to transmute to another language; yet SHAKESPEARE has been turned into nearly every language and still remains SHAKESPEARE. SHELLEY and KEATS, MARLOWE and MILTON evaporate in translation; but SHAKESPEARE even when shorn of his music remains the essential SHAKESPEARE. He is more lyrical in Italian, sturdier in German, more rhetorical in French; yet his essence remains. This cannot be said of GOETHE in French or of IBSSEN in English. If, as has been contended by modern iconoclastic critics, the philosophy of SHAKESPEARE is borrowed from MONTAIGNE, his humor from RABELAIS, and his history from PLUTARCH, HOLINSHED and the Italian romancers, and if his poetry is not translatable, what then is the secret of his power when garbed in foreign language? MATERLINCK does not pose this question, though he is conscious of its complexity.

His introduction poses as a preliminary the question of the trilogy, "Hamlet," "Lear" and "Macbeth." The latter is in the world of tragedy a solitary peak which ESCHYLUS alone could have attained. Many critics will disagree with this contention, for "Lear" has been held to be the Himalayan summit. However, we can but fall in line with the Belgian poet at present, for he is chiefly concerned with "Macbeth." He finds the play a sort of biography more or less legendary; it floats on the confines of history and legend. The form is confused, the chief characters not sympathetic, "Macbeth" is not a *piece bien faite*, it is too long. Of the more than two thousand verses about one-fifth must be suppressed for representation. This history of two crowned assassins is reagent, for their intelligence is mediocre, their morals on the other side of good and evil, their show of repentance null; in a word, there is little in the machinery of the drama to win our approbation. All the qualities that do not go to making a masterpiece are absent. Nevertheless, a masterpiece "Macbeth" is, and one that quite overflows (CONRAD, RACINE, GOETHE we are now quoting MATERLINCK, who sets himself the task of solving again the enigma. For the scholarly Frenchman from Voltaire to Faguet a play must be literature as well as moving drama. It must develop logically according to canon. If not Greek then Gallic. MATERLINCK, with his Flemish temperament, you are tempted to add his Gothic fond, has own theatre shows him a poet who first supped on the enchantments, mysteries and horrors of the Elizabethan and later writers. He knows MARLOWE as well as WEBSTER, JOHN FORD as well as BEAUMONT and FLETCHER. Thus it may be seen that "Macbeth," with its profound painting of sinister souls, *Ames domum: Aes*, would stir him to his marrow.

He points out the impersonality of the poet, the conversational diapason, a realistic speech so often to be found; above all his favorite thesis that it is a dramatist of the first order can suggest the "interior dialogue" (see MATERLINCK'S remarks on IBSSEN'S "Master-builder") is in the case of SHAKESPEARE triumphantly indicated. The very passages in "Macbeth" are pregnant with horror. The detestable crime is but the framework around which hovers the

echo of the supernatural. Voices of the human conscience, soundless overtones of guilty souls, flood the air. Nor does MATERLINCK revel in transcendental ecstasies. If he is the poet in dealing with SHAKESPEARE, he is also the cool headed man of the theatre. He realizes the miracle of "Macbeth," but, like GOETHE, he knows that every great work of art is immensurable, even to its creator.

And the translation? There's the rub. If, says MATERLINCK, a landscape is a state of soul (STENDHAL'S *Etat d'ame*) so is a translation. He rebuts the various attempts to make SHAKESPEARE domesticated in the French tongue from PIERRE LETOURNEUR, FRANCOIS VICTOR HUGO not to be confounded with his father BENJAMIN LAROCHE, MAURICE POTTECHER, ALEXANDRE BELJAME to his own. He does not mention the "Hamlet" of MARCEL SCHWOB and MORAND. Fidelity to the rhythmic movement, verbal music, poetic spirit, local color, idiomatic or interpretative—how many rocks there are in the road of the conscientious translator, tormented alike by the majesty and humanity of SHAKESPEARE'S speech! MATERLINCK gives us an example the lines (Act III, last scene):

"Strange things I have in head that will to hand Which must be acted ere they may be scanned."

HUGO thus renders the speech: "J'ai dans la tête d'étranges choses qui déclament ma main et veulent être exécutées avant d'être méditées" which is clumsy and unrhymic. BELJAME'S version is better, so is POTTECHER'S, GIZOT, DONTOUT, LAROCHE and GEORGES DUVAL are adduced. We like best of all MATERLINCK'S, as follows: "J'ai dans la tête d'étranges choses qui aboutiront à ma main; et il faut accomplir avant qu'on les a médité." We are here far from the famous French version of "Frailty, thy name is woman," which appeared as "Mlle. Frailty is the name of a lady."

But not MAURICE MATERLINCK, with his funds of poetic sympathy and subtle intuitions, his tact, knowledge and verbal versatility, can successfully bridge the gulf that lies between the genius of the English language and the genius of the French language. We select several of the famous single lines as specimens and admire the agile resources of the translator. For example: "Quand nous retrouvons-nous?" is the equivalent for "When shall we three meet again?" "Fair is foul and foul is fair" becomes "Le laid est beau et le beau laid." These are not very difficult tests.

The onomatopoeia is of necessity missed in the speech: "A drum, a drum! Macbeth doth come." In French: "Le tambour! Le tambour! Macbeth arrive ici!" Nor is "éteints-out, éteints-out, brief candle!" "Frappe donc, Macbeth, et damne soit celui qui crie la première: 'Arrête! c'est assez!'" retains some of the primal rhythmic vigor and assonance of "Lay on, Macduff, and damned be he that first cries 'Hold, enough!'" "Hang out your banners on the outward walls" is rendered: "Déployez vos bannières sur les remparts extérieurs," a faithful transcription.

Some of the tirades are admirably paraphrased, strange though they sound to English ears. The ferocity of *Lady Macbeth's* speech, Act I, scene 5, misses neither in meaning nor in terrible intonations; and MATERLINCK has fairly succeeded, we are fair to believe, with such a snarl as:

"He treads him: That I may pour my spirits in thine ear And chastise with the valor of my tongue All that impedes thee from the golden round Which fate and metaphysical aid doth seem To leave thee crowned withal."—Act I, scene 3.

With MATERLINCK this goes to the tune of "Viens ici que je puisse verser mon courage dans ton oreille et t'ôtier par la vaillance de mes paroles tous les obstacles au cercle d'or dont le destin et un appui sur lequel semblent te couronner," which is bald prose. Is it not odd that RICHARD STRAUSS should have selected this as a motto for his tone poem "Macbeth"? The gross humor of the Porter in the knocking at the gate scene is not attenuated, though we must protest against such a subtlety as "le trop boire est le jésuite de la pailardise" (the italic is ours) for "much drink" may be said to be an equivocal word of lechery.

We need not quote further to prove that if MATERLINCK does not overcome insuperable difficulties he has accomplished much more than the majority of his predecessors. It is a brilliant performance, this translation, superior to work for which many a man has attained a seat in the French Academy. This version sustained the trial of a public performance at the Abbey of Ste. Wandrille with Mme. GEORGETTE LEBLANC, MATERLINCK as *Lady Macbeth*.

for Switzerland stands in no fear of military aggression. But she has a customs tariff, and, what is of great importance, she derives considerable revenue from transportation and mail carrying monopolies. She cannot afford to have the aeronauts interfere with these. The great pleasure or playground of Europe, Switzerland's prosperity depends largely upon the entertainment of her visitors. Her charges for passenger, freight and postal conveniences are essential to her welfare. How are the coming and going and use of the airship to be regulated? Dr. RITTER said at Lake Mohonk:

"The freedom of airships must be considered in principle, as they travel at such a distance from the earth that the owner of land can have no interest in prohibiting traffic overhead. However, such traffic should be subject to certain regulations which on the one hand protect the property zone and on the other secure to the aeronaut certain privileges indispensable to him. Viewed in the light of public law the question also becomes important. How far up into the atmosphere does the domain of a State extend and to what height does the penal law follow the right of a State to mete out punishment? A few questions of martial law concerning aeronauts have heretofore been settled at the two peace conferences at The Hague. But other questions arise. For instance, shall the laws pertaining to contraband of war or blockade running be made applicable to air traffic? May airships for war purposes pass through the property zone of neutral States? May they land to take in equipment or provisions?"

Furthermore, all nations will have to consider whether and to what extent they will carry on aeronautics as a monopoly similar to carrying mails. Eventually the question will have to be decided whether Governmental airships shall be kept solely for war purposes or as well for the purpose of carrying the mails and to guard against smuggling. Especially as regards these two latter phases, the customs service and the mail service, the greater danger is apparent that the interests of a State may be prejudiced."

Dr. RITTER advocates the establishment forthwith of an international aeronautical bureau similar to the International Postal Union. He believes that airships will soon be serving the public very much as railroads and steamships do now, if in a limited degree. It is obvious that airships can never take the place of railroads and steamships; but on the other hand, it is the general opinion that the airship is well adapted for light freight traffic, and the carrying of the mails is well within its capacity. There must then be international as well as local law to regulate the use of airships. Of the assertion that a recent aeronautic conference in London of the "right to traffic in the air analogous to the right to traffic on land and water" Dr. RITTER says: "In future possibly a distinction may develop between a right to air traffic over sea and over land; there freedom, here territorial jurisdiction."

While it would seem that there must be a great advance in practical aeronautics before the law of regulation can take definite form and be divided into chapters and sections, some problems are pressing—those of the posts and customs revenue, for instance; and it would be well for some authoritative tribunal to take time by the forelock.

A Lesson of Experience.

To all Magistrates and to all others whose business or pleasure brings them into contact with those products of urban conditions known as "car rowdies" these words of City Magistrate CORNELL are commended:

"I find that imposing a fine has no effect in stopping this rowdiness, and I am going to send all such offenders to the workhouse as an object lesson."

Through all the years that have passed since the conduct of ruffians on street cars, elevated railway trains and subway trains has been a nuisance and a danger to the public policy of kindness, modified at times by the imposition of trivial fines, has been in the ascendency. It has been obviously and notoriously unsuccessful in checking the evil of rowdiness. Gentleness has failed, and in the height of its failure has been adhered to persistently.

A mistaken lenity has subjected the people of New York to annual seasons of terrorism and abuse. It is time for a moderate and enlightened sternness to be tried, to the end that freedom from assaults and batteries at least may be established on the normally uncomfortable transportation lines.

France, it seems, has just escaped another German peril, an actual invasion of French territory by the Kaiser. With characteristic light-heartedness, however, the Parisian press is laughing at the incident. During his recent visit to Alsace-Lorraine the Emperor WILLIAM made an automobile excursion from Strasbourg to Metz. He followed the military road that passes through the Vosges at Saverne and then skirts the French frontier for many miles. At Vic, however, the main road, a survival of the French times, crosses the frontier, while a new road branches off toward Metz. At the crossing the German authorities had placed a freeman, whose duty it was to give the Emperor the route. But the freeman was a thirsty soul and presently he disappeared in the little inn and sat down to beer. When he came back he learned to his horror that the Emperor WILLIAM had come, taken the wrong turn and was rushing on toward the French frontier. A car carrying attendants of the Emperor arrived just then and at the appeal of the frantic official set off in pursuit of the Kaiser. They overtook him within sight of the French custom house, and the invasion was avoided. The Emperor was very angry, and an investigation has resulted. But this does not diminish the appreciation of the incident either in France or Alsace-Lorraine.

This is to certify that the most sophisticated looking monarch now on earth is FREDERICK OF DENMARK.

The Praise of Donat. To the Editor of THE SUN.—I fully intend your correspondent E. H. J.'s glowing description of the comet of 1859 (Donat's) I saw it when staying in Switzerland, and while I cannot state in detail the discovery was taken up by its own recollection pictures (as of most brilliant and impressive things. Half a century has but little dulled the wonderful impression. PHILADELPHIA, May 20. EDWARD BROOKS.

THE SCHEDULED PUTTER.

Spirited Defense of an American Invention Which the British Ban From the Links. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Your cable report from England this morning says that the rules of golf committee of St. Andrews has legislated against the use of the so-called Schenectady putter, or the putter with the shaft running to the middle of the head, and that the United States Golf Association has been asked to adopt the same ruling.

This is a matter which affects more than a hundred thousand members of golf clubs in this country, to say nothing of the vast army of unattached, and it is to be hoped that the United States will not be so foolish as to follow in the footsteps of the conservative British, who never like to recognize a good thing if it originates on this side of the Atlantic, especially if we beat them out of a British championship with it, as Travis did with this same putter in 1904.

We are not stuck in the muds like the British. If the Schenectady putter will do better work than the old style, or if any person can design a club that will do better work than our present clubs, let us have the best tools for the job by all means. Why did not the British ban the rubber cored ball, which drove so much further than the gutty? Why did they allow the Drednought driver? Simply because the superiority was so marked that they had not the face to rule them out. Why should we do so with a putter which can improve the game as held as a benefactor except in England, where they hate progress of any kind when it beats them at their own game.

The British would like us to race in the old style huggers for the America's cup, and they find that they cannot design a cup that is equal to the American models. They fought against the sliding seat in the rowing shell, against the pneumatic tire on the bicycle, and against the peep sight on the rifle. They fight everything new that beats them.

It is a fundamental principle in all games that the individual player can use any tools he pleases, provided he does not force his opponent to change his game. If the innovation is a good thing every one will use it. If it is not a good thing the player who adopts it handicaps himself in billiards you must use standard table, balls and pockets because your opponent uses them. You can use a cue six feet long if you like, or the weight of any kind of ball, or you can play without chalking it if you think that is any advantage.

In shooting you can use any kind of a load you please provided you shoot from the same mark and at the same traps as your opponents. They do not care whether you shoot with a pump or a double barrel, with a weight of twenty-four ounces, with ten gauge or twelve, with an ounce of shot or one and a half ounces, with black or smokeless powder. If you can demonstrate that your gun and load are perfect the whole world will adopt them.

So in golf. You cannot change the size of the cups or the position of the disks on the tees, but you can use any kind of ball, even the old gutty if you fancy it. You can put the ball on a tee two inches high if you want to, or you can play it off the grass. You are perfectly at liberty to drive with a putter or a masher, and to put with a driver or a niblick. Demonstrate that your club is the best over the whole golfing world will copy it. If you can do better work by taking the head of the club in your hand and hitting the ball with the shaft no one will stop you as long as you don't lie down and use the club like a billiard cue.

There are men who insist that there is no such long ball as that driven with a club that has the least on the face, but others do not agree. The superiority of any particular make of club over all others for all players has never been proved. The perfect model for a golf club is still to be found. If we do not experiment we shall never reach it.

The Schenectady putter is a better putter than any other its use should be universally recommended by the governing associations, whose business it is to promote the game, not to hold it back. If it is not so good as the ordinary putter and hurts the player's game it will kill itself without legislation. If it is really the best putter, by all means use it, and let others do the same. The substitution of the modern masher for the short spoon? What right have we to use a niblick? How dare we put the whip in the shaft of a driver below the handle instead of just above the head? Perhaps they allow these things because they are British ideas, whereas the Schenectady putter is an American idea, a championship, and it may be well to think that an American can design a club that will beat them at their own game.

FEEL HILLS GOLF CLUB, MAY 20.

The City Hall Flag.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—What was the matter with the flag floating from the flagpole on City Hall on Friday? In contrast with the flag on other buildings in the vicinity of City Hall Park, which were all flying at half mast, the flag on City Hall was flying at full mast the greater part of the day.

As a mark of respect for the funeral of the late King Edward the flag should have been flown at half mast on the day of the funeral. The flag on City Hall failed to receive instructions from the Mayor or somebody else in authority, he should have followed the example set by the Post Office, where the two flags flew at half mast all day. Orders to American flags were received from Washington.

Nearly everybody who had business on Park Row or who passed that vicinity, remembering that it was the late King's funeral day, glanced up at the flag on City Hall, and when they saw it flying at full mast they made an expression of surprise. Some time in the afternoon the flag was lowered to half mast. Another thing that was noticed in connection with the flag was that the flag on the Post Office was hoisted early in the morning, but the flag on City Hall was not hoisted until 9 A. M. AMERICAN CITIZEN, NEW YORK, MAY 21.

The Cost of Living. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—There seems to be some justice in adding a couple of eggs to it, but a wall is permitted over a charge of 50 cents for a rye whiskey highball when the proprietor of a pretentious hotel imposes for a Sunday drink. Yet it led to the discovery that across the way the same could be had for a quarter.

Again, a customer on Fifth Avenue exacts 50 cents for a cognac, while a better quality may be obtained elsewhere for 30 cents. I recently found that the prices of a far down town hotel exceed those of a supposedly high priced place up town by from 10 to 25 per cent. The proprietor of the cheap house made a fortune out of 40 cent chops and retired, now his successor charges 70 cents. Why all this? There are enough who will pay it. NEW YORK, MAY 21. N. Y.

THE BOY PROBLEM.

Awkward Position of a Man Asked to Employ a Lively Youngster. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Probably "Business Woman," who writes on "The Study of Boys," is possessed of such an admirable personality as amply bears her power of moral suasion. The fullness of her argument lies in her admission that she has no boys of her own, which must have undermined the question what kind of boys they would be if she had them.

The difficulty is not with the boys themselves, but with the parents. The home discipline is in most instances lax, to the boy's undoing. The kids are run into the family councils and allowed their say in a manner quite astonishing.

Here is a case in point: The widow of a former Western business associate of mine told me that she had written an application for employment of her eldest boy would be entertained by my firm. I wrote an inquiry about the boy to a friend in the same town expressing the hope that the lad was many and energetic, that he was the sort that appeared to wear "leaves." The answer came back that the difficulty was too much "malingering," and that as for being heavy footed there was no likelihood of it, that he would probably "hit out" the high places in New York.

Now as my office is now a reformatory I am in a position to advise. BUSINESS MAN, NEW YORK, MAY 21.

Outlet for Animal Spirits.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—It looks to me as though most of those who have written you in condemnation of the rising generation of the masculine gender have regarded its members as its subjects rather than as its equals, and as though some special forms of punishment need to be devised to make good men out of the material at hand, which the writers seem to think is pretty poor material at best.

J. F. Henriques, who does not forget that he was a boy, probably was righteously indignant at the chap who was sent to the reformatory, but if he had gone at the offender in a kindly way instead of threatening him with condign punishment he would have had better results with that particular boy and probably would have stood a better chance at immunity from further vandalism, as I think he regards it.

The Brooklyn man, Philip D. Carver, seems to take the view of the matter, but he hits the nail on the head when he inquires what to do with the bad boys. This can be easily answered in one word: Give them a job.

Give them an interesting employment in their idle hours to take the place of the attractions toward evil of dance halls, pool halls, etc. The United Boys Brigade of America aims to do this, and in fact is doing it for thousands of boys in hundreds of cities and towns all over our broad land, and any person really interested in the future of his own boy, his neighbor's boy or his country's boy should get in touch with some officer of our organization or get some of our literature. He soon will learn how to get work to accomplish his aim, and which will be a better method than any he has invented.

Colonel Third N. J. Regiment, U. S. A., HADDONFIELD, N. J., MAY 20.

United Boys Brigades of America.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—My letter to THE SUN in reply to unkind criticism of the boys has evidently been misunderstood. The object of the United Boys Brigade of America is the advancement of Christ's Kingdom among boys and the promotion of habits of reverence, discipline, self-respect and all that tends to true Christian manliness. The boys are under hard, stern, United States Army regulations, and are not allowed to do as they please unless they are in the presence of a moral man or the regulations give them plenty of chance to work off their surplus steam, and strengthen the boy mentally, morally and physically.

I am glad that I have impressed one with my youthful enthusiasm, but I am not at all in a hurry to do a thing of the past, but I have unbounded faith in God Almighty and the American boy, and the commander of the United Boys Brigades of America.

DUMONT, N. J., MAY 20.

Where the Responsibility Lies.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—I read all the letters to THE SUN on the subject of boys, as I have been much occupied the last fourteen years bringing up three of them. I feel more and more strongly as the years go by that very much of the good or bad in children is due to parental influence. The father, and more especially the mother, are the moral man or woman, and the regulations give them plenty of chance to work off their surplus steam, and strengthen the boy mentally, morally and physically.

They should feel the same keen desire to make a success of their children as of any other work, and should be more vigilant and eradicated, the nervous child fed and soothed into serenity, the dour child nurtured and tempered, the irritable child taught self-control. No one but a parent should undress or dress a child before he is ten years old. Inherited defects of character, one but his mother should prepare his food until he is at least 5 years old.

Industry, honesty, personal cleanliness cannot be learned too young, and parents must be just as ashamed of defects or illness in their offspring as they would be in their own. The child who is ill, or who has any handicap, should be guarded against and eradicated, the nervous child fed and soothed into serenity, the dour child nurtured and tempered, the irritable child taught self-control. No one but a parent should undress or dress a child before he is ten years old. Inherited defects of character, one but his mother should prepare his food until he is at least 5 years old.

Industry, honesty, personal cleanliness cannot be learned too young, and parents must be just as ashamed of defects or illness in their offspring as they would be in their own. The child who is ill, or who has any handicap, should be guarded against and eradicated, the nervous child fed and soothed into serenity, the dour child nurtured and tempered, the irritable child taught self-control. No one but a parent should undress or dress a child before he is ten years old. Inherited defects of character, one but his mother should prepare his food until he is at least 5 years old.

Industry, honesty, personal cleanliness cannot be learned too young, and parents must be just as ashamed of defects or illness in their offspring as they would be in their own. The child who is ill, or who has any handicap, should be guarded against and eradicated, the nervous child fed and soothed into serenity, the dour child nurtured and tempered, the irritable child taught self-control. No one but a parent should undress or dress a child before he is ten years old. Inherited defects of character, one but his mother should prepare his food until he is at least 5 years old.

HERO WORSHIP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—The letter of Mr. Francis Mannion in THE SUN of May 15 is extremely interesting as an illustration of a tendency in our time, which is as attractive and valuable as it is at the same time dangerous, the power of personality, in other words hero worship. In democracy sweeps over the world the most pressing question is: How can it be managed and controlled? It cannot be by general principles expressed in concrete results, but the very simple reason that multitudes cannot act together. This is not only true of societies. They try to appeal to the feelings at large; but the people are big game against the men and the combinations of men who want war. It is of no use again to denounce combinations of capital, because when the strife comes the people always suffer in the end, or corruption in politics because the skilled manipulators will defeat and discourage more popular sentiment. In war the people are hounded. Thus in the civil war we went from disaster to another till Lincoln found a giant, Sherman and Sheridan the generals who could do the work. To get any definite results, good or bad, from a multitude there must be aroused enthusiasm for single men.

Now as my office is now a reformatory I am in a position to advise. BUSINESS MAN, NEW YORK, MAY 21.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—It looks to me as though most of those who have written you in condemnation of the rising generation of the masculine gender have regarded its members as its subjects rather than as its equals, and as though some special forms of punishment need to be devised to make good men out of the material at hand, which the writers seem to think is pretty poor material at best.

J. F. Henriques, who does not forget that he was a boy, probably was righteously indignant at the chap who was sent to the reformatory, but if he had gone at the offender in a kindly way instead of threatening him with condign punishment he would have had better results with that particular boy and probably would have stood a better chance at immunity from further vandalism, as I think he regards it.

The Brooklyn man, Philip D. Carver, seems to take the view of the matter, but he hits the nail on the head when he inquires what to do with the bad boys. This can be easily answered in one word: Give them a job.

Give them an interesting employment in their idle hours to take the place of the attractions toward evil of dance halls, pool halls, etc. The United Boys Brigade of America aims to do this, and in fact is doing it for thousands of boys in hundreds of cities and towns all over our broad land, and any person really interested in the future of his own boy, his neighbor's boy or his country's boy should get in touch with some officer of our organization or get some of our literature. He soon will learn how to get work to accomplish his aim, and which will be a better method than any he has invented.

Colonel Third N. J. Regiment, U. S. A., HADDONFIELD, N. J., MAY 20.

Notes for Women.

The Ballot Granted in Certain Swiss and British Churches. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—A vote in church affairs has just been granted to women in the National Church in the cantons of Vaud and Neuchâtel, Switzerland, and a vigorous effort is being made to extend this right to the other cantons. The Swiss women support the plea of the women and rebuff the objections. These bear a strong family likeness to the familiar arguments against woman suffrage.

For instance it is urged that this privilege is only the thin edge of the wedge and that if women are allowed to vote they may some day be elected to office. Also it is said that "many women do not desire to have a vote" in church affairs. To this the *Journal de Genève* answers: "Because some women do not wish to participate in the election of their pastor, why should that right be refused to those who take a more active interest?"

In the Church of England there seems to be less dread of women's holding office. The *Dorset Mercury* writes from Exeter, England, says: "At the Rural Diocesan Conference the following resolution was moved and carried unanimously: 'That in the opinion of this conference ladies should be eligible for election to the Rural Diocesan Council, and that the Bishop be asked to take the necessary steps to give effect to this resolution.'"

Last year two women were elected and served, but their eligibility was questioned, hence this resolution. MASS. STONE PLACEMEN, FORTRESS, MASS., MAY 20.

The Harriman Bill.

From the *Newburgh Journal*: It is to