The Sun.

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1915.

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 Month	25
SUNDAY (to Canada), Per Month	40
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 50
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 50
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	75
FOREIGN RATES.	
DAILY, Per Month	1 25
SUNDAY, Per Month	65
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	1 90
THE EVENING SUN, Per Month	25
THE EVENING SUN, Per Year	2 50
THE EVENING SUN (Foreign), Per Mo.	1 03

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer, William C. Reick, 170 Nassau street; Vice-President, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Secretary, C. E. Luxton, 170 Nassau street.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand.

Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodiere, off Rue du Quatre Septembre.

Washington office, Hibbs Building.

Brooklyn office, 106 Livingston street.

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

Will the Governor Heed This Appeal?

Mayor MITCHEL's request to Governor WHITMAN to give an opportunity for the city to be heard on the propriety and effect of the appropriation bills passed in the closing hours of the legislative session is reasonable and moderately expressed. This city must pay 70 per cent. of the direct State tax. If by the exercise of his veto power the Governor will reduce the total of allowances in a sum that will render such a tax unnecessary, in part or in whole, a special session can modify the tax legislation and thus relieve the community.

The situation in this city is serious. The physical development of the town has rendered necessary large expenditures in the past. Some of them have been extravagant, some indefensibly wasteful. Within recent years a more careful oversight has been exercised than was formerly the case, but the most diligent efforts have not prevented a high tax on real estate, nor can the ordinary and essential functions of city government be maintained for a cost substantially lower than has now been reached. The debt service and the expenses imposed by the mandatory acts of the Legislature are beyond reach of the administration. Hence, if $14,000,000 is to be included in the next budget for a direct State tax, the city faces a tax rate, in the Mayor's words, "well nigh confiscatory," or retrenchments that will cripple the police, the health department service and the charitable activities of the town.

From the leaders of the Legislature the officials of this town received scant consideration when they sought to protest against the financial programme in the earlier stages of its development. New York asked for a hearing and got the unsatisfactory concession of an informal discussion. It now asks the Governor for a judicial study of the facts, sufficient time for a careful examination of the items included in the bills, and a fair decision based on the necessities of the State and the plight of the city, instead of the appetite and capacity of machine politicians.

The Nature Theatre.

There is promise of more out of door drama this summer than there ever has been before. In addition to the usual number of so-called pastoral plays, "Siegfried" is to be sung at one of the American universities, while the others are to have their usual visitations of companies performing Shakespeare and the antique tragedies. But nothing is so ambitious in its purpose as the production of WAGNER's opera at Harvard.

"Tannhäuser" was sung in a forest near Königsberg several years ago. In France both MASSENET and SAINT-SAËNS have composed operas for performance in the antique theatre at Orange, where "Carmen" has more than once been sung. In California there was an open air performance of VICTOR HERBERT's "Natoma." But a classic opera has never been attempted here in an open air theatre.

Open air music is not as a rule satisfactory from an artistic point of view, and it is the picturesqueness and novelty of these representations rather than their technical excellence that interests the public. The same is true of dramatic representations in the open, although in Switzerland, Germany and France there are several out of door theatres which give regular seasons in normal times. In France one of these is in the neighborhood of Paris, although the most famous is in the land of MISTRAL. This country has no permanent playhouse of the kind, although many of the universities possess Greek theatres, which have been utilized by some of the most famous of actors.

In addition to the touring companies that will represent Shakespeare and the modern plays suited to out of door performance—possibly it would be more exact to speak of plays that could be performed in the open with the least loss of effect—there will be efforts to present certain of the Greek tragedies which have not hitherto had a place in the repertoire of the open air actors. So the country will see more than usual of the actors under the sky instead of the proscenium arch.

But acting of this kind will never be taken as seriously in this country as it is in some of the European nature theatres, especially that situated on the shores of the Lake of the Four Cantons. Here the actors play during a period of several months, the repertoire is especially selected from the classics of the German stage, and the whole arrangement of the season is as elaborate and substantial as if there were an enclosed theatre. Here the open air plays are never likely to be more than a novel transfer of the theatre from its usual medium to the surroundings of a summer landscape. Serious drama will always be reserved for the enclosed theatre, however entertaining such artistic excursions may be.

Mr. Barnes Appears.

The Colonel gave himself an excellent character in his testimony at Syracuse. He exposed the wickedness of those politicians with whom his destiny compelled him to associate, revealed the cunning with which he diverted their activities from evil to good, made plain the unyielding probity of his own enterprises and the skill with which he adapted to the purposes of virtue the weapons intended for vice. With a delicacy that could not fail to impress he accepted the burden of his reformatory record and acknowledged his superiority to those who surrounded him.

It was interesting, but much of it did not bear on the character and the practices of Mr. BARNES, who, it is useful to recall, is the plaintiff in the suit. It was because Mr. BARNES was alleged to be bad, not because Mr. ROOSEVELT confesses himself good, that the Syracuse court is occupied by the flower of our political life. That fact has been somewhat obscured so far, but with the appearance of Mr. BARNES on the stand it may be brought once more to public attention. Mr. BARNES is not without force and vigor; he is no decrepit, weak and tottering invalid; he is robust, purposeful, and possessed of a variety of unimpeachable souvenirs of the recent politics of New York.

The Colonel so completely absorbs and occupies the senses whenever and wherever he is present that Mr. BARNES's part in this action may easily have been forgotten. It will be encouraging to collectors of political memorabilia to be reminded that he is not to be despised in any contest, and that his appearance on the stand will not involve a lessening in the interest that the Rooseveltian testimony aroused.

Russian "Concession" to Polish Nationality.

If it be true, as reported from Petrograd, that the first step has been taken toward restoring the use of the Polish language in the schools of Russian Poland, those troubled subjects of the Czar who live where the periphery of his dominion wedges into Europe will greatly rejoice. Poland has been the Belgium of the east, with the added unhappiness of civil war, Russian Poles fighting against their brothers of compulsory Teutonic allegiance. In the mass of conflicting statements, full of bias and exaggeration, the weight of evidential value appears to rest with the report that the Russian Poles have rendered most useful service to their overlords. And in no way could the Czar bind closer to him these high spirited people than by such acts as the reported concession of the right to have their children's instruction carried on in the language of their fathers.

Russia is said to have made pretence of such concessions by high sounding decree wherein the substance was carefully nullified by conditional clauses of most innocent appearance. Language is the symbol of nationality, perhaps because it is the most vulnerable element. Deprive a people of free use of their native speech and you sow rebellion in their hearts. A command in his own tongue will send a Hungarian soldier six times as far as one in German. Holland was inert under French suzerainty until she was ordered to speak French; then the people, sputtering their dear Dutch about the guarded hearthstone, began to feel the stir of reviving nationality and to climb back to independence. It is easy to imagine how the Russian Poles, a fierce and fiery race for all their obdurate endurance, have told the national legends and sung the national songs to their children with the greater effect because forbidden.

As a "melting pot" Russia makes this country look like a refrigerator. PETER the Great gave the initial shock that set in motion the wheels of the Europeanizing machinery. CATHERINE II. directed the impulse into straightforward channels. The Japanese war repeated the shock, and the present war repeats the influence of concentration. In Finland and in Poland there is crisis, absolute uncertainty for the future. The process of Russification, rudely interrupted, may be chopped off short or accelerated; it is now suspended in the vortex of the political maelstrom.

The Finns may possibly be absorbed, the eastward pull overcoming the westward. There is no Gulf of Bothnia between them and Petrograd, as there is between them and Stockholm. But the descendants of SOBIESKI and KOSCIUSZKO are of different stuff; we do not call it better or poorer stuff, but in the Russian retort it seems sure to be found less fusible. As subject people the Poles will always be a thorn in the side of their rulers; but let Russia concede honestly and unequivocally those privileges dear to Polish pride and not opposed to Russian interest, and she will find Poland a loyal member of the family. Poland made a mess of it when she tried to make a Constitution; she may see her own gain in incorporation with the great State that Russia will be after this war: all of Poland Russian Poland.

But she will not be happy so long as she is regarded and treated as spoil for the tax collector, paying tribute to be spent entirely outside her own borders. Does not the profit of both countries rest in a compromise between the Polish dream of independence and the Russian scheme of subjugation?

The Terms of the Victors.

Professor J. HOLLAND ROSE in an article in the *Fortnightly Review* maintains that the idea, popular in some quarters, that the Allies if victorious will insist upon harsh and punitive terms of peace is "an unwarranted assumption." He is sure that the statesmen at the conference table would avoid the mistake which BISMARCK, spurred on by VON MOLTKE and the military party, made after the war with France in 1871, when he demanded a huge indemnity and insisted upon the cession of Metz. It might be said for this view that Mr. ASQUITH, and particularly Sir EDWARD GREY, who will have a good deal to say about the next peace if Great Britain and her allies triumph, are not vindictive men, but are eminently practical, cool headed and far seeing, men also of liberal and humane instincts. Blood and iron as a policy is foreign to their natures. They know that England would have to live with Germany after the war, not according to the gospel of hate, but in conformity to the imperative need for rehabilitation and enlightened progress. Dr. ROSE felicitously revives an utterance of PITT during the war with France on June 7, 1799:

"Our simple object is security, just security, with a little mixture of indemnification. These are the legitimate objects of war at all times, and when we have attained that end we are in a condition to derive from peace its beneficent advantages; but until then our duty and our interest require that we should persevere unappalled in the struggle to which we were provoked. We shall not be satisfied with a false security. War, with all its evils, is better than a peace in which there is nothing to be seen but usurpation and injustice, dwelling with savage delight on the humble, prostrate condition of some timid, suppliant people."

After Waterloo both WELLINGTON and CASTLEREAGH, as Dr. ROSE goes on to show, were opposed to humiliating a brave enemy or to any terms that would give France just provocation to disturb the peace of Europe again. "In my opinion," wrote the Duke, "we ought to continue our great object (as contemplated in the treaty of Paris in 1814), the genuine peace and tranquillity of the world, in our view, and shape our arrangements so as to provide for it." CASTLEREAGH was of the same mind and just as firmly opposed to recasting the main provisions of the treaty of Paris. "It is not our business," he said, "to collect trophies, but to try, if we can, to bring back the world to peaceful habits. I do not believe this to be compatible with any attempt now materially and permanently to affect the territorial character of France as settled by the treaty of Paris."

The truth is that Europe had a loathing for war when the Napoleonic era ended. It had cost every country engaged in the long drawn out conflict not only the best of its manhood, but appalling losses in treasure and ruin of property, dooming one and all to carry for an indefinite period a staggering burden of debt. Reconstruction was a problem to make the wisest statesman speculate whether half a century of toil and thrift would restore normal conditions.

After the great convulsion of the present day in Europe war will be hated and anathematized as much as was the case a hundred years ago. As in 1815 so in 1915, or the blessed time when peace returns, the statesmen to whom it falls to arrange the terms and to plan for the future will make "the genuine peace and tranquillity of the world" their governing consideration, and they will aim to insure a peace to last for generations. Such a consummation will be impossible if crushing indemnities are exacted, if colonies are torn from the defeated, if their fleets are appropriated and national pride is ground under the heels of the victors.

A Winning Issue.

The breaking heart of a sorely disappointed patriot is revealed in the subjoined unquestionably authentic lament attributed to a Republican Alderman who had learned of the veto of the gerrymander passed by the Legislature:

"It means that we will have a Tammany Board of Aldermen for the next ten years after the elections this fall.

"It means, too, that Tammany will elect a City Clerk and get the forty-one jobs in his office."

A Tammany board, and that after the triumphs of fusion in 1913 and of the Republicans in 1914! Are not the forces of virtue sufficiently endeared to the voters to assure victory to them this fall? If they feel to-day somewhat doubtful about the issue, can they not create a cyclone of enthusiasm by dwelling pathetically and hungrily on that "City Clerk and forty-one jobs in his office"?

By Rail From Paris to the Piræus.

America has more than a passing interest in the railway, now almost completed, which will connect the Greek roads with the rest of Europe, for the United States furnished the rails and locomotives used in the construction of the line.

From Larissa, the northern terminus of the Hellenic railway, to the junction point near Salonica is only seventy miles, yet the Greeians were never able until the Turks had been driven out of Macedonia to carry out this long cherished plan. With the completion of the line the time of travel from the Piræus, the port of Athens, to Paris by way of Servia and the Orient railway will be only sixty hours, and the time of the Indian mail service will be shortened thirty hours each way.

The Grecian Ministry of Communication appears to expect a great increase in travel to Greece and has arranged a dining and sleeping car service. It also informs the tourist world that the road will be opened to traffic in August, but it seems only natural to wonder if at that time some parts of this new international route may not be otherwise engaged.

It is highly probable that the 500 vacant seats in Carnegie Hall on the occasion of Mr. BRYAN's appeal for total abstinence represented the severe self-denial of gentlemen who wanted to attend but feared they might be reformed if they did.

Convicts win Sunday baseball.—*Headline.*

And only a short time ago they had to protest against the daily ball and chain.

In the records of old St. Patrick's, at Mott and Prince streets, the history of a century of New York Roman Catholicism may be read, and the story of New York's growth could be pretty accurately reproduced from the tale they would unfold. Nothing more vividly illustrates the shift of population than the fact that whereas the parishioners were once largely of Irish, German and French extraction, Italians now constitute an overwhelming majority of the worshippers. Of 2,800 children whose names are now on the rolls, all except fifty are Italians, when even twenty-five years ago the 1,300 youngsters represented families of all races. It is not without significance that St. Patrick's clergy find enough to do, a field needing and repaying their labors, without moving uptown.

Senator OWEN of Oklahoma, chairman of the committee of Democrats which is to devise rules for limiting debate in the Senate, speaks:

"In some States they do not use the previous question because the members of the Legislature are sufficiently considerate not to abuse the courtesy extended them by the majority, or to attempt to use that courtesy of full and free debate to convert it into an instrumentality of depriving to the majority which extended it the right of action."

So the right to debate very energetically supported by the Democrats in the days of "Czar" REED has degenerated into a "courtesy"!

If the Metropolitan Club in Washington loses its license to serve liquors, some of our most emphatic patriots will be obliged to find a new forum for the expression of their opinions.

The railroad employees, dissatisfied with the outcome of the arbitration over the dispute between the Western trainmen and the roads, now propose to ask Congress to investigate the appointment of Mr. NAGLE as a neutral member of the board. Apparently a neutral is not more popular in an industrial quarrel than he is in an international row.

SHOULD ITALY ARBITRATE?

A Wondering Question Inspired by the World's Changed Attitude.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* When the present war began a great deal was heard from the sentimentalists and others in this country condemning Germany for not having accepted arbitration to settle the dispute.

I am surprised, however, that no efforts are now made by any one party to suggest that Italy and Austria, who have been locked in friendship for the last forty-five years, submit their differences to arbitration.

Is there a standard for one side and another standard for the other? As Italy seems to be very likely to join the Allies nobody thinks of suggesting arbitration.

I should be very glad to hear the views of some of your correspondents on this question, and I will thank you if you will give this letter space in your valued paper. C. H. BRUCE.

NEW YORK, May 1.

Men, Women and War.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Just at present it seems to be the hue and cry among budding journalists, would-be poets and those whose reason is overshadowed by sentiment that in this war through which the world is passing it is "the woman who pays."

That may be all very well, but incidentally it might be just as well to remember that there are hordes of men fighting in foreign fields who are paying a bitterer price than the majority of women are ever called upon to pay.

No matter what privation the bereaved wives or sisters or mothers have to contend with, it can hardly be compared to the agonies of those nameless heroes in the trenches, their bodies infested with vermin, ill nourished, diseased, subject any moment to a tearing death, and half or more of whom are fighting for what they know not.

The woman, it is true, pays a price, but lest we forget, the man too is paying his price, his life. All the expense is not alone on one side.

MILDRED STEWART.

NEW YORK, May 1.

Beware the Knife! Cries an Old Republican.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* What is this talk about Roosevelt having something to say concerning Republican affairs and nominations? He is not a Republican, has no right even to vote at a Republican primary. Surely Republicans have too much self-respect, not to say horse sense, ever again to admit Roosevelt to their councils. It looks now as if nothing could prevent a Republican landslide next year except some such fool weakness as letting Roosevelt, for his own ulterior purposes, force himself back into the fold. A man who would once knife the party that gave him every political honor he ever enjoyed would do it again if he got the chance. He is out now; keep him out. A LIFELONG REPUBLICAN.

DECATUR, Ill., April 29.

It Depends on Whether One Is a Statesman or a Carpenter.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Does one take or make long steps?

Thanking you in advance for your reply,

NEW YORK, May 1. A CRITIC.

Prosperity in Pennsylvania Mountains.

Goodyear correspondence Valley Times.

J. H. Rockey has bought a horse, wagon, buggy, harness and gears.

The Overworked Twins.

First Poem—I have that tired spring feeling.

Second Poem—That's nothing; I have that tired war feeling.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

Statewide Balloting for Judges an Academic Proposal.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The plan urged by Mr. Charles W. Sloane that the Justices of our Supreme Court be chosen by the people of the entire State and not by the electors of the various judicial districts as at present is more academic than otherwise.

The trouble is that he confuses the jurisdiction of that court with the territory within which these various Judges preside. The State is divided into nine judicial districts. The first district comprises the counties of New York and The Bronx. The second district includes the counties of Richmond, Kings, Queens, Nassau and Suffolk. The ninth district embraces the counties of Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Putnam and Dutchess. The other districts are likewise made up of several counties. The Judges of the Supreme Court are chosen by the electors of these various districts. Thus the electors of the first district choose the Judges of the Supreme Court who are to preside at trials in that district, and the Judges chosen there do not sit outside that district. A similar situation is presented in all the other judicial districts.

Now, if a Judge chosen in the first or any other district were to sit at different times of the year in each of the other counties of the State, as well as within the counties of the district where elected, then there would be cause for complaint. As long, however, as Justices do not hold court outside of the districts within which they were chosen I fail to see how a situation is presented calling for the radical departure proposed by Mr. Sloane.

Furthermore, the present division of the State into judicial districts is both logical and productive of the best results. For one thing, it is in accord with the principle of home rule. It allows the voters of the various counties to decide who shall preside at their trials. It makes it possible for those Judges to hear cases who are acquainted with the generals conditions and the people of the community where they are tried. In some of the districts the business is so heavy and the conditions of living are such that the Justices are entitled to receive and do receive much higher compensation than in some other districts. Should the method proposed of electing Supreme Court Judges by the electorate of the entire State be adopted a uniform compensation would have to be paid to all; and as a result all the Judges would receive the maximum compensation now paid, thus imposing upon the taxpayers heavy additional expenses and burdens.

There are many serious questions with which the constitutional convention is confronted and which it should solve, such as giving equality to the city of New York in our State Legislature. So far as our judiciary as at present constituted is concerned, it seems clear that the convention should let well enough alone. TRUTH TELLER.

NEW YORK, May 1.

THE SAD TRAP DRUMMER.

Why Has Melancholy Marked the Man of Many Instruments?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* One of the most estimable men known to me is a drummer in a theatre orchestra, but, alas, "melancholy marks him for her own."

In the street, café, at home and among his friends, the monarch of his bosom tangoes blithely on its throne, but when engaged in the exercise of his art his features are curtained by sorrow whose cause I dare not ask. As well observed, a drummer does not have to pay much attention to his music score, because he has a score of implements and a roving commission to emphasize stage action, and one would suppose that he would enjoy a rattling good time in life just banging things.

Turning from him individually I have taken psychological observation of all orchestra drummers, and without exception all during their artistic performances bear a far away look at the audience and grief seems to weigh upon them with clubfooted violence. We may well understand why he who controls the destinies of the bass viol should suffer from calloused feet as he stands, and that while nature may have designed his heart for somersaults of joy, necessity may have inveigled him in the production of occasional guttural utterances from his instrument as though in mockery or derision of the rest of the music; but the drummer's woe beats everything hollow.

Any explanation?

FLATBUSH PHILOSOPHER.

NEW YORK, May 1.

The War of the Gaels.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* May I be permitted to say that Mr. John F. Murray would do well to be less vocal on the subject of Irish bardic history until he has learned enough to know that the city of Armagh and the ancient Palace of Emania were two entirely distinct and separate places? This knowledge would have prevented the childish blunder he made when writing of Queen Macha.

Mr. O'Farrell has on his side the authority of the very ancient topographical tract known as the Dinnseanchus, the Gaelic poet Kenneth O'Hartigan and the brilliant scholar Eugene O'Curry. It is true I rather incline to follow other authorities as to the origin and meaning of the word "Tara," but what of that? We are at one in all the essentials. Therefore I beg Mr. Murray to read again Mr. O'Farrell's scholarly letter in THE SUN of April 26. The closing paragraph is a splendid statement of the truth for all men, and especially for those who are so unwise as to belittle themselves by using such terms as "Biddy yarns." Mr. O'Farrell's last glorious sentence is worth reprinting.

Nor can any one say that the bardic history of Ireland is not as well deserving the care, consideration and study of modern scholarship as the ancient history of Greece or Rome, to which such study has been accorded.

That is a gospel which should be preached from the housetops.

WILLIAM LIVINGSTON.

NEW YORK, May 1.

Little Miss Inch.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* To-day I had occasion to ask the name of a lady. She said "A. Inch."

Being extremely quick and witty I said, "Anne Inch, I assume." "Yes," she replied, "that is my name, Anne Inch."

Here is a case where the articles "a" and "an" seem to fit the same word.

Isn't this amazing?

As the lady is very diminutive, perhaps she can enter your famous class.

BROOKLYN, May 1. C. J. M.

The Rarest Signer.

The highest price, $2,875, was paid by F. W. Morris for No. 432, the signature of Button Gwinnett, the most difficult of the signers' autographs to obtain.

Such a price we must declare
To be nothing more than fair,
You were rarest of the rare,
Button Gwinnett.

You were Uncle Sam's best friend
When he had to fight and fend,
Helped him then to hold his end,
Button Gwinnett.

Not an ornamental disk
Bearing neither strain nor risk
On a coattail end to frisk
Button Gwinnett.

'Tis for this that you shall sup
Ever more from glory's cup
For you held his gallus up,
Button Gwinnett.

MOLLENDOWER WINSOR.

WOMAN'S RIGHT TO VOTE.

An Examination of the Practical Facts of the Consent of the Governed.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In personal extenuation of the plain speaking to follow, permit me to declare an admiration and respect for womanhood both genuine and profound, and fully to acknowledge woman to be the equal or superior of man in every respect in which she appears successful in proving herself so. My criticisms are intended to be definitely restricted, and to bear no implication more offensive than a belief that each sex is possessed of its own peculiar merits and defects.

There are three main arguments advanced in behalf of woman suffrage; one, and the least convincing, an assertion that the influence of women in politics will be beneficial; another, that of the feminists, that political responsibility is necessary to advance their general development; and a third, the oldest in point of time, that a share in government is their fundamental right. May I be allowed to discuss these contentions in that order?

When advocates of woman suffrage base their claim on an assertion that the entrance of women into politics would improve the character of government they deal in unsupported conjecture. There is no evidence to show that a betterment of conditions would result. Where woman suffrage is in effect no such improvement is manifest; and in certain of those States, notably Colorado and California, there has occurred concurrently with the political innovation a conspicuous increase of erratic, irresponsible and intolerant tendencies of law making, accompanied in at least one of those cases by a pronounced enfeeblement of executive competence.

Further, a broad comparison of the moral and intellectual qualities of men and women there emerges not the slightest ground for a belief that women would or could improve the character of government. The general morality of mankind, even of woman herself, has been chiefly the creation of man, and woman has done but little more than conform in the main with his standard, and develop in herself those finer feelings and instincts natural to the mother and nurse and needful in defence of the purity of the home. The common prejudice that woman is superior morally to man arises purely in grateful recognition of her higher attainments in certain restricted fields of conduct, and is perpetuated in the public mind solely through a neglect to regard the fact that questions of ethics are involved in nearly every phase of human endeavor. A wide survey of the activities of life can leave no room for doubt that the morality established by man is the morality ingrained in the race.

Of the intellectual attainments of the sexes there is hardly need of making comparison. It is sufficient to point out that so long as the mass of practical men, and indeed the vast majority of women themselves, continue to recoil at the thought of facing a trial by jury of women there can exist no widespread confidence that the sound judgment of womankind as yet has become sufficiently apparent to qualify them for a judicious determination of governmental affairs.

When the advocates of woman suffrage put forward the argument that their participation in government would constitute the best possible means of raising women to an intellectual equality with men and fit them most speedily for a proper performance of political duties, the reasonable answer is that the welfare of a nation is too grave a matter for doubtful experimentation. If it were proposed, for example, to lower the age of male suffrage to ten years, a similar plea might be entered in defence of the absurdity, for assuredly the children could be educated to an intelligent use of the vote by no other means equal in effectiveness to that of actual experience. To the suggestion that children of ten should be accustomed to the duties of citizenship by the gift of the ballot even their own mothers would reply that they must demonstrate their possession of the requisite qualities first, not afterward; and until women in the mass exhibit in their general conduct a customary guidance by those attributes of mind which would fit them for political responsibility the answer to their demand for the vote logically must be the same.

This aspect of the matter is of considerable importance for the reason that woman suffragists apparently are unable to perceive the propriety of such a test in their own case, and seem wholly unable to realize that the majority of men oppose votes for women not because of prejudice, or even assumed principle, but purely on the ground of an honest belief that the intellectual and temperamental peculiarities characteristic of women constitute at the present time a political disability quite as pronounced and incompatible with governmental security as is the immaturity of childhood. And despite the fact that many who now enjoy the franchise unfortunately are not able to measure up to the rational standard, men holding this view maintain consistently that government is no proper field for the education of those who cannot bring convincing evidence of their ability to conduct it wisely and safely.

When the advocates of woman suffrage, blind to the true reason of men's opposition to their cause, cite their historic claim of an abstract right of self-government inseparable from the theory of democracy, they lean on a broken reed of incomplete generalization utterly without basis of justification in fact. Venerated documents and oratorical protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, there exists no fundamental right of government based solely on the consent of the governed. In point of reality such a loose and impracticable doctrine never but once has been put broadly in effect; and except in that single instance of the enfranchisement of the negro, a measure of merited partisanship which rational men have not ceased to regret, the doctrine of the consent of the governed has been accompanied in practice always by a requirement of the fitness of the governed to share in the responsibilities of government.

No reasonable man would dare offer self-government to the Filipinos, for example, until convinced that they would prove capable of it; and the United States has been reluctant enough to grant autonomy even to the Porto Ricans, a people of vastly superior mentality.

Finally, to show how completely inconclusive the dogma of the consent of the governed really is in the vital affairs of the race one need but recall the purpose and moral of the most momentous episode of our own national career; for the civil war was fought and won in absolute repudiation of that doctrine, and the North enforced on the South against its consent the Government of the United States. In that deadly struggle the American people disposed forever of the ethical myth that the right of government is grounded solely or even primarily in the consent of the governed; and until we have cause to repent that victory of the Union over secession no sensible person can deny that there are bigger things than the consent of the governed involved in the problems and duties of government. A full and truthful statement of the theory of democracy requires the assertion of the right of self-government to be qualified invariably by the demand of presumptive fitness to govern in conformity with the standards of the race on which the responsibility rests.

In the minds of those who accept these views as sound the arraignment of the suffrage propaganda assumes a simple, direct and practical purport quite thoroughly cleansed of the sophistries of visionary idealism. It runs in summary thus: the asserted right of self-government apart from a demonstrable capacity for it does not exist; the maintenance of government is too perilous an undertaking to justify its use as a training school for an entire sex in advance of a general demonstration of the fitness of that sex for the responsibility; woman as a sex has not yet evinced the possession of those qualities requisite to the safe conduct of government.

Thus the really critical issue in this question of the division of labor and responsibility between the sexes appears in its true light not as one of loosely conceived principle but of advantageous application in practice. The evidence required is not of words but of actions, not of argument but of the conduct of life, not of laudable purpose but of a sounder feminine understanding less perverted than now by irrelevant sentiment, indefinable impulse and temperamental idiosyncrasy. And it is obvious that evidence of this sort is not of a day but of a generation, not of exceptional women but of the entire sex, for which the demand for the vote is made.

The burden of proof assuredly rests on the proponents of woman suffrage, but they offer none acceptable to those who are as profoundly convinced of the practical difficulty as of the supreme importance of a wise, judicial and safe guidance of our national destinies.

FRED METCALF.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., May 1.

THE CASE OF THE FALABA.

What Is Our Government Doing or Going to Do About It?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is some weeks now since the Falaba, a British freight and passenger vessel, was sunk by a German submarine. As a result one of her passengers, said to be a native born American citizen, was drowned.

An official statement made some time prior to the unfortunate incident seemed to indicate that his death was a matter which this country would in some way take up. Naturally, of course, some time would be required to enable our Government to ascertain the alleged facts. Was he a native born citizen? If it be now known that he was not may we not be informed of that fact, so that we may regard the occurrence as one with which we have no concern?

Are we to stand by our former deliverance or are we to sidestep it? Ought we not to make our attitude known, diplomatically, before another similar unfortunate incident results in the drowning of some other of our citizens?

No one, I fancy, whose view of the situation is wholly American contemplates that our Government is to make any truculent deliverance. Germany and this country have always been on friendly terms. Germany now is engaged in a struggle which calls for the output of all her vigor and resources. Surely we could assure her that the loss of our citizen on the occasion of the Falaba's sinking is not to be pressed on her attention in her hour of strain and stress; but at the same time and in unmistakable terms we could also assure her that such loss and also similar losses under like circumstances are and will be considered by us to constitute a just and righteous claim against her which at a more convenient season we shall present and press. Laches in asserting our claim, if we intend ever to make one, will prejudice us if and when the controversy comes before any court of arbitration.

Suppose hereafter some other British or French passenger steamer is sunk on the open ocean by a German submarine and a score of our native born citizens are drowned; could not Germany before an arbitration court quite plausibly take this position: "We will pay reasonable compensation to the family of the man who was lost on the Falaba; but after that occurrence we notified the American Government that our position was that any neutral passenger who chose to travel on the ship of a belligerent nation assumed all risks. Since the United States did not take issue with our statement we assumed they acquiesced in it; therefore we will not pay compensation for the lives of those who were lost while we relied on that natural assumption." What would an impartial tribunal do with that argument? Sometimes watchful waiting may be a wise thing; sometimes it may turn out otherwise. L.

NEW YORK, May 1.

THE SEVEN SEAS.

Mr. Kipling Derives It From the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Failing to find any reference to the title "The Seven Seas" in either of my Kipling dictionaries, I recently wrote to Mr. Kipling himself asking for light on the question. I have to-day received from England the following answer:

BATEMAN'S BURWASH, SUSSEX,
17th April, 1915.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 1st inst. has been received, and Mr. Kipling asks me to say in reply that the expression in question is a very old one. It occurs, he believes, in the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam. Faithfully yours,

M. CHAMBERLAIN,
Secretary.

It would seem, therefore, that the origin of the phrase is still to be determined. JOHN A. TILLINGHAST.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., May 1.

The Patriarch and the Petticoat.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I arise to a point of order. The irreverent Billy Sunday is reported to have said the other day: "Oh, I expect that when I get to heaven I'll make a fool of myself." He said he would hunt up all the fine old fellows he had read about in the Bible and would say to Joseph: "Hello, Joseph! You're one of the gamest fellows I ever knew. I admire you for that time Potiphar's wife tried to make you sidestep your manhood and fall for her, and you looked her in the eye and said 'Nothin' doin'!'"

The story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, as written in the thirty-ninth chapter of Exodus, is an indifferent effort to whitewash an amazingly astute politician. It was written by a countryman of his and Potiphar's wife was an Egyptian, none of whom had any rights that an Israelite considered himself bound to respect. Joseph was no Sir Galahad. He holds the world's record as a land grabber. He worked a skin game on famine stricken Egypt for which he should have been lynched, and therefore it is easier to believe that Mrs. Potiphar "looked him in the eye" and said, "Nothin' doin'!" As proof—didn't he run away and leave his cloak?

Didn't he thereby become the first patriarch on authentic record to be scared by a petticoat?

GEORGE MOFFAT.

NEW YORK, May 1.

Beef and——.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It is meet that there should be a parade in honor of beef and——. If enjoyment in the consumption is a test of the merit of food, then beef and—— is the king of dishes.

We read in THE SUN that a certain man has partaken of it 17,550 times and yet his appetite is not jaded. Is there any other dish of which that can be said? Nightingales' tongues, terrapin? Tush!

NEW YORK, May 1. PALMA.

Delicate International Problem.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Would it be a violation of neutrality to sell to a belligerent Power in Europe the formidable commerce destroyers in the United States Cabinet? CURIOUS.

NEW YORK, May 1.

On the Wing in Alabama.

From the Huntsville Mercury-Banner.

Mr. and Mrs. Batt and daughter of Frog Pond made a flying trip to Huntsville Saturday.

PACIFIST VALOROUS, SAYS PRIZE WINNER

Pastor, First in Church Union Contest, Praises Man Who Prevents Wars.

OTHER WINNERS NAMED

The prize winners in the peace essay contest held by the Carnegie Church Peace Union, which closed on January 1, were announced yesterday. The first prize of $1,000 was awarded to the Rev. Gaius Glenn Atkins, pastor of the Central Congregational Church of Providence, R. I., a leader among the Congregationalists in New England. The judges were Robert Underwood Johnson, former editor of the *Century*; Canon George William Douglas of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, and Dr. Washington Gladden of Columbus, Ohio. The prize awarded to Dr. Atkins was offered to "any pastor of any church in the United States."

Three prizes offered to students in theological seminaries were awarded to the following: R. W. Nelson, Phillips University, East Enid, Oklahoma; P. V. Blanchard, Andover Seminary, Cambridge, Mass., and R. Niebuhr, Yale School of Religion, Lincoln, Ill.

The ten prizes offered to church members were all awarded to men. They are as follows: Hoyt H. Hudson, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Bryant Smith, Boulder, Col.; Oliver C. Moles, Edgewater, Col.; Philip Arnold, Cranston, Ill.; Benjamin Lloyd Knight, Iowa City, Iowa; Roy Francis Howes, Palo Alto, Cal.; Arthur Lockwood Johnson, San Jose, Cal.; Charles L. Stewart, Urbana, Ill.; Walter B. Brock, Bethesda, Md., and Clyde Eagleston, Oxford, Tex.

Some of the striking paragraphs in the essay of Dr. Atkins, which is entitled "The Causes of War," are as follows:

Fighting Edge Not Lost.

"This war is teaching us first of all that humanity has not lost its fighting edge. The hopes and fears of those who believed that our old fighting instincts were dead or so blunted as to have lost their primitive and terrible power are alike disappointed; we are offered from day to day proofs that men generally are capable of displaying a finer and more desperate kind of courage than ever before.

"So our world being what it is, we see how necessary it has been for liberty again and again to make its way with the sword. Religious wars are always quite as truly wars for religious freedom as wars of religious intolerance; a good part of all that fighting which we owe to imperialism is only the noble and saving resistance of those who refuse to be imperialized.

"It is not too much to say that there is no real freedom to-day, whether in the administration of the State, in the unhampered worship of God or in the operation of democracy itself, that has not been won by fighting. The measure of religious tolerance which holds in Europe to-day was, to begin with at least, won by the sword; at the edge of the sword Holland cut herself free from Spain; at the edge of the sword the 'divine right of kings' was hopelessly and finally beaten down in English soil; at the edge of the sword the better part of the French Revolution got room and chance for life; at the edge of the sword the American colonies freed themselves from their overzealous mother; at the edge of the sword slavery in America was challenged and paid for; and no prophet is wise enough to say that this long and honorable chapter in the history of humanity is finally closed.

"Democracies left to themselves do not take kindly to war; there is no denying that democracies have fought warily, but on the other hand they have never gone out to meet them, and have always been willing to make a just and honorable peace when the necessity of war has passed.

Wars Forced Upon People.

"If we can succeed in eliminating the causes of wars of aggression, we shall, of course, at the same time eliminate wars of defence. Wars for liberty and national independence, which are the only wars in which humanity can take just pride, have always been forced upon the people who carried them on. They have always been slow in appealing to the arbitrament of arms and have almost always sought to exhaust every means of peaceable settlement before they finally began to fight.

"The word 'pacifist' has become a term of reproach, and even now, when we are having such a demonstration of the havoc of war as has sobered the whole world, public opinion as represented by the average American newspaper is