The Sun.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 27, 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	50
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 150 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer, William C. Reick, 150 Nassau street; Vice-President, Edward P. Mitchell, 150 Nassau street; Secretary, C. E. Luxton, 150 Nassau street.

Readers of THE SUN leaving town for the summer months can have the daily and Sunday and evening editions delivered to them in any part of this country or Europe on the terms stated above. Addresses changed as often as desired. Order through newsdealer or directly of Publication Office, telephone 2200 Beekman.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand.
Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodière, 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.

If Cotton, Why Not Leather?

From an intelligent Yankee more or less directly interested in the prosperity of the shoe manufacturing trade THE SUN has received the following communication:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I notice that the United States Treasury has decided to help Southern cotton planters.

"I am connected with the shoe trade, and since the Wilson tariff went into effect the shoe business has been in the worst state ever known, from Eastport to Los Angeles. One thousand of the thirteen hundred shoe manufacturers in the United States would appreciate financial aid, and I wondered if you would use your kind offices with the Treasury Department in the endeavor to see that the shoe trade gets the same favor as the cotton planters.

"Somebody has once remarked that we were born 'free and equal,' and on this account I feel that the Democratic party, founded on the principle to serve all alike, will come to the rescue of the shoe manufacturers of this country.

"They certainly 'need the money,' and when they can secure it from the United States Treasury without being charged interest, it certainly speaks well for the generosity and kindly spirit of the Democratic party. EDWIN W. INGALLS.

"LYNN, Mass., August 25."

To the great majority of fair minded persons we think that this application in behalf of the shoe and leather industry will seem reasonable and in accord with American principles of equal rights and equal opportunities.

Possibly Secretary McADOO and his more or less populous surrounding of Southern gentlemen in office have a satisfactory answer to Mr. INGALLS'S question: If money from the United States Treasury is to be lent without interest for the support of the suffering cotton industry, why not likewise to sustain the languishing boot and shoe industry?

But if Secretary McADOO and his Southern friends have a satisfactory answer to this question we should like to hear it, for we cannot imagine what it is.

It cannot be that the far reaching plans of Mr. McADOO and his associates for the extension of Federal functions by the purchase of ships and the operation of a Government owned merchant marine contemplate also the purchase of cotton plantations with money from the Treasury and Federal operation of these plantations in order that the Government owned merchant marine may have Government raised cotton to carry.

Strangely Overlooked.

From Washington by way of a despatch to the Milwaukee *Sentinel* comes news that the Postmaster-General has reconsidered his plan of extending automobile delivery of mails on the rural routes. Such delivery, it is reported, will be continued in the various counties of the six States where it is already established, but it will not be extended. Temporarily at least Mr. BURLESON'S purpose to put the system in operation on all the rural routes has been abandoned.

When Congress passed the joint resolution continuing the post office appropriations of the last to the present fiscal year there was attached thereto at the suggestion of Mr. BURLESON permission in the discretion of the Postmaster-General to pay $1,800 a year to rural carriers furnishing their own motor vehicles and serving a rural route of not less than fifty miles in length.

To the Congressman from a district having many and long rural routes this looked promising and all in the interest of the plain people. On general principles it meant an increase in the disbursement of the public money, in itself ever desirable and commendable. Besides, there were the collateral personal advantages to the statesman himself in the gratitude, politically expressed, of the beneficiaries.

Sound in theory, but alas in practical application most lamentable! Instead of an increase in Government expenditure there was involved a wanton saving running far into the millions by substituting the automobile for the one horse shay. And how was this saving effected? By nothing more or less than rendering superfluous the services of thousands of able bodied voters!

Not to be wondered at that there were protests; that Congressmen heard from their constituents, heard from them vehemently. And the Postmaster-General has heard from the Congressmen as well as politicians of great influence in practically all the districts threatened with this blow inflicted right on the eve of important elections. So the rumor, not yet officially confirmed but persistent and credited, is that automobile rural mail delivery stops short.

Strange that the head of a Government department, particularly the head of the Post Office Department, should overlook so fundamental a principle of all Government owned and operated industries as the one making absolutely imperative the disbursement of taxpayers' money along broad and bountiful lines of scientific superfluity and waste.

The Colonel's Persistent Delusion About Belgium.

Anything so foolish as an attempt by the Executive to hold General LEONARD WOOD responsible for Colonel ROOSEVELT'S utterances at Plattsburg surpasses the longest range of credibility. Secretary GARRISON is not only a man of strong common sense but also a man with an active sense of humor. In this case his influence with the Administration ought to be sufficient to save it from making itself ridiculous.

For that part of Colonel ROOSEVELT'S speech which emphasized the importance of national preparedness, which discussed the maleficent workings of the peace at any price propaganda, and which vigorously exposed and denounced the true character of bipatriotism, the senior ex-President of the United States deserves the thanks of the country. It was a public service of which he and his friends may well be proud. On the other hand, Colonel ROOSEVELT'S personal attack on the President was so clumsy in conception, so childishly violent in expression, and so manifestly inspired by a mistaken idea of political opportunity, that nobody but himself is in any degree injured by the unfortunate diatribe. The effect must be everywhere to strengthen the President's claim on the loyal support of the nation in the difficult task which is wearing the soul out of him; not to weaken Mr. WILSON, at this critical time, as Colonel ROOSEVELT evidently intended it to do. We think the Administration can indeed afford to omit any action technically possible on the ground of a violation of War Department rules.

Our own feeling in contemplating the speech of our distinguished friend at Plattsburg is one of disappointment that he missed the chance of his life to convince the country that he is the reasoning statesman which he really is, at times. Colonel ROOSEVELT, it will be observed, returned intrepid and undismayed to his often repeated statement concerning the duty of the United States Government with regard to Belgium. He was more positive than ever in declaring that somewhere in some of the several treaties in the series of conventions signed at The Hague and subsequently ratified by the United States there existed a provision by which we undertook to guarantee, to assert, and if necessary to defend by force of arms, the neutrality of Belgian territory. His language at Plattsburg leaves room for no different construction:

"Under the Hague convention it was our bounden duty to take whatever action was necessary to prevent, and if not to prevent, then to undo, the hideous wrong that was done to Belgium. We have shirked this duty. We have shown a spirit so abject that Germany has deemed it safe to kill our women and children on the high seas."

That is to say, it was our own obligation, according to actual treaty contract, to send American troops to Belgium to resist the attempted violation of her territory by the Germans; or if we could not get our soldiers there in season, at least to send them to assist in expelling the invader. Our neglect to do our "bounden duty" to Belgium has covered the United States with shame and disgrace, for which the Wilson Administration's inaction and failure to intervene are responsible.

This much Colonel ROOSEVELT has declared already in one form or another, three or four times if not oftener, in his magazine writings. He has never yet taken the trouble to turn to the actual text of the conventions adopted at The Hague and ascertain, for the information of his readers, the exact whereabouts of the contractual obligation alleged by him to have been shamefully evaded by the United States. At least, the Colonel has never specified, so far as we are aware, the convention of the series, or the article of the convention, or the section of the article, warranting the tremendous accusation which he brings, in the most general and sweeping fashion, against the gentleman who has followed him to the White House as President of the United States.

Within the past week THE SUN has been obliged more than once to disclaim responsibility for these repeated declarations about our alleged treaty engagements regarding Belgium, and to refer inquirers to the Colonel himself for a more specific location of authority than he has yet vouchsafed in his vague references to "the Hague conventions."

Accordingly, we are both surprised and disappointed to find that he neglected so good an opportunity as was afforded at Plattsburg for satisfying the reasonable curiosity of the public as to the whereabouts and exact text of the treaty engagements so shamefully violated by the United States Government. All the more surprised because the Colonel went further than ever in his speech at the camp of military instruction. He went so far (will it be believed?) as to justify the sale of arms by American manufacturers to the allied belligerents, not upon the broad and incontestable grounds afforded by international law and invariable practice in the past, but upon the astonishing plea that our private citizens engaged in the sale of munitions of war were helping to perform in part the neglected duty owed to Belgium and to the good faith of treaty obligations by the Federal Government "under the Hague conventions"!

What singular delusion possesses this very active intellect? Instead of wasting voice in undignified denunciations of his successor's Administration, why does not Colonel ROOSEVELT at one stroke win the confidence of the people in the justice of his accusations and immeasurably strengthen the force of his arraignment of the President and his Cabinet by showing that the alleged treaty engagements respecting Belgium do in fact exist? It is a simple and easy process, if he has the facts. It is the method of procedure which in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred would suggest itself instantly to a sane and candid mind.

Brest-Litovsk.

The fall of the great fortress of Brest-Litovsk, upon which the Russians had pivoted their defence along the river Bug, has come in the short period of three weeks after the victorious German army entered Warsaw, capital of Poland and third city in the empire. Brest-Litovsk is a hundred miles east of Warsaw. Most notable is this feat of the Germans in breaking down the resistance of the Russian army and driving it from one prepared position after another a hundred miles in twenty-one days and at last reducing the stronghold which was to be the stumbling block in the path of the invader.

There is no parallel for this stupendous success in modern warfare, and any conjecture, therefore, as to what the German war machine may yet accomplish is futile. If the Russians were to make a successful stand anywhere, the River Bug in its course from near Novo Georgievsk to Brest-Litovsk and thence south to Cholm afforded a defence of great strength. But all has been in vain. The advance of the invaders was irresistible. Explanations have been offered for the evacuation of Warsaw and the collapse at Novo Georgievsk, a great fortress which was supposed to be impregnable, and in each case it was said that strategic considerations called for the retirement of the Russian army if its organization was to be preserved for a new plan of campaign; and presumably the fall of Brest-Litovsk will be accounted for in much the same way.

But the fact remains that the Russian army, which covered itself with glory in the Galician campaign, taking Lemberg and Peremysl, the latter with an immense number of prisoners, threatening Cracow, seizing strategic Carpathian passes to descend into the Hungarian plains, has failed utterly to save its prestige in the presence of the powerful German offensive and has with difficulty preserved its organization. When the brilliant successes of the Russians in the early Galician campaign are compared with their collapse in Poland in contact with Austrian as well as with German troops, the judgment is warranted that the Russians have been fighting lately under the handicap of a disparity of artillery and a deficiency of small arms ammunition. When such is the case there is no holding any position if the enemy has a considerable superiority in guns and a surplus of ammunition, as the Teutonic allies have.

A parallel with NAPOLEON'S Moscow campaign may therefore be regarded as irrelevant if speculation is in order about the future plans of the German General Staff. It seems idle to set a limit to the tide of invasion. The world in modern times has never known such a military machine or seen such an offensive as that of the Teutonic allies.

First Aid to a Philosopher.

From Mr. C. A. BOWSHER of the Cleveland School of the University of the World, an institution which professes to be engaged in a disinterested way in an effort to Propagate the Method of Right Thinking, we have received the subjoined somewhat orphic eulogy of selfishness:

"Who denies that he is selfish reveals that he is. Of such are the liars.

"Who decries the selfishness of others proclaims his own. Of such are the hypocrites.

"Who denies selfishness to others has greed. Of such are the parasite, the thief and the robber.

"Selfishness is of the spirit. It is the motive of progress. It is the desire of man to be in body, soul and mind the most excellent."

Mr. BOWSHER'S proper place is not in the University but in the Kindergarten of the World. What business has he to set up as a teacher of the philosophy of selfishness when he cannot even distinguish between enlightened selfishness and the common or garden variety?

Six hundred thousand flies have been slaughtered in the village of Peapack, near here, by the young people, who are engaged in a fly killing contest.—*Metuchen despatch.*

A fact which probably will not be featured in next year's summer resort booklets. If our memory serves, Peapack is the place where several hundred thousand of SMITHS used to swarm in August.

The Union County, New Jersey, Mosquito Extermination Commission is to electrocute mosquitoes in the Bayway meadows near Elizabeth. The process seems rather complicated and is evidently expensive:

"The marshes will be surcharged with electric wires attached to carbonized plates and the electricity generated by gasolene engines or motors is to cause chlorine gas to rise from the earth and kill the mosquitoes. The process, it is said, will also kill the eggs, or larvæ."

The New Jersey commission with the long name should be warned that complete success will be expected of it if such elaborate machinery is employed. Complete success is, however, impossible if preventive measures are permitted to lapse for even a brief time. In the Panama zone they say that if operations against the common enemy are suspended for a fortnight it reappears in force. The trouble with most of our exterminators is that there are too many intervals in their warfare on the pest.

The President has the right to have said of him nothing but what is true. —*The Colonel.*

The American Society of Deliberate and Unqualified Falsifiers smiles reminiscently.

NO ARMS TO MEXICANS.

The Plan of an Embargo Aimed at Carranza Condemned.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I am glad that THE SUN has disapproved of the plan, now being considered by the Pan-American Peace conferees, of putting an embargo on arms to Carranza, while at the same time allowing the other factions in Mexico to obtain them freely. The Administration made an unpardonable mistake in ever raising the embargo that was placed on all arms by President Taft. Whatever the object of the Administration may be, the result seems to be to keep any man from attaining a strong enough position to govern the country.

Suppose an embargo should lessen Carranza's power, would it not also assist in raising an even less desirable man to an exalted position? And have not the past years gone to prove that only the defeated pretend to listen to directions and suggestions from this side of the border?

The worst mistake of all, however, is to allow any arms at all to be sent into that distracted country where there is no Government to control or to be held responsible. American made arms are being used against our own citizens not only in Mexico but in our own States. Bullets have been shot into ranch houses sixty, seventy and ninety miles this side of the international border line by Mexicans who crossed the Rio Grande with intent to kill the American citizens who were defending their own property. And furthermore, American citizens and soldiers have been wounded and killed in United States territory.

The first duty of the United States Government is not so much to protect foreigners in foreign lands nor humanely to interfere in the internal political affairs of foreign countries as it is to protect its own citizens at home. If we can't do that we should at least refrain from materially aiding the assassins who invade our land with arms and attack our citizens. J. A. L.

CROTON ON HUDSON, August 25.

IMPROVING THE EDITORS.

The Fame of Miss Rettop's Society Straddles (?) the Continent.

From the Sacramento Bee.

One Mary Rettop, secretary of the Editorial Improvement Society, writes to THE SUN rebuking it for using the word "gosh" in an editorial. In her communication she says:

We propose to try and improve the literature of newspapers in general. That is we hope to give editors something real pleasant to write about instead of allowing them to collect all the blood curdling topics of the day for the minds of the young to peruse.

If you will believe me, I felt positively ill after reading THE SUN that morning, and then to come across that slang word "gosh" was the last straw, as it were.

Let us hope little Mary—or is she big and fat?—will never again have her good taste offended by seeing "gosh" in THE SUN.

That journal, a model of good English to all editors, should not lower its standard even for a second.

Whenever again it feels the "gosh" fever coming over it, let it omit the offence by substituting therefor the more ornate "jiminy-crickets" or "jerusalem-frying-pan."

How Many?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I have voted for the Republican candidate for President ever since Blaine's nomination. I hope to do so in 1916. But if President Wilson is renominated and our German American friends oppose him as German Americans I shall deem it my duty as well as my privilege to vote for his reelection.

I am mighty certain that thousands of other Republicans are of the same way of thinking. WILLARD E. KEYES.

BOSTON, August 26.

Burr McIntosh and the Propaganda.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In the recent exposition of those who were or might be directly or indirectly interested in advancing the "German propaganda" my name was mentioned because of "pro-military views which had been expressed."

While admitting that at various times during the seven years past I have endeavored to arouse my lethargic countrymen to the coming of present day conditions, my humble efforts were all directed toward "saving my own country" only.

I have had no desire to attempt to rush into print and was inclined to view the matter as a joke, but since receiving several diversified clippings as well as letters from friends I would deeply appreciate the opportunity of stating that at no time nor in any manner have I ever been approached by anybody regarding the possibility of my interesting myself in advancing the "German propaganda"; nor could any possible inducement be offered which could tempt me to do so.

I have no personal quarrel with Germany nor German Americans, but I hope to remain, for my allotted time, one who cares for the United States.

BURR MCINTOSH.

NEW YORK, August 26.

The Astounding Mr. Koeble.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Your violent friend Mr. Koeble made in the interview printed in THE SUN one statement which every German American should cut out and paste in his hat:

If a German submarine attacked the Arabic without warning that was a deliberate challenge to this country after the Lusitania note.

He then recommends a severing of diplomatic relations but deprecates war. So, after all, while he appears to be unnecessarily violent and excited about a lot of matters which he states so fantastically that not much attention need be paid to his views concerning them, it seems that, unconsciously, on the main issue involved he reasons correctly: the torpedoing of the Arabic if without warning was "a deliberate challenge to this country."

Also I believe that, after he had ventilated his ill humor, Mr. Koeble would, in the event of war, be found marching around with a gun, because he is an American after all. C. S. D.

NEW YORK, August 25.

MADAM LACKEY BACK AGAIN.

But Has She Really and Truly Given Us Her Name and Address?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I had no intention of seriously considering the many letters published in THE SUN in reply to my communication against woman suffrage of August 20, which has been called "The Chant of Hate," until I read the one from Mrs. Edith M. Arnold. Her letter so interested me that I am moved to reconsider my determination not to reply to the attacks made upon me. Owing to the fact that Mrs. Arnold insultingly describes the Almighty as a suffragist, I must say that she owes to the world the telling of the secret as to how the suffragists enlisted the Almighty Father in their cause.

Such a story with proof behind it would make the most interesting reading that has come down to us since the genesis of the world. If Mrs. Arnold will write this story for THE SUN she would go down in history and be forever immortalized.

I cannot understand, perhaps Mrs. Arnold can, why suffragists find it necessary to couple their cause with that of the prohibitionists. If votes for women means votes for prohibition the suffragists themselves are unconsciously knifing to death the cause for which they are fighting. To this we "antis" have no objection. I take it that the question of woman suffrage, so far as I have been able to learn from listening to its propagandists and from reading suffrage literature and the newspapers, is dissolving itself into the question of prohibition. While there is no apparent relation between suffrage and prohibition in my mind, nevertheless many men have come to view suffrage as a side street to prohibition.

How the millions of men who know how to use liquor and who find pleasure in its use can be asked to vote for a question that threatens to rob them of this pleasure and comfort is too deep for my solving. I leave it to Mrs. Arnold. The injection of the liquor question into the campaign for votes for women is to be deplored, but the suffragists are to blame. There are so many female free lances writing "pieces to the newspapers" about what women will do to the liquor business when they get the vote, so many would be female sociologists splattering broadcast their puerile opinions about the coming results of universal suffrage, so many unmuzzled female "philosophers" running loose in the land, that I do not wonder at a remark made by a gentleman the other night in speaking of suffrage when he called it the "Twentieth Century Plague."

Mrs. Arnold in her letter says: "I have read much on both sides of this question and I firmly believe that the Almighty is the substantial backer of equal franchise."

Now I shall herewith propound three questions, to which I trust Mrs. Arnold will make reply.

First, Can you, Mrs. Arnold, prove to me beyond every doubt "that the Almighty is the substantial backer of equal franchise"?

Secondly, If "more women will line up with God than Booze," why did the women of California vote against prohibition last November and against it in Denver last April?

Thirdly, Are the men of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts who will vote on the question this fall to believe that woman suffrage and prohibition are one and inseparable?

MRS. ISABELLA D. LACKEY.

SOUTH ORANGE, N. J., August 26.

What Is the Underlying Motive of the Demand for the Vote?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The most noticeable feature of the correspondence published in THE SUN regarding "Votes for Women" is the prominence given to matters which, when not merely irrelevant recriminations, are at best but of minor importance. Hardly any of the correspondence touches fundamental matters.

One of the woes from which the body politic is now suffering is that the suffrage, through the influence of political demagogues whose instincts are anything but altruistic notwithstanding their professions, is already too greatly extended and it is very difficult to see how the virtual doubling of the voting population would improve matters. Do those who advocate "Votes for Women" realize that the ratio of ignorant and unfit women to the total number of women is probably approximately identical with the ratio obtaining among men? While this question is not susceptible of direct proof, it appears logical to accept past experience in other matters and assume that the ratio is about the same.

The advocates of "Votes for Women" assert that the entrance of women into the direct activities of politics is going to purify politics. Past experience shows rather that the touching of pitch brings defilement, and instead of politics being purified by women it is more likely that women will be contaminated. With very few exceptions, such men as have entered politics with the idea of purification have either become so smirched themselves that they are as bad as or worse than those they started to reform, or else they have quit in disgust.

It shows a large degree of complacent self-conceit on the part of women strenuously striving for the vote that they imagine themselves capable without experience of accomplishing that which men after years of experience have not yet accomplished. Is there any noticeable improvement in the purity of politics in such States as have granted the suffrage to women, Colorado, for instance? Has not the tendency been rather to raise up a tribe of female politicians? And Kipling's poem about the female of the species is fairly familiar.

We have suffered and are suffering from ill advised, ill considered legislation which, ostensibly in the interest of justice, has proved to be unmitigated humbug, not accomplishing that which it was ostensibly designed to accomplish. There is good reason to fear that more of this sort of legislation will be foisted upon us should "Votes for Women" become a fact.

No system of government, no system of distribution of the privilege of suffrage designed by mortal minds is or ever will be perfect, and the extension of the suffrage to women does not appear to be a step in the direction of perfection.

With many people there is a desire to have something merely because some one else has it, without any reference to fitness or use. While this desire is not confined to women, it is more apparent in such women as have it. It is perhaps ungracious to suggest that this is probably the real underlying motive of the demand for "Votes for Women," but, nevertheless, the idea persists.

H. H. MCCORD.

BROOKLYN, August 26.

The Origin of the Suffrage Movement.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The Almighty has been blamed for a good many of the evils of this wicked world, but nothing quite so bad has heretofore been laid at His door as this from Mrs. Edith M. Arnold of Putnam, Conn.: "I firmly believe that the Almighty is the substantial backer of woman suffrage."

If the Almighty is the "substantial" backer of woman suffrage, then either Jesus was not the Son of God, or Paul was not a true disciple, for woman suffrage is admittedly antagonistic to the "doctrine of Jesus as preached by Paul" with reference to woman and the marriage relation.

The Almighty is presumably not ignorant of the fact that the suffrage movement was started in this country by Frances Wright, a free thinker and socialist, whose "moral" philosophy is summed up in this excerpt from her writings:

I have devoted my time and fortune to laying the foundation of an establishment where affection shall form the only marriage, kind feeling and kind action the only religion.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, shining light of suffrage, addressed what Horace Greeley called the "easy divorce" convention of suffragists in 1860 and delivered herself of this extraordinary utterance:

The right of woman to put away a husband, be he ever so impure, is never hinted at in sacred history. Even Jesus himself failed to recognize the sacred rights of the Holy Mother of the race. We cannot take our gauge of womanhood from the past, but from the solemn convictions of our own souls in the higher development of the race.

Undoubtedly the Almighty heard that suffrage doctrine and remembers it to-day.

Woman suffrage was first made effective in this country by the Mormon Church, the foe of Christianity and democracy, and it derives a large part of its strength to-day from Socialists and feminists, whose immoral and unchristian writings form a very important part of the literature published and circulated by the national suffrage organization in its campaign for "votes for women."

Are we to understand that the Almighty is the "substantial backer" of Mormonism, Socialism and Feminism?

Unless it can be shown that it was unusually hot in Putnam when Mrs. Arnold penned her letter to THE SUN, I think it must be admitted that her statement comes pretty close to the line of blasphemy.

GEORGE R. CONROY.

BOSTON, August 26.

The Opposition Heard From.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Three cheers for Mrs. Lackey of South Orange, N. J., that she has the courage of her convictions and dares to express what so many feel!

Some one asks in your columns, "Does Mrs. Lackey understand the suffrage cause?" Apparently she does, thoroughly, and though she may have omitted some "despicable" points, she has made a good beginning with her list.

Suffragists have promulgated their propaganda so long without active opposition that they consider it a personal grievance if other women express their views on the subject.

Here's to Mrs. Lackey's good health! May she live long and prosper!

CORA M. BROWNE.

NEWPORT, R. I., August 26.

A Postscript to the Corollary of the Thirty-one Despises.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Will you allow me to add a postscript to my corollary to Mrs. Lackey's thirty-one despises:

I despise the policy of the suffrage party for its frequent statement of half truths. For instance, the Federated Woman's Clubs indorsed suffrage with a large minority recording its protest. This was followed by an immediate proclamation from the suffrage headquarters that 2,000,000 women (the full numerical strength of the federation) indorsed suffrage.

I despise its policy of deluding the ignorant by its promise that suffrage will lighten the burdens of women workers, whereas the whole truth is that suffrage will increase the stress upon them and increase competition against them. Like Tarpela at the gate of Rome, they ask for the shields that men wear, and would receive them to be crushed beneath the weight.

I despise its policy of suggesting a woman's strike, sex against sex: "Americans in groups," which would prove nothing that is not already known, and add to the burdens of the working women exploited by the suffrage party.

AN AMERICAN WOMAN.

NEW YORK, August 26.

The Prussian Sidewalk and the New York Subway.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Thanks to Charles A. Gehrie for his fair and dignified letter to THE SUN.

This disgraceful propaganda of racial hate and injustice carried on against our "hyphenated" citizens is ignominious and quite un-American. Those so-called Americans who are inciting all this racial warfare are not much better than the mob which lynched Frank, and as an American and a patriot I am heartily ashamed of them.

In answer to those compatriots of mine who were rudely jostled by German officers in the streets of Dresden and Berlin, I can only say that I spent several months at different times in both cities and never had any such experience. I only remember that when riding in the Berlin subway during rush hours I never had to stand, because an officer invariably rose to give me a seat, and I have often wished I might be shown the same courtesy in our New York subway.

Now in these hysterical and troublous times the best we can do is to follow our noble President's advice and not stir up more strife and hatred.

L. E. MILLINGTON.

NEW YORK, August 26.

Japanese Emperor's Coronation Costume.

From the Tokio Advertiser

For the coronation ceremonies in Kyoto this fall the Emperor of Japan is having made a full uniform of a design worn by a Shogun of 370 years ago. The costume is being made in the Household Department. The cloth has been handed down from old times. Because there was some difference of opinion as to the method of making and sewing this unusual uniform, members of the department in charge of the tailoring were sent to inspect the treasures of the sacred shrine Atsuta, where ancient costumes of the period are to be found. The dresses at Atsuta are to be brought to Tokio at the request of the Household Department.

Micrococcus Prodigiosus in the Staff of Life.

From the Topeka Capital.

That housewives may blame the germ and not the cook when bread goes wrong Instructor Glasco of the Kansas State Agricultural College is completing a series of experiments on bacteria in bread. It was found that bread could be exposed and made sick similarly to an animal, by the harmful micrococcus prodigiosus and others. Practically every kind of bad bread was found to be caused by bacteria.

August 27, 1776

There was gloom throughout the nation at
the close of that dark day,
For the march of the invaders they had
vainly tried to stay;
Their outnumbered little army on Long
Island's battlefield
Though it fought with desperation, had at
last been forced to yield.

But a light shone through the darkness in
that hour of their defeat,
And it heartened the survivors of that
glorious retreat;
They had learned their own shortcomings,
all their weaknesses were bared,
And they knew that they would triumph
when at last they were prepared!

There's a lesson in that battle we would
now do well to learn
(Even though for peace and plenty through
all time we daily yearn);
If a war is forced upon us, Yankee boys
will have to go;
Shall we send them out untrained to fight
against a practised foe?

C. E. E.

DANGERS OF MUSHROOMS.

Their Harmfulness Often Exaggerated Through Ignorance.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The reason suggested in the editorial article in THE SUN for the limited popularity of mushroom gathering is undoubtedly the main one, yet I think there are more mushroom hunters than is generally supposed. Certainly the fascinations of the quest are enough to outweigh the dread with which one starts. There are very few poisonous varieties, and these are almost all included in the Amanita family. If one is equipped with just a little common sense and a modicum of caution there is no cause for fear. Many edible mushrooms bear an undeserved sinister reputation because of the accusations of the ignorant. Some plants will make people ill, but they are usually their own antidote, as the emetic Russulas and Boleti. Some are harmful, but not fatally so, to certain people, while they are eaten by others with no bad result. A few people cannot eat any varieties, even as certain ones cannot eat strawberries or clams.

The meadow mushroom, Agaricus campestris, is the one most commonly used in the East. There are close relatives of this species which the casual observer would take for the meadow mushroom. They are all good and all to be distinguished from Amanita phalloides by the color of the gills. In the meadow mushroom these are at first pink; as the plant becomes older the color changes to purplish brown and at last to almost black. Now Amanita phalloides show gills which are always white, no matter how old the plant is. The stem of the meadow mushroom is not bulbous at the base and shows no sign of the sheath, while the stem is almost always free from any evidence of the veil. Amanita phalloides has a stem bulbous at the base, set in a kind of sheath which is popularly called "the poison cup," and the stem carries the disrupted veil in the shape of a collar.

Some cases of poisoning have been the result of mistaking Amanita muscaria for the highly prized Amanita cæsaria, but none but an expert should attempt this selection, and even he with scrupulous care. I am sceptical of the bona fides of many reported cases of amanitine poisoning. The "silly season" produces exaggerations along other lines, why not along this line? Then some physicians are relieved from strenuous thought about patients that puzzle them if it can be established that they have been guilty of eating mushrooms.

I remember one case. A woman died after more than a week of sickness and she had eaten mushrooms before she was taken down. A friend who shared the feast suffered no bad effects (and be it know that amanitine is no respecter of persons). Perhaps if a dog had licked her hand before her illness the attending physician would have pronounced her case one of hydrophobia. Amanitine poisoning, I understand, is rather slow at first, the symptoms manifesting themselves about twelve hours after ingestion; then the progress is as rapid as strychnine poisoning, which it resembles.

There ought to be a wider knowledge of the many edible mushrooms which grow abundantly almost everywhere. No variety of the Coprinus genus is harmful and they are produced lavishly. I found a quantity of them some time ago by a tree in East Fifty-second street. They indicate generally an old tree stump or root buried where they grow. There there are some of the Hypholomas, abundant on lawns, and the Marasmius oreades (the fairy ring mushrooms), and many others very delectable.

I met a man this summer who made my mouth water by telling of the morels which grow in his dooryard. None of the puffballs is poisonous, though they are not all, perhaps, edible. There are much less attractive eatables than a puffball in prime condition, fried like an omelet or stewed with sweetbreads. Then there is the Pleurotus ostreatus, found on certain kinds of trees, and the Pleurotus ulmarius, found on the elm, and the delicious Lepiota procera, broiled, and the—but space is wanting.

JOHN C. STEPHENSON.

LYNDONVILLE, Vt., August 24.

THE LIFEBELT PUZZLE.

Singular German Comment on the Lusitania and Arabic Cases.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* To judge by the utterances of German newspapers we must revise our American prejudices concerning the nature of logic. There are now two distinct kinds of logic: to wit, logic and German logic. The latter from some points of view is far more interesting, being very novel if not original.

In order to illustrate the methods of this new German logic we need only compare the statements of the German press concerning the Lusitania with the statements of the German press concerning the Arabic. The Lusitania case, the German editors informed us, was a horrible example of British inefficiency. The loss of life would not have been so great, in other words, perhaps only hundreds would have been drowned instead of a thousand or more, if the proper precautions had been taken, namely, efficient lifeboat and lifebelt service.

That was sufficiently brazen, but it evidently had its effect on British merchant captains. At any rate, Captain Finch of the Arabic, as the unbiassed will admit, most efficiently carried out the German idea of lifeboat and lifebelt precautions. As a result of Captain Finch's precautions the passengers of the Arabic were fully provided with lifebelts, and as a result of his issuing lifebelts we have the new German logic, which says: "The liner's captain furnished lifebelts to the passengers and crew. This was done because the captain planned to ram the submarine."

According to the foregoing the first principle of the new German logic must be: "Heads I win; tails you lose." Had the captain of the Lusitania taken the precaution to issue lifebelts to the passengers and crew he would by that act have been convicted of the intention to "ram the submarine," and then, of course, there could have been but one thing for the German submarine to do, namely, sink the Lusitania. If the captain of the Arabic had not issued lifebelts it would have been another horrible example (see under Lusitania) of British inefficiency and the cause of great loss of life.

We must therefore conclude as follows: Be it understood by the new German logic that the captain of a British merchant ship (1) must issue lifebelts, (2) must not issue lifebelts.

The British Government may now offer a king's ransom to Edison if Edison can invent a lifebelt that is not a lifebelt, a lifebelt which being used is not used, and which not being used is used.

Edison can no doubt invest such a lifebelt, but it will not circumvent the new German logic, which can be made to cover any British action, however normal. H. C. W.

ANNAPOLIS, Md., August 25.

Druggists' Night in Maine

From the Portland Daily Press.

'Twas druggists' night with the deputies, the busiest night of the year; they called at lots of the dispensaries, never giving a thought to beer. They came back loaded with treasure—whiskey, brandy, rum and gin; 'twas contained in many a measure, jugs and cans and bottles thin. There were gallons and gallons of beverages, spirituous liquors galore; considerable more than the average carried in a druggist's store.

The Ruling Passion.

From the Milwaukee Sentinel.

Dr. J. H. Terhorst, 240 State street, was the first to take out a hunting license at the office of the County Clerk on Friday.

REPORT OF WALSH BOARD CRITICISED

It Has Done Little in Suggesting Practical Reforms, New Yorkers Say.

SCORE INHERITANCE PLAN

That the Industrial Relations Commission, headed by Chairman Walsh, had done little in the way of suggesting practical reforms for existing industrial troubles, seemed to be the opinion of most of the prominent men interviewed yesterday on the subject. Many whose comments were sought were on their vacations, but those who remained did not for the most part agree with the findings of the commission. The opinions were as follows:

Paul Fuller said: "Although I have always been a friend of the laboring man, I don't favor the report of Mr. Walsh in the least. The idea of placing a sum such as $1,000,000 as the maximum which a man may leave to his heirs seems ridiculous to me. Why not $100,000? A man can live easily on that.

"I believe in an inheritance tax, but not such a tax as is suggested by Chairman Walsh. The tax he proposes is not a tax at all, for taxes are levied merely to support the Government, not to strip men of their property. If we must, let us openly declare ourselves to be a socialistic state, in which no man may possess more than a certain amount of property, but let us not go about it in this sly, underhanded way which he suggests."

Prof. John Dewey of Columbia, president of the Association of American Professors, characterized as trifling the charge of Chairman Walsh and his associates that the Carnegie Foundation has caused the abandonment by several colleges and universities of sectarian affiliations and charter clauses relating to religion.

"A committee of the Association of Professors is at present investigating the cases of two professors mentioned in the report, who were dismissed without 'valid reason' being made public, as the report puts it," said Prof. Dewey. "I don't think the fact that they were witnesses before the commission had anything to do with their being dropped. I do not feel at liberty to discuss the two cases mentioned, however, until our committee has reported its findings."

Dr. Lyman Abbott, editor of the *Outlook*, said: "I am in favor of a progressive inheritance tax such as the commission recommends, but I strongly oppose the idea of fixing the amount which a man may leave to his heirs."

Frank Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank, said: "My opinion of Chairman Walsh is such that I do not care to comment on his findings. I am interested in the commission only as a striking illustration of how far wrong a commission can go."

Clyde Furst, secretary of the Carnegie Foundation, which was criticised in the latest report of the Industrial Relations Commission, declined to comment on the report.

"I will say, however, that we meet Mr. Walsh's chief objection to foundations," he said. "We are under the jurisdiction of Congress, for we have a Federal charter. I do not think the commission was very desirous of investigating the Carnegie Foundation, for during the hearings our president, Dr. Henry S. Pritchett, sat in the meeting room for several days waiting to be called as a witness. He was never asked to testify."

Ivy Lee, personal representative of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was out of town. Several days ago, however, Mr. Lee declined to comment on the first report. He said that if Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., who is at present at Seal Harbor, Me., desired to make any statement in reply to the commission it would be given out through him.

TEACHERS ARE TO GET PENSIONS FOR AUGUST

Prendergast Announces Good News for All Except Those Under Legal Ban.

Comptroller Prendergast said yesterday that despite the perilous condition of the teachers' pension fund all the retired teachers, except those who in the opinion of the Corporation Counsel were retired illegally, will receive the full am