The Sun.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 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 00
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.

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.

An Attempt to Be of Assistance to Senator Gore.

We are honored by a request from Senator GORE to suggest to him any change which, in our opinion, would improve the working efficiency of his bill creating an International Trade and Tariff Board. This measure was introduced by Mr. GORE last January; and as he has been reelected from Oklahoma for the term running to 1921 he doubtless intends to push it at the coming first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress.

A careful and respectful examination of Senator GORE'S plan to remove tariff making from partisan politics and to establish it upon a basis of intelligent investigation and scientific construction, at an estimated additional expense to the Government of $100,000 a year, inclines us to the opinion that the intelligent Senator might greatly improve the bill by dropping it altogether.

First, as to non-partisanship:

The six members of the tariff board are to be chosen for "special fitness"; nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The term is six years. Senators and Representatives are excluded. "Not more than three members of said board shall be members of any one political party." It is evident that if the membership were confined to the two principal party organizations, Republican and Democratic, Mr. GORE'S tariff board would always be in a deadlock politically. On the other hand a President and Senate belonging to a party which already had three members of Mr. GORE'S non-partisan tariff board could erect that moiety membership into a plurality at any time when the expiration of a term permitted by the simple expedient of selecting for the vacancy a Prohibitionist, a Laborite, a Socialist, or a member of any outlying organization.

Next, as to the scope of the proposed board's operations and its actual power in influencing the formation of the schedules:

As might be expected of so good a constitutional lawyer as Senator GORE, his bill makes no attempt to invest the proposed international trade and tariff board with any legislative powers whatever. Nor would he give it any practical functions of any sort beyond the ordinary warrant to conduct investigations, to hold hearings and compel testimony, to meet regularly four times a year, or oftener if the President calls, and to travel, in the person of the members or the board's employees, anywhere in this country or abroad in pursuit of information. The duties of the board of six commissioners at $7,500 each are "to study and investigate"; "to report from time to time"; "to consider the conditions of domestic and foreign commerce and ways and means for presenting the same"; "to submit recommendations for the proper expansion of foreign commerce"; "to render such other assistance to the committees of either house of Congress as may be from time to time required"; and so on, vaguely and interminably throughout marching orders that march to no definite or practical conclusion.

Now, THE SUN is not greatly impressed with the importance of adding thus expensively and ostentatiously to the fungoid growths upon the body politic. In recent years there has grown up in new departments of the Government, in commissions, in bureaus, a stupendous mass of machinery for the collection of information, for study, investigation, recommendation and reporting "from time to time." Some of it is useful; much of it is unproductive of results except as it causes the Government printing presses to groan out additional burdens on the taxpayers. The junk shops yawn for a very large percentage of the laboriously acquired and imperfectly coordinated output. Much of this tremendously costly research and collection could be dispensed with. Much of it is unfruitful. The entire system, unknown to the governmental methods of a generation ago, is coming to be like one of those "efficiency" devices of cataloging and cross referencing which are so elaborate that in the end they become the master instead of the servant of the establishment.

We share with most business men of intelligence and many broad minded statesmen the conviction that few things are more desirable for this country than the complete divorce of tariff making from partisan politics. A measure promising substantial progress in that direction would receive our hearty support.

Such a measure, however, to be worth anything practically, would have to be simple, direct, unencumbered with correlated subjects; and to be effective it would have to invest the new tariff board with something more nearly like real power over the schedules than the mere power to study, investigate and report from time to time. No one has yet pointed out how this necessary power can be bestowed without an amendment of the Constitution.

No matter how good is the intention of the bill which Senator GORE so politely asks us to help improve, its defects are flagrant and almost grotesque. It not only creates a sterile organism but it also duplicates existing agencies of information, such as the consular report system as to trade conditions abroad and the multifarious activities of Brother REDFIELD'S men in the domestic field. It does not abolish the parallel work which it duplicates. Most of all, in a most incomprehensible manner it ties up vague and general functions of trade promotion with the specific advisory function in regard to the tariff schedules. We trust the Senator will pardon us for saying that his International Trade and Tariff Board seems to us an awful muddle of legislative enterprise. We advise him to simplify, even if he has to begin all over again.

Meanwhile it remains true that until a constitutional amendment shifts the seat of power, purely advisory tariff commissions can study and investigate and recommend scientific and non-partisan tariffs till all is blue, and Congress can legislate unscientific and partisan tariffs all the same, to carry out partisan theories, to promote partisan ends, or to fry the fat.

Tuskegee's Maker.

Dr. BOOKER T. WASHINGTON'S work among the members of his race was based on the belief that the negro would win social and political advancement only after he had achieved economic independence and stability. He held that time was better spent in demonstrating the capacity of the black man in those callings that are now open to him than in seeking opportunities in fields where every factor was opposed to him.

This policy brought Dr. WASHINGTON into conflict with many other leaders of the negroes, but he maintained it from the beginning of his work at Tuskegee. He was not less concerned with the progress of the blacks in the United States than were those with whom he could not agree as to methods; their dispute was over the means to be used, not the end to be sought. His belief was supported by the intelligent judgment of thousands of citizens who saw in Tuskegee a possible instrument for the solution of a pressing problem.

Did the school's success depend on Dr. WASHINGTON'S energy and personality, or was he able to install an organization competent to continue it? Such questions will be answered in the not remote future; it is to be hoped that the institution in which he labored for more than a generation possesses the apparatus and personnel necessary to its continuance and growth as a memorial to this sensible and interesting educator.

City Pensions.

Of the various pension funds for the benefit of municipal employees now calling for contributions from the taxpayer's pocket the Bureau of Municipal Investigation and Statistics tells the Comptroller that:

"In short, all the systems were established in total disregard of the principles of mathematics and the practical experience and business methods of prosperous insurance companies."

Since 1905 the public treasury has been depleted in the sum of $29,714,000 to support these benefactions, and the burden is rapidly growing heavier. The police fund called for $193,000 ten years ago; for 1914 it required $1,450,000. Annuities for incapacitated employees having thirty years service to their credit cost $31,000 in 1913, and more than three times that in the next year. All this has been accomplished without the aid of actuaries, and in consequence some of the pension funds are practically bankrupt and all of them will be unless they are reformed.

This condition has been invited by the city by its reckless disregard for experience and its failure to take advantage of the easily accessible statistics of insurance. No private corporation would embark in a scheme of benefits without attempting to count the cost; yet the city did this, and now while it pays heavily in cash for its blunders, the recipients of pensions themselves may suffer as innocent victims of its stupidity.

Loose Talk.

How unreasonable are those residents of Brooklyn who object to having an enthusiastic social reformer circulate the report that the girl pupils in one of the high schools visit a resort whose patronage arouses suspicions as to the moral tone enforced by its proprietor!

They are not satisfied even with the explanation that the accusation was circulated by the reformer without facts to back it up. They are unresponsive to the thoroughly satisfactory acknowledgment that it was merely a rumor. They hold the obviously reactionary opinion that the reformer should not give currency to derogatory tales unless he has evidence to support them. If reform is thus to be shackled, whence will come the material with which to shock the sensation seeking auditors? Moreover, it should not be overlooked that the reformer retailed his rumor in such fashion as to escape entirely the possibility of prosecution for slander, and skilfully avoided ruining any individual's good name by assailing the repute of an entire school. Does not the finished art of this accomplishment appeal to the trained intelligence of teachers, pupils and parents?

Loose talk is the vocation, the avocation, the profession, the trade, the task and the amusement of a certain type of reformer of other folks' habits. It sustains a great industry and supports in enviable luxury not a few well clad and persuasive citizens. It enjoys special immunities and privileges, and if it endangers the good name of a few hundred innocent schoolgirls it only fulfils its mission. Our Brooklyn friends must learn to be philosophical.

Red Victor Rends the Veil.

Illuminating the future with the unrivalled radiance of his own glorious thatch, VICTOR MURDOCK sees far and clear into the politics of 1916. The Democrats are to be hopelessly split by February; the Republicans are already torn by conflicting ambitions, confused by selfish counsels. Red VICTOR is a pessimist, but he is compelled to acknowledge the fact:

"The Progressive party has every reason to plunge into the campaign with vim, vigor and a determination to win."

Were he not bound to conservatism and dedicated to sobriety of statement by the high duties of his national chairmanship, MURDOCK of the flaming topknot might be suspected of optimism. Nobody else can hope to find vim and vigor in the army of social justice that fought in 1912 under the standard of a leader now indifferent, silent and darkly musing. The determination to win is expended in the ranks of the Republicans. But VICTOR knows the truth. He rockets to all the warning:

"All those who attempt to pose as reformers when they are really not reformers are beaten."

Mr. MURDOCK ought to know. He, posing as a reformer, was beaten to a frazzle in Kansas in 1914.

Columbia University.

The 1915 report of the president of Columbia University illumines many of the problems of college management. Dr. BUTLER says: "Columbia has consciously and with success separated the task of pure administration from the task of academic legislation." The justice of the distinction is quite generally recognized, but many a college is pestered with internal dissension because of failure to realize it in practice. Congratulations to President BUTLER and his staff from fellow educators will have sincerity emphasized by some honest envy.

Not only collegians but business men inclined to sceptical regard of collegiate business management will be impressed by the full exposition of Columbia's budget system. The annual deficit is a fixture in college finance, but Columbia's of last year was only $13,500, in contrast to the $42,900 of the previous year. Gifts and bequests in 1914 were $814,111, little more than half of those for the year before the war began. Attention of municipal finance boards should be directed to this paragraph: "So accurate are the budget forecasts that the difference between the estimated income and the income actually collected and the difference between the budget appropriations and the amounts actually expended are almost always very inconsiderable."

In a time when the rule of reason has been more or less obstructed by the willingness to rule of some professors, Columbia has had its experience in free speech. Never, so the report informs us, have academic critics been so severely criticised by the non-academic world. Columbia's mail bags have been crammed and jammed with protestant communications, in most instances, Dr. BUTLER says, exhibiting a hostility based on inaccurate report of the original professorial utterance. But of course some of them "reveal narrowness of view or stupidity." Often those who accuse the professors of demagogy are demagogues themselves, fearful, perhaps, of being surpassed in their fine art.

It is evident that Columbia University, with its 16,000 students, its splendid endowment and equipment and its efficient corps of administrators, has no longing for academic seclusion, but means to be of and for the people. In a few more years her restored football team may be able to beat Yale and Harvard, placing this town on an equal footing as an educational centre with Cambridge, Mass., and New Haven, Conn.

A Storm Belt Ahead.

An incidental advantage to the Administration's frank change of front regarding adequate equipment for national defence will be the cover such action will afford to a probably inevitable bond issue. Bond issues in times of peace are never popular. On the eve of a Presidential election they impinge upon indiscretion.

Whether made necessary by extravagance or by ill advised application of theories of uplift to tariff revenues, there is a distinct limit to public toleration of management resulting in a deficit that can only be made good by the Government's appearance in the market as a borrower. Even as a measure necessary to the furtherance of so popular a movement as that for an adequate navy and army, the tendency to look askance at it and to inquire minutely into just how much and how little the war preparedness programme is responsible, will be very strong and will naturally be pressed with embarrassing insistence by the party in opposition.

Yet with that disagreeable feature quite inevitable, the imposition of a bond issue to meet a deficit of equivocal origin will be much alleviated by such freedom from harsh exposure as the cover of a patriotic purpose to meet military aggression will afford. None the less there will be jealous watchfulness over the application made of the proceeds of such a loan.

If there are latent plans for the diversion of any part of such revenue to a Government plunge into a mysterious socialistic mercantile marine speculation it will be well for those harboring such projects to trim ship for storms ahead.

The Danish steamer Vinland's escape after being pursued from this port to Norfolk by two British warships suggests that England's blockade of New York is not working as well on this side of the Atlantic as on the other.

ELLIS M. BLACK, working in the laboratories of the Ohio State University here, announced to-day that he has discovered a hitherto unknown substance, found in practically all animal and human foods, with which the growth and development of animals can absolutely be controlled.—*News despatch from Columbus, Ohio.*

An elixir of this sort might come in handy just now to the keepers of the Bull Moose, who is dwindling alarmingly.

Some outsiders may be surprised to hear of the land lottery by which, in 1786, Massachusetts tried to bulge its flattened pocketbook, and at the reverends and honorables who held tickets. But in hasty pudding days lotteries were not so hated of the moralists as they are now. In its early history, one of struggle for the bare means of existence, the College of New Jersey regarded such money raising devices as a perfectly legitimate way for a Presbyterian school to earn its living. And who shall say that the "eminent divines" of the eighteenth century were less admirable canvassers than their successors in the good year 1915? In the lamented past the pleasure of giving was enhanced by some prospect of getting.

Call drive at Egypt Germans' last hope.—*Newspaper headline.*

Decidedly an outer line in Germany's war of defence. Such wars do not commonly produce the "far flung" battle line.

Police Inspector HUSSEY, having been dismissed from and reinstated in the force so often his head must whirl, has been retired on a pension, and the city will save enough in legal expenses to make this disposition of his case eminently satisfactory to all the taxpayers.

Interest is being shown by foreign municipalities in the administrative and financial methods of American cities.—*The news from Washington.*

For any political corporation anxious to get into debt American municipalities offer a splendid course of instruction.

It seems to be pretty well established that the belligerent aviators in Europe conduct their part of the fighting with refreshing chivalry so far as their attacks on each other are concerned, but there is nothing to indicate that their example has so far been followed in the councils of their superiors.

Congress will have a hard time keeping down appropriations this session. There will be demands for expenditures for rivers and harbors, good roads and public buildings.—*Representative* JOHN J. FITZGERALD.

In pork we trust.

It is always impossible to tell just when Russia or Yale may come back.

MR. ANGELL'S OPINION.

He Explains a Misconception of His Ideal.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In a report which appears in THE SUN of November 12 you wrote me, in the headline, as saying that "the policy of arming is a mistake."

May I say that not merely did I not say this in the address with which the report deals, but explicitly warned my audience that I had not a word to say against the policy of arming? I was very careful to declare that, for all I knew, it might be necessary greatly to increase the armed forces of the United States. But I added that that was not enough. I said then, as I have often said, that I am not opposed to preparedness, but to preparedness by half measure, incomplete preparedness.

The preparedness which we are neglecting is the preparedness of policy. In our days a nation's interests and rights can never be protected by arms alone. No one of the nations now fighting in Europe could have been secure if it had had to depend solely upon its own armed force without reference to some international policy or alliance. Which nation could have defended itself alone? Belgium? France? Is there a single one?

Where do we stand in the world combinations? Who is going to be on our side in demanding a more civilized sea law? Who against us? And if we can't answer these questions, how can we pretend to defend our citizens or their trade at sea?

If this country, while enlarging its influence in, say, South America, piles up great armaments and manages to create the idea among the more expansive European nations that it means to use its military power to exact preferential commercial advantages for itself and in some measure exclude Europeans commercially, it may well find itself embroiled in South America in costly and enervating wars against great European nations, wars which will serve no real purpose to us and which some definiteness of policy might have avoided.

My whole point was that arms in the last resort are for the defence not properly speaking of a country but a policy, a simple truth which American history particularly illustrates. If its armaments are to be effective, the people of this country, the world at large and the prospective enemy must know what policy the armaments stand behind. Failing that, this country will fight first and find out what it was fighting for afterward. And that is not the way to defend national interests.

What every country needs as well as armaments is a formulation of policy which the world cannot mistake. What do the armaments of this country stand for with reference to South America, sea law, Japan and the open door in Asia and the support of some international code for the prevention of crude aggression by any nation?

These are not simple questions. They will need a great deal of discussion on the part of the American people and are not getting it. But a decision concerning them is as necessary for security as battleships, and without such a decision America will get into the same kind of muddle that Europe manages to, however many battleships she may have. That is not an argument against battleships; it is an argument for something else as well. NORMAN ANGELL.

NEW YORK, November 14.

THE WOUNDED IN THE WAR.

Light Upon Mr. Asquith's British Death Rate of 24 Per Cent.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A statement has recently appeared in a number of journals on no less an authority than that of the Prime Minister of England to the effect that 24 per cent., or practically one-fourth, of the wounded British soldiers die as an unavoidable result of their wounds. The idea is further developed to the effect that this terrible mortality is largely due to the increased use of artillery, resulting in frightful wounds, which are almost always infected, and which the surgeons are unable to handle successfully. This statement has been so often made and has gone so long uncontradicted that it appears to be accepted as a settled fact. Nevertheless, the statement that one-fourth the English wounded die is entirely erroneous.

In the wars of the Middle Ages, when armies were entirely without a sanitary service of any kind, it is probable that nearly all the seriously wounded (one-third as a rule) died. While there are no statistics of those armies, there are excellent reasons for believing that 33 1-3 per cent. of the wounded perished. In recent wars the death rate of the wounded has declined greatly. In the Crimean war, the worst of recent times from a sanitary standpoint, 16 per cent. of the English wounded died and 19 per cent. of the Russian. Of the French wounded possibly 25 per cent. died, but not of their wounds; they died of everything from frost bite to typhus. In our own civil war 14.6 per cent. of the wounded died; in the Franco-Prussian war 12 per cent. of the German wounded perished. In the Spanish-American war less than 5 per cent. of our wounded died; and in the Manchurian campaigns the death rate of the wounded was about 5 per cent.

It will be seen that there has been a gradual decline in the percentage of deaths from wounds, due, without doubt, to the great advances in medicine and surgery of the past half century and their application to the care of armies. Now, if the deaths among the wounded, which had declined from 33 per cent. to about 5 per cent., should suddenly jump to 25 per cent. again, it would be a surprising phenomenon and a consummation that would render many of the boasted claims of sanitary science vain. And no explanation of shell fire, intrenchments or more malignant infections could dissipate the feeling that science had failed.

But science has not failed. It may be stated with the utmost confidence that 24 per cent. of the British wounded have not died. While the exact figures have not been given out, the death rate is almost certainly not more than 5 per cent., possibly not that much. Why, then, did Mr. Asquith make the statement? The reason is that by the term "wounded" he meant to convey quite a different idea from that which we are accustomed to associate with that word. The term "wounded" has two meanings. First, there is the strict, logical meaning, very seldom used, which includes all those hit by weapon or missile. Every man hit is of course wounded. In this sense the term includes all battle casualties, all those who are wounded. Some of these die soon, some later.

There is a second meaning of the word "wounded," and a meaning made common by long and widespread usage. It is the meaning used by most if not all writers on military statistics. With this meaning the word or term includes only those who are hit and live long enough to be picked up and carried to a hospital. All those hit are divided into two categories, the "killed" and "wounded." The class "killed" is made up of those so seriously injured as to die on the field. The class "wounded" includes all the remainder who reach hospitals. Of these some also die. These we classify under "died of wounds."

It will be seen that there are many opportunities for a confusion of terms in the use of this word "wounded" with the two meanings. Mr. Asquith, possibly not very familiar with medico-military statistics and terms, used the word with the first meaning. When he said that 24 per cent. of the wounded died he meant to convey the information that 24 per cent. of all those hit in battle died; either on the field or later in hospital. In his classification of wounded are included the class "killed" (some 21 per cent.) and the class "died of wounds" (some 4 per cent.). When he speaks of those dying of wounds he includes all who die on the field or in hospital. When we speak of those dying of wounds we restrict the term to those dying in hospital.

And there is good reason for this use of the term. Those dying on the field have for the most part received wounds that are necessarily fatal; as for the others, the surgeons have no opportunity to stay the hand of death. Those who reach the hospitals are as a rule not so desperately wounded and the surgeons have at least an opportunity to exercise their skill in attempts to save them. The measure of the efficiency of the sanitary staff and of the state of sanitary science in general is not the whole number of deaths from battle wounds, but the percentage of deaths among those who reach hospitals. If 25 per cent. die quickly on the field it cannot be avoided; if 25 per cent. of those who reach hospitals die it is a matter of grave concern, for we have been claiming that not more than 5 per cent. of these should die. It appears, then, that Mr. Asquith was correct in his statement as he understood the term "wounded"; but owing to the fact that the world in general has become accustomed to another definition of the term, he has conveyed an erroneous idea.

It is further reported that Mr. Asquith made the statement that the percentage of deaths among the wounded is now greater than in other recent wars. This is wholly erroneous in whatever sense it may have been intended, whether referring to the whole number of deaths or to those dying in hospital. The table below will demonstrate the fallacy of such a statement. In this table the first column gives the total of battle casualties (except the missing) both killed and wounded. The second gives the percentage of those hit who die on the field. These we commonly term "killed." The third column gives the percentage of the hit who die in hospitals. These we class as "died of wounds." The last column gives the sum of the second and third; this is Mr. Asquith's class "died of wounds." It is the sum of those killed and those who die of wounds; all deaths resulting from battle injuries:

Peninsular war	23,760	30	11	41
Crimean war, E.	14,450	19	15	34
Civil war, U.	867,000	18	12	30
Franco-German, G.	117,000	15	9	24
Anglo-Boer, E.	28,700	20	7	27
Russo-Japanese, R.	171,000	15	3.5	18.5
Russo-Japanese, J.	220,000	21	5	26
Present war, Brit.	336,946	*22	*3.5	25.5

* Estimated.

The total of deaths from battle injuries in the British army is 25.5 per cent. of all those hit; rather more than Mr. Asquith stated in July. But it is impossible to determine at present what proportion of these deaths occur on the field and what later in hospitals, for no information on these points has been given out. It has been stated that the proportion of "killed" was high. In former wars the average was 20 per cent. of all hit. If we estimate the killed at 22 per cent. we shall have 3½ per cent. dying of wounds. This rate for all hit would figure out a rate of about 5 per cent. of the wounded (88 per cent. of the whole). It is very probable that the death rate of the wounded in hospitals will prove to be about 5 per cent. instead of 24 per cent. Instead of increasing the death rate of the wounded has decreased greatly, from one in three or four in the old wars to one in twenty at present.

While the total of deaths from battle injuries has not decreased so markedly, it is also considerably less. In the Peninsular and Crimean wars about one-third of all those hit died on the field or later. In our civil war 30 per cent. of those hit perished. In the present war the total of deaths is 25 per cent. Formerly one of three hit died; now one of four.

If the death rate of the wounded in British hospitals was actually 24 per cent. the total mortality would be truly terrible, for on adding the killed in battle (22 per cent.) to this 24 per cent. we should have a figure well over 40 per cent. for the total of deaths from battle injuries. This figure is erroneous on its face.

The error may be shown in another way. There is no reason to think that the death rate of the British wounded is different from that of the German wounded. Now, the Germans say that 80 per cent. of their wounded return to duty. It would manifestly be impossible for 24 per cent. of them to die and 80 per cent. return to duty, even with all the remarkable German efficiency. It is probable that 80 per cent. do not become able to do full duty again, but there is little doubt that 95 per cent. recover, either wholly or in a disabled condition.

It appears to be true that nearly one-third the British officers hit in battle die, mostly on the field. It was reported that in France up to July 18 3,288 officers had been killed and 6,803 wounded. The only explanation apparent is that when a soldier is wounded he at once leaves the field; when an officer is wounded (and not gravely) he continues at his post until gravely wounded or killed. In any case, the death rate will be high, both on the field and in hospital. Since the other nations do not give out their losses it is impossible to make comparisons.

Fortunately for my idea of Mr. Asquith's statement, which covered the war up to July, 1915, the British War Office afterward gave out the British losses to August 21. That is for one year, as the British army began fighting near Mons on August 22, 1914. They are as follows and are without doubt as nearly correct as is possible at this time. The exact losses in our civil war were not known for thirty years after the war closed:

Killed or died of wounds	85,885
Wounded	251,059
Total	336,946
Missing	56,967
Grand total of losses	391,913

There is probably an overlapping here of wounded and those who died of wounds, but to offset it there are doubtless many both dead and wounded among the list of 56,967 missing.

As to the statements that various conditions to-day are unheard of, they are generally made by persons unfamiliar with the history of other wars. Soldiers are no dirtier now than in other campaigns; they are neither so dirty nor so much exposed to vermin, as the disappearance of typhus from the great armies testifies. Nor do the wounded lie longer on the field; they do not as a general rule lie so long. It is a privilege of soldiers and war correspondents to think that everything in their particular war was more bloody, more heroic and more frightful than in any other war that ever was fought. But the careful and unprejudiced student knows that such views are false. The American who thinks that wounded men never lay on the field for days has evidently never read the story of the second Bull Run and Cold Harbor. Men have not changed greatly throughout the ages. They fight as bravely, endure wounds as patiently and die as heroically now as under Grant or Napoleon or Gustavus Adolphus, or Hannibal or Alexander, but not more so.

A few of the factors of war have changed; the material, not the men. There is a much greater use of artillery now than ever before; consequently there are more shrapnel and shell wounds, and these wounds are commonly infected. Owing to the general use of trenches there is a larger proportion of wounds of the head, and head wounds are particularly fatal. The use of machine guns also may increase the proportion of killed, since a man hit by one bullet is very likely to be hit by several others of the stream pouring from this diabolical machine. Soil conditions in Europe are also bad, as always.

But with the increase in deadliness of weapons there has been a still greater increase in the facilities for saving life. Unlike the contest between gun and armor, the sanitary experts have run ahead of the ordnance experts. The results of sanitary efficiency are perhaps best seen in more strictly medical fields. Witness the reduction of typhoid in the British army, from 50,000 cases and 7,000 deaths in the Boer war to 1,000 cases and 120 deaths in the present war. But sanitary science has its victories in handling the wounded also. Not only in collecting them quickly and transporting them comfortably to hospitals in the rear, but also in saving twenty men out of every hundred wounded, who in other wars would have died.

British courage is what it has always been. British losses in battle are about what they have always been. The death rate of the wounded in hospitals is very much less than of old. Why? Because British medical officers are competent and make use of the discoveries and improvements made in sanitary science during the last half century. The same might be said of the Belgians, the French or the Germans. The Austrians and Russians are possibly not quite so efficient in sanitary affairs, and the Serbians and Turks are still less so.

There can be no question that the lot of the wounded soldier has vastly improved since the Middle Ages, and particularly in the last seventy-five years. And this improvement is most clearly indicated by the decline in the death rate of the wounded in hospitals. Why, there was a time when hospitals themselves increased the death rate, by the fact that every inmate was sure to become infected with the suppurative germs of his fellow sufferers, and was very apt to contract some hospital disease, typhoid, typhus or dysentery.

The soldier wounded at that famous victory Blenheim had one chance in three for his life. The trail of maimed soldiers that lined the roads behind the march of Napoleon's Grand Army were as a rule abandoned, and one of each four died. Of the wounded who escaped the jaws of death at Balaklava five out of six recovered. Of the German wounded in 1870-71, in spite of the excellent medical service, one of each twelve died. The soldier who is wounded in France to-day and lives to reach a hospital has nineteen chances out of twenty for his life.

Let us hear no more of increased mortality among the wounded. There has been no increase, but, on the contrary, a great decrease. Sanitary science has outstripped the art of killing. The test tube has beaten the shell.

MEDICAL CORPS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 13.

Advance Guard of the Grand Army of Prophets.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* With the Presidential election less than a year off I want to make a prediction as to the candidates of the various parties in 1916:

DEMOCRATIC:
For President,
Woodrow Wilson of New Jersey.
For Vice-President,
Thomas R. Marshall of Indiana.

REPUBLICAN:
For President,
Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana.
For Vice-President,
William E. Borah of Idaho.

PROGRESSIVE:
For President,
Hiram W. Johnson of California.
For Vice-President,
Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania.

Another three cornered fight, which means "Wilson; that's all."

INDEPENDENT.

PHILADELPHIA, November 13.

FARMING AS BUSINESS.

Use or Neglect of Timberlands Affects Profit Percentages.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The New England farmer has been living along too contentedly on a 4 per cent. business basis. A successful merchant never goes afoot when he can ride. Active working capital must earn 6 per cent. or better. A large part of the farm home should be looked at as stock in hand. If the farmer doesn't work to develop that as a business man and keep books, some one else ultimately will and have all the benefit and enjoyment of that extra 2 per cent. The business farmer should be paying himself fair living wages and 6 per cent. interest on his stock in trade or else he should want to know why.

Trees should be reckoned by the farmer either as a liability or an asset when he is looking over his stock in trade. The old school lumberman has biassed sentiment too much to his own advantage in his references to forestry as something for the rich man to play at who wants to keep trees to look at. Twenty years ago possibly the portable sawmill had a place in moving onto lots where the pine timber was dense and cutting off the largest and ripest trees. Even then, though, selective cutting and thinning would have been in order if we had known what we know to-day. Then timber stumpage was worth but one-fifth of what it is to-day and you could hardly blame the farmer for letting the mill onto his land, when with all the long teaming he got so little for his logs at the old water mill. But to-day for him to allow an outside corporation to come onto his property and cut clean is too much like a forced sale of the stock in trade. It is like leaving a 6 per cent. investment which he might work at himself and earn good wages besides for a 4 per cent. one. The sum received for his lot seems big, but possibly the purchasing agent is not paying him over a compounded 4 per cent. for his original investment. He failed to get his 6 per cent. and bought a gold brick.

Timber commands enough to-day so that the farmer is paid for going into the woods and carefully selecting out that part of the tree crop which is ripe for cutting each winter and also the cost of the hauling to mill even though it be ten miles.

Local banking and agricultural institutions should bear a large part of the responsibility for this actual shortsightedness. PAUL W. GOLDSBURY.

NEW YORK, November 13.

ONCE A CAPITOL.

Save the Hotel Royal of New Orleans, Grandeur in Decay.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The Seattle *Daily Times*, commenting upon the fact that the Hotel Royal in New Orleans is to be torn down to make way for a modern skyscraper, reviews the history of the hotel from slave auction days, and says:

A wonderful place was the Hotel Royal in those days! There the Tennessee "backwoodsman," who had travelled down the Mississippi with his pocket full of American dollars, met the descendants of the Arcadians, the Dons from Cuba and Mexico and the children of the Virginia Cavaliers, who had thrust a way westward through Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi to the old French city by the side of the Father of Waters. Likewise he met the gamblers of the Mississippi packets—and, if fortunate enough to escape from their clutches, he later met those of the Hotel Royal.

Some rich man might put some of his wealth to good use in buying up this old hotel and its site and turning over to the Government so that this famous structure might be preserved as a historical relic.

I saw this old hotel in 1913, and was greatly impressed by the spectacle it presented of ancient grandeur gone to decay. Let me cite an account of the Hotel Royal as given on a card that was presented to me when I went through the old place (the Hotel Royal and the St. Louis Hotel are the same):

OLD ST. LOUIS HOTEL.

The building formerly known as the St. Louis Hotel was erected in 1836 by the Improvement Bank. The edifice was commenced by Mr. Deponiby, a distinguished architect. In the '70s the State bought the building and used it until the capital was moved to Baton Rouge. When the Legislature occupied the hotel as a State House the dome room was floored over on a level with the second story and used for sittings of the legislative bodies. While the hotel was used as the State Capitol General Phil Sheridan, during the troublesome period of reconstruction, drove out the Legislature in session at the point of the bayonet; the session was presided over by Speaker A. Wiltz, who afterward became Mayor of the city of New Orleans and then Governor of Louisiana. The Constitutional Convention of 1879 framed in this very dome room the Constitution of the State. Statesmen, royalty and famous men were banqueted in this same hotel.

Dom Pedro, Emperor of Brazil, and afterward his grandson were its guests. Henry Clay was banqueted on one occasion at a cost of $20,000. General Boulanger was also its guest.

I have no doubt that the building could be bought at a comparatively moderate figure, and I urge the Government, or a wealthy man, or a syndicate, or an organizer of popular subscription, to take it over and preserve it as one of our historical monuments.

CHARLES T. HOOPER.

SEATTLE, Wash., November 13.

MIDDLE AGED RELIGION.

Is Neglect of the Church Due to Indifference or to Matured Intellect?

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Several of the leading religious journals have recently published articles commenting on the difficulty that the church encounters in reaching or retaining its hold on the men of middle age. The writers seemed to imply that men of mature years are apt to be so bound up in worldly affairs as to cause them to neglect the religious associations of the church. It apparently does not occur to them that because men of middle life are at the maximum of their mentality they are better qualified to weigh men and religious affairs than they were before arriving at that time of life, and that it is the fault of the church that so many good men remain outside.

In common with the great mass of mankind in this country, I have the greatest respect and veneration for Christianity, the religion of Christ; but when we see churches dedicated to the Most High desecrated by the presence of so-called evangelists whose ribald jests and blasphemous utterances are disgusting to those who object to a merger of the church and vaudeville, when instead of pastors who "allure to brighter worlds and lead the way" we see them on every hand dragging politics into the church, is it any wonder that so many men refuse to follow their leadership?

If a man holds aloof from the church, is he to be branded as a miserable sinner? Some years ago I became associated in business with two gentlemen, both of whom were prominent in church work, one a high official in a certain church, the other prominent in the Sunday schools of that city and the State. Shortly after engaging in the business venture one of the partners confided me to be on my guard against the absent member, who, he said, was in the habit of lying. This one in turn told me in confidence that the other member of the firm was a grand rascal. I was shortly convinced that both were strictly truthful in this instance. If the church would purge itself of such it would have an attraction for those who may prefer to hold communion with the Great Spirit apart from those who claim to be the elect. ONE OF THE MANY.

SPRINGFIELD, Mass., November 13.

COLUMBIA STUDENT BODY U. S.'S BIGGEST

Enrolment Is Now 16,172—Faculty Comprises 962 Persons.

ALIENS ARE TO BE AIDED

Certain facts and figures stand out impressively from the great mass of information supplied about Columbia University's year's activities by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, its president. Dr. Butler's annual report, submitted to the public yesterday, states that the total enrolment at Columbia is 16,172, which makes Columbia the biggest institution of learning in this country. The faculty alone numbers 962 persons, or rather more than the total enrolment of many substantial colleges.

The financial statement alone is indicative of the bigness of the university and the wide scope of its work. Since 1890, the year Seth Low was elected president of Columbia, the sum of $28,085,514.27 has been given to the institution. Of this amount about $8,000,000 was contributed in the administration of President Butler, which began in 1901. Last year the cash gifts amounted to $814,161.19. Among the principal contributors were William K. Vanderbilt, $113,750 for the new medical school site; the estate of Joseph Pulitzer, $50,000 for the School of Journalism endowment; Mrs. Samuel W. Brigham, $20,000; the Dr. and Mrs. Frederic S. Lee Fund, $20,000; the estate of Admiral George W. Melville, $5,280.15, and George Ehret, $2,000.

One of the most interesting parts of Dr. Butler's report deals with the public habit of injudiciously criticising university professors and with the bad taste and bad manners of professors who become involved in loud strife over "academic freedom."

Nearing Case Touched On.

Dr. Butler's references to the Scott Nearing case in the University of Pennsylvania are very thinly veiled indeed. He says:

"All this would be amusing were it not sad. It illustrates once more how much the public at large has still to learn as to the significance and purpose of universities. The notion which is sedulously cultivated in some quarters that there are powerful interests, financial, economic and social, which wish to curb the proper freedom of speech of university professors in America probably has little or no justification anywhere. So far as Columbia University is concerned it has no justification whatever. That there are large elements in the population which do desire to curb the proper freedom of speech of university professors is, however, indisputable.

"Genuine cases of the invasion of academic freedom are so rare as to be almost non-existent. It may be doubted whether more than two such cases have occurred in the United States in the past forty years. It is a misnomer to apply the high and splendid term 'academic freedom' to exhibitions of bad taste and bad manners. The serious scholarly and responsible investigator is not a demagogue, and demagogues should not be permitted to take his name in vain."

Dr. Butler finds that the restoration of intercollegiate football has been received with great satisfaction by students, the faculty, the trustees and the public.

School of Journalism Plans.

As regards the work of the School of Journalism Dr. Butler says:

"The three years' experience which has already been had suggests some changes of policy, not very great or very important, which will undoubtedly increase the effectiveness of the School of Journalism and make its relation to the rest of the university more definite and more helpful than at present. It has already been demonstrated that the training of such journalists as Mr. Pulitzer contemplated when making his benefaction more time is required than was supposed at the outset, and greater concentration