

passenger ships to be immune even when they carry 5471 cases of ammunition? It is true that there were passengers on board of the *Lusitania*, among them over a hundred Americans, but why did they not heed the solemn warning of the German government? Is it really inhuman on the part of Germany to protect her soldiers against bullets and shells manufactured by us, and is our claim justified that to furnish ammunition is our good right as a neutral nation? The Germans stopped their export of ammunition for Spain to use against us; but we claim that our neutrality imposes upon us the duty of letting the Allies have the death-dealing means of warfare actually used to kill German soldiers.

Our president is a university professor but his logic is somehow twisted and in the name of humanity he demands of Germany that she shall abandon her barbarous warfare.

There are some people who are curious to know what the human warfare President Wilson hints at would be like, and I have come to the conclusion that he will probably propose to replace the Big Berthas and other cannons by pop-guns and use sugar-plums for projectiles. That would be a merry war indeed, but so long as humaneness is to be imposed upon Germany only, while American manufacturers continue to furnish shrapnel for the Allies, we fear that the proposition will remain unacceptable to the Huns.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### "BRITISH FAILURE."

BY THE EDITOR.

Under the heading "British Failure" the *New York Tribune* of May 1, 1916, published an editorial which pro-British interests of this country have endeavored to eliminate by buying up the whole edition and thus keeping it out of the market; but the article was reprinted in the *Milwaukee Free Press* of May 19, and so is still obtainable. Its arguments are pretty vigorous, but not in the least exaggerated. On the contrary they could have been much more vigorous if all the failures in both British diplomacy and British strategy had been pointed out; for instance the British fiasco at the Dardanelles is not set forth in detail, nor in its dreadful seriousness. But the remarkable thing is that this article appeared in a paper that is commonly regarded as pro-British. If the *New York Times* is aware of "British Failure" there can no longer be any doubt of the fact.

The *Tribune* says:

"The Germans are mistaken when they say that the effect of this defeat

[before Bagdad] will be to rouse the French and the Russians against their allies, the British. The French have been disappointed since the beginning of the war at what the British army has accomplished. They have been disappointed because the failure of the British has cost them terrible losses, but they are equally conscious of the fact that the failure has not been through lack of effort, and that the British aid remains a great and useful, even more, a necessary, factor in the result they seek. The Russian sentiment is more obscure, but hardly different.

"On the other hand, the effect upon British prestige in the world, upon British confidence at home, can hardly be mistaken. At the moment when Dublin is in ashes and a rebellion in Ireland is demonstrating the fatal folly of the domestic policy of those who rule Britain, an army sent foolishly to certain disaster surrenders, not to the Germans, not to the Austrians, but to the Turks. Gallipoli is followed by Kut-el-Amara, and a British army has laid down its arms to the troops of the Mahometan Sultan.

"In the Near East, in the Far East, this surrender before Bagdad is a greater fact than the Russian victory at Erzerum or the French at Verdun. What the French have purchased on the Meuse, the Russians along the upper Euphrates, for prestige and influence for the anti-Teutonic alliance, has been wasted by the British in Mesopotamia and in Ireland. All the Allies suffer thereby; but who can exaggerate the decline of British prestige in the world?"

Each of the nations entangled in this war has accomplished something, and if the war were to stop and each country keep just what it has now, Germany's prestige, even if she did not win European hegemony, would be preserved. Says the *Tribune*:

"Germany would stand forth as the marvelous nation which had for many months faced and, on the whole, bested the world in arms, performing miracles but failing to conquer Europe because the thing could not be done."

France and Russia will come out of the war with honor. "But," continues the editor, "what of Britain? Her fleet has kept the seas, she remains the ruler of the oceans, but on land wherever her armies have gone to battle they have gone to defeat, ignominious defeat, regard being had for the generalship, splendid defeat, regard being had for the soldiers. French's failure at Mons, not to win, but to retreat in time; the subsequent peril of his army, which eliminated it as a factor at the Marne; the British failure at the Marne, which spoiled Joffre's magnificent combination and nearly ruined his battle; French's indecision at Ypres, followed by his decision to retreat, a decision only just blocked by Foch in that terrible night when, having lost a son and a son-in-law and being nearly spent with weariness, he went to French and by moral force compelled him to reverse his decision to retire; the butchery of Loos, where men won a battle and their victory was thrown away and they were left to die unsupported—this is the story of Britain on the Continent to date.

"And at home. There is Ireland blazing into revolt. We have had strike after strike; we have had, and there remains, the struggle over conscription, the quarrel about married men. We have seen a civil government that cannot deal with a situation because it cannot understand it, because it cannot deal with facts at all, because it can only talk. It lied to the British people over all the years before the war came. It almost lied the British people out of the war altogether and left France to perish alone. It has been lying ever since."

The New York *Tribune* draws the following lesson from "British Failure":

"The tragedy that is contemporary Great Britain has a meaning for Americans that should not, cannot be mistaken. Our leaders have lied to us as the British have lied to them. They have hidden the truth, they have fled the facts and suppressed the truth. They have made us feel safe when we were in peril, they have taught us to be selfish and to forget what our fathers and our grandfathers died to make enduring. When our crisis comes, and that day is not distant, we shall have the same defeats in the field, the same revolts at home, the same wanton waste of all that is best. It, too, will be thrown in the ditch and wasted in the swamp by leaders who cannot lead, and a people which cannot foresee will not then be able to rescue itself from the body of its own death.

"Democracy has failed in England as it is failing in the United States. It has failed because it has not bred up men who can lead, who have courage, faith or vision. It has not failed in France because the nation has taken over its own leadership and the men who are in office (weak men for the most, too) march to the command of a people who are facing the facts without illusion and without dismay. Such hope as there is for democracy must be found in France, not in England or America; it must be found in the fact that the people have proven themselves to be brave and sound. In the ultimate analysis the same will probably be true in Great Britain and America; but how much of terrible sacrifice there is to come before the people are at last able to understand and to act, the British history of recent months is a plain evidence."

There is only one mistake in this view. It is the use of the word democracy. Germany is certainly more democratic than England or France. All we can say in favor of France is that the French army is undoubtedly superior to the armies of the other Allies.

---

## DISPOSING OF THE HYPHENATES.

BY MEDICUS.

It seems to me that in America our patience must by this time have nearly reached the breaking point. Is it not quite time that we follow the examples of France and England, and separate the loyal from the disloyal? Every American should be made to swear allegiance to France and England, and to declare himself in favor of the Allies first, America second. As is our way always in such matters we have been too lenient and procrastinating with those who insist on the United States first. All such should be rigorously interned in barbed wire enclosures. For this purpose I suggest the use of military barbed wire; first because the barbs are heavier and much longer than those of ordinary barbed wire, and second, because our factories are making it on a large scale at present, and it is, therefore, to be had more readily in quantity on short notice. It is the ideal barbed wire for internment camps. The wires should be placed not more than 2 inches apart, and the fences should be 27 feet high. This may seem like a waste of wire; but frankly I think not. Wires strung 2 inches apart will effectually prevent the small children from escaping, and a height of 27 feet will reduce all escapes to a minimum. This, in turn, will operate to reduce materially the number of guards necessary, and at the same time reduce the public expense incident to chasing and tracking down escaped Hyphenates. Another advantage that can hardly be ignored in