

Tägliche Omaha Tribune
TRIBUNE PUBLISHING CO.; VAL. J. PETER, President.
1911 Howard Str. Telephone: TYLER 340. Omaha, Nebraska.
Preis des Tageblatts: Durch den Träger, per Woche 10c; durch die Post, per Jahr \$5.00; einzelne Nummern 2c. — Preis des Wochenblatts: Bei freier Vorabbezahlung, per Jahr \$1.50.
Entered as second-class matter March 14, 1912, at the postoffice of Omaha, Nebraska, under the act of Congress, March 3, 1879.
Omaha, Neb., Samstag, den 21. Juli 1917.

Die neue Krise in Russland.
Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, daß der militärische Rückschlag, den die Russen am 1. Dezember erlitten, im englischen Zusammenhange mit der neuen Krise steht, die neuerdings im russischen Kabinett ausgebrochen ist. In vielen über London kommender Verichten geschilderte plötzliche Wandlung zum Besseren in Russland mußte von Anfang an verdächtig erscheinen, denn darüber muß sich doch jeder denkende Mensch klar sein, die russische Revolution steht erst in den Anfangsstadien ihrer Entwicklung. Weber ist das russische Volk in seiner Gesamtheit heute schon zur vollständigen Selbstregierung herangereift, noch ist es willig, dem Kriege, dessen Verantwortung es dem alten Regime und dem ihm fremden Imperialismus zuschiebt, weitere Opfer zu bringen, wenn diese nicht von den Geboten der Selbsthaltung verlangt werden. Und das russische Volk wird seine berechtigten Forderungen über die weitere Blutvergießen nicht zurücklassen, sondern es wird die russische Demokratie in Verbindung zu treten, und der alte Reichstag sich jetzt auch zu diesem Programme bekennen.

Die russische Revolution, darüber kann wohl kein Zweifel bestehen, hatte ihren Höhepunkt im Krieg. Das russische Volk lehnte sich gegen die imperialistische Politik der alten Regierung auf, und der Zweck der Revolution war es, die erste und letzte Phase der Revolution zu sein. Das russische Volk ist noch nicht reif genug, die hohen Ideale, für die ihre Revolution zu kämpfen erlitten, zu verstehen. Der Mensch gibt nichts um Nichts; er will ungestört seine Kartoffeln und seinen Weizen bauen. Das alte Regime vertrat dies, indem es ihm die Hoffnungen auf baldigen Frieden eröffnete. Heute sind die Hoffnungen auf Frieden geworden, und der Mensch soll wieder für Ideale kämpfen, zu deren Verständnis sein noch bedürftiger Geist nicht hinreicht.

Die Bolschewiken, die Washington zu Anfang der russischen Offensive erließ, waren schmeichelnd bescheiden, denn diejenigen, die allzu große Hoffnungen auf die russische Offensive setzten, mußten mit der Zeit enttäuscht werden. Es ist bezeichnend, daß die drei zurückgetretenen Minister Heberleib der ersten provisorischen Regierung waren, in der der Geist des Imperialismus herrschte. Die Meldungen, daß Meinungsverschiedenheiten bezüglich der gegen die Ukraine zu ergreifenden Maßnahmen den Grund zu der Krise gaben, müssen deshalb mit Vorbehalt aufgenommen werden. Es scheint vielmehr, daß der Geschichtsroman am 1. Dezember bei den russischen Massen nicht das freudige Echo erweckt hat, das man vielfach erwartete.

Die Aufgaben der Engländer an der Westfront.

Darüber äußert sich der Schweizer Militärfachverständige Dr. Steiner, auf dessen Urteil in Europa sehr viel gegeben wird, und der an dieser Stelle mehrfach erwähnt wurde, folgendermaßen: Treten die Engländer unter Einfluß der vollen Kraft zu Lande und zur See in Flandern zum Angriff an, so können sie doch nicht daran denken, die zwischen Lens und Arras vorgeschobene Offensive zurückzuführen, weil die gegenwärtigen Stellungen zur dauernden Verteidigung wenig geeignet sind. Sie müssen um jeden Preis die Transvermale Cambrai-Douai zu erreichen suchen, obwohl ihnen auch damit eine Durchbrechung des hinfälligen Jönensystems nicht gelingen würde. Jetzt liegen sie noch zwischen Buzetourt und Miencourt und bei Roer und Gavelle fest. Sie haben am 5. Juni wieder angegriffen und bei Roer ihre Stellung etwas vorgeschoben, aber große Opfer gebracht. Sehr viel Geduld ist es im Abschnitt St. Quentin-Le-Cateau, und man ist geneigt zu schließen, daß dort große Verschiebungen stattgefunden und die Engländer sich mehr nach Norden konzentriert haben. An ihrer Stelle müssen Franzosen dem Brückenkopf von St. Quentin und der Straße St. Quentin-Le-Cateau gegenüberliegen; ob sie sich hier angreifensweise betätigen, ist noch nicht zu erkennen.

Zwischen St. Quentin und La Fere breitet sich das überkommene Diktat aus, das jeden Angriff unmöglich macht, und auch am Westflügel von St. Omer liegt die Offensive vollständig still. Am Chemin des Dames dagegen wird auf beiden Seiten um die Verbesserung vorgeschobener Stellungen gekämpft, ohne daß daraus strategische Folgen abzuleiten wären. Im Südgelände von Moronvillers sind die Franzosen im Besitz einiger wichtiger Beobachtungsstellen geblieben, in der Ostflanke und im Räume Verdun deuten der wechselnde Niveaufuß und lebhaftere Erregungen auf verborgene Absichten. Der Nachdruck liegt vorläufig auf dem südlich gestreckten Artilleriepark im Bois-aux-Bois, die von den Franzosen zurückgeworfene Ausfallstellung von Verdun und die Gefahr, daß die deutsche Stellung von St. Mihiel bei der gezielten Artillerierückführung einer modernen Verteidigung ausgesetzt ist, heißt aber den Raum Verdun-Toul im Auge behalten.

Im Westgelände sind die Dinge inzwischen beinahe zum Abschluß gekommen, und in dem Räume bei Neversort, wo die Deutschen jüngst Erfolg erlangt haben, ist die Situation in der Hauptlinie geblieben, wie dieser Schweizerische Sachverständige sie schildert. Ueber die Lage des im italienischen Kriegeschauplatz hat Steiner folgendes zu sagen: Die zweite Frontschlacht hat sich ausgetobt. Wreden die Italiener noch einmal, so wird man dieser Offensive eine neue Nummer geben müssen. Verlangt haben die Österreicher das Wort, die am Südfuß zum Gegenangriff übergegangen sind und nach ihrer Wiedergewinnung von 5. Juni in der Seite von Sarnano einen starken Erfolg davongetragen haben. Es lag nahe, anzunehmen, daß die Italiener Wiede haben würden, sich in dem von uns beschriebenen Abschnitt zwischen Mondar und Selo in der Richtung Westflanke zu behaupten, wo sie gegen die Nordflanke der Hermannstellung vorgedrungen, aber der hartnäckigen Abwehr an der Straße Sarnano-Prethofen nicht Herr geworden waren.

Nur hat sie der österreichischen Gegenangriff gefehlt, der nach der italienischen Wiedergewinnung von Sarnano bis in die Gegend von S. Giovanni Marterte und im Zentrum durchdrang. Es ist eine größere Kampfhandlung, die die Italiener nach österreichischer Wiedergewinnung über 6500 Mann an Gefangenen gefohlet hat. Wenn man, wie wir, die von den Italienern an der Nordflanke und Südfilanke der Hermann erlangten Erfolge ernst einschätzt, so muß man auch den Rückschlag ernst nehmen. Zweifellos ist die Lage der Österreicher dadurch bei Medicago und Selo wieder hergestellt, der auf der Nordflanke der Hermann lastende Druck aufgehoben worden.

Die Lage der Österreicher auf dem Karst ist also wieder als gefestigt zu bezeichnen. Am Dolomiten dagegen behaupten sich die Italiener auf dem stübera und bei Badice, so daß der Druck auf die Stellung an den Heiligenbergen anhält und die Österreicher am Monte Santo und an den Zugängen des Molentals im Abschnitt Mivovizza-Taragora zu scharfer Wachsamkeit verpflichtet bleiben. Ob es auch hier zu Gegenangriffen kommt, nachdem die Hermann auch in der Südfilanke wieder entlastet worden ist, wäre abzuwarten. Vielleicht ist der Rückschlag so groß, daß Gaderas Aufmarsch zur ersten Frontschlacht über den Sarfen geworfen worden ist.

Kurzzeitige Politik rückt sich.

Ne mehr sich in unjener Industrie und in unjener Landwirtschaft die Wirkungen der Abnahme der Einwanderung geltend zu machen beginnen, desto augenscheinlicher und unbedeutender wird es, daß Präsident Wilson im Rechte und der Kongreß im Unrechte war, als die Frage der Einwanderungsbeschränkung zur Debatte stand. Der Sieg, den damals unjener Nationalismus und die Selbsthüt der organisierten Arbeiter über Vernunft, Menschlichkeit und großzügige Auffassung des Nationalismus davongetragen haben, hängt an, dem Lande teuer zu stehen zu kommen. Und wenn augenscheinlich die frühere auswärtige Lage nicht alle Aufmerksamkeit und alle Zeit der Gesetzgebung in Anspruch nehmen würde, wäre vielleicht schon ein Versuch gemacht worden, wenigstens die radikalsten Bestimmungen des neuen, vor kurzer Zeit in Kraft getretenen Einwanderungsgesetzes zu mildern. Daß dies schon durch administrative Verfügungen anzuordnen für notwendig befunden wurde, beweist den Ernst

der Situation und die Dringlichkeit von Änderungen. Gleichzeitig ist es aber auch klar, daß es Sache des legislativen und nicht des administrativen Zweiges der Regierung ist, hier eingzugreifen, und daß dies Eingreifen der einen Regierungsgewalt an Stelle der anderen bestenfalls nur ein vorübergehendes sein darf.

Wimmer, die über die Forderungen des nächsten Tages hinweg auch in die weiter liegende Zukunft zu sehen vermochten, wiesen in der Debatte über die neue Einwanderungsvorlage auf die unermessliche schwere Einbuße hin, welche eine Beschränkung der Einwanderung für unsere Industrie und Landwirtschaft in Gestalt von Arbeitermangel schon in Friedenszeiten mit sich bringen müßte. Die durch unsere Teilnahme am Kriege obendrein noch notwendig gewordene Eingiehung von vielen Hunderttausenden von Arbeitern hat die Lage noch wesentlich verschlimmert und in manchen Gegenden sogar geradezu einen Notstand schwerer Art geschaffen.

So ergab sich j. B. vor einigen Wochen, daß infolge der hemmenden Bestimmungen des Einwanderungsgesetzes und der Anforderungen des Seeresdienstes die Farmer von Texas in Gefahr standen, wegen Mangels an Arbeitskräften ihre Ernte nicht einbringen zu können. Es blieb der Einwanderungsbehörde nichts übrig, als die Geltung gewisser Verfügungen des neuen Gesetzes zeitweise zu stützen und die Einwanderung merkwürdiger Arbeiter, die als des Lebens und Schreibens unfähig unter normalen Verhältnissen an der Grenze zurückgewiesen worden wären, für die Dauer der Erntearbeiten zu gestatten.

Zugleich sah sich die Behörde angezogen der bestigen Proteste, die hauptsächlich vonseiten der Bewohner der pazifischen Staaten erhoben wurden, nicht in der Lage, die Einwanderung von chinesischen Arbeitern der niedrigen Klasse, der sogenannten Sluts, zu erlauben. Diese Forderung ging von den großen Fabrikzentren in New York, Pennsylvania und den Neuenlandstaaten aus, deren Stahl- und Eisenindustrie durch das Wegbleiben der aus dem südlichen und südöstlichen Europa kommenden Einwanderer schon schwer gelitten hatten und durch das Entziehen weiterer Arbeitskräfte infolge der Einberufung zu den Waffen sich in ihrer Existenz bedroht sahen.

Im diesem Nebelstande zu begehen, schloß die Bundes-Industrie-Kommission jetzt vor, den Mangel an ungelerten Arbeitern durch Zuzug aus Porto Rico abzuwehren, dessen Bevölkerung als die einer amerikanischen Weltung den Einwanderungsbeschränkungen nicht unterworfen wäre. Es bleibt jedoch zweifelhaft, ob sich trotz höherer Löhne genügend Arbeiter von dort finden würden, um ihr halbes Jahr Nichtstun mit der schweren Arbeit hier zu vertauschen, und ob sie selbst bei gutem Willen fürderlich geeignet sind, unter so radikal verschiedenen Umständen zufriedenstellend zu arbeiten.

WHAT RECRUITING FIGURES SHOW.
Seventy thousand volunteers were called for to fill up the ranks of the regular army. Eight thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine responded. Verily this a popular war. Those who did not answer the call individually will be "volunteered en masse" by the authorities at Washington.

FRUITS OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL CENSORSHIP.
Washington seems troubled because the people doubt the denials of naval battles and the assertion of naval battles. The situation is of Washington's own making, and the remedy is in its hands. Abolish the trouble breeding, unconstitutional censorship.

BLURTING OUT THE TRUTH.
Truth leaks out in strange quarters occasionally. In an address by Mr. George E. Roberts, assistant to the president of the National City Bank of New York, and published by that bank, we read: "It is no startling pronouncement to say that property rights and trade rivalries are the chief factors in international complications." Keep on talking Mr. Roberts.

ENGLAND IN NEED OF PROTECTION.
The editor of the "Providence Journal" is worried over the growing seriousness of the submarine situation; Northcliffe is urging us to speed up. From these things it is easy to infer that Britannia, ruler of the seas and according to Roosevelt our protector, is in dire need of protection. Is it really to protect England that we entered the war? When will Washington give us a concrete statement?

THE AMERICAN FLEET AND IRELAND.
The American fleet, under a Canadian born admiral, is guarding the shores of Ireland, that is to say, holding them for England. This admiral is the person who, years ago, declared that America's last dollar and last man would be used for England's defence. At the time most people took this to be an ebullition due to the combination of his Canadian birth and English wine. It would seem now as though he merely spoke a bit early. Sims guarding the Irish coast at a time when Ireland is practically in full revolt against England, seems sinister. It throws a curious side light on the war for small nations. Are we in the war to hold Ireland under English rule? It is time we knew definitely. (All five from "Irish World", July 14.)

Does The English Press Give Their Readers The News, to Which They Are Entitled?

Omaha, June 23, 1917.
To the Editor of the Tribune:—
On the 12th I sent the following communication to the Bee:
Omaha, Neb., June 7, 1917.
To the Editor of the Bee:—
In yesterday's editorial you draw a parallel between General Pershing and Benjamin Franklin's missions to France and refer to the success of Franklin's pleadings at the French court. In this connection it might be of interest to your readers, while approaching our national holiday, to mention Franklin's opinion of England in those days of the Prussian King Frederick the Great, whom Washington held in such high esteem that he said he would consider it a lifelong honor to be received by "that great monarch and general", who proved himself a staunch friend of the American Colonies in their struggle for independence. Benjamin Franklin reported home that "all Europe" prayed to see England humiliated, because, whenever she found her star in the ascendancy, she managed at every opportunity "to offend all nations" by her limitless arrogance.

You report General Pershing's visit to the tomb of the great Napoleon in Paris, but fail to state that Napoleon was the one ruler in Europe of his time, who "saw through" England's insatiable greed for world supremacy at the expense of small nations, and only failed in his endeavors to check her ambitions through the accident of Trafalgar.

I mention these incidents because President Wilson had proclaimed the entire unselfishness of the United States in entering this war, and the question now arises will he be able, also, to induce our ally England to forego her intention to "hang on" to Germany's Colonies, and thus remove the suspicion, fully justified by her past history, that she is fighting

for extension of territory or for self-aggrandizement, a course which would necessarily prolong the war.
Without publishing my letter, the Bee's Editor answers same in an Editorial as below:
Omaha, June 20, 1917.
My dear Mr.:—
I am returning your enclosure which I take it you wish back inasmuch as I cannot see my way clear to give it space in The Bee under existing conditions.
In your present, as well as your previous letters, you fail to distinguish between helpful criticism of the government and placing palpable obstructions in the way of marshaling the forces of this country for the successful prosecution of the war.
The Bee does not propose knowledge to permit its columns to be used to discourage enlistments or responses to other war demands or to engender friction with the nations fighting this battle with us or to exploit any propaganda against the American cause.
Since you refer to Benjamin Franklin, let me refer for justification to Franklin also where in his biography he explains his refusal to print abusive letters, as follows:
"Whenever I was solicited to insert anything of that kind and the writers pleaded—as they generally did, the liberty of the press—my answer was that I would print the piece separately if desired, and the author might have as many copies as he pleased to distribute himself, but that I would not take upon me to spread his detraction."
Very truly yours,
Victor Rosewater.
Mr., Omaha.

To this I have replied as follows:
Omaha, Neb., June 23, 1917.
My dear Mr. Rosewater:—

When you published editorially your answer to my letter of the 16th inst., which letter, however you declined to publish, thereby concealing its contents from the readers of your editorial, you did me an injustice. Instead of entering, in your answer, into the subject matter as presented by me, you set up a strawman to fire at, making your readers believe that my letter sought to place "palpable obstructions in the way of our government's successful prosecution of the war". You know it contained nothing of the kind.
I trust that you do not, like some others, deem it necessary, in order to uphold the righteousness of the war, to either hide or distort the truth, or to ignore or misrepresent facts, when they do not happen to fit into the war program. They forget, that the cause they are trying to advance, must suffer by such a course, because it leads to the suspicion that that cause would suffer if examined in the light of truth.

You could hardly have failed to understand the object of my letters as being a protest against the misleading editorials, but more especially against some of the outrageous falsehoods so frequently contained in your letter box, because and only because such epistles are plainly intended to heap opprobrium upon good American citizens of German descent with the deplorable result of creating race prejudice in our own country, the very thing our President earnestly wishes to avoid. President Taft only a few days ago publicly denounced everything tending in that direction. Even Viscount Bryce, in an address to the congressionalists at Birmingham denounced hatred and revenge as "sowing the seeds of future wars". He had reference to the publication of such news as, I L, the jubilant satisfaction expressed by a London paper that hundreds of thousands German women and children had become so feeble as to cause a high increase of the death rate amongst them; or the Paris "Gaulois" writing triumphantly that as a result of the English blockade the German race will undergo a general physical degeneration, and that the blockade therefore is an entire success, etc.

Being a Jew you can appreciate the sting of race prejudice. It is only another kind of race prejudice which is being engendered by such writers as the one hiding behind the pseudonym "Der Heide". Just such prejudice kept your distinguished father out of a much deserved seat in the U. S. Senate, and caused young Frank to be lynched in Georgia.
You quote Franklin as an example for objecting to the "spreading of detraction" through the columns of his papers. Does it not occur to you, that in publishing such letters, as contributed by the hiding "Heide" you yourself are guilty of the very thing Franklin condemns?
You cannot be so blind as not to see that calling attention to the historical shortcomings and selfishness of one of our allies, is not an interference with the interests of this country. The war cannot continue forever. When ended, a settlement between the allies and ourselves will be in order, and it is of supreme importance, that the people of these U. S. should know something more of the past history of England, than the majority of our papers are willing to tell them.

It is of course possible that like some news agencies, you have entered into obligations, which prevent you from publishing certain news or events, no matter how truthful, correct or important, and that you must live up to your pledges, but in doing so, you practice, in the policy of your paper, a censorship which when recently attempted through legislation, you freely denounced. In doing so, you are not giving your readers all the news at your command. But you do give space to anonymous letters, teeming with deliberate insults, not only to the enemy, but to thousands of loyal Americans of German descent. Does that not indicate that you share the opinions expressed by such writers? I have subscribed to the Bee for over 33 years, but am sorely tempted to do so no longer, not that a subscriber more or less will make any difference to you but so as to avoid reading such malicious attacks which could spring only from a diseased mind. However, I still hope that the Bee will see the error of its ways, and realize that the systematic campaign of spreading hatred and prejudice is not for the ultimate good of this nation. I am sure you would not wish to see pogroms or the experience of Kishineff enacted in our country. Nor can I believe that you wish to encourage recent rumors about the starting of another daily paper in Omaha.

Yours very truly,
.....
Die Stanadier, die sich so zahlreich als Freimittler gemeldet haben, opportunisten noch immer den Militärgang — und zwar ebendeshwegen.

MORE A HOPE THAN A POSSIBILITY. THE OBSTACLES THAT BESET THE AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION BOARD OF THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Due to congressional delay, we read in a Washington dispatch of the New York Evening Mail, the happy thought of winning the war with a great fleet of aeroplanes is rapidly becoming more a hope than a possibility. The aeroplanes situation is in a worse way than has been generally supposed. Howard E. Coffin, chairman of the aircraft production board of the Council of National Defense, admitted as much himself. His efforts to obtain action, though he made no such charge himself, have been aided mostly by talk. There has been, in Congress and outside it, no end of conversation dealing with the glorious possibility of overwhelming the Germans by taking complete possession of the air. Opposed to this flow of conversation are the established facts. They are:

(1) The fact that we must have 20,000 aeroplanes to accomplish our purpose.
(2) The further fact that we have only approximately 400 delivered or in service.
(3) And, lastly, opposed to the Germans' high production, the fact that our manufacturers are delivering only 100 machines a month.

This is no fault of Mr. Coffin and his committee. They are doing their best to remedy conditions. On their advice alone manufacturers are investing millions in the preparation of plants. Far more than has been done must be done, however, and Mr. Coffin cannot get any further unless Congress comes through with an appropriation and reassures the business interests of the country. DEMAND TOO GREAT.
The difficulty has arisen because the need for aeroplanes has increased, in the short spaces of eight years, from almost nothing to a demand for thousands of machines. To meet this demand, grown to huge proportions in four months,

very little has been done, relatively speaking. So far as the government is concerned, as an example of the increased demand before 1916 the War and Navy departments had ordered only fifty-nine machines and received fifty-four.
When the act of August 29, 1916, appropriating \$18,000,000 for aeroplanes went into effect, nearly 400 machines were ordered by the government. The manufacturers were able to deliver only 175. The growth of manufacturers able to cope with the demand was nowhere near in proportion to the increase in the demand.

Nor can this type of specialized manufacturer be found, financed and put into shape to make aeroplanes at the rate the government requires them unless the government itself takes the problem under its wing. They can be found among those who know how to make motors and those who know how to handle wood—furniture makers, cabinet makers, the manufacturers of limousine bodies and similar concerns. But the work of these two types of factories must be coordinated.

To bring these two separate systems of manufacturing into a cohesive alliance will solve the aeroplane problem. It cannot be done without government help, and that help should be voted immediately. Some of the wealthier manufacturers have gone ahead on their own initiative. The lesser ones either have not sufficient capital, or dare not risk what they have for fear the government may change its mind about building a great aeroplane fleet. "It is unfortunate that we cannot get quicker action," said Mr. Coffin, commenting upon and explaining the situation, "because every day of delay means an increase in the number of lives we will have to sacrifice in France."

WHY HE WORKED FOR PEACE.
But you say that we prophesied peace. Yes, we not only prophesied peace, but we worked for peace, just as you prophesied war and worked for war. We lost and you won, and you rejoice in the victory that has made Europe a shambles. Is it really a matter for rejoicing? A million men have died on the battlefields of Europe already and a million more will die. Millions of lives are being broken, millions of poor homes darkened by death and suffering. Is this really a subject for a newspaper advertisement? Do not suppose that we could not have preached war, too. It is the easiest thing in the world. It makes you popular, it brings you readers—as you know. It is so much simpler to burn down than to build up, and a fool can light a powder barrel. The crowd will run to a fire, but it will never run to see the builder add stone to slow stone. No, we did not work for peace because it paid. It does not pay to go against the popular tide. No one knows that so well as you who talk of the "horrible commercialism of the Daily News" and who have spent your life in an infamous servitude to the changing passions of the hour. We worked for peace because we believed that that was the duty of a responsible journalist. We worked for peace because we wanted to see a better and a fluster world, because we believed that the fulcrum of human society is international co-operation, and not international enmity, that civilization cannot co-exist with barbarism, that war would ruin all the hopes of that social readjustment, that alleviation of the lot of the poor that was the purpose for which the Daily News was founded and for which, whatever its failure, it has lived.

WAS IT A LOST CAUSE?
And who shall say that in working for peace we were working for a lost cause? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the inevitable war, recalled how in past years there had been prophecies of "inevitable" wars with Russia which had not taken place, showed how the perspective of the world was constantly changing, and declared that it was not a subject for a newspaper advertisement? It was not a lost cause. Did Mr. Bonar Law believe it was a lost cause when he made that memorable speech in November, 1911, in which he repudiated the doctrine of the