

THE OMAHA DAILY BEE

FOUNDED BY EDWARD ROSEWATER.

VICTOR ROSEWATER, EDITOR.

THE BEE PUBLISHING COMPANY, PROPRIETOR.

Entered at Omaha postoffice as second-class matter.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Daily and Sunday	By Carrier per week	By Mail per year
Daily without Sunday	\$1.00	\$4.80
Evening and Sunday	.45	.48
Evening without Sunday	.40	.40
Subscription	.25	.25
Daily and Sunday Bee, three years in advance	\$10.00	
Send notice of change of address or irregularity in delivery to Omaha Bee, Circulation Department.		

REMITTANCE.

Remit by draft, express or postal order. Only 2-cent stamps taken in payment of small accounts. Personal checks except on Omaha and eastern exchange, not accepted.

OFFICES.

Omaha—The Bee Building,
South Omaha—211 Main street.
Council Bluffs—14 North Main street.
Lincoln—518 Little Building
Chicago—101 Peoples Gas Building
St. Louis—Rock Island—345 Fifth Avenue
St. Louis—521 New Bank of Commerce
Washington—725 Fourteenth Street, N. W.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Address communications relating to news and editorial material to Omaha Bee, Editorial Department.

NOVEMBER CIRCULATION.

55,483 Daily—Sunday 50,037.

Irving Williams, circulation manager of the Bee Publishing company, being duly sworn, says that the average daily circulation for the month of November, 1916, was 55,483 daily and 50,037 Sunday.

DWIGHT WILLIAMS, Circulation Manager.

Subscribed in my presence and sworn to before me this 2nd day of December, 1916.

C. W. CARLTON, Notary Public.

Subscribers leaving the city temporarily should have The Bee mailed to them. Address will be changed as often as required.

Not much left of the old year. Make the most of it.

Incidentally peace still rages on the other side of the Mexican border.

Push Omaha further forward! That's a platform all of us can stand on.

The strain on the mapmaking world pleads for the service of fatigue experts.

No 1917 program for Omaha will answer the demand that does not include a concerted effort for a new Union depot.

That "High-Cost-of-Living" coon doesn't seem to want to come down any faster just because congress is in session.

By nailing some new timber to his cabinet King Charles crowds the political speed limit of enemy nations. Which is going some.

Christianity no doubt would prove mighty helpful in composing life in Mexico, but who will provide safe conduct beyond the Rio Grande.

Of course, it is out of thoughtful consideration for the losers that Secretary of State Pool selected a blue cover for his election returns pamphlet.

Having discovered how it feels to sit in the "House of Governors," Governor-Elect Neville should be fully prepared to try out a seat in the executive mansion.

While speeding up the shippers to abate the needless detention of cars, the railroads could also do something themselves in the same direction by speeding up the movement of the cars over their tracks.

Food and fuel in Europe grow scarcer as the days pass. Conditions are slightly different in this country. The problem here is to stretch the money to the goods. Over there the trouble is to connect the goods with the money.

Congressman Adamson talks to the railroad bosses and brotherhoods like an irritated dad and threatens to apply the swatter. The gentleman from Georgia doesn't look the part. He is at his best only when the White House presses the button.

Now that the British government is officially in possession of the German peace note, it will have to reach a decision as to what it is going to do about it. The only sure thing is that Uncle Sam will be permitted again to serve as the messenger boy for the answer.

The late Emperor Francis Joseph is reported to have bequeathed out of his private fortune 60,000,000 crowns, or \$12,000,000, as a fund for the relief of wounded soldiers, invalids and relatives of men killed in the war. The bequest has the merit of making partial recompense for injuries to the victims of imperial folly.

Speculation in War Losses

Brooklyn Eagle.

Berlin recently sent out by wireless a statement by the Overseas News Agency, saying that the Association for Research into the Social Consequences of the War, of Copenhagen, has given 15,100,000 men as the total losses of the entente nations in the war to date. The statement is interesting and would be more so if we knew positively that this association is identical with the War Study Society of Copenhagen, which has given out figures of losses from time to time.

The first product of the War Study society was a bulletin issued on August 1, 1916, computing the human losses in each belligerent country during the first two years of the war. The total for all countries for the first two years was given as 15,876,800, with 3,373,700 invalids. Of this grand total 3,731,800 were credited to Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey, and 11,876,800 to the entente nations. Since August 1, appalling losses have been sustained by both sides. On the Somme, where the Anglo-French offensive started in July, and in Galicia, Bukowina, Transylvania, Roumania, Macedonia and on the Italian-Austrian front, the losses have been accumulating at a fearful rate.

Judging from the nature of the fighting, the total losses of the entente since August may easily reach the figure given above. On November 15, it was estimated, on the basis of previous figures compiled by the same source, that the total losses were approximately 5,600,000 killed and 13,000,000 wounded. That was a month ago. Since then most of the fighting has been in the Balkans, and the Roumanians and Russians have been the heaviest losers. But the Roumanians are credited by the recent statement with having lost 200,000 men, which seemed a bit excessive then, although the total cost of the invasion will not be less.

There is no conclusion to be drawn from such speculation, except that in the man-killing game the question of available numbers counts for most. If the entente has lost 15,100,000 men, the central empires must have lost only some million or so less. In all computation France and Germany are shown to have losses that are about equal. This leaves the rest of the entente losses to be balanced against those of Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey.

Both Sides Waking Up.

The railroads and the brotherhoods alike are coming to realize the two-edged character of the Adamson law. Crude and unworkable as it is, it yet contains the germ of a law that will put the big transportation companies and the labor unions under the closer control of the federal government. This is one of the unconsidered possibilities of the measure so hastily driven through Congress, the early effect of which was to produce political influence for which it was primarily designed. Only one phase of the real situation was then taken into account, but some of its other aspects are now gaining attention. This is a natural outcome of the prolonged and senseless agitation that has disturbed the country for months. The public deserves protection from conditions that have prevailed for almost two years in the railroad world. Continual bickerings and threats of strike have menaced business until the situation is unbearable, and even though the companies and the men do agree on some settlement of their present difficulty there is strong likelihood of either the Newlands or the Adamson law being amended as to obviate the danger of a general strike on the railroads. The remedy is drastic, perhaps, but the disease has been acute. Each side to the dispute has blamed the other, but that both are at fault is clear to any who has followed the controversy.

Good Roads and Farm Hauling.

The Bee relies upon statements made by State Engineer Johnson to support its contention that good roads are to the benefit of the farmer more than any other citizen of Nebraska. Here is what the state engineer says on the matter of hauling:

A team that can haul 3,000 pounds over an ordinary road could haul 3,500 pounds over a well-graded road, 4,000 pounds over a clay and gravel road and 7,000 pounds over a brick road. On long hauls freighting is usually done at 1 cent per mile per hundred, but for short hauls, such as the farmer makes to and from towns, it usually costs 25 cents per ton mile over ordinary roads. By hauling the amounts I have heretofore stated, on different classes of roads, this would make a cost of hauling on well-graded roads 21.4 cents per ton mile, over clay and gravel roads, 18 cents per ton mile, and over brick surface roads, 10.7 cents per ton mile. This would make the cost of hauling over brick surfaced roads 37 per cent less than hauling over ordinary roads.

If Mr. Johnson's figures are dependable and applying them to the wheat crop of the current year, we find some inkling of what poor roads cost the farmers of the state. The wheat crop of the state for 1916 is returned at 68,773,681 bushels, or, in round numbers, 2,031,603 tons, to move which one mile at the rate of 25 cents per ton would cost \$507,851. If one-half of this could be saved by good roads, it would be \$253,925 into the farmers' pockets. Capitalize this at 5 per cent and we have \$5,078,510; if the average haul for a ton of wheat on its way from the farm to the shipping point is seven miles, the saving thus effected would pay 5 per cent on \$35,500,000, which would under Mr. Johnson's estimate construct 250 miles of brick-surfaced roads. And this is on the wheat crop of the state alone and takes no account of the millions of tons of other materials hauled by the farmers.

Have We Learned Our Lesson?

General Hugh Scott is again before the Senate committee on military affairs, presenting the cause of the army of the United States as a factor in the problem of national defense. He argues that events have shown the futility of dependence on volunteers. On one point all agree: If we are to have a defense, it must be adequate, and to be adequate the soldiers must be trained. On the main point, however, opinions differ. Many earnest people sincerely believe that we can avoid war through the simple expedient of doing away with army and navy. To propitiate these, the perpetuation of the National Guard is held out as an alternative to universal military training.

No criticism of the National Guard contains any reflection on the splendid young men who make up that organization. They have shown their quality by their actions and have proven their high devotion to their country by sacrifice as sincere as men may be called upon to make short of death. But their patriotic devotion does not compensate for their lack of training. They are not to blame for this, but the miserable system that broke down last June when the Guard was called into action is responsible.

Not only did the world get an impressive illustration of how unready is the United States to make proper defense of its territory, but our own people had impressed upon them how feeble the arm upon which they relied.

The great question now is, Have we learned the lesson? Are we ready to squarely face our situation and determine if we are to be ready to meet any emergency, or will we proceed as we have with no preparation, and trust to luck to save us from our own folly?

Law That Needs Overhauling.

Strict application of any law may become inhumane at times. Our immigration law and the rules made under it afford many illustrations of the suffering that may be caused by too rigid observance of the letter and indifference to the spirit. The latest incident reported is that of a Spanish merchant, carried ashore from a steamer at New York in a dying condition, while his son was sent to the Ellis Island detention station because he was under 16 and "unaccompanied by parent or guardian." The inspector who ordered the removal said he had no discretion, but surely the safety of a nation like the United States does not require the separation of a child from its parent under such circumstances. Men of wealth and influence undertook to secure the boy's release, but without avail, and the inhuman application of the regulation in its strict letter went on. This is not notable solely because of the prominence of the persons involved. Many poor people have suffered similarly, and with no more of justice. Omaha residents frequently have been called to exert themselves in behalf of some deserving person held up at Ellis Island because the government's machinery moves so inexorably. This law should be readjusted, to the end that the nation may protect itself against the visitation of the unworthy without causing needless hardships and sorrow to the innocent.

General Joffre passes from the front to the rear of the Anglo-French army to the post of commander-in-chief of all allied armies and military adviser to the French ministry. Title and honors are unchanged, but active duties are reduced. His retirement indicates a reversal of the military policy of wearing down the enemy in the west and more determined drives than any hitherto undertaken.

There is no conclusion to be drawn from such speculation, except that in the man-killing game the question of available numbers counts for most. If the entente has lost 15,100,000 men, the central empires must have lost only some million or so less. In all computation France and Germany are shown to have losses that are about equal. This leaves the rest of the entente losses to be balanced against those of Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey.

History's Method

Minneapolis Journal

The ascendancy of Mr. Lloyd George in England marks the dawn of the new democracy in the British Isles. Nor is this change confined to one country. It is manifest in Russia even, where the new prime minister, Treppoff, told the Duma that for the first time the will of the Russian parliament had forced the resignation of a premier and the appointment of a successor of another politics.

War is an awful price to pay for fundamental changes in the order of things. But the history of the human race proves that an awful price is always exacted of humanity for each progress. We of America realize the price paid for freeing the slave. And what France paid a century ago to be rid of monarchy and feudalism scarcely can be exaggerated.

It might even be argued, as indeed it often has been, that the overthrow of the whole ancient Mediterranean civilization and the thousand years of night that followed were required in order to produce modern Europe. All the blood and suffering of the Crusades was necessary to rouse western Europe from the pit of ignorance, stagnation, superstition and cruelty. The long religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were required to establish tolerance. The history of mankind is very wonderful and glorious, but it is also very bitter and terribly tragic.

Rationalists and pacifists are always asking, usually after the event, why the difficulties could not have been arranged by right, reason and justice. They think it madness that the union did not buy out of slavery the negroes in the south, since, however large the cost, it would have been small compared to the prodigious expenditure of blood and treasure that the civil war entailed. If reason ruled the affairs of men, if it were easy to define and to declare justice, the complaint of the philosophers and humanitarians would be well grounded. Now in Europe, after two years of havoc, reasonable persons are asking why prevention was not secured by means of conferences, concessions, compromises, arbitrations.

In the first place, human nature prefers to fight. In the second, were settlements to be substituted for decisions by force, the greatest progresses would be impossible. There was no price that the south would have accepted for the emancipation of her slaves. The south had not only property to save, but also a social system to which her belief was committed. Emancipation spelled anarchy to her mind. She meant to defend it with her blood as an article of faith as well as a matter of wealth. Apply the same principle to the situation in Europe before the war, and the inevitability of the war demonstrates itself.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called, the managers, the able men, the ones trusted for ability and shrewdness, are those particularly who resent radical change. They once defended the feudalisms, the monarchies, the oligarchies.

But let us go farther. Civilization would not be what it is without its great conflicts. Without them we should today be feudalistic still.

Establish society on any basis, and every force of bigotry, prudence and inertia is enlisted to support that society as it is. The practical men, so-called,