

Opposition to Frank's Commutation. Nobody could read the pleas made by the delegation of citizens of Marietta to the Georgia Prison Commission, opposing interference with execution of the death sentence under which LEO M. FRANK now lies, without being convinced that they are honest men, thoroughly well-intentioned. Equally obvious was it, however, that what these men did was not to make a logical argument from the premise that FRANK was guilty to the conclusion that he should be put to death. At that they made no attempt. Instead they expressed the feeling—natural enough and quite comprehensible—that their community would suffer in its dignity and its sense of justice if the daughter of one of its honored families could be brutally murdered without anybody being brought to pay the legally allotted penalty of such crimes.

These men from Marietta said in effect, "If FRANK is not hanged for the killing of MARY PHAGAN, her death will go unpunished. A jury convicted him and the higher courts have declared the forms of law complied with. Let him die." Questions as to his guilt or innocence, as to the fairness or the unfairness of his trial, were ignored in some of these pleas, and in a few were dismissed as having been raised only by people outside of Georgia, misled by an ignorant or subsidized press.

The strange delusion that FRANK has been the beneficiary of vast expenditures evidently has a firm hold in Marietta, though there is not even excuse for believing that anything has been spent in his behalf except for counsel fees, or that these have been met for any other reason than the widespread conviction of his innocence.

Governor-elect HARRIS, on whom the final settlement of FRANK'S fate may devolve, is quoted as having made the statement that, should this task come to him, he will perform it only after a most thorough examination of all the evidence. That, of course, is highly commendable, but why did he add that in this examination he would keep in mind the interests of the State as well as those of the defendant? The State's only interest in the case is to do justice, and nothing more or less than that should be or is or can be asked for FRANK.

Trenches as Seen Near Arras. In the highly informative account, printed in this paper yesterday, of a tour through the

French trenches near Arras, made by a special correspondent of THE TIMES, there was to be found more than proof that the violent fighting in that region has resulted in a considerable pushing back of the invading army. It also revealed that the much vaunted and generally admitted superiority of the Germans in what may be called the business side of war was not apparent in this particular "zone." Of the many trenches examined by this observer, those constructed by the French were better made than those which they had taken from the opposing force, and not until he came to a part of the excavations where German officers of high rank had been stationed did he discover any of those elaborate and efficient devices for securing safety and comfort of which so much is heard and read.

The German private soldiers had fought—and died—in narrow ditches, un-concreted and undrained. Their assailants, on the contrary, while they did not do so much for their officers, did more for the men, and their engineers, though presumably not more skillful, had been more industrious and produced better results. Of course it would not be safe to deduce general conclusions from the conditions existing in a single "zone," but this was a large one and the comparison was not without significance. On that long line, at least, the French trenches were the better—a fact that must have had something to do with the failure of the Germans to hold their ground there.

And it has been shown a thousand times, in this war, that, man for man, the Germans, in spite of a training as soldiers claimed to be better than that given to any other people in the world, are no better or more successful fighters than Canadians or English, who, six months ago, had never handled a gun or worn a uniform. It was only in the first weeks of the war that German "system" demonstrated the value expected of it. Thanks to it, the Germans went in their first rush almost to Paris, but it didn't enable them to go further, or to remain there, nor has it saved them from being pushed back, steadily though slowly, ever since.

He Seems Rather Inconsistent. Why does Speaker CHAMP CLARK in one sentence condemn those who "hamper" the President

by expressing opinions as to what ought to be done now by and for the country, and then, in the next, formulate an earnest desire that everybody who talks war should be grabbed by the neck and deposited on the firing line in Europe?

That, too, is an expression of opinion—a giving of advice—and, while there isn't a single good reason why Mr. CLARK shouldn't exercise the right of every free American citizen and let other folk know what he thinks of things in both general and particular, there is a certain inconsistency in scolding his neighbors for utilizing the same freedom.

President WILSON in explicit terms has declared his desire to know, and his intention to heed, the sentiment of the country, and how could he do either if nobody did any talking?

As a matter of fact, Mr. CLARK wouldn't find the grabbing at all good, even if he had the power to treat "jingo" as he says they ought to be treated. Nobody in the United States, so far as other ears than his can hear, is yearning for war or demanding it.