

# CURRENT LITERATURE

July, 1912

page 818

Ismay's Misfortune  
or Fault?



CONTRARY view is taken by another American Admiral,—F. E. Chadwick. Mr. Ismay, he reminds us, was not an officer of the ship and did not have an officer's authority. Have we any reason to suppose that the lifeboat would have been held indefinitely waiting for him to go in search of other passengers, especially as it has been shown that many passengers were unwilling to enter the boats? The concrete matter, says Admiral Chadwick, is this: "Did Mr. Ismay's going in the boat prevent any one else's doing so? Would his staying aboard to the very last have tended to the saving of an additional life? If not, I do not think we have a right to demand that he should have committed suicide." A distinguished British Admiral, Sir Cyprian Bridge, takes the same view as Admiral Chadwick. He says: "Ismay could not have been expected to scour the vessel to see if any more were left. He did more than his duty by assuring himself that nobody was left in the part of the ship he was in." The disposition of the less radical American papers seems to be to view the propriety of a man's conduct under the circumstances that confronted Mr. Ismay as doubtful and to give him the benefit of the doubt. The *Chicago Evening Post* detects the "mob vote" in much of the unrestrained denunciation of Ismay. The *Pittsburgh Dispatch* says:

"It is hardly more than fair to say that the evidence given at the Senate hearing . . . went far to absolve Mr. Bruce Ismay of the imputation of having saved himself to the exclusion of women and children or other passengers. . . . But it cannot be ignored that the man who in the management of the line had sent the great steamer to sea with lifeboats for about one-third of the ship's company, bore a responsibility that might well have been atoned by joining the gallant men who went down with the ship."