

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorial—Advertisements.

FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, Inc. New York corporation. Office: 110 Nassau Street, New York.

Subscription Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. Daily, 10 cents a copy, 3 months, \$2.75; 6 months, \$5.00; 1 year, \$9.00.

Foreign Rates:—Daily, 15 cents a copy, 3 months, \$4.50; 6 months, \$8.00; 1 year, \$14.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay you money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

No Wonder Bryan Wept.

There was one man in the St. Louis convention who caught the real point of ex-Governor Glynn's perfunctory rhetoric. William J. Bryan, sitting in the press section, burst into tears of joy when he heard Mr. Glynn extol the Wilson Administration for having kept the country out of war.

To keep the country out of war, whatever the cost, was Mr. Bryan's unalterable purpose when he was Secretary of State. He knew that that was also, fundamentally, Mr. Wilson's purpose. He left the Cabinet, as he truthfully said at the time, not because he and the President differed in principle, but because they differed as to methods. Mr. Bryan was willing to admit—and did admit it frankly to Ambassador Dumba—that Mr. Wilson's notes demanding satisfaction for the Lusitania massacre were written only with a view to placating home opinion.

Mr. Wilson himself was never courageous enough to admit this. He intended to keep the country out of war with Germany, but he wanted, for personal and party reasons, to make a pretence of risking war in the notes which he wrote demanding a disavowal of the Lusitania outrage.

It must have been meant and drunk to Mr. Bryan to hear the temporary chairman of a convention from which he had been excluded by the action of the Democrats of his own state conclude each paragraph of a eulogy of the President's foreign policy with the sentence: "But he kept us out of war." Mr. Wilson didn't get a disavowal of the Lusitania massacre; he didn't obtain the salute to the flag which he demanded of President Huerta; he hasn't protected the rights of Americans on the high seas or in Mexico; he hasn't brought back Villa "alive or dead" from the wilds of Chihuahua. But he has "kept us out of war."

Hear Chairman Glynn tell about it: "If the Administration's foreign policy does satisfy the mothers of the land at whose hearth and fireside no jingoistic war has placed an empty chair. It does satisfy the daughters of this land from whom bluster and brag has sent no loving brother to the dissolution of the grave."

No wonder Mr. Bryan wept enthusiastically. Mr. Glynn was eulogizing him more than he was eulogizing President Wilson. If he had had his way American sailors and marines would never have landed at Vera Cruz and American soldiers would never have invaded Northern Mexico. The correspondence over the Lusitania case would never have been pointed enough to flutter the nerves of anxious mothers, daughters and sisters, worrying because they construed its "omit no word or act" flourish as meaning something. His "there-can-never-be-an-ultimatum-between-friends" policy would have satisfied the country, assuming that it was clamorous for peace at any price, much more completely than Mr. Wilson's near-peace-at-any-price policy has ever satisfied it.

What do such fictions as national honor, responsibility, self-respect, the duty of guaranteeing to all American citizens that protection will follow the flag amount to, when weighed in the scale with empty chairs at American hearths and firesides? Mr. Bryan is for the heartsick chair in such cases much more wholeheartedly than Mr. Wilson is. If there is any glory attaching to the Administration's peace-at-any-price record, the ex-Secretary is the greater glory. No wonder he wept at a eulogy which, meant for the President, was meant even more logically for him.

"He kept the country out of war." Mr. Wilson's desire to keep us out of war has always been subordinated to his desire to keep himself in office. Mr. Bryan was so intent on keeping us out of war that he sacrificed the Secretaryship of State on the altar of undiluted pacifism. It is easy, therefore, to understand his gratitude, welling up in tears, and to share his intuition that his own great renunciation, not Mr. Wilson's shilly-shallying, was the real inspiration of our gifted ex-Governor's eloquence.

Toning Down a Victory.

When Rear Admiral Hipper's squadron escaped annihilation the winter before last in the running fight that began off the Dogger Bank some German writers, such as Captain Kuhlvetter, endeavored by degrees to magnify the event into a victory—a difficult enterprise involving the imaginary sinking of a British battle-cruiser to offset the loss of the Blücher. In dealing with the recent battle off the coast of Jutland the commentators are working in the opposite direction by a gradual toning down of the enthusiastic and glowing report first given out to the German public.

The addition of a few vessels, including a battle-cruiser, to the original list of losses has been followed by a considerable modification of the statement of conditions after the engagement. The impression formerly given was that "the entire mod-

ern English fleet"—to quote the official report—was beaten, leaving the Germans in possession of the field, as one enthusiast expressed it. The belief that they had succeeded in avoiding a decisive action—a very natural conclusion to draw from the account—was indignantly denied, the truth being that it was the British who abandoned the fight. In the later accounts, however, while it is still maintained that to talk of the Germans avoiding a decision is "silly," it is explained that it was "but natural that they should gradually have worked nearer their base."

This is a more reasonable version of the affair, and it was probably in the endeavor to prevent this that the three British battle-cruisers were sacrificed. Nothing, indeed, could be more natural than the endeavor of the weaker fleet to escape destruction, and the success of the endeavor was the proper point for the German writers to enlarge upon. On the other hand, it is obviously inconsistent to add that the British must have been overcome because "nothing prevented them from following," for if that were true the withdrawal could not rightly be described as "natural," unless we are to believe that the Germans were suddenly overcome by an irresistible compassion for the foe.

Advertising Good Works.

One of the best records of achievement in the whole Mitchell administration is that of Fire Commissioner Adamson, and his remarks upon the importance of publicity in connection with the public's business have interest and weight. "Many a worthy and deserving and able public official has failed," he declared, "because he did not get his case across to the public through the newspapers." Eventually, he believed, the city might resort to advertising in order to inform citizens of what it was doing.

It has been one of the follies of much well-meaning reform in America that it has rather sniffed at this necessity of getting its deeds "over." Your intelligent and practical politician does not make this blunder. A keen instinct for publicity, of what and when and how to advertise, is the mainspring of political ability. And the best politicians have always known what the modern publicity agent has but just come to realize, that the best and sure way to have one's fame exploited is not to talk but to do. If a public officer—or a railroad, or an actor—can do the interesting thing in an interesting way, the publicity will take care of itself.

This dramatic treatment of public life is likely to bring down the scorn of a certain type of mind. But why should it? Why not admit such an obvious characteristic of democratic government? The public officer under a tyrant does not have to please anybody but his bureaucratic superior. The Governor of an American state or the Mayor of an American city must please and interest several millions of human beings, despite the competition of five-cent magazines, movies and the ball game. A whole lot of factors have contributed to make American politics dull. The good old school of politicians, with its rule of addition, division and silence, has been glad enough to have the voter forget all about government during the bulk of the year. Also our beautifully designed system of checks and balances and diffused authority has made for dreary delays and tangles. It is not about time to stop laying all the blame on the poor voter for his lack of interest and turn our attention toward making politics as direct and forceful and appealing as, say, a box score or the automobile advertisements?

Where Mendacity Is Superfluous. "The Philadelphia Record" paid us the compliment the other day of reprinting a portion of our editorial entitled "Making Army Service Worth While." It sought, however, to impugn our sincerity in advocating vocational training in the army by charging that we have bitterly criticized Secretary Daniels for conducting schools for enlisted seamen and for trying to give them an opportunity to qualify for commissions. Says "The Record": "What teams of good paper have been wasted in fibes over classes on board ship for sailors and marines, and how deep has been the scorn for the Secretary's efforts to fit the man before the mast for a commission if he shows himself worthy and competent to receive one?"

Our Philadelphia contemporary is wholly mistaken in thinking that The Tribune has criticized Secretary Daniels for advocating vocational training for enlisted men or promotions from the ranks. It is heartily in favor of such promotions in the navy as well as in the army. We believe in abandoning the outworn tradition that there must be an impassable gulf fixed in any branch of the military service between the enlisted force and the officers' corps.

What we have criticized in Secretary Daniels has been his desire to make the navy a school first and a navy afterward. He entered office with an extreme pacifist prejudice against the navy in so far as it constituted what he and his sympathizers considered an instrument of militarism. He assumed from the start the pose of apologizing for the maintenance of the navy on the ground that it could also be made to serve its uses of peace by being turned into a great national university. To him the opportunity it offered for vocational training and general education was of greater consequence than the efficiency it was to develop as a first line of national defence. It is this curious inversion of normal values which, in our opinion, has made Mr. Daniels' administration of the navy exceedingly demoralizing to the service and dangerous for the nation.

"The Record" says that The Tribune has been "one of the most bitter and mendacious" of Mr. Daniels' critics. We may have been bitter, but what inducement or temptation have we ever had to be "mendacious"? It would be a sheer waste of imaginative energy to invent labels on the Daniels administration. The plain truth

in his case is vastly more damaging than any amount of the cleverest fiction could be. Mr. Daniels is by all odds the worst Secretary the navy ever had—worst in his temperamental failings and his unsympathetic point of view; worst in his inability to grasp an opportunity for constructive work such as was never before thrust on any Secretary of the Navy. He has been an incubus on the navy's development ever since he took office. He has held back authorized construction, has tried to keep down authorizations by Congress of new construction and has, so far successfully, fought off the creation of a naval general staff or any body similar to it which could be confided the military direction of our naval establishment.

What need is there of going further for material with which to construct an indictment? Mr. Daniels' record is a complete indictment in itself. We are for vocational and other educational training for seamen and for promotion, whenever possible, from the ranks. But we are, first of all, for an efficient fleet and for a modernization of the outworn methods which now deny the navy any centralized military control. Mendacity would be absolutely superfluous in making out a case against a head of the Navy Department who is not only lacking in will power and initiative, but who is unable to visualize the navy's manifest and urgent needs.

Mr. Asquith's Pledge to the Women. The British Premier's promise to lay certain proposals before the House of Commons for the revision of the electoral registers has been taken by the Women's International League as a convenient occasion to remind him of the pledge he gave in 1908; namely, that when the time came for the government to introduce a measure of franchise reform the question of woman suffrage would not be left out of account.

It is unlikely that so controversial a problem will be taken up while the war lasts, yet it is not unreasonable that the women should seize this opportunity to remind the government of their services to the state. If there is any certainty at all about conditions after the war it may be assumed with perfect confidence that women will take a very active part in the business of reconstruction. Their services during the war have proved indispensable and were given unsparingly. It is a certainty that when peace is reestablished their place in the industries of the country will be far stronger and more important than ever before. This is clearly recognized by the trade unions and by the women themselves.

At a recent meeting of the Women's Labor League one speaker predicted that at least 2,000,000 men now at the front will never return to their old tasks and that a vast number of women will refuse to be turned out of employment. Two and a half million women and girls have entered various industries since the beginning of last year, and these women will have to be reckoned with. A considerable proportion expect to spend their lives in industry, and in all probability they will ultimately be joined together in unions as men have been. They will not lightly give up their work when the war is over. They have already shown great power of organization and have begun in a most determined manner to discuss their status and to plan for the future. It is hardly to be supposed that they will submit tamely to dispossession.

Arbor Day in China. The American commercial attaché at Peking reports that the gospel of tree planting is spreading in China. And Arbor Day, the truly great invention of the late J. Sterling Morton, of Nebraska, sometime Secretary of Agriculture, has been added to the calendar of public festivals. With characteristic frugality, however, the Chinese combine the observance with their ancient one, "Ching Ming," when they visit the graves of their ancestors—corresponding in a way to our Memorial Day.

No country is more in need of trees than China. It has been styled the "forested nation." In one of President Roosevelt's conservation messages photographic views were printed to show the desolation of a great part of the Chinese domain, where in ancient times there had been trees and streams. No trees, no water—that theory of forestry is pretty well substantiated. And without water there can be no life. China is commonly spoken of as a densely populated country. But, in fact, the density is in a very small part of the vast area, more than 90 per cent of the population occupying one-third of the land.

Forty per cent of the people are concentrated in a few provinces, with more than 200 to the square mile, while the density is only to the square mile over 45 per cent of the country. And although rice is supposed to be the national staple, millions of Chinese have never tasted rice or even seen it; it grows only where there is plenty of moisture. To restore the forests to any considerable part of China would call for persistent planting and cultivation over a long period. But a hundred or even a thousand years would not seem long to the Chinese.

A Gift to France. To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: As recently announced by The Tribune, the French Government asked the American Committee for Training in Suitable Trades the Maimed Soldiers of France to establish trade schools in their largest institution for maimed soldiers at the Maison Blanche, Neuilly-sur-Marne.

This involved an expenditure of \$15,000 for installation and \$60,000 to provide teachers and maintain the trade schools for one year. The American committee has been able to accept this offer of the French Government through the great generosity of Mr. Edward L. Stotesbury, of Philadelphia, who has donated the sum of \$75,000 for this great work.

No more public spirited or important gift for France could be made at this time, and our committee feels deeply grateful that Mr. Stotesbury's wonderful gift has made it possible for us to accept the offer of the French Government. My hope is that this splendid gift will stimulate others to start trade schools in other parts of France, for which the need is most pressing. I thank The Tribune for the valuable help which it has given the committee. MRS. EDMUND L. BAYLES, Chairman for the United States, American Committee for Training in Suitable Trades the Maimed Soldiers of France, New York, June 14, 1916.

TO VOTE FOR AMERICA

One Republican Who Refuses to Side with the German-American Alliance.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I read in your issue of this morning your leading editorial headed by a letter from one Ackermann of our city. I have been a Republican since 1884 and have voted for every candidate of the Republican party since that time. No matter what Mr. Hughes says or will have to say, he is the candidate of the German-American Alliance, and their power and force will be directed to destroy Wilson for no other purpose than revenge for not toadying to Potsdam. I for one Republican will vote for America.

We are not all Ackermanns in New Haven. Keep up the good work, Mr. Editor. I find the shop where I am employed any number of Republicans who welcome this issue and will meet it as it should be met. F. T. BATES, New Haven, Conn., June 14, 1916.

A Call to the Colonel.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Will you permit an admirer of The Tribune to offer a few words of criticism? You say in your editorial this morning: "The Tribune did not criticize Mr. Wilson's foreign policy as a Republican newspaper. . . . It supported Mr. Wilson up to the moment in which it became convinced that he was not following an honorable or patriotic course."

If this was and is your policy, why did you pledge your support to Mr. Hughes before he had supplied any evidence that in the present crisis he intends to follow a course one whit more honorable or patriotic than that of Mr. Wilson? Even though Mr. Hughes may be, as you stated in an earlier editorial, a wiser man than Mr. Wilson, it must be borne in mind that Mr. Wilson has had four years of experience to weigh against the (possibly) better judgment of Mr. Hughes. The Tribune might well have waited with Colonel Roosevelt till Mr. Hughes showed his hand.

If the Republican candidate does not come out squarely against hyphenism before June 25, I, with many others, earnestly pray that Colonel Roosevelt will consent once more to head the Progressive party and make it possible for honorable and loyal Americans to vote for a brave, able and honorable man. There seems at present to be little choice between the Republican and the (presumptive) Democratic candidate.

Among the Republicans of my acquaintance, with the exception of German-Americans, there is an absolute lack of enthusiasm for Hughes. They will, in general, vote for him if or because the result in response he rarely swept a candidate into office. J. Y. A. White Plains, N. Y., June 14, 1916.

Diuted.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: With every access of desire to respond to Judge Hughes's trumpet blast, the stoutest admirer must admit, if candid, that "Undiluted Americanism" is a condensed dilution. Covering the whole ground is sometimes not so desirable as uncovering some of it. Is The Tribune the only newspaper in the country that comes to something definite itself, and demands it whence it is due? The national need of getting rid of the winds of Woodrow Wilson, that phantasmal inanity, is vast. We hope in Hughes, and the first echo to Hughes from his undiluted American supporters was a query. In an answer he condensed his first utterance without clearing it, the meaning of his terse language, and in spite of the ringing echo his sonorous blast resounded the keynote of the campaign to date in an interrogation point.

As a rally cry, as a "slogan," the words, "Just what in particular do you mean?" leave something to be desired. Meanwhile Justice Hughes is the candidate whom the American-German, anti-American element told us we were going to get, because he was the President they were going to give. WATCHFUL WAITING. New York, June 14, 1916.

The Thanks of a Republican.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I heartily agree with and thank you for your editorial of this morning, "Undiluted Americanism." I have heard to-day a number of Republicans declare most emphatically that they would not support Mr. Hughes unless he speedily found courage to rebuke and repudiate the Hyphenates who are making him their instrument in the punishment of those leaders who have had the hardihood to have the so-called "German vote."

Already he has served this purpose in one instance. In that case we accept the plea that a special scruple closed his mouth and so performance made him their tool. But now it is another matter, and I feel confident that American voters will not permit their President to be turned out of office because he has dared denounce the Hyphen.

If Mr. Hughes permits this to become the issue he will find himself, I believe, very badly beaten on Election Day. And so, just now, like other Republicans, I must thank you for your word of warning and counsel to Mr. Hughes. J. KOUTANT, New York, June 14, 1916.

Provided—

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Having read your editorial in to-day's issue on "Undiluted Americanism," would you please consider your editorial one of the best that I have ever read.

As I favored Theodore Roosevelt for the nomination in the Republican convention because I believed him to be the greatest American in our political life to-day, still I will support Charles E. Hughes for President provided he declares against the Hyphenates. You are to be congratulated on your powerful editorial, and I believe that Mr. Hughes will certainly declare against any foreigners trying to run our country or dictating as to what our policy should be.

If the German-Americans support Hughes for President, that does not mean that he will have to do their bidding if he is elected. Believing that Charles E. Hughes will get the support of The Tribune and all other good Republican papers, and that his Americanism cannot be questioned by any paper throughout the United States, I also believe that Hughes will certainly declare against any foreigners trying to run our country or dictating as to what our policy should be. J. K. New York, June 14, 1916.

An Indorsement.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I heartily indorse the opinions so well expressed by George Coggeshall, D. W. Diggs, "Disgusted Progressive Republican," and others, in your paper of to-day's date. Mr. Hughes, without lifting a finger, has stepped in and expects to appropriate all that Colonel Roosevelt has spent years working for. P. MEIGS, JR., New York, June 15, 1916.

Made in U. S. A.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Let us have a President made in U. S. A. and not the man recently nominated in Chicago at the dictation of the German Kaiser. JAMES W. FOUTZ, New York, June 14, 1916.

"UNDILUTED AMERICANISM"

Some Republicans Find Ample Definition in Mr. Hughes's Phrase—The Presumption of Innocence in His Favor—As Good an American as Colonel Roosevelt or Any One.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Tribune founded by Horace Greeley is the stuff. My father swears by it yet—past ninety—as his father did before him; and I swear by it, too, except sometimes when I swear at it. This morning I am not exactly swearing at it but rather wondering what it is driving at.

What do you mean by your editorial "Undiluted Americanism"? Is not Mr. Hughes specific enough in his professions of truthfulness? It seems to me he has already said more than is strictly necessary. He is entitled to the presumption of innocence until proven guilty. And how absurd it would be, right offhand, to presume that a Presidential candidate was bent on treason to the American people? Is not he entitled to the benefit of the doubt? Could not you imagine some other crime than that of treason and a course violation of his oath of office, which he would commit if elected, upon which to base your demand for a more specific statement of how he feels toward crime? Mr. Hughes has never been suspected of safe-blowing, however guilty he may be of a secret sin of that sort; but would not you be just as much justified in demanding that he should recede a catchism against safe-blowing as one against a betrayal of the people into the hands of the "Dutchmen"? No, suppose everybody votes for Mr. Hughes, as everybody should, there is no doubt that he would receive the votes of a bunch of safe-blowers, too. Would that be anything against him? Would it prove him guilty of safe-blowing? Now if the "Dutchmen" vote against Wilson and for Hughes, will it prove Mr. Hughes the vicerey of the Kaiser in the United States? Won't you give us a bill of particulars? What is the formula to which he must subscribe in order to be free from the suspicion of being the Kaiser's agent for upsetting the government here?

By the way, while we are about it, would it not be just as well to presume our fellow citizens of German ancestry innocent of intended treason until they are proven guilty? If here and there one of them has gone wrong and bombed a factory or a big boat to help the Kaiser along and done other kinds of mischief, ought Mr. Hughes to step out and damn the whole crowd on suspicion? The hyphen was never intended to mean a divided allegiance. It signifies geography and not allegiance. Why should you expect Mr. Hughes gratuitously to insult a body of citizens heretofore justly celebrated for their American patriotism? Why should not the ink on whose resignation as a Supreme Court justice is hardly dry, remember his judicial learning long enough to insist that the so-called German-Americans be held innocent of even mental treason until they have been proven guilty?

ROSWELL A. BENEDICT, New York, June 14, 1916.

The Optimistic View.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Tribune, independent, is Republican, and is found promptly supporting and advocating the support of Mr. Hughes, and will have great influence throughout the campaign, which is most gratifying to contemplate. In the midst of a world of troubles this country should rise up and give thanks for two great events. One, the nomination of Mr. Hughes, who appears before us as a legal giant, cool, collected, courageous, eager to defend and determined to protect and advance the interests of his country—the ideal Chief Executive. The other, the satisfying and inspiring hope that Colonel Roosevelt is not hindered but to help elect Mr. Hughes. I feel safe in saying that few events in this country's history could have been the cause of greater satisfaction and joy than would be

ROOSEVELT FOR WILSON? A Progressive Believes That Americanism Points That Way. To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your leading editorial of to-day must certainly reflect the mind of Colonel Roosevelt, and it will not be safe for the self-satisfied Republican bosses to proceed on the assumption that Progressive support is assured. It is not!

The difference between the Hughes and Roosevelt attitudes toward the "Hyphen" is the difference between a "pusyfoot" and a man of courage. The managers of the Republican party plainly have told Mr. Hughes to pusyfoot, and he is doing it. Colonel Roosevelt has called a spade a spade. He has declared the German-American Alliance by name, and the next President of the United States, whoever he may be, can do no less.

Go back to your editorial captioned "The Bourbons," printed early this year, and see if the record of the Chicago convention just closed does not carry out exactly what you had in mind then. Let this thing cool off a while, and then see what the American people are going to say about a man who will follow the course that it will then be plain is being followed by the Republican candidate.

Wilson means well, but is weak; but he will make a better President as he goes along because he is honest in his efforts. To me it looks as if he is the best we can expect. The Republican choice, in his place on the fence, is hopeless. I honestly feel that it would be more consistent for Colonel Roosevelt, from the point of view of straight Americanism, to indorse and seek to counsel Wilson than to help elect a dodger.

I think that even now it is too late to brace up. The record is made, and I believe the damage is done. The Bourbons have done for the Republican party as I wrote you several months ago they would do. There never will be another Republican President unless Hughes shunt the "German-American" vote as a thing unclear. Your reluctance to swallow the Republican programme, hook, line and sinker, and your insistence on a courageous attitude shows your great, even unsurpassed, courage for a party newspaper. Seems almost unprecedented. You're great, simply great. GEORGE L. RAPPLER, New York, June 14, 1916.

An Accusation.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I have read The Tribune for fifty years and I am sorry to say that it is not the newspaper of former years. Are you planning to leave the Republican party? If so, come out and say so.

Your continual raps at Justice Hughes, both before and after his nomination, are doing him and the Republican party more harm than an outspoken Democratic newspaper, and plainly show that you are trying to defeat the Republican candidate for President in a subtle, insinuating way. F. D. C. Cheviot, N. Y., June 15, 1916.

A CALL FOR MORE LIGHT

Former Judge Lacombe Asks Mr. Hughes to Expound His Views.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Goethe's last words were "Light! More light!" unless I've misapprehended the old story. Some of us to-day are inclined to echo the wish, for November is ahead of us and we shall have to drop each his individual snowflake for one man or another as the next President of these United States. To do this intelligently we must be fully advised as to both candidates. Contrary to our wish and hope, we have been confronted with most serious problems growing out of the great war in Europe and have learned that we cannot live our life simply as a hermit nation, entirely without concern touching anything beyond the environment of our own borders. We shall be confronted with more of these problems in the future. To an intelligent use of the snowflake it is necessary to know how such problems will affect the next President of the United States. As to one candidate we need no further enlightenment. For nearly two years he has lived in the "great white light which beats upon a throne," equal to a throne whether King or President scrippies it. He has been confronted with serious problems and has dealt with them. From his record we can discover all the elements of his personal equation and touching possible future problems can with reasonable certainty deduce his probable orientation.

Mr. Hughes and His Record.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your editorial "Undiluted Americanism," headed by the letter of Mr. V. Adolph Ackermann, is misleading in that this man's false assertions are given such a prominent place. This man says: "We told you long ago that our candidate would be nominated at the Chicago convention." Perhaps Mr. Hughes was his candidate, but the value of the Hyphen vote was given very little consideration at Chicago and Mr. Hughes was not nominated because the Hyphenates supported him, but because the members of the Republican party believed him to be the strongest candidate in their ranks and because he was free from any connection with the split of 1912.

It is ridiculous for Mr. Ackermann or any other so-called German-American citizen to think for one minute that Mr. Hughes is not as good an American as Colonel Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson or any other man. His very record refutes any such assertion. If the Hyphenates desire to support Mr. Hughes, they are at liberty to do so, but they need not think that because of that support he will not stand out strong for Americanism and American rights on sea and on land, and I assure Mr. Ackermann and all his brother Hyphenates that if elected President of the United States, Mr. Charles E. Hughes will do a great deal more to maintain our national honor and rights than write blundering notes, which gain nothing and simply hold us up to ridicule.

Mr. Hughes stands on his record and I, for one, do not think that record can be impeached by any assertion that he is the candidate of the Hyphenates. Mr. Hughes is not, as Mr. Ackermann says, "our candidate, who is wise enough not to offend the Hyphenates," nor is he the candidate of any other faction in American politics whose allegiance is divided. Mr. Hughes is and always will be an American, and at present he is the candidate of the united Republican party and stands for everything that this great party represents and everything that is American. GORDON P. GLEASON, Albany, June 14, 1916.

A Hughes Supporter.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I was utterly opposed to the nomination of Justice Hughes because I believed the people who were to elect him should know where he stood. Since the nomination he has expressed himself in language that is easily understood, so that I am as earnestly for him as I was bitterly against him before. Ultra-Americanism is good enough for me, and I believe, for the entire country. I am confident will support the nominee with his whole wonderful power and personality.

I do not see the necessity of The Tribune's endeavor to antagonize all Americans of German descent. I know many Germans ready to vote the Republican ballot, as they always have, but if I was a German by birth and I was obliged to read The Tribune and form my estimate of public opinion from it, I should be led to believe American-born Americans who at war with German-born Americans, who is not true. A. E. ALBEE, Torrington, Conn., June 14, 1916.

Viewed as an Unreal Issue Manufactured by a Pro-Ally Press.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: With all due respect to your opinions as to what constitutes good American citizenship, you have not put forward the slightest evidence that German-Americans are second in devotion to our country to any other element in our population. The history of our country proves that our foreign-born citizens have always observed the oath of allegiance in letter and spirit.

The hyphenated American bogie has been worked to death. No longer can this term of reproach, attached by pro-Ally sympathizers to other citizens who hold opposite views on the European war, deceive any impartial or intelligent American. Our President has been carried away by this bogie, and his denunciations of genuine American citizens have demonstrated that he lacks that balance and judgment which should characterize a Chief Executive of the United States.

When or where have citizens of foreign birth proved a menace to their adopted country? Was the Hartford Convention convened and attended by hyphenated Americans? Was the population of the seceding states largely made up of hyphenated Americans? The hyphenated American bogie is the creation of the pro-Ally press.

In a dispatch in "The London Times" of May 16 from the Washington correspondent The Tribune, "The World," "The Times," "The Herald" and "The Sun" are represented as "pro-Ally organs."

Hyphenated Americans with "Anglo-French," "Russian" or "Italian" before their hyphens are without blame or blemish. So are our friends the Jewish-Americans, who are compelled or induced the politicians to insert a plank in the Republican platform which is in essence a protest against the persecution of the Jews in Russia. In connection with this plank there has been no comment whatsoever in the New York press. Is the golden hyphen above criticism? CHARLES THOMPSON, New York, June 15, 1916.

Regularity.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: At the request of a good many staunch Republicans we want to know if The Tribune is going to be a regular Republican paper or foot in the hands of the Bull Moose party. For the last few months you have advocated Mr. Roosevelt and pounded Mr. Hughes. Many a time we have threatened to give your paper up, but being a constant reader of The Tribune for over twenty years it seemed like losing an old friend. Now that Mr. Hughes is nominated you are very silent with congratulations. C. A. H., Columbiaville, N. Y., June 14, 1916.

"Undiluted Americanism."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: There was a time when your editorials commanded the attention and thoughtful consideration of all intelligent readers. Your editorial "Undiluted Americanism" is the most stupid, ridiculous article you have ever published. I know of many readers who are getting disgusted with your paper. If for one shall cease reading it immediately and take "The New York Sun." BUSINESS MAN, New York, June 14, 1916.

The One Question.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The writer has the highest respect for the men on The New York Tribune and "The New York World" who compose their leading editorials. Goodness knows there are sufficient great questions before the people of the United States to-day, but before any of these questions comes the "bolt out of the blue" that shocked all true Americans about one year ago. Shall the United States be a country divided? The answer of foreign extraction or abolition? The answer of "one" is guilty of moral treason. The situation is clear, concrete, vital and must be settled once for all time to come. OSCAR T. PECK, New York, June 14, 1916.

Former Judge Lacombe Asks Mr. Hughes to Expound His Views.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Goethe's last words were "Light! More light!" unless I've misapprehended the old story. Some of us to-day are inclined to echo the wish, for November is ahead of us and we shall have to drop each his individual snowflake for one man or another as the next President of these United States. To do this intelligently we must be fully advised as to both candidates. Contrary to our wish and hope, we have been confronted with most serious problems growing out of the great war in Europe and have learned that we cannot live our life simply as a hermit nation, entirely without concern touching anything beyond the environment of our own borders. We shall be confronted with more of these problems in the future. To an intelligent use of the snowflake it is necessary to know how such problems will affect the next President of the United States. As to one candidate we need no further enlightenment. For nearly two years he has lived in the "great white light which beats upon a throne," equal to a throne whether King or President scrippies it. He has been confronted with serious problems and has dealt with them. From his record we can discover all the elements of his personal equation and touching possible future problems can with reasonable certainty deduce his probable orientation.

As to the other candidate, touching these practical matters we have no information at all. Quite naturally so: situated as he was he could not voice personally and publicly any criticisms he might entertain (if he entertained any) as to the conduct of the Administration as other men, his competitors for the nomination, were free to do—a freedom so fully exercised that to the three most prominent ones we know quite accurately their personal equation in relation to these questions outside of our domestic concerns. It is for the candidate who now asks for the votes of those who criticize the course of the present Administration to give them the necessary information—in the concrete, not in the abstract. This we have not yet had. An evening paper states that Mr. Hughes announced that his attitude is one of undiluted Americanism, that he is an out-and-out American. The reporter adds that on hearing this statement Mr. Henry Clews exclaimed: "Bravo! That means a lot." Perhaps it does to Mr. Clews, but to others of us it means no more than the characterization of the telegram of acceptance, an "Americanism that knows no ulterior purpose, a patriotism that is single and complete." Some