

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1916

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation.

Subscription rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

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

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety.

The Summer Campaign

Regard being had for weather conditions rather than for precise calendar divisions, it may now be fairly said that the end of the summer campaign in Europe has come.

What, then, have been the results of this contest, of the most terrific phase of the Great War in more than two years of its duration?

The answer is not hard to find. The year 1916 opened as brilliantly for the Central Powers as any in the Napoleonic cycle for the French Emperor.

It was then, with the purpose of dealing the final blow to France, that Germany opened in February that drive at Verdun which filled the press of the world for the next four months.

And with the coming of summer the attention of the world was suddenly turned to the Russian drive in the east.

It is not too much to say that with the ending of the summer campaign the certainty of German defeat is no longer to be mistaken.

German agents will make the most in Europe and here of the temporary and considerable success in Rumania.

Too Late

President Wilson's agreement to reexamine the circumstances under which the Federal Civil Service Commission adopted a policy of secrecy as to its acts in order to avert "such criticism of the Administration as would seriously embarrass it" involves no risk for this campaign.

Up to date the President has completely supported the remarkable cover-up policy of his appointees in a case where the Administration is charged with violating the spirit, if not the letter, of the civil service law to create political patronage.

Unshackling Regulation

Regulation of public service corporations by the Public Service Commissions has not heretofore been especially successful when remedial orders have been sufficiently important to be contested in the courts.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

At the Somme the Germans have lost not less than 250,000 men; the Allies about 500,000, accepting the ratio of Verdun, which gives every advantage in calculation to the Germans.

material have been enormous, their loss in territory has been considerable.

Now, to balance this account what can be said for Germany? Allied success has brought a new nation into the war, involving a new strain upon German resources.

In the larger sense, the summer campaign has been wholly unfavorable to Germany.

In our own Civil War 1864 was the most disappointing year of all for the North, because it was the year in which the victory that seemed assured after Gettysburg and Vicksburg in 1863 was not achieved despite the terrific sacrifices of Grant from the Rapidan to Cold Harbor.

Defeat Him!

On March 9 of this year Representative John F. Carey of the 17th District sent out to constituents, under his frank, a letter warning such of them as might have business in Europe to keep off vessels of belligerent nations.

Discontent on the Border

Though the commands sent to the border were better cared for than any other large body of American troops has ever been, and while the training unquestionably has been for their own and the country's good, the experience does not seem to have stimulated the popular interest in the Guard service.

Oh, my country, now to stand with the grave, inspired, earnest brothers, breast to breast across the sea!

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? When they say: "Arms and navy both are lacking"—see, a cloud from coast to coast.

Will you lose the chance, my country, oh! my country? Days shall come when your golden mines and forests and your mighty wealth shall seem

three weeks remaining until the election is held cannot be expected to yield the information which the public desires and has a right to have.

Patent Contradictions in Mr. Wilson's U-Boat Policy

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The question as to what should be done by the United States regarding the destruction by a German submarine of the ships of Nantucket was settled by Mr. Wilson in his note of last April to Germany, as follows:

"Vessels of neutral ownership . . . have been destroyed along with vessels of belligerent ownership. . . . Sometimes their passengers and crews have been vouchsafed the poor security of being allowed to take to the ship's boats before the ship was sent to the bottom. . . ."

"The government of the United States has been very patient. . . . It has become painfully evident to it that the position which it took at the very outset is inevitable, namely—the use of submarines for the destruction of an enemy's commerce is, of necessity, because of the very character of the vessels employed, and the very methods of attack involved, utterly incompatible with the principles of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants. . . ."

"If it is still the purpose of the imperial government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines, without regard to what the government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rights of international law and the universally recognized rights of humanity, it is at the same time the duty of the United States at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. . . ."

"Unless the imperial German government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels, the government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the government of the German Empire altogether. . . ."

There can be no loophole or misunderstanding in regard to what should now be done. Neutral vessels have been destroyed, together with vessels of belligerent ownership. "The use of submarines for their destruction is, of necessity, because of their character, utterly incompatible with the principles of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants," and Mr. Wilson cannot escape his own conclusion that, unless the imperial German government abandoned that mode of warfare, the government of the United States had no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with Germany.

What I cannot understand is why we should speak of "the universally recognized rights of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants," and then supinely wait until an American is killed. There seems to be a contradiction of terms. Is an American the only one that can be considered a non-combatant? Have we not as a people chosen to offer obligations to inhabitants of other countries? Have we not obligations toward humanity in general? Does not the starvation and slaughter of Armenians, Serbs and Belgians appeal to us? Why, then, should Mr. Wilson wait until some American is killed before severing diplomatic relations with that country which is waging a ruthless war toward humanity?

Mr. Wilson is reported to have said: "The country may rest assured that Germany will be held to its promises. I have no right now to question the obligations of the Government. That is not the question. Mr. Wilson definitely crossed his bridge and burned it behind him when he concluded that unless they declared and effected an abandonment of their present methods of warfare (the sinking of passenger and freight carrying vessels by submarines), "the United States government can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the government of the German Empire altogether."

CLARENCE B. WOOD, Boston, Mass., Oct. 10, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

three weeks remaining until the election is held cannot be expected to yield the information which the public desires and has a right to have.

Patent Contradictions in Mr. Wilson's U-Boat Policy

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The question as to what should be done by the United States regarding the destruction by a German submarine of the ships of Nantucket was settled by Mr. Wilson in his note of last April to Germany, as follows:

"Vessels of neutral ownership . . . have been destroyed along with vessels of belligerent ownership. . . . Sometimes their passengers and crews have been vouchsafed the poor security of being allowed to take to the ship's boats before the ship was sent to the bottom. . . ."

"The government of the United States has been very patient. . . . It has become painfully evident to it that the position which it took at the very outset is inevitable, namely—the use of submarines for the destruction of an enemy's commerce is, of necessity, because of the very character of the vessels employed, and the very methods of attack involved, utterly incompatible with the principles of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants. . . ."

"If it is still the purpose of the imperial government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines, without regard to what the government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rights of international law and the universally recognized rights of humanity, it is at the same time the duty of the United States at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. . . ."

"Unless the imperial German government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels, the government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the government of the German Empire altogether. . . ."

There can be no loophole or misunderstanding in regard to what should now be done. Neutral vessels have been destroyed, together with vessels of belligerent ownership. "The use of submarines for their destruction is, of necessity, because of their character, utterly incompatible with the principles of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants," and Mr. Wilson cannot escape his own conclusion that, unless the imperial German government abandoned that mode of warfare, the government of the United States had no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with Germany.

What I cannot understand is why we should speak of "the universally recognized rights of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants," and then supinely wait until an American is killed. There seems to be a contradiction of terms. Is an American the only one that can be considered a non-combatant? Have we not as a people chosen to offer obligations to inhabitants of other countries? Have we not obligations toward humanity in general? Does not the starvation and slaughter of Armenians, Serbs and Belgians appeal to us? Why, then, should Mr. Wilson wait until some American is killed before severing diplomatic relations with that country which is waging a ruthless war toward humanity?

Mr. Wilson is reported to have said: "The country may rest assured that Germany will be held to its promises. I have no right now to question the obligations of the Government. That is not the question. Mr. Wilson definitely crossed his bridge and burned it behind him when he concluded that unless they declared and effected an abandonment of their present methods of warfare (the sinking of passenger and freight carrying vessels by submarines), "the United States government can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the government of the German Empire altogether."

CLARENCE B. WOOD, Boston, Mass., Oct. 10, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

three weeks remaining until the election is held cannot be expected to yield the information which the public desires and has a right to have.

Patent Contradictions in Mr. Wilson's U-Boat Policy

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The question as to what should be done by the United States regarding the destruction by a German submarine of the ships of Nantucket was settled by Mr. Wilson in his note of last April to Germany, as follows:

"Vessels of neutral ownership . . . have been destroyed along with vessels of belligerent ownership. . . . Sometimes their passengers and crews have been vouchsafed the poor security of being allowed to take to the ship's boats before the ship was sent to the bottom. . . ."

"The government of the United States has been very patient. . . . It has become painfully evident to it that the position which it took at the very outset is inevitable, namely—the use of submarines for the destruction of an enemy's commerce is, of necessity, because of the very character of the vessels employed, and the very methods of attack involved, utterly incompatible with the principles of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants. . . ."

"If it is still the purpose of the imperial government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines, without regard to what the government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rights of international law and the universally recognized rights of humanity, it is at the same time the duty of the United States at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. . . ."

"Unless the imperial German government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels, the government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the government of the German Empire altogether. . . ."

There can be no loophole or misunderstanding in regard to what should now be done. Neutral vessels have been destroyed, together with vessels of belligerent ownership. "The use of submarines for their destruction is, of necessity, because of their character, utterly incompatible with the principles of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants," and Mr. Wilson cannot escape his own conclusion that, unless the imperial German government abandoned that mode of warfare, the government of the United States had no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with Germany.

What I cannot understand is why we should speak of "the universally recognized rights of humanity, the long established rights of neutrals and the sacred immunities of non-combatants," and then supinely wait until an American is killed. There seems to be a contradiction of terms. Is an American the only one that can be considered a non-combatant? Have we not as a people chosen to offer obligations to inhabitants of other countries? Have we not obligations toward humanity in general? Does not the starvation and slaughter of Armenians, Serbs and Belgians appeal to us? Why, then, should Mr. Wilson wait until some American is killed before severing diplomatic relations with that country which is waging a ruthless war toward humanity?

Mr. Wilson is reported to have said: "The country may rest assured that Germany will be held to its promises. I have no right now to question the obligations of the Government. That is not the question. Mr. Wilson definitely crossed his bridge and burned it behind him when he concluded that unless they declared and effected an abandonment of their present methods of warfare (the sinking of passenger and freight carrying vessels by submarines), "the United States government can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the government of the German Empire altogether."

CLARENCE B. WOOD, Boston, Mass., Oct. 10, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the protagonist and protector of the neutral powers; but what kind of neutrality was that when a vessel of the United States Navy stood by while a vessel of a neutral country was sunk on the high seas by a belligerent? Nay more, the vessel of our navy meekly and obligingly got out of the way when told to do so by the raider! Was that neutrality? It looks to me more like a rhetorical flourish, the author is a brainy statesman of the right type, and a therefore absolutely worthy of the confidence and ballot of every conscientious, mentally sound and truly American elector, be he native-born or naturalized. With Mr. Hughes at the helm of state the right man would be in the right place, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

WOODHAVEN, N. Y., Oct. 12, 1916.

Oh, for a Dewey!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has posed as the