

LAZLS I FLIRT IN EURO

King Alfonso and the Princesses He Has Turned Down.

ALPHONSO, King of Spain, is Europe's royal flirt. In fact, royal or plebeian, he is probably the greatest flirt on the Continent. He has been reported engaged a dozen times, and some of these reports have been labeled "official," and yet the machinations of all his prime ministers and half the diplomats of Europe have not availed to make him wed.

He has been to nearly every court, he has met almost all the eligible princesses. To each he has expressed devotion and admiration, but from each he has fled as soon as the novelty began to wear off.

Spanish diplomats say that one of three fates awaits the ruler: He will be killed by anarchists, dash out his brains in some automobile accident, or get married.

The King seems to think the last alternative the worst of the three, for he courts the first two, but avoids matrimony with the same fear that a man might dodge a plague.

His auto seems to be his favorite. He makes the most unexpected and dangerous trips, going out in the worst kind of weather, not warmly clothed, and exposing himself without a guard to the parts of Spain which are supposed to be breeding grounds of anarchistic sentiment.

In such exploits he seems to know no fear, but when it is a case of obeying diplomatic law and marrying so as to secure an heir for the throne of Spain, then he dodges.

Some few months ago "the greatest flirt in Europe," as they privately call him in diplomatic circles, visited England on a match-making journey.



PRINCESS LOUISE OF PRUSSIA



KING ALFONSO OF SPAIN



PRINCESS EDA OF BATTENBURG



PRINCESS VICTORIA OF SAXE-COBURG



PRINCESS EDA OF BATTENBURG

Not Beautiful Enough.

It had not been easy to start him off, for the King insisted that there was no hurry, he was only 19, and that he would just as leave wait a while before giving up his freedom, until he was 21, anyway, but the ministers were insistent, and as it was felt that a marriage with the house of England would give Spain a powerful ally, so Alfonso was taken to the Princess Victoria Patricia, the young daughter of King Edward's brother.

If rumor speaks truly, the fair daughter of the Duke of Connaught looked with kindly eye on the dashing King, and warmed up to the project of becoming the Queen of Spain. The match presented many points of advantage. It meant a wealthy and powerful ally for Spain and the infusion of new blood into the peninsular country.

One serious obstacle intervened. The Princess was a Protestant, and the Vatican had ruled that Spain's lone church history could hardly brook a change that would make an Episcopal Queen.

But members of royal families usually find little difficulty in changing faith when a crown is at stake, so it was said that the Princess had agreed to wait her own beliefs and become a member of her prospective husband's faith.

Just when all these knotty problems had been solved a new trouble arose.

Alfonso himself called off negotiations and left for home. It appeared that the Princess did not coincide with his ideas of beauty, and that even a matter of international politics did not suffice to cajole him into a union against his will.

The blow was quite a serious one to the vanity of the English royal family, and as a counter move a statement was given out that King Edward had caused a surgeon to make an examination of King Alfonso, and that the latter had been pronounced a degenerate. It was for this reason, the rumor concluded, that England's sovereign had ordered off all negotiations.

few weeks ago to stay for a time in his realm. Nothing loth, the King accepted, and went to Berlin early in November. Again came the rumors that the matter had been fixed, and that the Kaiser's daughter, after becoming a member of the Catholic Church, would, when she becomes of marriageable age, two years hence, mount the throne of Spain.

But again the prophets proved all at sea, and after a short stay the King left Germany, and it is said that the greetings exchanged between himself and the Kaiser at his leave-taking did not begin to equal, in cordiality those that had marked their meeting.

No Success in Vienna.

Having failed in Germany and Great Britain, the counsellors bethought themselves of Austria. Here was a country where the royal families were just as good Catholics as Alfonso himself. No difficulties could arise on that score. The Archduchess Gabrielle was the ideal bride for Spain's King. The wedding would unite once more the fortunes of two nations who had been joined in the past under the great Emperor, Charles V.

King Alfonso wasn't averse to looking the Archduchess over. That feature of the programme suited him admirably, but as in the case of the edipus about one man being able to lead a horse to water, but not being able to make him drink, it was a very different matter for Alfonso to get to Vienna, and as a counter move a statement was given out that King Edward had caused a surgeon to make an examination of King Alfonso, and that the latter had been pronounced a degenerate. It was for this reason, the rumor concluded, that England's sovereign had ordered off all negotiations.

Failed at Berlin.

Foiled though they were in this attempt, the diplomatic matchmakers did not give up. There must be a marriage. They were confronted with the proposition that if anything happened to the 19-year-old King he would be succeeded by his sister's eldest son. Such an event meant all kinds of trouble, for the late Princess of the Asturias had been unpopular, and her husband, Prince Carlos, still more so, for his was the odium of being the son of the Count of Caserta, the chief lieutenant of Don Carlos, pretender to the throne and representative of everything distasteful in Spanish politics.

Rather than have this take place, the Ministers went after Alfonso afresh, and finally pointed out to him, that the crown of Spain would profit enormously from a union with Germany. Fortunately the Kaiser had a daughter, his only one, Princess Victoria Louise of Prussia.

William was reported as viewing the project favorably, and invited Alfonso a

King Alfonso Entering Berlin in Royal State Upon Occasion of His Recent Match-Making Visit to Germany.

Princess Victoria of Saxe-Coburg.

Princess Eda of Battenburg.

Seven Mistakes, by Principal W. I. Marshall
Rev. M. Eells Reviews the Chicago Man's Pamphlet on the Whitman-Saved-Oregon Discussion.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL, of Chicago, is the author of two recent works which have reference to the early history of the North Pacific Coast, and especially in regard to the work of Dr. Marcus Whitman and his relation to it. One is entitled "History vs. the Whitman-Saved-Oregon Story," (1898), and the other "The Hudson's Bay Company's Archives Furnish no Support to the Whitman-Saved-Oregon Story," (1898). Both of the letter appeared also in the Oregonian of March 26, August 12, 20, 27 and September 2, 1898. A part of these were entitled, "Seven Pure Fictions Concerning Marcus Whitman." The professor also expects soon to publish a much larger work on the same subject.

In all of these the professor takes strong ground against the idea that Dr. Marcus Whitman did anything or even went East in 1842-3, in order to do anything to save Oregon or any part of it to the United States.

Without doubt all readers of these writings of his will agree in regard to four things: that he has professed to go to the "original sources" for his information and statements; that his opponents have suppressed very much of the available information in regard to the question under consideration, which did not favor their side; that some of them have made so many mistakes in their statements that it is very difficult to believe most that they have written, this being especially noticeable in regard to the statements of "Cushing Eells, H. H. Spalding, W. H. Gray, W. A. Mowry, G. W. Nixon and M. Eells, and that the professor has spent much time in his researches, and has learned much in regard to many points.

Two questions, however, now arise in regard to him. Is he reliable in his statements, and when he has learned facts in his reasoning good, so that his conclusions are correct.

First—Are his statements reliable? On the first page of his introduction to "History vs. the Whitman-Saved-Oregon Story," he speaks of Harvey W. Scott, editor in chief of the Oregonian and first president of the Oregon Historical Society, and who he and I and many others agree in saying is a very able and learned man. Professor Marshall, how-

ever, says that he "is a native of the old Oregon Territory." Now as Mr. Scott was partly on his side, as the professor was in Portland twice at least before he wrote that where Mr. Scott lives, and goes to his original sources for his information, it must be so; and yet I do say it is not true. It is exactly opposite from the truth and is just as plain a mistake as any with which I have ever charged Rev. H. H. Spalding.

Under date of February 17, 1877, Mr. Scott wrote me as I was preparing sketches of the alumni of Pacific University according to a request of that body: "Born in Tazewell County, Illinois, February 1, 1838, came to Oregon in September, 1852. Lang's History of the Willamette Valley," p. 517, says that he was "born in Tazewell County, Illinois, February 1, 1838." In an address at Pacific University and published in the Oregonian September 25, 1891, Mr. Scott said: "About the first thing our family heard of when we came to Oregon—I was then in my early boyhood—was the school at Forest Grove, which was in 1852." In how many other places these two facts have been published I know not, but doubtless in many. As far as I have known Professor Marshall is the only person who has learned that Mr. Scott is a native of the old Oregon. The information is certainly "original" with him.

His Latest Flirtation.

Regarding the Princess Eda, of Battenburg, the report of the engagement, after being semi-officially promulgated, was, after Alfonso's visit, just as vigorously denied by both sides, which is proof that while the plan was undoubtedly entertained at first, it had been dropped

after the King had enjoyed his usual little flirtation.

The mother of Alfonso is said to favor the Archduchess of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, but has refrained from taking any active part in the discussion for the reason that in a matter of such moment she wants the King to have as much freedom of action as possible.

Perhaps the most interesting of all the theories advanced in explanation of the King's extraordinary indifference to the charms of Europe's princesses, is that he has actually conceived the idea of marrying an American, preferably Alice Roosevelt, the daughter of the President.

It is known that Alfonso is a great admirer of things American, and feels that Spain would profit by the infusion of American blood. He has planned for the last two years to visit the United States. It would be one of the most astonishing events in the history of the nations if he came here a-wooing.

habitable. Two gentlemen of the Hudson's Bay Company, Messrs. McLean and McPherson, volunteered their services to assist in whatever was necessary to be done, and came at the same time with them, or rather led the march. All crept upon the ground when the marching must have been not less than ten below zero, and the snow from six inches to a foot in depth. This is but a specimen of the unwavering kindness shown us by the gentlemen of the Hudson's Bay Company with whom we have had any particular intercourse or connection.

Professor Marshall adds: "No advocate of the Whitman Legend has ever quoted this letter or alluded to this action of the Hudson's Bay Company."

This last statement, I must say, is as far from the truth as the preceding ones, and as plain a mistake as any with which he has charged his opponents, for I published it ten years before he did. On page 105 of my book, "Father Eells," I quoted the same words for word, except that where the Hudson's Bay Company is referred to in the first time, I wrote "Company" instead

"any." With this last exception I quoted exactly as it is in the Missionary Herald for October, 1841.

(5) On pages 22-3 of the last-named pamphlet, where Professor Marshall discusses the subject that there was no opposition to the American missionaries in Oregon by the Hudson's Bay Company, he says: "The correspondence and diaries of these missionaries (Messrs. Spalding, Whitman, C. Eells, Walker and their wives, and Mr. Parker) during the whole of the existence of the mission give no support to the claims made by Reverends Myron and Edwin Eells since the publication of my 'History vs. the Whitman-Saved-Oregon Story,' that while the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company were generally friendly, the employees were at all times hostile and bitter toward the missionaries."

I am not aware that there was ever any public reply to any of these articles until 1878, and consequently no controversy. That year Hon. B. Evans in an address in Seattle stated his disbelief in it. This was heard by comparatively few, and was not published until 1880, when it came out in the North Pacific Coast. Mrs. F. E. Victor took the same side in the Californian in 1880. Between this time and 1885 the controversy became quite general and was carried on mainly by Mrs. Victor and E. Evans on one side, and W. H. Gray, E. C. Ross and Mr. Eells on the other. But I am unable to understand how anyone can say that "the controversy was constantly on after 1880."

These seven mistakes of his, so contrary to the truth, four of them with reference to one person, myself, raise the question: Is he reliable in his statements? He sat for the greater part of two days in my room staying, where he could easily have learned the truth about these matters, some of the time within five feet of books which would have corrected him, but evidently failed to go to "original sources" for his statements. One, at least, of the above works of mine he has had no opportunity to read, and he is under the shadow of one of the great libraries of America, where all of these works are presumably kept, and yet has failed to learn the truth. It is strange that one person recently said to me in regard to him, that he had made vast research and learned much and yet he would not take any statement of his without first investigating for himself to see whether it were true or not.

M. EELLS.
Union, Wash., November, 1896.

Second—On page 51 of the same book, when referring to the diary of Rev. H. H. Spalding, Professor Marshall says, "From this diary, which has been in Rev. M. Eells' possession for many years, it is only necessary to publish a few pages of his pamphlet, Marcus Whitman, M. D., and those 61 words, not till 1882." This, too, must be so, as the professor has his facts from original investigations. But I am ready to say again that it is just as great a mistake as he has ever charged upon Mr. Spalding or Gray. In the Whitman College Quarterly of March, 1898, pp. 2, 10, 12, 11, and June, 1898, pp. 3, 4, are considerably more than 500 words from that journal, different from the 61 referred to. If my memory is not at fault when the professor was in my room where those quarters were in 1892, and I referred to the fact that I had written a sketch of Mr. Spalding's life, and offered to show it to him, he said he did not care anything about it, as he was searching for original writing. I, e., he was then engaged in reading Mr. Spalding's journal. Over 20 words from

that diary I published in the San Francisco Pacific in January and February, 1887.

Third—On page 58 Professor Marshall writes in regard to a letter written in 1842, as follows: "The (Mr. Eells) has in all his voluminous writings quoted the order, i. e., to discontinue a part of the mission, nor quoted one word from Walker's 16-page letter of October 2, 1842, indorsed as correct by his father (which he admits he has in his possession)."

This is as complete a mistake as the two preceding ones. On page 14 of an address, which I delivered at the commencement of Whitman College June 1, 1888, and which was published, I held that letter in my hand, and quoted it word for word from it. While I have never literally quoted the order to discontinue the mission verbatim, for I am quite sure I have never seen it, as it is in Boston, yet I have often referred to it and have stated that it was made. On the page referred to (p. 14), I also said: "Four years after his arrival (that of Rev. E. Walker), an order came to discontinue the two southern stations of the missions, at Lapwai and in this valley (Walla Walla)." I also said that that "Messrs. Spalding and Gray were to go to what he could save the southern stations of the mission, and that that letter, pleading for their continuance was written to assist him.

Again, in my "History of Indian Missions," published in 1882, p. 42, I make practically the same statement, and add that "Messrs. Spalding and Gray were to return East, and Dr. Whitman was to join the Spokane mission."

In the Pacific of San Francisco, of April 25, 1888, after giving the reasons for the order, I wrote that the board sent "an order to discontinue the stations among the Cayuses and Nez Percés." I said practically the same in the Whitman College Quarterly, of March, 1888, p. 8, and page 69 of my "Reply to Professor Bourne."

(4) On page 27 of Professor Marshall's pamphlet, "The Hudson's Bay Company Archives," etc., he refers to the burning of the house of Rev. G. Eells in January, 1841, and of a letter which he wrote to Dr. Green. He quotes from that letter as follows: "Mr. McDonald, who is in charge of Fort Colville, on hearing of our misfortune, unasked, dispatched four men immediately, and they soon made our house-

TO fool the other fellow successfully, you first have to fool yourself. Try to remember this the next time that you are helping to frame a political platform, composed of a little liver pill or establish a new religion.

Take the successful real estate agent. The reason that he convinces you your purchase of a corner lot in Hazelhurst Addition will place you next door to the gates of Paradise is because he believes it himself; that is, for the 15 minutes he spends on you.

We miss a great many opportunities of enjoyment by not taking advantage of circumstances right at hand. It is not necessary to go to the theater and hear May Irwin by paying three dollars to get a little bit of life's comedy; you can get it for nothing right around the block.

Get a hair cut, put on a new suit of clothes, then call on your nearest real estate agent and explain that you are a stranger seeking a home. Comedy will commence to come in great chunks from the street-car lines, railroads and rolling-mills galore will be trotted before your astonished vision and you are liable to buy a gladder on Mount Hood for an ice plant before you wake up. And of course he believes most of it or he would not be in the business and making a success of it.

Then look at our great men and so-called statesmen. The first requisite for getting into a position of that sort is to adopt the New Thought philosophy and go into the silence. After you have gone in a decent distance, say a couple of miles, and commenced with your thoughts, providing they are not too disagreeable, you want to say over to yourself a reasonable number of times, "I am a great man." This is guaranteed to work wonders. To insure a

complete cure for mediocrity, however, the treatment has to be repeated at frequent intervals. There is one agreeable thing about this treatment, though, and that is the fact that it grows more pleasant with repetition. In fact, some patients carry it so far that they insist on their friends and acquaintances repeating the honeyed phrase.

We see examples right here in Oregon of the powerful effects of this formula. What would George C. of Clackamas or "Windy Joseph" have amounted to, if each had not kept saying over to himself, "I am a statesman," and also insisting that the rest of us join in on the chorus? Why, simply nothing at all. They would have been in a perpetual state of innocuous desuetude.

Even in philosophy does our law hold true. Here is a Chicago philosopher who is striving to bring the world around to the idea that the surface of the earth is concave rather than convex and that the sun is in the center. This makes us living on the inside of the sphere rather than on the outside. You say, "Rats in the belly." Sure; but the man believes in it himself, and so finds followers and supporters. Besides, Chicago has given us worse things than a concave earth, and as long as the best trust makes only a profit of 30 cents on each steer killed we surely cannot complain whether we are on the inside or the outside of the earth.

Right here occurs an idea. It has always been a great problem with the sociologist to arrive at some method for selecting an intelligent vote. Now I suggest that when a young man arrives at the age of 21, he go before a commission of respectable citizens and that they ask him a question something like this: "Do

you believe the best trust to be a philanthropic institution?" If he answers intelligently, let him vote; if he does not, cast him out into outer darkness. Of course, the constitutional fellows would want a precedent for this, and so I would refer them to Gideon, who chose the men for his army by the way each one drank water out of the creek.

As a parting bit of wisdom, let me inform you that you are more liable to get three dollars a day if you think you are doing nine dollars' worth of work. I believe those are the latest figures on the subject.

MARCUS W. ROBBINS.
Grant's Pass, Or.

Musings for Three Minutes

By Marcus W. Robbins

On How to Make the World Believe You Are Great—Begin by Believing It Yourself.

you believe the best trust to be a philanthropic institution?" If he answers intelligently, let him vote; if he does not, cast him out into outer darkness. Of course, the constitutional fellows would want a precedent for this, and so I would refer them to Gideon, who chose the men for his army by the way each one drank water out of the creek.

As a parting bit of wisdom, let me inform you that you are more liable to get three dollars a day if you think you are doing nine dollars' worth of work. I believe those are the latest figures on the subject.

MARCUS W. ROBBINS.
Grant's Pass, Or.

"ISMS" NOT MAIN ISSUE

Our Public Schools Are in the Main Lifegivers.

Collier's.

Secularism vs public schools, an issue which ought to have been dead and buried long ago, shows signs of life again. It has lately reappeared in a semi-virulent form in Chicago, and it has been made a primary political issue in Canada. There is the same old-time recklessness of statement on the part of the foes of the public schools, and the same brazen disregard of facts.

Among other things is the familiar denunciation of the schools as godless and irreligious. If the foes of the public schools mean that they are not sectarian, agreed; this is greatly to their credit. Schools are not necessarily godless or irreligious because they are not managed by Presbyterians, Catholics, or some other lam. The fact is the public schools were never more earnest in their endeavors to reach the holy things of the child nature, and to

inculcate principles of right conduct, than at present, and they are succeeding. To maintain a claim that the schools are irreligious is a gratuitous insult to the thousands of devoted Christian schoolteachers the continent over. It is to say that the schools are irreligious because the irreligiousness of our public schools somehow confuse creed and deed, a theory of religion with its spirit. Our schools in the main are lifegivers. They teach no "ism," no particular creed, but they do surround the child with cultural and spiritual influences which constitute the most vital elements of religion. Talking botany for a used will not make it; they do surround the child with cultural and spiritual influences which constitute sprout, nor does teaching a particular theory make a claim a Christian. That the schools do not teach the favorite religious theories of this or that church is no sign at all that they are irreligious. We certainly need conscience as well as brain. We are not overburdened with a sense of our obligation to righteousness. We are victimized by educated knaves as well as by ignorant ones. But people do not fall into the snare of confessionalism with religion, or ungodliness with the absence of church control.

Common Mistake.

"Billings said that when he went to school he was one of the brightest boys in his class."

"Yes," answered the sporting man; "that's where so many of us fall down—getting out of our class."—Washington Star.

Wanted It Reversed.

"This cheese is full of holes," complained the prospective purchaser.

"Yes, sir," said the proprietor. "That's right."

"Haven't you got one with the holes full of cheese?"—Louisville Courier-Journal.

of "Co." and where it is referred to the second time I wrote "Company" instead of "Hudson's Bay Co." and a printer's mistake in the last line makes in my quotation the word "no" for

While the professor puts this claim in finer print, and in quotation marks, yet one thing is noticeable; he does not refer to any letter, article, lecture or anything where the claim was made. As far as I am concerned I say that the statement is as far from the truth as any of his preceding ones. Since the publication of that work of his, I have not written or said anything of the kind, not even at any other time to my remembrance have I ever said, written or even thought of making such a claim.

I have also before me all of the published statements of Edward Bellows, since Professor Marshall published his book, and nowhere does he make such a statement.

The only claim that we have ever made which would give any color to the professor's statement is that after the coming of the Catholic missionaries in 1838, some of the Hudson's Bay Company's employees who were Catholics very naturally worked for the success of their religion among the Indians. In support of this statement I quote from one of Dr. Whitman's letters to me, written in May, 1841. Mr. Pamrison was in charge of Fort Walla Walla for several years before his death, and he and Dr. Whitman were ever on friendly terms. He died of the effects of an injury, and Dr. Whitman attended him then, and did all he could for him. Yet Dr. Whitman knew that he was a Catholic and favored that religion, and wrote as follows: "There is likely to be a strong Catholic division here for nothing. It has been fostered more or less by our late neighbor, Mr. Pamrison, who died on the 18th inst."

Sixth—On pages 72 and 73, "History vs. Whitman Saved, etc." the professor finds fault with me for saying that the testimony of Rev. E. Walker was not obtained before his death in 1877, before the Whitman controversy arose. The professor says: "Could anything be more disingenuous than that?" But he was too roughly honest a man to make any statements (the advocates of the claims made for Dr. Whitman could use.) In answer to Walker's death, written in May, 1841, Mr. Pamrison was in charge of Fort Walla Walla for several years before his death, and he and Dr. Whitman were ever on friendly terms. He died of the effects of an injury, and Dr. Whitman attended him then, and did all he could for him. Yet Dr. Whitman knew that he was a Catholic and favored that religion, and wrote as follows: "There is likely to be a strong Catholic division here for nothing. It has been fostered more or less by our late neighbor, Mr. Pamrison, who died on the 18th inst."

Seventh—in regard to my statement that Mr. Walker died in 1877, "before the controversy arose," the professor says (page 73) "The controversy was constantly on after 1861." This I deny, and claim with this statement that Mr. Scott is a native of the old Oregon.

As far as I have ever been able to learn, the first persons who wrote in favor of the idea that Dr. Whitman saved Oregon, were S. A. Clark, in the Sacramento Union in 1864; H. H. Spalding in the San Francisco Pacific in 1865; in the Albany States Rights Democrat, 1866-8, and in the Californian in 1880. Mrs. F. E. Victor, in the Missionary Herald in 1897; G. H. Atkinson in the same magazine in 1898; Mrs. F. E. Victor in the "River of the West," 1898 (page 188); W. H. Gray in his history of Oregon in 1900, from articles he had previously published in the Astorian, and H. H. Hines in the Ladies Repository in 1898.

I am not aware that there was ever any public reply to any of these articles until 1878, and consequently no controversy. That year Hon. B. Evans in an address in Seattle stated his disbelief in it. This was heard by comparatively few, and was not published until 1880, when it came out in the North Pacific Coast. Mrs. F. E. Victor took the same side in the Californian in 1880. Between this time and 1885 the controversy became quite general and was carried on mainly by Mrs. Victor and E. Evans on one side, and W. H. Gray, E. C. Ross and Mr. Eells on the other. But I am unable to understand how anyone can say that "the controversy was constantly on after 1880."

These seven mistakes of his, so contrary to the truth, four of them with reference to one person, myself, raise the question: Is he reliable in his statements? He sat for the greater part of two days in my room staying, where he could easily have learned the truth about these matters, some of the time within five feet of books which would have corrected him, but evidently failed to go to "original sources" for his statements. One, at least, of the above works of mine he has had no opportunity to read, and he is under the shadow of one of the great libraries of America, where all of these works are presumably kept, and yet has failed to learn the truth. It is strange that one person recently said to me in regard to him, that he had made vast research and learned much and yet he would not take any statement of his without first investigating for himself to see whether it were true or not.

M. EELLS.
Union, Wash., November, 1896.