THE GREAT ANTI-SLAVERY CRUSADER

(Copyright, 1900, by Seymour Eaton.)

THE OREGONIAN'S HOME STUDY CIRCLE: DIRECTED BY PROF. SEYMOUR EATON

GREAT AMERICAN STATESMEN

Contributors to this course: Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, Prof. John Bach McMaster, Prof. Charles H. Smith, Dr. Frederic W. Speiss, Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin and others.

XVI. CHARLES SUMNER.

BY JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN, PH. D.

There are those who believe that a nation's history is involved in the lives of its great men. The life of Charles Sumner certainly very largely embodies the history of the anti-slavery conflict in America. To study that life is to study the causes, the issues and the results of the great struggle for emancipation and union, and to know the merits of that struggle one must needs know something of the life and service and character of Charles Sumner.

Sumner, the Scholar and Jurist.

Little need be said of Sumner's early life. Born in Boston, January 6, 1811, he became a graduate of Harvard in 1830. Like Motley, he enjoyed early affluence and advantages, and succeeded in spite of them. In 1833 he entered the Harvard law school, where he studied under the renowned Judge Joseph Story. He continued for several years to apply himself to study in classroom, office and library, bringing to his books a marvelous memory and extraordinary intellectual industry. He spent the years from 1837 to 1840 abroad, as a student and observer, in London, Paris, Rome, Berlin and other European centers, becoming acquainted with the leading public men of Europe. His studies and taste led him toward politics and the law. His legal studies were not such as would develop the shrewd practitioner at the bar; for as his eulogist, Mr. George William Curtis, afterward said of him, "He was not formed for a jury lawyer where the jury was less than a nation or mankind," and, in sporting language, "though he had a fine eye for country, he had a poor scent for the trail." His tastes drew him rather to public and constitutional law—the law of peace and war and of nations—and in these he had a preparation that stood him in good stead in the years to come. In these 10 years of study and travel and reflection we find developing Sumner the scholar—a scholar whose attainments were admirably manifested in his first notable public oration, delivered July 4, 1845, on "The True Grandeur of Nations," a magnificent plea for peace, a severe denunciation of war.

Sumner, the Free-Soiler.

But of greater interest is Sumner the anti-slavery senator and moral reformer. The inspiration of Sumner's early public career is found in the cause of free soil. He became interested very early in the anti-slavery movement. He was a subscriber to the Liberator in its early years, and he was a friend of Garrison, Phillips and Channing. In 1841 he criticised Webster's correspondence in the "Creole case" as giving unnecessarily national support and countenance to the slave interest. He denounced the admission of Texas, and he held the war with Mexico to be "unconstitutional in origin, unjust in character and detestable in object," and, above all, he held that if additional territory be forced upon us "from all such territory slavery should be forever excluded." At the conclusion of the Mexican war, with the prospect before us of slavery extension toward the south and west, Sumner felt that the time had come when men of all parties should unite against slavery. In politics he was a whig. But he understood that a party was a means, not an end, and if his party would not serve his purpose he would find an organization that would.

Sumner and the Fugitive Slave Law.

On November 6, 1850, in Faneuil hall, soon after the passage of the fugitive slave law of that year, Sumner spoke on "Our Immediate Anti-Slavery Duties." This was a remarkable speech. He denounced the fugitive slave law and deliberately counseled resistance.

"I will not," he said, "dishonor this home of the pilgrims and of the revolution by admitting—nay, I cannot believe—that this bill will be executed here. Among us, as elsewhere, individuals may forget humanity in fancied loyalty to law, but the public conscience will not allow a man who has trodden our streets as a freeman to be dragged away as a slave."

This is the speech that is said to have made Sumner senator. It sounded the keynote for the free soilers of America in the face of the "finality" legislation and compromise of 1850. The speech was denounced as treasonable by Southern men and apologists for slavery, and it is certain that more than anything else it determined Sumner's selection by the free soil party as its candidate for the senate. In the election of 1850 there was a coalition in Massachusetts between the free soilers and the democrats in the choice of state senators and representatives, with the understanding that the state officers chosen by the legislature should be democrats and the United States senator a free soiler. Sumner was chosen senator in April, 1851, after a long contest.

"He was not a member of either of the great parties. He was pledged then, and always and only, to his sense of right. He stood for no partisan end whatever, but simply and solely for uncompromising resistance to slavery."—Curtis.

In the senate it was with difficulty that Sumner found an opportunity to speak upon his "one idea." It was not until August 26, 1852, that by a parliamentary maneuver he gained his chance. He then made his celebrated speech for the "Repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law." This is recognized as the masterpiece among Sumner's anti-slavery orations. Mr. Curtis pronounces it "the most significant event in the senate since Webster's reply to Hayne, and an epitome of Sumner's whole career." In maintaining his fundamental thesis—"that freedom was national and slavery was sectional"—Sumner held that wherever there was national power there was national responsibility, and that this responsibility could not be discharged unless that power were used in restraint of slavery. Therefore he demanded the instant repeal of the fugitive slave bill, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, that congress should prohibit slavery in the territories, that the domestic slave trade be restrained, especially on the high seas, under the national flag, and that the national government should go to the limit of its constitutional power to relieve itself from all responsibility for slavery. This was, substantially, the free soil platform. The conservative character of Sumner's speech is seen in the fact that in his constitutional argument against the fugitive slave bill he fell back on the compact theory of the constitution in that he held that the fugitive slave clause of that document was not a power-conferring clause, but merely a compact agreement among the states. Its enforcement must be left to state comity.

"Slavery," as he said on a former occasion, "where we are parties to it, wherever we are responsible for it, everywhere within our jurisdiction, must be supported by every instrument of the political power. It is a mistake to charge that we seek to interfere through congress with slavery in the states. Our political aims as well as our political duties are coextensive only with our political responsibilities."

Such was the message that Sumner gave the senate and the nation in 1852, and such was his constant, uncompromising platform in the great anti-slavery conflict.

Sumner's Inflexible and Uncompromising Character.

In 1854 Sumner made a plea against the Douglas repeal of the Missouri compromise, calling the repealing bill "at the same time the worst and the best bill in the annals of congress," for while it broke down an historic barrier against slavery it at the same time placed the great antagonists, Freedom and Slavery, face to face and bade them grapple. He was denounced and buffeted and badgered in the senate as a fanatic, a traitor and a perjured violator of his oath, on account of his public utterance against returning the fugitive slave. "Is thy servant a dog?" he answered, in the words of the prophet, "that he should do this thing?" Against his assailants, Butler of South Carolina, Mason of Virginia, Douglas of Illinois, Pettit of Indiana, and others, he defended the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and facing, as Jackson faced, an adverse supreme court decision, he quoted Jackson and Buchanan as good democratic authority for the position that when a public official swears to support the constitution he swears to support it as he understands it, not as it is understood by others.

CHARLES SUMNER.

On May 19, 1856, Sumner delivered his celebrated speech in the senate on "The Crime Against Kansas," the speech for which he was assaulted by Brooks. Sumner's speeches were very offensive to his opponents. When he assailed slavery its advocates felt themselves to be personally insulted. The passage in this speech to which exception was taken was certainly in bad taste, and it shows personal offensiveness, if not coarseness. Mr. Rhodes, the historian of the period, finds no apology for Sumner's bitter personal attack on Senator Butler. But Sumner did not transgress the bounds of parliamentary decorum, and he was not called to order by the president of the senate or by any senator. In Sumner the uncompromising Southerner met aggression, boldness, defiance, denunciation, equal to his own—forms of speech to which he had not been accustomed. Brooks' bludgeon merely revealed the spirit and weakness of slavery.

For four years Sumner was absent from his seat in the senate, under medical treatment in Europe. He returned to his seat in 1860, and in the notable session of 1860-1 he was a strong opponent of any form of compromise; he held that the slavery question did not admit of compromise; it did not come within the domain of expediency. "To be wrong on this is to be wholly wrong. On this question there is no other side." In this conviction, therefore, when at the opening of the war, as Miss Martineau relates, every public man in the country with whom she talked agreed that silence upon slavery was the sole condition of preserving the Union—when in this crisis Sumner was appealed to to vote for the Crittenden compromise and save the country from war, he answered: "I must do my duty; I can vote for no concession to human slavery." In this he spoke more as the moral reformer than as the statesman, more like one who has been well described as "conscience incarnate."

In other phases of Sumner's public career he filled an important place in the history of his country. But these, in the story of his life, will always be subordinate to his career as an anti-slavery advocate and statesman. From 1861 to 1872 he was chairman of the senate committee on foreign affairs, and in that position, so entirely in accord with his tastes, he contributed materially to the literature of international law. His great speech on the "Trent Affair," January 9, 1862, is one of his ablest productions, and it placed the surrender of Mason and Slidell on the most acceptable ground—on ground sounder and more tenable than that assumed by Secretary Seward: That the country was ready to acquiesce in the surrender of the Confederate envoys, it has been said, was due to Sumner, who made it clear that the action was in accordance with principles always maintained by the United States and in accordance with our humane and peaceful traditions of neutrality.

The war over, Sumner spoke for conciliation and amnesty. He harbored no resentment or revenge. But he never wavered in his devotion to the cause of equal civil and political rights for all men, regardless of race, color or previous condition of servitude, and when he died, in 1874, it may be said that the struggle for the protection by national power of the Southern freedmen in their civil and political privileges came to an end.

To Sumner's mind politics was an ennobling pursuit. His life forcibly illustrated his maxim that "politics is but the application of moral principles to public affairs." He brought to his political life profound conviction, supreme conscientiousness, great resources, careful training, unselfish devotion to the public weal, and the indomitable martyr spirit of the reformer. In times like these it is well that the American people should turn to the contemplation of such a life.

James Albert Woodburn.

Indiana University.

GOOD-BY, ROBERTS.

Peace Go With Him to His Labyrinth of Woes and Wives.

REPUBLIC, Wash., Jan. 27.—(To the Editor.)—After a play that was hardly a success from a dramatic standpoint, congress has found that Roberts is a polygamist. There were several wagon-loads of petitions lying at Washington, and Roberts is denied a seat in the hall. One thing the case has done—it shows how eager the average congressman is to assume a virtue he does not necessarily possess. In deference to public opinion, they voted the Utah man out.

To the sentimentality that tries to find some excuse for Roberts in his labyrinth of woes and wives, and thinks him honest when he claimed to be making the row out of "loyalty to women" because "they are good and true," and sought to hide behind some diviner right than even that of the church, it should be remembered that though the soul of a woman is in all probability the very broadest thing in the world and great enough to embrace in its consideration the whole of humanity, it is not large enough to hold in reverence and love a husband divided by three, and no woman capable of understanding a man like Roberts would believe it. Roberts is a lawbreaker, having defied the law of God and man, and no woman could, with any degree of reason, expect him to live up to promises made to her, except those of course which pleased him. If men of today lived up to the divine obligation as taught by every breath of American civilization there would be such a change in the order of human affairs as to make the souls of Martin Luther and Jeanne D'Arc send up a shout which would be heard through all Christendom.

In regard to the much-married aspirant for congressional honors, the people should consider how annoying this must be to the Mistresses Roberts. Think of those two or three or four female links that bind Mr. Roberts to his hearthstone! My sympathy has gone out to them, but now that they have a notoriety that rivals either Mrs. Dewey or the interest in Ladysmith, I am inclined to weep with the man from Utah. When we consider the responsibility of looking after one woman, just think of a man who buys "tailor-made gowns" for several. Then think of what a power he would be in attacking any of the three or four-sided questions that are driving our senators to matrimony and the grave.

However, we ought to "wake the echoes" when it comes to a question of principle—just as we must lull to sleep the conflicts that arise in our own households—for are we not rocking the cradle of our infant government? F. M. H.

THE PRO-BOER MEETING.

Here Is a Correspondent Who Rises for Information.

PORTLAND, Feb. 1.—(To the Editor.)—It was my good fortune to attend the pro-Boer meeting last Saturday night, and to be most highly edified and entertained by the astute and scholastic speakers. Especially did the observations of the Hon. Judge O'Day strike me when he stated what a thorough American citizen he was, and that the United States, through its executive and legislative branches in Washington, D. C., should send some tangible evidence of its sympathy with the Boers in the shape of resolutions of condolence.

I do not wish to discuss the merits or demerits of such proposed action, though doubting its diplomacy and expediency; but, when a brilliant orator like the judge assumes such a conspicuous and pronounced attitude before an intelligent Portland audience, our minds naturally revert to the time when Cuba was having her trouble with Spain. When Cuba was in distress, why did we not hear words of commiseration from such a learned man as Judge O'Day? Why did we not hear from these distinguished speakers earlier?

The judge is a fine talker, and, no doubt, is entitled to credit for the patriotic (?) stand he has taken; in fact, we ought to be proud that we have such a frank, outspoken man in our midst; but, for the sake of consistency, why did we not hear from him at the time before mentioned?

To be candid, the meeting at the Metropolitan theater Saturday night was but little more than a democratic dodge to catch votes. To a man viewing the situation from a broad-gauge standpoint, this conclusion is not only logical, but irresistible. There be but few Cuban votes in the United States, but votes from the German and Dutch element are in abundance, and must be catered to in some wise.

Without drawing this communication to an undue length, allow me, as good an American citizen as any one can be, to state that the declaration of war in Africa was not a despairing struggle for liberty, but a bold bid for empire. It was not to preserve what the Transvaalers had, but to get what they had not. Their desire was to make the Orange Free State and the Transvaal a separate, Dutch-speaking paramount power, and to exclude forever the Britisher from any dominating influence in that part of the world.

Our word for it, if the union jack waved over the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, the only result would be that henceforth good government and justice would prevail, and if prosperity followed, that Great Britain would share it, as was its custom, with the whole of the civilized world. D. C. WILSON.

The Roberts Case.

ADNA, Wash., Jan. 29.—(To the Editor.)—While reading in The Oregonian today the way a woman criticised Roberts' defense, which he made in congress the other day, I am struck with horror to think that there is a woman in this republic who will denounce the Bible and Martin Luther, when taken as a basis for defense, and furthermore is afraid that such an assumption will cast a shadow and disgrace the American people. I want to know whether slavery disgraced the American people, and still will for years to come; if so, then of all wrongs we have done or crimes our ancestors have committed, we should be ashamed of such. In other words, if a father commits a crime and is convicted, and not let to enter the halls of congress any more, then his son, the product of American soil, should be convicted and deprived of such privileges. Any sound-minded person that claims that Roberts held up polygamy surely misinterprets his language, because the last thing Roberts said when he left congress was that polygamy was dead, and, if not, is dying as fast as it can, and he does not hold it up.

FRANK RADMAKER.

Advice Gratis to Salem.

Albany Democrat.

It takes money and action to build creameries. The butter will never come until after some live churning.

Persons suffering from sick headache, dizziness, nausea, constipation, pain in the side, are asked to try one vial of Carter's Little Liver Pills.

FILIPINOS NOT WARLIKE

INTERVIEW WITH AN EX-MEMBER OF AGUINALDO'S CABINET.

Future Peace of the Philippines Depends on Course Pursued by the Washington Government.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 27.—One of the Western senators has just received a copy of the Manila Tribune of December 10, in which is printed an extended interview with Senor Mabina, formerly a member of the cabinet of the rebel chief, Aguinaldo, and who, according to the paper, is considered to be one of the brainiest diplomats among them. In the course of his interview he makes several statements, which, if he can be taken as a representative Filipino, would indicate that spurring them on, might readily be induced the natives, without their warlike leader to accept the terms that are offered them by the United States. The statement of Senor Mabina is as follows:

"I cannot give the number of Filipino soldiers who have been arrayed against you during the present insurrection, because my duties as a cabinet minister had little in common with the military side of our government. I once asked for information concerning our forces, but it was not given me, for what reason I do not care to state.

"For the same reason I am utterly unprepared to name you the number of our casualties up to the date of my disconnection with our government.

"Since last May I have been removed from political life. After my leaving the cabinet I made my home at Rosales, a town in the province of Nueva Ecija, situated between Tayug and Bayomboog.

"From my own personal observations, I believe that the future peace of the Philippines depends entirely on the course pursued by the Washington government towards the Filipino people.

"If the United States gives us a free, liberal government, one that will satisfy my people, under which they may live happily and contented, I do not foresee a repetition of past events.

"In fact, the main thing is to satisfy the people in the form of government established; then there will be enduring peace. If the people are happy, they will lend no aid whatsoever to future insurrection, and without the support of the people any revolutionary movement will prove a failure.

"Discontented, the people will give support to the men in the field, who are fighting to obtain a liberal form of government. Contented, the people will be faithful to the regime and there will be no trouble.

"Remember, I am speaking strictly from a personal standpoint, and not as a representative of the Filipino government.

"We maintained the rebellion against American authority not with idea of obtaining our actual independence, for we soon recognized that we were too weak a people to cope with a power like the United States of America. Our idea was to force the Americans to eventually give us a government that would prove satisfactory to all concerned.

"I confess this much, that we failed in our effort, because we lacked food and ammunition, and because we sadly mismanaged our own affairs. But the idea we fought for are not forgotten, and never will be.

"We have impressed upon the United States the mode of government we want and need, and if it is accorded us we will prove loyal citizens; if not I believe that there will be much dissension in the future. If a revolutionary movement has the sympathy of the people it will prosper to a certain extent.

"The guerrilla warfare, which has followed the disbanding of our troops, will be easily terminated if the guerrillas fail to secure the sympathy and support of the Filipino people at large and this help will not be accorded them if the people find that the Americans have the welfare and interests of the Filipinos at heart. Otherwise, I believe that guerilla warfare can be kept up for an indefinite period by the natives, who are well acquainted with the wild mountain country.

"The American congress, I understand, will determine the form of government for the Philippines. I do not believe they can do this with equity and justice unless they first consult the foremost men among us, and act to a great extent in accordance with their council."

INSPECTING COOS BAY.

Captain Harts Finds Improvements Progressing Well.

Captain W. W. Harts, United States engineers, who has charge of government work on the coast of Oregon, having been unable to get down to Tillamook bay, went on a tour of inspection of the works at Coos bay and the Coquille river, from which he has just returned. He took passage on the steamer Homer, which is running in place of the Alliance, and was four days on the trip. Off Yaquina bay they encountered a violent blow against which the steamer labored for 24 hours without making more than five miles headway, and of the 12 or 15 passengers, Captain Harts and a commercial traveler were the only ones who put in an appearance at every meal.

Captain Harts inspected the jetty work at Coos bay and found it making very satisfactory progress. The tramway has been extended 115 feet, and the delivery of stone is very satisfactory. The stone is brought from the government quarries and an adjoining new quarry, 20 miles up the Coos river, and about 500 tons, in fine, large blocks, some weighing eight tons, is delivered daily. It is impracticable to deposit the stone on the jetty directly from the barges, on account of the constant swell, so it is carried out on the tramway on trains of five cars at a time, and dumped, and thus the enrockment proceeds rapidly.

A visit was made to the upper bay, where a number of beacons have been placed to mark the channel. They have proved a great convenience to navigators, as now vessels have no trouble in getting out on a single tide, while formerly it used to take two tides. The people are much pleased with these aids to navigation, which have materially increased the shipments of coal.

Captain Harts then proceeded to the Coquille, where he found that the contractor for the extension of the jetty had made a fine start on the job, the tramway having been extended 100 feet, or about one-third of the distance contracted for, and the jetty being partially enrocked for that distance. The channel at the mouth of the Coquille is better than it has been for a long time, there being 10 feet depth of water, which is three feet more than is called for.

There is a very large business being done in shipping lumber, from just above Bandon. Captain Harts will send a dredge over to the Coquille in April, to remove a very awkward rock, which is an obstruction to the entrance of the river, after which she will go to the upper river, to remove some snags and deepen the channel on some bars, which obstruct navigation there.

From Coquille Captain Harts proceeded to Port Orford, where he had not been before, as he wished to see the place and the port, in case he may be called upon to make a report in regard to it. He found a pretty little village situated on a beautiful and picturesque bay, and says the scenery there reminded him more of the Mediterranean than any place he has before visited on the coast. He returned home by stage across the Coast range to Drain, and found the road in very bad condition, worse than he had ever before seen it. They had one breakdown and a narrow escape from going over a grade, and were from 4:30 A. M. till 9:30 P. M. in making the trip of 36 miles, which is at the rate of about two miles per hour. As to his preference for stage or steamer travel, Captain Harts is of opinion that whichever way a man went he would wish that he had gone the other.

ANGLO-BOER WAR.

American History as a Source of Anti-British Feeling.

PORTLAND, Jan. 31.—(To the Editor.)—Many persons are saying a few words—some are saying a great deal—on both sides of the question in the matter of the position Americans should take in the South African war, and if you can spare space I would be glad to express my views on this subject.

In the first place, this war would probably not have been so earnestly discussed in this country, had it not been for the attitude of our high officials and that of many papers published in the United States. The fact that we speak what is called the English language needs have no influence on our sentiment, for while we were at war with England ourselves we spoke this same language. Then, again, all Americans are not descendants of English people, even if they do speak the tongue, and none in this country have any reason to feel they owe sympathy or allegiance to Great Britain because of our language.

Do we owe England sympathy or allegiance because of the fact that she is a large buyer of our products? I think not. England buys our products because she has use for them and needs them—not because of any maudlin sentiment or brotherly love.

It has been said, in clippings printed in The Oregonian, that we should support England in this war because we need her to help us hold the Philippines against the powers interested in Asia; also, that if England fails in this war, we will be at the mercy of European powers, who, it is alleged, are planning the partition of South America in a way something similar to the operations in China. Now, as to the first assertion, I believe that if the United States has any territory which it cannot hold without the assistance of Great Britain or any other foreign power, the best thing we can do is to get rid of such territory. In regard to the other argument, that we need the success of England in order to keep other greedy European nations from violating the Monroe doctrine, it may be said that we have struggled along pretty well for over a century now without any outside assistance. And it may not be out of place to add that an American president, about four years ago, found it necessary to notify England that the Monroe doctrine "went." Right after our rebellion, France was put out of Mexico, and it may be remembered that at that time England was not our best friend. Still we were able to take care of ourselves—and I believe we always will be, notwithstanding there are some in the land who seem to think we are still an English colony.

The United States fought two wars with Great Britain. We need not argue why we came to blows. The record the British made in the methods of carrying on her wars in this country are matters of history, and do not shine with particular splendor. The war of 1812 was forced upon the United States by England for the purpose of regaining her lost colonies. The case looks nearly parallel to England's conduct in the preliminaries to the present war. In 1812 she forced the United States to declare war, and in a similar way she forced the Transvaal to open hostilities—and for about the same reason. And the Boers are doing about as well as the Americans did.

It is claimed we should support England because she was our friend in the Spanish war. The fact that she upheld us in a worthy cause is no reason that we should be bound to support her in everything she may undertake—especially when she attempts to repeat the history of her wars against us.

It is a fact—and all Americans know it who have studied history or who have attended our public schools—that the United States does not exist by the sufferance of Great Britain, but in spite of her. It is another fact that our citizens are not all English descendants, and that one citizen—if he is a law-abiding, good, honest man—is as good as another. And it is quite possible there are more citizens of the United States who are not English-born than there are English-American citizens; and it is just as well not to consider too lightly the sentiment of the citizens of this country who hail from other countries besides England. Besides, there are American-born Americans (and it is possible there are millions of them) who, from their school training in the history of the United States, have no love for Great Britain, and their sentiment is certainly with the people of South Africa—not because they are Dutch, either—and they cannot be blinded by this talk of the "promotion of civilization" by the English.

It is claimed that the Boers are uncouth, slow, unprogressive, and, in fact, barbarous and uncivilized. Why? Because they have no large cities? Then to be a farmer must be a crime against civilization. Is it because the Boer doesn't speak the English language? There are other languages. Is it because he is a heathen? He is reputed to be a good Christian. Perhaps it is—yes, it must be—because his clothes don't fit him; he probably doesn't copy his style from the Prince of Wales.

I believe the large majority of our people are against Great Britain in this war, and I believe they are more in earnest in their opposition because of the effort of the press to make it appear otherwise.

H. WAGNER.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

An Equation of Right and Wrong to Baffle the Most Astute Casuist.

PORTLAND, Jan. 31.—(To the Editor.)—A question involving the immolation of a nation could not fail to elicit world-wide interest and criticism. The Transvaal and Natal are today the amphitheater round which the nations gather, awaiting the signal, "Habet!" from the victor's lips. And it is a certainty that the thumbs will be turned down when the victim lies prostrate. The merits of the case have been exhaustively discussed, and it is not my purpose to dwell upon them. The passion-distorted features of the writers gleam through every line that has been offered for publication. I have read the fustian of one whose emotional prejudice led him to quote such phrenetic rhapsody as Cowper, the insane hymnist, effused in one of his wildest deliriums. This in lieu of logic. I have perused with some amusement the fulmination of the "flat crank" who found in this terrible clash of nations a pretext for venting his favorite hobby; and I have viewed with sympathy the efforts of the partisan religionist who saw Jehovah perched like a victory on the banner of his principal and the devil poised like an ominous cloud upon that of the other combatant. Lastly, I have decided to view the question as one presenting those perplexing points of logic, to which Kant has given the name of "antinomies." It is a case wherein Ahriman and Ormusd assume protean aspects of good or evil—an equation of right and wrong which baffles the most astute casuist.

Anent the controversy itself, therefore, I have nothing to offer, but there is apparent a phase of the criticisms which cannot but be viewed by reasonable observers as an epiphany of the moral callousness of this civilization and era, the atavism of the soul, which history teaches us has ever signaled the approach of great social convulsions and dissolutions. I allude to the materialistic tone of press and public. There is a passage in the conclusion of Darwin's "Origin of Species" which might have been taken as a text by all those commentators. It reads: "From the war of nature, from famine and death, the most exalted object which we are capable of conceiving, namely, the production of the higher animals, directly follows."

Were all men of the mental capacity of Darwin and Spencer, this had been excellent pabulum for the masses. The world would have been uplifted by such teaching and broadened. But as men cannot be made to think deeply by mere precept, this passage, which in the mouth of Darwin was a divine message, when formed by unworthy lips becomes "Procuress to the Lords of Hell."

In their mad search for the "soul of good in things evil," the rabble, little skilled in that fine acumen which betokens the philosopher, confound the sense of this theorem and use it as a weapon to degrade the human race and defeat the purpose of its great enunciator. Evolution, in the mind of a primitive thinker, becomes blatant, unblushing atheism, and there is nothing more hideous in nature than the "Blastoderm" who diuternally vaunts his noxious principles in defense of all the brutalizing tendencies of human nature, in the guise of "natural selection." This is applicable to nations. We talk glibly of the advance of civilization, the "survival of the fittest" (than which no more damnable phrase was ever coined), and of "manifest destiny," yet we blind ourselves to the fact that the moral concept of a great people, committed in restraint of a vicious tendency, is the voice of God.

I am not pessimistic enough, however, to concede that such hideous spectacles as the French revolution, the Napoleonic wars, the "Great Rebellion" or the present South African slaughter, are necessary to the reform of abuses. Some Diogenes will cite the facts as they live in history to confute any argument I might put forth in support of my belief, and as usual the mob will applaud his jeu d'esprit and cry as of old, "Not this man, but Barabbas!" for such is the perversity of humanity. Therefore, I will let the question rest with mere predication of my faith in the ultimate triumph of good.

Today, two great hosts are contending in South Africa for possession of the soil. The victor is destined to drink the "wine of Thrasymene" when the strife is concluded, for men are being mangled, slaughtered and broken in mind and body by thousands. It is probable that a few weeks will have seen this swelled to tens of thousands. In England, Ireland, Scotland, Canada and Australia there have been tears and breaking hearts and homes blighted and ruined. Land is being laid waste, towns and cities desolated, great works of engineering skill, the mighty fruits of human energy and intelligence, destroyed. The minds of men are being inflamed with the lust of war. Their nostrils have caught the odor of human blood and God alone knows where the end lieth. And this is being condoned in the holy names of liberty and civilization. The deeper portent that hints of crashing empires and of tottering thrones is lost in the dulciloquy of idle phrases that bespeak the moral inaptitude of their authors.

Let us, as a people, "pause to pray," for though we be but atheists, we shall, at least, draw from the elements, as it were, a certain calmness of mind that will give our maddling brains an interval in which to regain their moral equilibrium.

C. LEOVERT SEYES.

TO CURE A COLD IN ONE DAY.

Take Laxative Bromo Quinine Tablets. All druggists refund the money if it fails to cure. E. W. Grove's signature is on each box. 25c.

NO PAIN! NO GAS!

NEW YORK DENTAL PARLORS

No charge for painless extraction when teeth are ordered. All work done by graduate dentists of 12 to 20 years' experience; a specialist in each department. We will tell you in advance exactly what your work will cost by a free examination. Give us a call, and you will find we do exactly as we advertise.

Set of Teeth.....$5.00
Gold Filling.....$1.00
Gold Crown.....$5.00
Silver Filling.....50

NO PLATES REQUIRED

All work examined by professional manager, Dr. J. S. Walter, registered dentist.

New York Dental Parlors

N. E. Cor. Fourth and Morrison Streets

Lady always in attendance.
Hours, 8 to 8. Sundays, 10 to 4.

STRIKE!

Hundreds of Thousands Are Involved.

Trouble in an Important Part of the Organization Affects All the Rest—A Perfectly Harmonious System Easily Thrown Out of Order.

Organized labor has reached such a stage that anything affecting a particular branch of it draws all the rest into the difficulty.

It is exactly the same way with the different organs of the human body. Work too hard, eat too much, drink too much, exercise but little, be a little irregular in any way, and the liver quits work.

Then the bowels became constipated and the stomach goes on strike. The heart is affected, the brain follows suit, and every part in the body is dragged into the trouble.

The only way out of it is to go at the source of all this—the liver. Square yourself with the liver and all will get back to regular natural work.

Cascarets Candy Cathartic make things right with the liver. They perfume the breath, prevent food from souring on the stomach, give tone to the bowels, strengthen the intestinal muscles, while they are cleaning and stirring up the liver to renewed activity.

No matter how long a case has been incurable, Cascarets are guaranteed to put things right as they should be, and set the whole machinery a-going. And you can get them at any drug store or by mail for price—10c, 25c, or 50c. Address Sterling Remedy Co., Chicago or New York.

CCC

This is the CASCARET tablet. Every tablet of the only genuine Cascarets bears the magic letters "CCC." Look at the tablet before you buy, and beware of frauds, imitations and substitutes.

Ely's Cream Balm has completely cured me of catarrh when everything else failed. Many acquaintances have used it with excellent results.—Alfred W. Stevens, Caldwell, Ohio.

Cream Balm is placed into the nostrils, spreads over the membrane and is absorbed. Relief is immediate and a cure follows. It is not drying—does not produce sneezing. Large Size, 50 cents at Druggists' or by mail; Trial Size, 10 cents by mail.
ELY BROTHERS, 56 Warren Street, New York.

WRIGHT'S INDIAN VEGETABLE PILLS

Are acknowledge by thousands of persons who have used them for over forty years to cure a SICK HEADACHE, DIZZINESS, CONSTIPATION, Torpid Liver, Weak Stomach, Pimples, and purify the blood.

THE PALATIAL

OREGONIAN BUILDING

Not a dark office in the building; absolutely fireproof; electric light and artesian water; perfect sanitation and thorough ventilation. Elevators run day and night.

ANDERSON, GUSTAV, Attorney-at-Law
ASSOCIATED PRESS; K. L. Powell, Mgr
BANKERS' LIFE ASSOCIATION, of Des Moines, Ia.; C. A. McCargar, State Agent
BEHNKE, H. W., Pres. Pernin Shorthand School
BENJAMIN, R. W., Dentist
BINSWANGER, DR. G. S., Phys. & Sur. 411-
BRUERE, DR. G. E., Physician 412-413
BUSTEED, RICHARD, Agent Wilson & McCallay Tobacco Co.
CAUKIN, G. E., District Agent Travelers Insurance Co.
CARDWELL, DR. J. B.
CLARK, HAROLD, Dentist
CLEM, E. A. & CO., Mining Properties 315-
COLUMBIA TELEPHONE COMPANY 604-605-606-607-612-614-
CORNELIUS, C. W., Phys. and Surgeon
COVER, P. C., Cashier Equitable Life
COLLIER, P. F., Publisher; S. P. McGuire, Manager 415-
DAY, J. G. & I. N.
DAVIS, NAPOLEON, President Columbia Telephone Co.
DICKSON, DR. J. F., Physician 713-
DRAKE, DR. H. B., Physician 512-513-
DUNHAM, MRS. GEO. A.
DWYER, JAS. F., Tobacconist
EDITORIAL ROOMS Eighth
EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY; L. Samuel, Manager; F. C. Cover, Cashier
EVENING TELEGRAM 128 Alder
FALLOWS, MRS. M. A., Manager Women's Dept. Mutual Reserve Fund Life, of New York
FENTON, J. D., Physician and Surgeon 509-
FENTON, DR. HICKS C., Eye and Ear
FENTON, MATTHEW F., Dentist
FIDELITY MUTUAL LIFE ASS'N; E. C. Stark, Manager
FRENCH SCHOOL (by conversation); Dr. A. Mazzarelli, Manager
GALVANI, W. H., Engineer and Draughtsman
GEARY, DR. EDWARD P., Physician and Surgeon 212
GIESY, A. J., Physician and Surgeon 715
GODDARD, E. C. & CO., Footwear, ground floor 129 Sixth
GOLDMAN, WILLIAM, Manager Manhattan Life Insurance Co., of New York 203
GRANT, FRANK E., Attorney-at-Law
GRENIER, MISS BEATRICE, Dentist
HAMMOND, A. B.
HEIDINGER, GEO. A. & CO., Pianos and Organs 131 Sixth
HOLLISTER, DR. O. C., Phys. & Surg. 504-
IDLEMAN, C. M., Attorney-at-Law 416-1
KADY, MARK T., Manager Pacific Northwest Mutual Reserve Fund Life Assn. 604
LAMONT, JOHN, Vice-President and General Manager Columbia Telephone Co.
LITTLEFIELD, H. R., Phys. and Surgeon
MACHUM, W. S., Sec. Oregon Camera Club
MACKAY, DR. A. E., Phys. and Surg. 711-
MAXWELL, DR. W. E., Phys. & Surg. 501
McCARGAR, C. A., State Agent Bankers' Life Association 502
McCOY, NEWTON, Attorney-at-Law
McFADEN, MISS IDA E., Stenographer
McGINN, HENRY E., Attorney-at-Law 311
McKELL, T. J., Manufacturers' Representative
MILLER, DR. HERBERT C., Dentist and Oral Surgeon 605
MOSMAN, DR. E. P., Dentist 512-513
MANHATTAN LIFE INSURANCE CO., of New York; W. Goldman, Manager 203
McELROY, DR. J. G., Phys. & Surg. 701-702
McFARLAND, E. B., Secretary Columbia Telephone Co.
McGUIRE, S. P., Manager P. F. Collier, Publisher 415
McKIM, MAURICE, Attorney-at-Law
MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO., of New York; Wm. S. Pond, State Mgr. 404-405
MUTUAL RESERVE FUND LIFE ASS'N; M. T. Kady, Mgr. Pacific Northwest 604
NICHOLAS, HORACE G., Attorney-at-Law
NILES, M. L., Cashier Manhattan Life Insurance Co., of New York
OREGON INFIRMARY OF OSTEOPATHY; Dr. L. B. Smith, Osteopath 408
OREGON CAMERA CLUB 214-215-216
PERNIN SHORTHAND SCHOOL; H. W. Behnke, Prin.
POND, WM. S., State Manager Mutual Life Ins. Co. of New York 404-405
PORTLAND EYE AND EAR INFIRMARY, Ground floor, 133 Sixth
PORTLAND PRESS CLUB
PROTZMAN, EUGENE C., Superintendent Agencies Mutual Reserve Fund Life, of New York
PUTNAM'S SONS, G. P., Publishers
QUIMBY, L. P. W., Game and Forestry Warden 716
REED & MALCOLM, Opticians, 132 Sixth
REED, F. C., Fish Commissioner
RYAN, J. B., Attorney-at-Law
SALISBURY, GEO. N., Section Director U. S. Weather Bureau
SAMUEL, L., Manager Equitable Life
SANFORD, A. C. & CO., Publishers' Agts.
SCRIBNER'S SONS, CHAS., Publishers; Jesse Hobson, Manager 515-516
SHERWOOD, J. W., Deputy Supreme Commander, K. O. T. M.
SMITH, DR. I. B., Osteopath 408
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
STARK, E. C., Executive Special, Fidelity Mutual Life Association of Phila., Pa.
STARR & COLE, Photography
STEEL, G. A., Forest Inspector
STUART, DELL, Attorney-at-Law 615-616
STOLTZ, DR. CHAS. E., Dentist
SURGEON OF THE S. P. RY. AND N. P. TERMINAL CO.
STROWBRIDGE, THOS. H., Executive Special Agent Mutual Life, of New York
SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE
TUCKER, DR. GEO. F., Dentist 411
U. S. WEATHER BUREAU 506-507-508
U. S. LIGHTHOUSE ENGINEERS, 17TH DIST., Captain W. C. Langfitt, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.
U. S. ENGINEER OFFICE, RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, Captain W. C. Langfitt, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.
WALKER, WILL H., President Oregon Camera Club 214-215-216
WATERMAN, C. H., Cash