The Oregonian

PORTLAND, OREGON.

Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-Class Matter.
Subscription Rates—Invariably in Advance.

(BY MAIL.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months	4.25
Daily, Sunday included, three months	2.25
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75
Daily, without Sunday, one year	6.00
Daily, without Sunday, six months	3.25
Daily, without Sunday, three months	1.75
Daily, without Sunday, one month	.60
Weekly, one year	1.50
Sunday, one year	2.50
Sunday and Weekly, one year	3.50

(BY CARRIER.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	9.00
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75

How to Remit—Send Postoffice money order, express order or personal check on your local bank. Stamps, coin or currency are at the sender's risk. Give postoffice address in full, including county and state.

Postage Rates—10 to 14 pages, 1 cent; 16 to 28 pages, 2 cents; 30 to 40 pages, 3 cents; 40 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage, double rate.

Eastern Business Offices—Verre & Conklin—New York, Brunswick building. Chicago, Steger building.

San Francisco Office—R. J. Bidwell Co., 742 Market street.

European Office—No. 3 Regent street, S. W., London.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, OCT. 5, 1912.

JUDGE GATENS ON VICE.

Judge Gatens speaks from a wide experience upon the subject of youthful delinquency and "the social evil." As judge of the Juvenile Court he has been confronted with these and kindred evils in their most shocking forms. It is impossible that a man of his intelligence should not have reflected upon them deeply and the hearty applause which greeted his remarks at the Progressive Business Men's Club on Thursday was as much a tribute to the gravity of his thought as to the soundness of his convictions. We must all agree with him that modern society is suffering from a deadly disease growing out of misdirected sex feeling and that the only cure for it must be sought in the home.

"The fault lies primarily among ourselves, in our homes," said Judge Gatens, "and the remedy must come from the fathers and mothers of the community." This is so obviously true that it admits of no comment. Were every home what it should be no lost women would haunt the streets and no contaminated young men would disseminate the poison they have acquired by vice among innocent wives and children. What change shall be made in the rules of the home in order to end this frightful tragedy? Judge Gatens advises "stricter regulation of our boys and girls." He told the Progressive Business Men that he was in favor of the old-fashioned mother, the kind that maintained absolute control over her young. "Some people tell me," he continued, "that they rule their children with love. Love! Rot! Take a club."

It is needless to remind the reader that the "club" has already been tried without any particularly encouraging results. Many social students believe that the laxity of this generation is the inevitable reaction from the severe restrictions of our predecessors. No doubt there are instances where "a good, sound flogging" has proved to be the moral salvation of a boy or even a girl, but we can hardly hope, as a general practice, to flog virtue into our young people. The "club" indiscriminately applied is far more likely to cultivate a crop of revolt and hatred.

Experience does not warrant any expectation that the morals of the world can be materially bettered by brute force. Watchfulness over the goings and comings of the young, "stricter regulation," as Judge Gatens puts it, is a more promising expedient, and yet it cannot be overlooked that this has been fully tried out, too, without solving the problem. France educates her girls in convents under eyes whose vigilance never sleeps and the law of that country makes parental authority absolute in many directions. But for all that the "social evil" in France is as virulent as in the United States. Vigilance and "the club" must play a part in the solution, very likely, but by themselves they will not suffice. Thus much experience infallibly teaches and what other guide have we?

In our opinion Judge Gatens speaks somewhat too disparagingly of "love" as a factor in the prevention and cure of bad habits. We dare say he has been justly exasperated by the slushy twaddle of sentimentalists who do not know the difference between love and foolish indulgence. Love, in spite of all the idiots who misuse the word, lies at the root of justice and without justice the young cannot be redeemed, as Judge Gatens himself well knows. But there is reason to believe that clear, unabashed knowledge is as badly needed as anything else in this fearful business.

The prudery which has tried to keep the young ignorant of the laws of life has delivered them over to destruction. The knowledge which their parents would not impart they have acquired from vile companions. Facts which in themselves are innocent come tinged with wickedness from wicked lips. American "purity" has actually made Heaven's highest law a thing of shame. The great miracle of nature, the transmission of life, must only be mentioned in evil dens with obscene comment. With the intelligence of a whole Nation thus fundamentally perverted, is it any wonder that passion runs to sin? From the time he begins to understand language everybody assures the child that passion is sin and the organs connected with it are shameful, if not wicked. He cannot escape the onset of nature's imperious will, and, ignorant of the nobility of her purpose, he sinks into disease and filth.

Never was light more needed than upon this subject of the transmission of life. Many will sin against the light, of course, and for them other measures, even harsh ones, may be needed, but first of all every child should be taught the truth about his body and the consequences of abusing it. After that has been thoroughly done, perhaps we shall find the club still useful, but without the light of knowledge it will surely fail. There is no good reason why society should give up trying to solve the social problem and lapse back in despair to "the restricted district." There is something incongruous in preaching Christianity in the churches while at the same time we complacently dwell beside a tophet which jeeringly proclaims Christianity a failure.

If water transportation is valuable as a regulator when we simply have a navigable channel and water terminals without any steamers to churn the waters or to tie up at the wharves, it is many times as valuable when steamers ply the waters and use the wharves in constant, active competition with railroads. An oft-repeated but never-executed threat of water competition gradually loses its force until it provokes only a smile on the face of a railroad man. When carried into practice, it spurs the railroad man to meet an actual, present danger to his business. If the railroad is prompted to make concessions by a mere threat, it will make still greater concessions when action replaces the threat.

THE CALIFORNIA WAY.

California fortunately has the recall, judicial and otherwise, and the Supreme Court may be ejected by the offended Bull Moosers. The Roosevelt faction won a tainted legal victory in its battle over the electoral ticket, but the Supreme Court had the unspeakably bad taste to say that the primary law is a "very bad law" and to admit that by its decision it had virtually disfranchised a third of the citizens of the state. An admitted wrong committed under the forms of law and in the name of justice makes it not the less intolerable.

The California ballot will have a Roosevelt ticket under the label "Republican" and there will be no electors for Mr. Taft. The virtuous Johnson and the impeccable Heney and their blind followers who went to Chicago and made the welkin ring with their furious denunciation of the wrongs California suffered there, have got even by disfranchising a hundred thousand voters at home. They have usurped the name and place of the Republican electors on the ballot, and for the purpose of perpetrating this gross infamy they are willing to masquerade as Republicans, though they have proclaimed everywhere their independence of the Republican party and have set out to wreck it.

What sympathy can the California Bull Moosers expect for the injustice they say they endured at Chicago in face of the vastly greater injustice and oppression they impose in California?

WISE CUSTOM.

The most pertinent comment to be made upon the persuasive communication of Mr. Peddicord may be found in the following words of Theodore Roosevelt:

> The wise custom which limits the President to two terms regards the substance and not the form, and under no circumstances will I be a candidate for or accept another nomination.

One may quibble and evade, twist and double twist all he pleases over the exact meaning of these plain words, but there is no ambiguity about them and there is no uncertainty about what Colonel Roosevelt intended they should mean.

The Oregonian said that the no-third-term precedent is a sound principle of our unwritten law. Mr. Roosevelt himself says it is a "wise custom." It is not a formal precept of any written constitution. It is a traditional sentiment, imbedded in the minds and consciousness of the American people, and based on a certain knowledge of the fallibility of human nature and human institutions and on the disastrous lessons of all human experience. If it were merely a constitutional inhibition, it might be changed in these days of facile law-making. But being a safe and sound rule of National conduct, it cannot with impunity be modified or disobeyed.

We would remind Mr. Peddicord that the country refused General Grant a third term, notwithstanding the eloquent appeal of his friend, Senator Conkling; and we think the people now regard it as an eminently wise decision. Why make Roosevelt the Great Exception? The government that cannot get along without the services of any man is in a bad way.

ROOSEVELT ON CAMPAIGN FUNDS.

The difficulty Colonel Roosevelt encountered and failed to overcome in testifying before the Clapp committee was in showing that eight years ago he was awake to what the public now considers bold improprieties in accumulating campaign funds and then looked upon with lightly expressed resentment.

Public sentiment against admitted or implied political obligation to concentrated capital has grown and spread in the eight years. It has seemed a popular key at which to pitch the political bugle. So the Progressive party candidate has sounded it from Atlantic to Pacific. Colonel Roosevelt individually has given unmeasurable impetus to resentment against trust dictation of National policies. That his own campaign eight years back received aid from the large corporations calls for more adroit explanation than if it had been disclosed in that of any other candidate.

That Colonel Roosevelt asked no man to contribute, made no promise as a return for any contribution and had never been asked, "by anyone having authority," to guide his course in a particular way because any contribution had been made, may be given ready credence. He has put a qualification in his leading answer sufficient even to cover the representations of Morgan's friendliness made to him when he licensed the absorption of the Tennessee Iron by the Steel Trust.

But does the statement wholly cover the case? Has it ever been customary for a President or a National committee to make specific promises in return for financial aid? Is there not an implied agreement in the acceptance of large sums from men whose fortunes may be marred or enhanced by the National policy? Did the tariff-protected interests or the immunized monopolies never contribute to Presidential campaigns prior to 1904 without specific promise and profit thereby? Would Mr. Morgan, Mr. Archbold or Mr. Harriman put vast sums into the committee treasury because of mere philanthropic desire that the people might hear the eloquence of campaign orators?

It may be profitable, moreover, to contrast the deeds of the Roosevelt administration with what was said or left unsaid when the corporations contributed to his 1904 campaign. Did Roosevelt ever cause the criminal prosecution of any individual offender against the Sherman law? Did he not forbid the prosecution of the Harvester trust? Did he not give the Morgan interests a practical monopoly of the steel business by permitting the Steel trust to absorb its chief competitor? Did not unlawful business combinations increase from 149 in number to 10,020 during his administration? Did he not decline to prosecute E. H. Harriman on a charge of looting the Alton railroad? Did he ever recommend downward revision of the tariff?

In Oregon we have gained the impression, apparently, that a corporation is a hard-headed, money-grubbing concern, without a spark of sentiment or patriotism. We have made it unlawful for a corporation to aid with money—even money spent otherwise lawfully—the fortunes of any candidate for office or nomination. A potent recommendation for the direct primary is the freedom of its candidates from the implied obligation that rests upon those chosen by corporation-controlled conventions. The same argument is now a favorite with advocates of the Presidential primary. The aim in giving the people greater political power, if this argument is sincere, is as much to rid public officers of implied obligations as it is to make specific compacts of corrupt character impossible.

But Colonel Roosevelt, while indorsing the Presidential primary—nay, demanding it—gives us to understand that even the money of trusts may be accepted with propriety under certain conditions. Notification to one's committee that no promises, express or implied, are to be made as to receipt of funds absolves the candidate. Contributions ought to be returned if the donor asks for something in return. Money ought not to be accepted from a trust under inquisitorial fire. These are the set rules we might frame from the Colonel's testimony. But we also must infer therefrom that a contribution silently offered and mutely accepted calls for no return and that he he who expects it is a crook or a fool.

These ideas ought to cause a revision of plans among those who are now looking forward to everlasting fame as authors of National corrupt practices acts and Presidential preference laws.

PERILS OF LAUGHTER.

If there is any lesson to be drawn from Wilma Wade's experience it would seem to be that laughter is dangerous. While she was indulging in a hearty outburst the other day she sucked a safety pin down into her bronchial tubes. The surgeons succeeded in removing it, fortunately, but the operation required apparatus with terrific names and an amount of deftness which it appals one to try to conceive it. If Miss Wade had been taught not to laugh, but only to smile, she never would have found herself in this perilous dilemma.

Preceptresses of young ladies' boarding schools are agreed upon the precept that laughter is vulgar. They permit nothing more strenuous than a smile and even that must be managed with infinite discretion. It should be worked upon cautiously by enunciating "Papa, potatoes, prunes, prisms, peonies" slowly and softly. By this process the lips are elegantly persuaded to assume the aspect of a ladylike smile.

Laughter is not only unlady-like, but it is cruel. At any rate its origin is cruel. Philosophers are a unit in telling us that it began in racial history with that stretch of the lips and show of teeth which a warrior exhibits when he smites a foe. If the foe falls the warrior emits a brutal cackle in harmony with the expression of his features. We are most inclined to laugh when we witness the misfortunes of our neighbors. A fat man who slips on a banana peel causes laughter in all the bystanders. The loss of a stovepipe hat in a gust of wind invariably brings forth guffaws. We never laugh at a humorous story because humor is pervaded with the milk of human kindness, but a witty anecdote, particularly if the wit is bold and obvious, makes one crow like chanticleer.

BALKAN WAR CLOUDS.

The threatened war of the four small states which surround Turkey in Europe against the Ottoman Empire is more important because of its possible than because of its immediate consequences. Should Bulgaria, Servia, Greece and Montenegro combine in an attack on Turkey and should they succeed in their announced purpose of liberating Macedonia from Turkish rule, a quarrel among themselves for the conquered territory would almost certainly ensue; but even more momentous would be the attitude of the great powers.

Austria long has had a covetous eye on Macedonia, her ambition being to secure an outlet to the sea at Salonica. Russia desires Constantinople with control of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus and the consequent ability to send her navy from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean without restraint from other powers. Great Britain is traditionally opposed to the realization of the Russian ambition and, in case of a decisive move on Russia's part, would find her newly formed bond of friendship with the Muscovite severely strained. Germany has acquired great influence at Constantinople, which she has used to secure concessions for German investors in the Turkish Empire, and has shown her gratitude by diplomatic endeavors to ward off danger from the Sublime Porte, so far as this can be done without offense to Austria and Italy. France is particularly interested in averting a crisis, lest she be forced to take sides in a quarrel between her two allies, England and Russia, and thus to lose the friendship of one or the other. Italy, being at war with Turkey, may be expected to take advantage of that country's new troubles to raise the price of peace, but she will not welcome a struggle wherein others would share with her the spoils of war.

So well aware are all the powers of the probability that any seizure of Turkish territory by another power would embroil all Europe in war that they may be trusted to exert themselves to the utmost to avert a crisis. Russia and Austria, having most definite designs on Turkish territory, may prove to be exceptions. While ostensibly joining the other powers in efforts to preserve the peace, they may be secretly intriguing to grab the plunder just when the Balkan allies have it in their grasp, in case the four little states should prove victorious. Austria, fearing that the aggrandizement of Servia would block her outlet to the Aegean, is credited with a purpose to occupy that kingdom and to prevent its participation in the war. Her alliance with Italy may prevent her making such a move until Italy and Turkey have ended the Tripolitan war, and, if she should make the move, she would exact compensation in the shape of a slice of territory which would advance her ambition another step towards its goal. Russia may be behind Bulgaria, ready to seize Constantinople in case Turkish armies should be defeated.

As usual, Turkey will play for another lease of life by skilfully exciting the mutual jealousies of her enemies. Opportunity to do this exists no less among the Balkan states than among the great powers. She may first make the best terms possible with Italy in order that the sea may be open for the transporting of troops from Asia and Africa and that she may be able to withdraw her forces from Tripoli. Turkey's total war strength is stated to be 725,000 men, against 350,000 for Bulgaria, 175,000 for Servia, 50,000 for Greece and 36,000 for Montenegro, a total for the allies of 611,000. To these must be added the revolted Albanian tribes, which are no mean fighters, as the Turks have once more been reminded recently. Turkey has the advantage of numbers and of splendid fighting blood, fired by religious zeal, but many of her troops must be gathered from remote provinces. The allies have all their forces close to the scene of hostilities and can close in on the Turks from north, south and west.

A power which will fight for Turkey is the conflicting claims of the allies to any territory they may conquer, which will inevitably breed discord before war has long continued. Servia dreams of restoration of the Servian empire as it was ruled by Stephen Dushan in the middle ages, extending from the Danube to the Aegean Sea and from the Black to the Adriatic Sea. Bulgaria hopes to found an empire covering the same territory. Greece dreams of a restored Greek empire, which would add all the territory south of the Balkan Mountains, including Constantinople and the Aegean archipelago, to the present kingdom. Montenegro pines to expand from her sterile mountains over the rich neighboring valley.

When the allies nourish such irreconcilable ambitions, victory over the Turks would almost inevitably be the signal for war among themselves, which would reach a climax in the seizure of the spoils of war by Austria or Russia, or both of those powers, as the monkey devoured the cheese when called upon to divide it between the quarreling mice.

TRUSTS AND LABOR UNIONS.

Louis D. Brandeis, of Boston, gives his support to Wilson principally because he holds the Democratic candidate's policy with regard to the trusts to mean "justice with liberty," while he holds Roosevelt's policy to be an effort "to get justice without liberty." His objection to the Roosevelt policy of regulated monopoly is based chiefly on the hostility of the trusts to labor unions and he cites the easy triumph of the steel trust over the unions as proof that legalized trusts would crush the unions. In an address before the Massachusetts branch of the American Federation of Labor, Brandeis said that "until the Federal Constitution is so amended neither Congress nor the interstate trade commission can prevent their discharging employes for joining trade unions." He continued:

> It seems to me very unwise, particularly for labor, to surrender industrial liberty and to rely wholly upon legislation and a commission. Legislation and commissions—like God—help only "him who helps himself"; and a social programme which accepts these things as a substitute for industrial liberty, instead of using them as means of securing industrial liberty, is fundamentally unsound. You know perfectly well that no legislation, even when sustained by the court—and no commission, though able and honest—will effectually protect labor, unless the workingmen and public opinion are behind them.

A trust is in a much better position to overpower the unions than is an individual manufacturer, for it can close union mills and transfer work to non-union mills until the strikers are starved into submission. The steel trust won its victory over the unions in this manner and has established a pension system which Mr. Brandeis describes as a form of peonage, since the pension is the reward of twenty years' uninterrupted service and would be forfeited by striking.

Driven to make a reluctant statement of contributions to Roosevelt's pre-convention campaign, Senator Dixon says:

> Outside of the money contributed by local leaders in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Massachusetts for the primary campaign in these four states, the entire pre-convention campaign cost less than $160,000. I think $155,000 would be a better figure.

This is a parallel to the case of a man who, when asked how much he spent yearly on clothes, should say: "Outside of what I paid for my suits, hats, shoes, shirts and underwear, I spent so much." Omitting Ohio omits Dan Hanna; omitting Pennsylvania leaves out Flinn and the $5 a head he distributed in Pittsburg; by excluding Illinois he excludes what was given by McCormick, and so on through a long list of wealthy "angels" of the Progressive party. Then Dixon caps the climax of his shallow attempt at deception by saying:

> We didn't get a single dollar for this fund from any corporation; all contributions were from individuals.

Of course, they didn't. But they got money from the individuals who control corporations. Such a statement is an insult to the intelligence of the people to whom it is made.

A. H. Lea, who failed to secure the Republican nomination for State Dairy Commissioner, but whose name was written enough times on Democratic ballots to make him the choice of that party, has heeded the call. In the meantime, J. D. Mickle, the Republican nominee, is announcing a sale of his blood cows and other animals and farm paraphernalia in Washington County, preliminary to removal to Salem, and the political skies seem to make him a good forecaster.

Chicago has a new magazine of poetry whose life is fairly certain to last five years, since it has been endowed for that period. What may happen to it later is pure, though not difficult, conjecture. Americans do not love poetry well enough to support a magazine which publishes nothing else. The editor, Harriet Monroe, herself wooes the muses with some skill, and it is her ambition to attach the best American poets to her roll of contributors.

The effort of the Consumers' League to establish a minimum wage scale of $9 a week for women is meritorious, but will fail just as long as the ranks of workers are crowded by young women who are not obliged to labor, but do so that they may spend more money on dress.

Demolition of four Pullman cars and loss of life in that Connecticut wreck dislodge long belief in the safety of the end of the train.

Production of clover seed is a great source of profit, but many a farmer cheats the soil by burning the threshed hay.

A half-holiday can well be spent today at the Multnomah County Fair, which should not be slighted because it is outside the city limits.

The powers and their money lenders will let the trouble rage in the Balkans just long enough to produce more securities.

The dog without his muzzle looks askance at the man with the straw hat.

DANGERS SEEN IN SINGLE TAX

Mr. Lowell Points Out Damage That Oregon Would Reap.

PENDLETON, Or., Oct. 3.—(To the Editor.)—May I venture a few suggestions upon the single tax menace which confronts the commonwealth at this time? The atmosphere is charged with theories, some of them born of the vision of Henry George and some of them of the gold of Joseph Fels. But there are a few hard facts grounded on experience which ought to control both thought and vote upon a question like this.

First—Every single tax apostle admits that the process of education toward his ideal is a slow one. It ought, then, to be remembered that Oregon is still a state of magnificent proportions and of few people. We are inviting settlers from all portions of the world, urging men and women to come here to establish homes and assist in the state's development. We have less than 1,000,000 people within our borders and can easily support 20,000,000. Assuredly, the adoption of the single tax will not serve to swell the population here, for whether sentiment is correct or not, the fact remains that most men look upon the single tax as a dream of visionaries, and fear it. They will not settle in a state threatened by it.

Second—Like every new and undeveloped state, Oregon now needs, and for another half century will need, outside capital for its material development. Its natural resources will never develop themselves. It must be patent to every citizen, whether favorable to the single tax propaganda or otherwise, that the adoption of the amendment will halt capital at our borders, turn it to other states and arrest our progress for a generation. Whether right or wrong, it is a fact demonstrated over and over again in financial history, that money always avoids experiments.

Third—The majority of farms have been developed, the majority of homes have been built, in Oregon as elsewhere throughout the West, through borrowed money, secured by mortgages upon the real estate upon which the money is expended. Assuredly, it is not expected by the protagonists of the single tax that the cold-blooded mortgage companies and hard-headed Eastern farmers, from whom the most of this money has come, will continue in the field under single tax conditions. They may be mistaken, but they do not believe in either the justice or the theory of making lands bear all the public burdens. If the single tax amendment is adopted our home building will be crippled and our farm development hamstrung.

Fourth—It is reported that the labor unions are inclined to support the single tax, but I am not ready to believe that such is the case. Theoretically, some of their membership may believe it correct, as many believe that the theory of free trade is correct, but as a rule I have found the men affiliated with labor unions remarkably clear thinkers, and they must now realize, as every considerate man realizes, that, with the adoption of this amendment, there is grave danger that immigration to Oregon will practically cease, that our transportation companies will suffer, that our established industries will languish and that the inevitable result will be limited employment and low wages.

I have not dealt in theories, but in facts demonstrated by human experience. With these before us it is not important what a man may theoretically accept. Conditions confront us, and rainbows will not change them. Men ought to vote from the standpoint of practical, everyday affairs, and serve notice upon Mr. Fels that, while we have no objection to his trying the single tax experiment in his own State of Pennsylvania, we decline to drink the hemlock in Oregon.

STEPHEN A. LOWELL.

OFFICIAL STUDY OF SOCIAL EVILS

Government Department and Administration Is Suggested.

EUGENE, Or., Oct. 1. — (To the Editor.) — Mankind, it seems to the undersigned, is beginning to see the relation or mutual dependence of the physical and material realms upon the mental, or spiritual, or psychical as never before. One of the faults, or defects, in the teaching of past ages was the omission of this element of fact from its curricula of instruction, domestic as well as public. The increasing recognition of the solidarity of the race as well as the various interests concerned in every-day life is bound to bring about certain and, perhaps, many changes in the civilization of the race and the solution of many vexed problems confronting the people.

Among these there is none more important or intricate and involved than the social problem — sometimes referred to as the social evil, "white slave," or "race suicide." It is questionable whether in advancing (or changing) standards and inventions, which are coming into use, there will not be new methods to deal with this matter. In fact many things point that way. The new interests and problems of life are becoming so many that the habit is to specialize on them. That is becoming, in fact, almost necessary.

The question of marriage and divorce, including the said evils referred to, will have to be put into a department by themselves, somewhat in the same way as the schools are now conducted, which will involve, as we can see, a separate administration, with special officials in charge of it. It is, not to joke a bit, large enough a matter for a few and the best of such officials. If the railroads and corporations of the Nation are deemed worthy of such treatment, why should not the vastly more important matter of social relations, with the incidentals referred to, resting at the foundation of the growth and even existence of the race, be the same?

This may be considered by many a too early draw on the future, but they can be assured that it is not too early to look ahead sometimes. In fact there are signs that some such line of policy will become essential before long, if we are not to see increasing danger and decadence in the social order.

F. A. GUEREY.

SPLENDID POEM IS NOT COWBOY'S

"The Maverick" Not Written by Jack Murphy, Montana Indian.

PORTLAND, Oct. 4.—(To the Editor.)—In The Oregonian September 27 and also in a later issue you published a splendid poem entitled "The Maverick," presumably written by one Jack Murphy, a Montana cowboy, of Flathead lineage. According to The Oregonian Jack has a streak of genius. He has, indeed, a streak of that genius which gives one man the courage to plagiarize the work of another and brazenly claim credit for that which he has not the ability to produce.

This splendid poem was originally written by Charles Badger Clark, Jr., the only typically Western poet who has had any claim whatsoever to fame for the virility and freshness of his verse. It first appeared in the Pacific Monthly of October, 1911, and it was deemed so good by the editor of that estimable magazine that Mr. Clark received a check of no mean size for it.

That Jack Murphy or any other would-be poet should claim credit for it this early after its publication reflects more or less upon the intelligence of the lovers of literature and fair-play. I am sorry to rob Jack Murphy, the Flathead, of any honors which might be his due, but there is no literary crime so detestable as plagiarism.

C. E. FISHER.

THIRD TERM IDEA ADVOCATED

Mr. Peddicord Finds Support in Evolution and Conkling's Speech.

PORTLAND, Or., Oct. 4.—(To the Editor.)—In an editorial article in The Sunday Oregonian, entitled "Face to Face With a Crisis," you said: "The election of a Presidential candidate for a third term involves a departure from the historic policy of the Government, held inviolable from the beginning and preserved for more than 100 years as a sound principle of our unwritten law. If we elect Mr. Roosevelt, we declare to the world that the apprehensions of our forefathers were groundless and the repeated admonitions of our statesmen foolish."

I am not going to impeach the wisdom, the patriotism, devotion and sincerity of the founders of our Republic, nor even call them "foolish;" nor shall I impeach the sincerity and patriotism of the thousands who honestly differ from me on this or other great issues before the public today. There is little doubt in my mind that the fathers dealt as wisely with the problems of their day as circumstances would admit. But you, and other well-informed persons, know that in addition to the great questions which naturally arise with the march of government and the development of a great nation, the founders of our Republic, notwithstanding their unquestioned patriotism, wisdom and learning, passed along down to us some very difficult problems. To begin with, they recognized slavery. It is needless to mention what it cost a later generation, even this, to get rid of it. Their method, the Constitutional method of even today, of electing United States Senators has been subject of attack for many years, and will, doubtless, soon be discarded. They gave us the useless, perfunctory Electoral College, when today it is safe to say the whole country favors direct vote of the people. They gave us a four years' Presidential term, which today is little short of a calamity to the country, and which the people would be practically a unit in greatly lengthening. We have added several departments to the Cabinet of Washington. Fifteen times that sacred palladium of our liberties, the Constitution itself, has had to be amended already. We are indulging in a great deal of direct legislation, wise and otherwise, but a necessary check on the method the founders thought wise enough in their day. We are getting rid of the old convention system, so fraught with methods of thwarting the will of the people. So we might continue at great length.

How would it seem to the founders of our Republic to behold George and Martha Washington and their slaves going to the polls to vote on November 5? Doubtless many of those truly progressive founders of a once great refuge of the down-trodden would really be shocked from a purely sentimental standpoint, and, on regaining their equipoise, would soon begin to see nothing but ruin in the great change. They would forget, as do many of today, that, farther back still, government was on a par with other conditions, when men plowed with a stick and reaped with the hook and threshed with a flail. And today, although immeasurably pleased to think we hourly flash wireless messages over seas and talk almost as face to face with distant friends, and travel at "lightning speed" upon the land and ride upon the storms, many seem never to have thought that all things, including government itself, must advance to meet the new conditions, not realizing that the leaven is necessarily in "the whole lump."

Although I look on the real objection to a third Presidential term as evanescent, unsubstantial sentiment and untenable tradition, grounded in the same apprehensions, as the other great advancements I have named, nevertheless I frankly admit many are still honestly opposing the third term idea. But I say to you, with all candor, that if Mr. Taft should be re-elected, and so serve the people that they may see fit to nominate him again, I should be more strongly in favor of him for a third term than I am opposed to him today for a second term, and the Lord knows that would be strong to the limit of my being. It was, doubtless, just such nominations as Mr. Taft received at Chicago last June at the hands of the bosses and the interests that caused the founders of our Republic to oppose a third term.

Permit me to conclude with the following from Senator Roscoe Conkling's speech in nominating General Grant for a third term; for, to us who have never once doubted the sincerity of Mr. Roosevelt nor the justice and wisdom of his nomination, there will seem a marvelous parallel:

> "He is struck at by the whole Democratic party, because his nomination will be the death blow to Democratic success. He is struck at by others who find offense and disqualification in the very service he has rendered and the very experience he has gained. Show me a better man. Name one and I am answered; but do not point, as a disqualification, to the very facts which make this man fit beyond all others. Let not experience disqualify or excellence impeach him. There is no third term in the case, and the pretence will die with the political dog-days which engendered it. Nobody is really worried about a third term except those hopelessly longing for a first term and the dupes they have made.
>
> "Never having had a 'policy to enforce against the will of the people,' he never betrayed a cause or a friend, and the people will never betray or desert him. Vilified and reviled, ruthlessly aspersed by numberless presses, not in other lands, but in his own, the assaults upon him have strengthened and seasoned his hold upon the public heart. The ammunition of calumny has all been exploded; the powder has all been burned; its force is spent; and General Grant's name will glitter as a bright and imperishable star in the diadem of the Republic when those who have tried to tarnish it will have molded in forgotten graves and their memories and epitaphs have vanished utterly."

W. J. PEDDICORD.

OCTOBER.

October comes, a gorgeous knight,
In gold and purple, richly dight
Upon his brow an amber light.

There's silver on his nodding plume,
And in his air a hint of doom
For all the things that bud and bloom.

The landscape 'neath his quivering lance
Seems touched into a mystic trance,
Like realms of fabled old romance.

The river flows as if in sleep,
With dreams for utterance too deep,
And golden tears the willows weep.

There's peace upon the hazy hill;
The roses, blooming bravely still,
Seem sad for some impending ill.

Faint o'er the fields of fruitage shorn
Seems thinly blown an eerie horn
From far-off "fairy lands forlorn."

REX LAMPMAN.

Identity of a Chicken Thief.

Puck.

"Mordecai Judson," roared Colonel White, who had been aroused in the middle of the night by a suspicious noise in his poultry-house, "is that you in there, you black thief?" "No, sah!" humbly replied a frightened voice. "Dis is muh cousin, Ink Judson, dat looks so much like me and steals everything he kin lay his dog-gawn hands on. Ah's at home dis minute, sah, uh-sleeping de sleep o' de jest."

Not a 1913 Model.

Chicago Tribune.

Rose—You had to give Clarence a hint before he'd propose, eh?

Lily—Y-yes. He didn't seem to be equipped with a self starter.

WOE IN STORE FOR OLD MAIDS

Women Who Spurn Marriage Will Come to Certain Grief.

PORTLAND, Oct. 2.—(To the Editor.)—Upon reading the letters published in The Oregonian, one by the "Bachelor Girl" or "That's Me," September 30th, and the two in reply today, I wish to say a few words in praise of the author of the letter signed "One Who Knows." She takes the correct view of "That's Me's" letter, as every good and true women should, as woman was not put in this world by the Great Creator to flutter through life like a butterfly, but for a purpose. That purpose, every good and high-minded woman knows, is to love and be loved, and have a helpmate and to rear children that will be their pride and the pride of their fellow-beings. When they are old they can sit by the fireside with the satisfaction of their duty done, loved and respected by all.

Let us picture, on the other hand, the woman that lives the butterfly life, which is no doubt gay while it lasts, basking in the love of this fickle man now, and anon to the next. How long does it last? Only as long as her beauties and youthful charms last. When they shall have disappeared, so shall the love of "mere man," such as throw their affections away upon creatures of that sort. There are too many such women as "That's Me" in America today; such women as she are the cause of the breaking up of many homes, and filling the courts with divorce cases, for she will receive the attentions of any man whether single or married, regardless of consequences, and openly boast of her conquests as a man would boast of how many fish he had caught upon this or that fishing trip. It's all very well and good now, dear little bachelor, but wait until you are down in the vale of years; you will ask yourself, Where are my loves of yesteryear? Then is the time when you will be deserted. Sans husband, sans children, sans friends, sans everything—"last scene of all."

R. W. F.

RISKS ARE SEEN IN MATRIMONY.

Married Man Suggests That Even Husbands Get "Stung."

PORTLAND, Oct. 2.—(To the Editor.)—I have been reading the letters of Janet and right here I want to say I heartily coincide with her, for unless a woman does get a man who loves her and is true to his marriage vows she is much better off single. I am a married man and have children of my own and I have seen so much slavery and hardships that many good women are subject to that I entertain fears for my daughter. Men who drink, men who gamble, men who lavish their affections on other women and stay out late at night, are a menace. I venture to say, as Janet does, that a large majority are sorry they ever married. They expect to get a man, not a brute. While my wife has had no reason to regret our marriage, she would not be to blame if she had had fears of ill treatment and not married me. It is all a gamble or lottery, anyway. So let our girls take a warning. Mine says she sees so much ill treatment in families that she would not want to trust another man. Lots of men think that a woman is their slave. On the other hand, good husbands get bit, but they are more able to take their part. Sure, it is everyone's prerogative to marry or stay single, as they wish. Paul tells us it is better to stay single if we can. So I glory in the maids for not being fools. As Janet says, it is easy to get married, but not easy to get free.

W. H. JOSEPH.

FEMALE FLIRTS ARE CONDEMNED

Girls Who Shy at Marriage Are Not Normal, Says Writer.

M'MINNVILLE, Or., Oct. 2.—(To the Editor.)—After reading with interest the many letters printed in The Oregonian in reply to "A Young Old Maid," "Janet" and others, I have decided to express my opinion. I am not as old as "Janet," nor have I had her experiences, but I do think that I can appreciate her feelings more than any of those who have thus far replied. Duty is not always the most pleasant course to follow, and when one bravely does so they should receive only respect and honor for it. I know several "old maids" who are among the most noble women of my acquaintance, but when one deliberately shirks the duties of married life that they may be more free to flirt and make love to every pair of pants that puts in an appearance, whether married or single, as "That's Me" appears to do, to my mind they cannot be too strongly condemned.

If young people would take a more serious view of marriage, considering it rather in the light of a divine institution than an experiment, it would be better for the human race, as well as for the good of their own souls. So if "That's Me" has no higher ideals than those she has expressed, she would do well, at least, to keep her opinion strictly private.

A MERE GIRL.

Population of Spain.

PORTLAND, Oct. 3.—(To the Editor.)—On September 25 The Oregonian had an item which said "that 12,000,000 of the 177,000,000 people in Spain can neither read nor write."

I do not doubt that 12,000,000 of them are illiterate, but will you kindly inform your readers if 177,000,000 is the correct population figure? I think it is somewhat large.

G. E. H.

The figures given for Spain's population should have been 20,000,000. The illiteracy figures are correct.