The Oregonian

Entered at the Postoffice at Portland, Oregon, as second-class matter.

REVISED SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

By mail (postage prepaid in advance)—

Daily, with Sunday, per month	$0.85
Daily, Sunday excepted, per year	7.50
Daily, with Sunday, per year	9.00
Sunday, per year	2.00
The Weekly, per year	1.50
The Weekly, 6 months	.50
Daily, per week, delivered, Sunday excepted	15c
Daily, per week, delivered, Sunday included	20c

POSTAGE RATES.

United States, Canada and Mexico—

10 to 14-page paper	1c
16 to 30-page paper	2c
32 to 44-page paper	3c

Foreign rates double.

The Oregonian does not buy poems or stories from individuals, and cannot undertake to return any manuscript sent to it without solicitation. No stamps should be inclosed for this purpose.

EASTERN BUSINESS OFFICES.

(The S. C. Beckwith Special Agency)—New York: Rooms 48-49, Tribune Building. Chicago: Rooms 510-512, Tribune Building.

KEPT ON SALE.

Chicago—Auditorium Annex; Postoffice News Co., 217 Dearborn street.

Denver—Julius Black, Hamilton & Hendrick, 906-912 Seventeenth St.; Louthan & Jackson, Fifteenth and Lawrence.

Kansas City—Ricksecker Cigar Co., Ninth and Walnut.

Los Angeles—B. F. Gardner, 259 South Spring; Oliver & Haines, 205 South Spring, and Harry Drapkin.

Minneapolis—M. J. Kavanaugh, 50 South Third; L. Regelsburger, 317 First Avenue South.

New York City—L. Jonas & Co., Astor House.

Ogden—W. C. Alden, Postoffice Cigar Store; F. R. Godard; W. G. Kind, 114 25th St.; C. H. Myers.

Omaha—Barkalow Bros. 1612 Farnam; McLaughlin Bros., 210 South 14th; Megeath Stationery Co., 1308 Farnam.

Salt Lake—Salt Lake News Co., 77 West Second South St.

St. Louis—World's Fair News Co.

San Francisco—J. K. Cooper Co., 746 Market, near Palace Hotel; Foster & Orear, Ferry News Stand; Goldsmith Bros., 236 Sutter; L. E. Lee, Palace Hotel News Stand; F. W. Pitts, 1008 Market; Frank Scott, 80 Ellis; N. Wheatley, 83 Stevenson.

Washington, D. C.—Ed Brinkman, Fourth and Pacific Ave., N. W.; Ebbitt House News Stand.

YESTERDAY'S WEATHER—Maximum temperature, 46 deg.; minimum, 39. Precipitation, 0.50 inch.

TODAY'S WEATHER—Showers; south to west winds.

PORTLAND, SUNDAY, MARCH 13, 1904.

ETHICS OF THE BAR.

In the obituary addresses on the late Frederic R. Coudert he was described as a fine type of the old-fashioned lawyer, who, despite his great professional ability and learning, died possessed of no great amount of personal property because he was one of those who constantly refused retainers the acceptance of which involved the preparation of some plan by which corporations might avoid the law, "jump over it, creep under it, or get around it." Elihu Root, in his tribute to Mr. Coudert, said he greatly regretted the passing of the old-time practitioner, like Mr. Coudert, who refused to aid men to evade the law. This degradation of legal ethics dates back to the day of Aaron Burr in America and to Lord Brougham in England, but it never obtained large acceptance in America until the day of Jay Gould, who boasted that he was ready to pay large sums to lawyers who were able to tell him how far he might go and how he might accomplish his railway wrecking and railway robbery without violating the laws. Jay Gould's lawyer was David Dudley Field in all his piracies upon the property of the Erie Railroad.

Field was at the head of his profession, and in the days of the Tweed Tammany ring the ring Judges, who were subsequently impeached and driven off the bench by the Legislature, were part of the crew of the Erie pirate ship, were members of both the Tweed and the Erie ring. Field knew perfectly well that these "ring" Judges had the retainer of Gould in their pockets whenever he asked for an injunction to prevent robbed men from regaining their property; he knew that these Judges stood ready to ratify judicially any piracy that Gould might commit. Field's code of legal ethics was that of Lord Brougham, who declared that a lawyer was justified in doing anything and going any lengths to win his case for his client. This immoral code of Lord Brougham was long ago publicly repudiated and denounced by the great English jurists, and after Aaron Burr's day it had no eminent support in America until David Dudley Field revived it in America, when he defended notorious rascals before notoriously venal Judges. After these venal Judges had been driven off the bench by the New York Legislature, Field had become rich enough to retire; but his code of legal ethics was eagerly accepted and adopted by the late General Wager Swayne, and is practiced today by railroad lawyers of his quality.

Swayne persuaded a senile United States Judge, when the victims of the robbed Wabash system asked for a receiver, to appoint the Gould robbers receivers of the very railroad they had wrecked and plundered. The late United States Circuit Court Judge Gresham interfered to prevent the consummation of this bit of judicial outrage, but it was subsequently repeated in the case of the Reading Railroad system and other wrecked railroad properties at the East. When the Broadway Railway boodle Aldermen were tried a number of years ago in New York City, it came out in the testimony that David Dudley Field was in the habit of telling the scoundrel manager of this corrupt ring how he could rob the city and corrupt its government and yet shelter himself behind a technical defense so as to escape the penitentiary. That is, this distinguished lawyer, after his client had unfolded his scheme of public robbery, accepted a large fee to tell the robber in advance how he could steal effectively within the law and escape by a technical defense all legal punishment for his conspiring to swindle the city and corrupt its government; that is, this eminent lawyer knew in advance that his client was plotting to rob the city, and was willing, like his great prototype, Jay Gould, to pay liberally for legal information as to how he could execute his swindle and theft and yet escape legal punishment.

Another illustration of "legal ethics" was the action of the late Judge Maynard, of the New York Court of Appeals, who stole an election return in order to steal the New York Legislature, and boasted that it was the proudest act of his life. David Dudley Field educated a class of so-called "great" lawyers in this country who are largely responsible for devising the vast system of legal wreckage of great railroads and other great corporate trusts, and the nephew of Field, David J. Brewer, now of the United States Supreme Court, did not hesitate when he was United States Circuit Judge to sign all the orders presented by General Wager Swayne, under which the Wabash was wrecked by Gould, Sage and Dillon. One of the graduates of the David Dudley Field school of "legal ethics" organized a legal conspiracy to pirate, wreck and rob a great trust, and he was able to persuade another graduate of the same school of "legal ethics," the nephew of its founder, to give this conspiracy his official blessing.

No wonder plain people utterly distrust the moral sense and public conscience of so-called "great" lawyers. No wonder they rave about the enormous inequality in the operation of laws when a wealthy convict can command an army of lawyers to save him from punishment while an ordinary, obscure, friendless, impecunious offender is railroaded to the penitentiary. No wonder plain people howl when a wealthy man, or a man at least who has wealth behind him and social influence, can rob a bank as president from within and suffer not more than three to five years' imprisonment, while an ignorant horsethief gets seven or an ordinary clumsy highwayman gets from fifteen to twenty. The popular verdict is that a man with money enough in his pocket to make him a bird worth picking escapes the law or obtains small punishment, with a pardon in the near future, while the impecunious, ignorant criminal is sent up for the full limit, not so much because he was a criminal as that he was a penniless thief. Wendell Phillips said of Rufus Choate: "Thieves anxiously inquired after his health before they went forth to steal," and so Jay Gould and his successors anxiously inquire after the health of the so-called great railroad or great corporation lawyers before they go forth to steal.

SEATTLE AND PORTLAND.

Seattle has two advantages over Portland. One is the united spirit of its people, the other is the natural depth of its harbor. In other respects the two cities stand on even terms. In still other respects the advantage is with Portland. Seattle seems to be the natural point of contact with Alaska; and until the mines fail, as those of California have failed, this northern trade will be of large and steady volume; but this is offset by the greater productiveness of the territory surrounding Portland. There is a solidity and permanence about communities built up on agricultural industry which cannot be claimed by the more feverish and precarious activities of mining, lumbering and handling of goods in transit.

We have been accustomed to regard the railroad resources of Seattle as superior to those of Portland. Perhaps this difference has been exaggerated. The Hill interests have done much for Seattle, but the Harriman interests have done much for Portland. The Great Northern's tunnel and terminal undertakings at Seattle are matched by the O. R. & N.'s outlay for betterments. One is as potent aid to a city's commerce as the other, as will be realized from a recollection of the recent lumber troubles on the Southern Pacific, primarily due to the inadequate roadbed. Mr. Harriman shows a disposition to grant such concessions as Portland's commercial interests unite in demanding.

But they must unite. And herein lies the most important thing for the men of Portland to realize today, so far as Seattle is concerned. If Seattle passes Portland, it will be merely through the force of more effective concerted action. Individually, Portland business men can take care of themselves. Portland jobbers are not menaced by Seattle jobbers. Portland drummers swarm everywhere, to Montana on the east and British Columbia on the north; while Seattle drummers are few. The big men of Seattle are lightweights in the commercial and financial world, compared with the big men of Portland. The earnings of Seattle's buildings go East in the form of interest to add to the wealth of New York and Boston. The earnings of Portland's buildings remain to add to the wealth of Portland.

Singly, the men of Portland have no reason to fear the men of Seattle. The danger is in those aspects of commercial progress that are carried forward by united action. A bundle of tightly bound twigs can compete with a solid stick of timber. In Seattle there is a welcome for newcomers, a desire to help each other, a determination to stand together, which have become proverbial. If you can assure a Seattle man that an enterprise is for Seattle's benefit, he will help it, promptly and to the limit of his power. If you can assure a Portland man that an enterprise is for Portland's benefit, he will be apt to inquire, "What is there in it for me?"

Portland has the power. The only question is as to whether it will use it. The game is football, and the victory is won by team work. Nature has put into Portland's hands an instrument which it can employ successfully against any and every rival. That instrument is the Columbia River. The one thing that will clinch and perpetuate Portland's pre-eminence in four states is the maintenance of a channel from the sea to Portland docks, ample for ocean-going vessels with safety and without delay, and the opening of the obstructions between The Dalles and Celilo. This done, everything else is easy. Not done, everything else is problematical. The commerce of the world will not be guided by empty boasts here or envious sneers elsewhere. Its motto is "Show me." If the water is here, the ships will come. If not, not.

The report of the Secretary of State upon the status of the Red Cross Society abroad, which was prepared for the information of Congress, was recently submitted to the United States Senate. It shows that Great Britain gives no financial support to the society. In France none is given, but in war time an indemnity of 20 cents is allowed for each sick and wounded soldier cared for. Germany gives no government aid; the Netherlands pays the salary of the society's secretary, and makes allowance for certain expenses. Belgium gives support in time of war; Denmark contributes $1000 annually to the funds of the society; Austria gives $2400; Switzerland, $5000; Japan, $1250. Russia gives no fixed sum, but in time of war the government pays the society for the care of the wounded. It is remarkable that Switzerland, with the least likelihood of needing the ministrations of the society, contributes more liberally than any other European country to its treasury. Not having to face even the possible wastage of war or maintain an extensive military equipment, the little republic can perhaps afford to be generous in the care of the wounded and sick of nations that maintain themselves by force of arms. The belief has been quite prevalent in this country in recent years that money expended by the Red Cross Society was not always prudently or wisely disbursed, hence the demand for the report which was lately transmitted to the Senate through the office of the Secretary of State.

GENIUS AND MARRIAGE.

Mrs. Kate Upson Clark, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in a recent lecture before the North End Art Club, of Chicago, on "The Relation Between Art and Morals," argued that the way to be happy for a genius is never to marry. Among other things Mrs. Clark said:

> The genius should not marry. A woman wants her husband—not his art. Genius is insanity. In order to be genius it lives most of the time in a world of deep emotions. It is hard for people of artistic temperament to conform to ordinary rules. Thus divorces, suicides, drunkenness and impulsive vices are found among people of genius. The irrepressible temperament seems to be absolutely necessary to art.

Mrs. Clark has evidently not read the history of the lives of men of genius very carefully or she would know that the facts do not bear out her assumption that they find marriage more of a failure than the majority of persons of equal intelligence and good breeding, who are not men of genius. Nor is it true that divorces, suicides, drunkenness and impulsive vices are found more common among people of genius than among their social peers who are not possessed of genius; nor is it true that "genius is insanity," or that the "irrepressible temperament is essential to art," meaning by "the irrepressible temperament" the temperament that is prone to find or make marriage a failure. Selden, a profound English scholar, wrote: "No man is wiser for his learning," meaning that mere learning has no necessary connection with great wisdom in the conduct of human life. And so of men of genius; they are neither better nor worse morally because they are possessed of what is called genius; men of genius as a rule have reflected in their conduct within or without the married state the dominant social atmosphere and moral standards of the public and private circles to which they belonged.

The majority of men of genius have never been below the social atmosphere of their times and the society they moved in. Many of them have been above the social atmosphere of their times as husbands and fathers, and few of them have been below it. The explanation of the aberrations of the few men of genius who have not adorned the married state is not found in their genius or their "art" at all, but in the same infirmities of moral character and temper that are offered and accepted for other men of high intelligence and good parts who have not been men of genius. To illustrate: Shakespeare at 18 married a woman eight years older than himself, and before he was 21 was the father of three children. It was probably not a judicious marriage. It may have been akin to what we call "a shotgun" marriage, but no man of sense will pretend that so common an act of folly was due to what Mrs. Clark calls "the irrepressible temperament that seems absolutely necessary to art." Nothing is more common in life than for a boy of 18 to be captivated by a woman older than himself. It is not a peculiar characteristic of the artistic temperament at all; it is one of the most common infirmities of human nature, if it be an infirmity.

From this time forward Shakespeare, if not a devoted husband, was a devoted father. He was as sane in all his actions as a man could be. He was a sound and thrifty man of business; he retired early to country life; he was, in the temperate and wise conduct of his life, not below, but above the atmosphere of his time, and so for that matter were Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney. No argument against the artistic temperament, against men of genius as peculiarly unfit for the married state above other men of their social environment and level of intelligence, can be drawn from Shakespeare, for his youthful folly, if it needs any explanation, was due not to what is called "the infirmity of genius," but to the passions and rash judgment that are characteristic of human nature in youth, and not the peculiar weakness of "genius." Milton surely cannot be quoted in support of this view, for while he had a foolish young wife who in a tantrum went home to her parents, she was glad to come back, and nobody who is familiar with the life and character of John Milton will believe for a moment that his daily life and speech were discreditable to the married state. He was a stern Puritan and his religious acceptance of the Pauline philosophy regarding the submissiveness of wives to husbands may have made him too exacting, but this error was not a moral infirmity due to the temperament of genius; it was due to his Puritan religious belief.

In our own New England colonial life there is abundant evidence that the Puritan was a reserved man, a stern head of the household for conscience' sake. Dryden in the most dissolute court of Charles II was above rather than below the morals of his time in the daily conduct of his life; a man of dignity and good sense, with none of the qualities that make a bad husband and father. Addison was married in his 43d year to the Countess Dowager of Warwick, a woman older than himself, an arrogant, imperious virago; but he bore his domestic vexations with the patience and good temper manifested by Socrates to Xantippe. He was a man of deep piety and sweet temper and pure life; he made an error of judgment in marrying out of his social class, a rich, aristocratic, comparatively old woman of large wealth, but this error surely was not due to his "art" temperament, for excellent men have made the same mistake in all times. It was not a weakness peculiar to men of genius. Dr. Johnson, a rough, boorish man among men, was a very kind, affectionate husband to a very weak, ugly woman, much older than himself, and always spoke of her in life and long after her death as "pretty creature." Thackeray, Tennyson, Scott and Wordsworth were the best of husbands and fathers. Mrs. Clark has championed a threadbare popular notion, for the record shows that in modern times men of genius have as a rule done credit to the married state. There is not a name of distinction in the annals of American literature that stands for a bad husband save Edgar A. Poe, and he was an alcoholic and deficient in moral honor, not because of his genius, but in spite of it, for Hawthorne, Poe's equal in the endowment of the poetic, artistic temperament, was an exceptionally happy husband and father all his days, and he was as poor as Poe when he married; his wife was equally poor, and she was not a woman of genius at all; she was just an intelligent, lovable, loving woman.

Wendell Phillips, who had the peculiar poetic, artistic temperament and all the tastes it implies, was the loving and happy husband of a hopelessly invalid wife for more than forty-five years, but he did not find marriage a failure, and if he had it would not have been due to his genius; it would have been only a common weakness of human nature to which men of genius are not an exception, but of which they furnish relatively no more examples than other men who are not endowed with the "art" temperament. Shelley made a schoolboy and schoolgirl marriage at 19, which turned out sadly, as such marriages often do, whether negotiated by men with or without genius; but the marriage of his maturity with Mary Godwin was a true marriage and was as happy and loving a union as possible. There is no man of genius in the Victorian age in England who made a heartless husband, save Dickens; there is no man of genius in the United States who made a bad husband save Poe; and within 150 years there is no record of a man of genius who made a bad husband for whom his genius can be offered as an explanation. Coleridge and Hazlitt are not explained by their genius. Goethe lived happily for thirty years with a humble-born woman of no culture, who was his mistress for eighteen years before he married her in 1806. Heine was married happily to a similar woman who had no culture but loved him in his last years of paralysis and suffering. Balzac was a good husband, and so was Zola. Napoleon was a very good and long-suffering husband. Even in the roll of great composers, musicians and actors, it will be found that they do not make marriage a failure more than any other class of people of intelligence who are without the so-called "artistic" temperament. No man or woman adorns the married state or disfigures it because of the "artistic" temperament.

A NEW WHITE MAN'S BURDEN.

The Island of Santo Domingo is in a condition politically, socially and morally that mocks at civilization—a condition well designated "a state of chronic deviltry." The Dominicans seem to be a counterpart, done in ebony, of the Filipinos, weak, treacherous, vengeful and cruel even among themselves, to a degree that almost passes the comprehension of civilized man.

William Thorp, an Englishman who has spent the past five years in the West Indies, where through connection with the press he had wide opportunities for gathering information, publishes an article in a late number of the New York Independent in which he gives an insight into the life of these people that is at once interesting and revolting. He finds a key to the trouble that has arisen between the United States and the mulatto Republic of Santo Domingo in the deeprooted anger and hatred that the half-caste nurses against the superior race, which is responsible for his invidious position in the world. This hatred, mingled with contempt, is also felt by the negro for the mulatto, as being neither the one thing nor the other. As Behazin, the deposed King of Dahomey, in his exile at Fort de France, Martinique, expressed it, "The white is a race and the black is a race. Each is good, but the mulatto—he is neither good milk nor good coffee." While this judgment is colored by prejudice, it gives one a good idea, says Mr. Thorp, of the hatred and contempt which the average negro cherishes for the brown man.

This feeling the latter duplicates by his hatred of the white man as being responsible for his anomalous position in the world. This antipathy in the view of the writer quoted is responsible for three-fourths of the offenses against Americans and Europeans, both in Hayti and Santo Domingo, and, so far from being surprised when an outbreak occurs, similar to that between the insurgents and American marines, February 12, men who are fully informed in regard to conditions that prevail there are surprised that a general massacre of the whites in that "isle of unrest" has not long ago taken place. It is safe to say, says Mr. Thorp, that such a catastrophe has only been averted by the constant patrolling of United States and European warships between the principal ports.

A curious and almost ludicrous evidence of the hatred of these mongrel islanders for the whites is found in the fact that in the cathedrals and churches of both Hayti and Santo Domingo the Savior, the Virgin Mary and the saints are almost always represented in pictures and statuary as negroes or mulattoes. This falsification of sacred history is explained, if not justified, in the declaration that "otherwise there would be no congregations."

While these people fight among themselves relentlessly, treacherously and brutally, they would make common cause against an invader. While, as in the case of the Filipinos, their armies as armies are practically worthless, they are adepts in the type of warfare that finds expression in guerrilla methods—the only type that at the present stage of military and naval development is likely to lead to tedious and troublesome campaigns. Utterly without moral sense or physical prowess; unknown factors in the world of intellectual and industrial progress, the gulf that separates these people from Western civilization is so wide that the prudent nation, though lying just at their gates, will be chary of its dealings with them in the vain hope of bettering their condition. There is sound advice without officiousness in the following opinion touching this point, with which Mr. Thorp concludes his article:

> As the United States Government seems to have no intention of conquering or annexing the country, it would be advisable to confine military operations to the ports and points in touch with the sea coast. Otherwise, the matter may become far more serious than the Administration contemplates or cares for. But it is conceivable to those who, like myself, are well acquainted with the Dominicans that, once embarked in the enterprise, the Administration will be carried by force of circumstances beyond its original intention.

This is precisely the view with which thoughtful Americans at first inclined to regard our experiment in the Philippines. It is not improbable that in the West Indies, as in the East, first inclinations will be overruled by circumstances, necessity and larger considerations of destiny. The "white man's burden" is heavy and vexatious; but it is often imposed without chance of escape by those who are compelled to assume it. Civilization will not forever endure that fertile spots of the globe be ruled by unproductive and murderous barbarism.

William C. Dreher, in his "Letter From Germany" to the current number of the Atlantic Monthly, says that under the new German tariff Germany is certain to withdraw from the United States trade advantages given to other countries under treaty. It was announced nearly a year ago in the Reichstag that the most-favored-nation clause no longer exists as between Germany and the United States, because our action in making special concessions to other countries in order to secure reciprocity arrangements amounts to its suspension. This decision has been strengthened through our ratification of our Cuban reciprocity treaty, which will give the deathblow to Germany's sugar trade in the United States. Nothing short of a radical revision of our tariff law in the direction of giving the President large discretion to reduce duties in return for equivalent advantages will enable him to secure to American farmers and exporters their due place in the German markets. The German government says that it cannot hope again to succeed in negotiating good commercial treaties with Russia and Austria if those countries know in advance that the United States can have, without the asking, all the trade advantages that they themselves must haggle and barter for. The stress of home and foreign politics will oblige the German government to apply to our goods, in absence of treaty, rates of duty which it regards itself as excessive. Only the action of the United States will enable the German government to dispense with applying these excessive legal rates of the new tariff against us.

In support of the bill introduced by Representative McCleary, providing for an increase in the pay of free rural delivery carriers, it is urged that since the inauguration of the service over 2000 of these carriers have voluntarily given up the work. It is alleged, though necessarily without proof, that those who have continued with the service have done so in the hope that after a time they will receive better pay. The provision that $600 shall constitute the minimum and $850 a year the maximum salary of the rural mailcarriers is not unreasonable. No man can work for less than the sum first named, maintain his equipment for the service, which he is required to do, and have anything left of the fruits of his endeavor at the end of the year, while at the maximum salary even a frugal man with a small family would be able to save very little. Rural free delivery has developed into one of the most beneficial and popular institutions of the country. Efficiency, dependent to a considerable extent upon a minimum number of changes in the service, can only be secured by paying wages at which good men can be secured.

Noah Raby, who died last week in a town poorhouse near New Brunswick, N. J., claimed to have been born in North Carolina in 1772, which would make him 132 years old at his death. His age is as well authenticated apparently as that of "old Parr," of England, who claimed the age of 152 years. This claim of Noah Raby rests on quite as solid ground, for it is known that he had been an inmate of the poorhouse for nearly fifty years, and he was an old man when he went there. He was born of an Indian father and white mother, and claimed to have heard Washington speak at a gathering in Norfolk, Va., and to have served on the United States frigate Constitution before the War of 1812. This remarkable case of longevity, while confessing that he had drunk all the whisky he could get and smoked without cessation from boyhood, stoutly maintained that he was never intoxicated but once in his life, which is an exceptionally good record for 132 years. It is doubtful whether Methusaleh could equal this temperance record, and old Father Noah surely could not.

While China has prudently declared her intention of "looking on with her hands in her sleeves" while Japan struggles with Russia for supremacy in the Far East, her task will not be an easy one. She is too closely in touch with Russian interests in Manchuria to maintain absolutely the passive attitude indicated by this declaration. According to the proclamation of Viceroy Alexieff, whose word, needless to say, is law in the premises, to the Chinese of Manchuria, "the interests of China and Russia are identical in that province, and the Chinese merchants and farmers must continue their usual vocations and supply the Russian troops with provisions and assistance." It is scarcely necessary to say that this sort of neutrality is not the kind that Japan is looking for. There is, however, no appeal from the words of the Viceroy, which declare that "if the people treat with enmity the Russian army, the government will exterminate them without mercy." The situation illustrates forcibly the predicament described as being "between the devil and the deep sea."

Copper has become a great necessity of modern life in the development of mechanics. In the matter of supply the United States leads the world. The total production of copper last year was 1,110,000,000 pounds, of which 714,000,000 pounds were mined in this country. This represents an increased output of about four-fold since 1884. Spain and Portugal come next in line as copper producers, but they are far behind, their total being hardly more than one-eighth of that of this country. Mexico ranks third, but her yield also is small as compared with that of the United States. With the development of electrical science and the growth of applied electricity a demand for copper arose which only the most tremendous energy has been able to meet. American skill and enterprise rose to meet the demand and the copper output has increased by leaps and bounds and is still forging ahead. The copper mines in Mexico are being worked by American capital and labor, but the output is, of course, accredited to the country that produces it.

The Orchardists' Association of Pajaro Valley, California, recently voted down the question of asking the market supervisors of San Francisco to prohibit the sale of wormy apples in that market. The vote was on the basis of one to each acre of orchard owned by members, and there was a substantial majority against the proposition. This is a very suggestive advertisement of the apples that are grown in the Pajaro Valley. Fancy the orchardists of Hood River voting "no" on a resolution to shut wormy apples out of the Portland market! Wise applegrowers are the first to insist upon restrictions that bar out wormy fruit, and those that are most progressive insist upon this point even if trees have to be uprooted and burned in order to enforce it. Wormy apples are not only disgusting, but they are a disgrace to the man whose orchard is allowed to produce them year after year, and who is so shortsighted as to throw them upon the market.

INTOLERANCE AND AGNOSTICISM

PORTLAND, March 12.—(To the Editor.)—Last Sunday an article appeared in the editorial column on the inconsistencies of agnostics. I shall not enlarge on the merits of the editorial page of your paper for it speaks for itself. However, I think every intelligent reader will agree with me that though the average is high, there is, nevertheless, now and then a leader that falls below, and is unworthy as sober a journal as The Oregonian. The article mentioned falls into this category.

The premise is that since all human being are very much alike fundamentally, they necessarily would act alike under the same circumstances. That this is false is asserted by the author of the story of the Good Samaritan. There we have three ways of regarding an unfortunate.

As all mankind is of one nature, and as we know that, at least in Christian lands and by those professing a Christian creed those in power have terrorized the few who would not accept the beliefs of the many, so it must follow, that were those who in our day are called agnostics in power, so would they be certain to torture and burn those who believe in the tenets of churches.

History does not bear this out. The rack and fagot are eminently Roman means of persuasion—Roman pagan or Roman Christian, and in those places where Rome, pagan or Christian, has held sway. Even the Protestants were not heretical on this point for a century or two. Pagan Japan is free from this charge, while Christian Russia still persecutes the nonorthodox. Perhaps here lies the secret of the sympathy for the former nation in the present war. In Ceylon, India and Siam the people are free to worship either Allah, Brahma or any other deity. In Buddhistic countries freedom is and always has been enjoyed. King Asoka, who brought the latter religion to the banks of the Jordan, did not do so behind an army as did later fanatics with later religions. Every human being undoubtedly has a dark side to his nature, but that it is fundamentally evil I deny, and leave it to every reader of your paper. Are not the days of innocent childhood the happiest because of its innocence, because of its divine proximity, because not yet befouled by a vicious life? And would not, could not each individual retain that happiness through life if he did not depart from it? Is not the depression of old age one of divorce from the childlike innocence? I believe the child is born in the very image of God and that oftenest he departs from it during life. This is more reasonable to me than that he is born totally depraved and must get some blood of some one innocently slaughtered to restore him to whiteness, etc.

That obsolete profession that dealt in racks, fagots, stakes, thumb-screws and dozens of other equally esthetic appliances, worked in the interest of creed. It does not follow that those who have no creed (at least none to force on their unwilling neighbors) would use these tortures for the sake of giving vent to their pent-up, born-in-sin natures. While I may not be classified as an agnostic, I do defend them against the charge, because it is unjust. When history produces the first instance of an agnostic pouring liquid lead through a man's ears for a faith he denies, then will I recant the last sentence.

I would rather trust my life and honor in the hands of Huxley, Spencer, Wallace, Darwin, Ingersoll or Draper than with the Borgias, Loyola, Torquemada, Calvin or Cotton Mather. This is not saying that all who are creedless are good men and preachers are scoundrels. Far from it. I have many friends who preach for a living and some of them are as liberal toward their friends as any agnostic—certainly more so than some who pretend to live and breathe and have their being in material science. To be free is the first necessity. Then can man make a start in search of light, and feel sure that no effort is in vain.

ERNEST BARTON.

The superstition that underlies this letter is the idea that religion makes a people. The truth is that every people makes its religion. The religious rites of a barbarous people are barbarous, those of an enlightened people are refined. In a cruel age ecclesiastical discipline is cruel, whether it is in pagan Rome, Mohammedan Islam or Canaan under the conquering Jews. In this day we do not burn at the stake; we merely hold our heretics up to scorn as Dr. Barton does the Christian believer. Catholicism prevails in Spain and also in the United States; but its manifestations are different. The religion does not make its people; the people make their religion. The doctrine that the child is born "in the very image of God" must be accepted if at all with important reservations. He is just what the legacies of heredity have made him, not forgetting his brute ancestry with its remnants of beastly passions. Those who have traveled in Russia like Henry Norman, Senator Beveridge and Burton Holmes, say that antagonistic creeds are not interfered with by the Russian church or government, and that this liberality accounts for the easy reign which Russia holds in the vast Asiatic countries that have come under her rule. It is a piece of statesmanship reminding us strongly of the Roman method, or that of Great Britain in India and Africa.

A WOMAN'S GRAVE.

(There is a lone grave in the sandhills in the Western part of Nebraska, near the route of the overland trail. Camping close by it some years ago the rough draft of these lines was written the next morning.)

The tall grass waves on the sandhill's side—
A coyote crosses the sand flat wide
With hungry eyes on his destined prey—
A prairie dog on his porch at play—
Crosses and scatters beneath his feet
The wind-blown folds of a winding sheet.

I stopped to study with curious air
The lonely grave that was hidden there;
A headstone, scarred by sand and flame,
Still recorded a woman's name
And the legend carved in rude design—
"Died, April, 1849,
"Aged five and twenty years;
"To the Mount of Life from the plains of tears."

Was she a wife? It does not tell.
A mother? Perhaps. We know as well.
For on the gravestone above the mould
Simply a woman's name is told.
—A woman's name, but let it rest—
'Tis better not to be here exprest;
Let the desert claim her for his bride,
Sleeping softly upon his side.

Long I paused in the evening dim
And gazed at the headstone black and dim—
Black with the fires of many a year,
Sweeping the sandhills far and near.
The coyote's cry came thro' the shades,
A lizard troubled the spear grass blades,
And a light gray cloud passed overhead,
Dropping a tear—for it knew the dead.

I mused and wondered the more I thought—
Who she was who lay in that lonely spot.
Was she slender and fair to view
With a soul to dare and a hand to do?
A hero's heart in her woman's breast
Beating with passion to know the West,
Yet soothing with ways that never fail
The long, wild leagues of the Overland Trail—
With a woman's vision of faith and hope
Viewing the mountains' western slope—
Till the setting sun on the western sea
Beckoned her on to its mystery?

The cactus grows on the drifting mound;
The wolf and the sandstorm scar the ground;
The wolf and the wind may wail and sweep
Above the bed where she lies asleep—
Not the wind nor the wolf shall disturb the rest
Of the woman hero who loved the West.

—A. E. SHELDON.

Lincoln, Neb.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

The Black Man's Pathway.

Coolies have been prohibited from using the sidewalks in Johannesburg.—Cable dispatch.

Now this is the song of the white man, the
song of the conquering race,
Which holds in fee the nigger folk by God's
especial grace;
This is the song of the Saxon, whom God has
given the land
Of all the simple peoples that smite not with
iron hand:
'Come, listen, ye foolish peoples, and hark to
the boon we give—
In the land of your fathers' fathers we grant
ye the right to live;
Ye may live and work for your masters—for
the fruits of toil are sweet—
But off from the white man's sidewalk—the
place for brutes is the street.''

Now this is the way of the white man, from
Manila around to the Rand,
He piles no more on the nigger than he thinks
the nigger can stand,
For 'twere folly, egregious folly, to make the
laborers few
When there's any amount of work to be done,
far more than the niggers can do;
So he lightens the laborers' burden, and furnishes straw for the bricks,
And calls 'em uncivilized ingrates for kicking
against the pricks.
He feeds them as well as his cattle—and the
bread of toil is sweet—
But he kicks them off from his sidewalk—the
place for brutes is the street.

Now this is the grace of the white man, to
cherish the nigger's soul;
He puts them to work at building a church
and paying the parson dole;
If they're good in this world, says the preacher, above they shall surely go,
Where even niggers are welcome and have
skins that are whiter than snow,
And to gain all these wonderful blessings
they've only to do as they're told,
To work like the devil for white men, who've
got to have lots of gold—
But up at the gates of heaven will Saint Peter
still repeat:
"Get off from the golden pavements—you niggers must walk in the street!"

At the Seat of War.

Corea is the Land of Morning Calm, Afternoon Ructions and Midnight Hades.

"Talu" does not mean "yellow," nor is it part of the chorus of a coon song.

Ping Yang is Corean for bing! bang!

The mountains in Corea are quite hilly, and the plains, as a rule, are level. The rivers run into the sea, and the people run into the rivers.

The roads in Corea are easily traversed by airships.

The climate of Northern Corea is like that of Oregon when the forecast says, "Fair, with occasional showers;" that is to say, it freezes and rains at the same time, with a little sleet on the side.

The Coreans are an interesting people. They wear such high headgear that it is rare to find a native that talks through his hat. Cuss words are unknown in Corea, the worst thing ever said being, "Oh, go to Fengwangcheng!"

The Russians lost their grip on Talienwan by renaming it Dalny.

New Chwang is the same place as Old Chwang.

Wiju is an important strategic point in Corea, and has had more puns fired at it than any other town in the Orient.

No Vulgar Fractions.

"I hired ten chorus girls in five minutes this morning," remarked Julian Mitchell, who wanted to show how busy he had been.

"Geewillikins!" exclaimed Jack Flaherty, manager of the Majestic Theater, "you are quick at figures."—New York Times.

Thank heaven for web feet.

A long wet spell—Mississippi.

Bristow stirred up the animals.

Why the fuss over impure milk—does it not help to eliminate the unfit?

The censorship at Telluride has been abolished. Russia beat Colorado by a few weeks.

A non-combatant suggests that the successor of Admiral Alexieff intends to Makaroff house with the Japanese navy.

The Ladies' Club at Vladivostok is making sandbags for the defense of the port. This is quite a change from the custom many club members have of sandbagging one another.

Mr. Himes and the "son of a pioneer" are arguing about the date bees were first introduced into Oregon. It is safe to bet that the first male settler brought an office bee along.

PORTLAND, March 12.—(To Note and Comment.)—What is your estimate of the population of heaven? HOMESEEKER.

You would better wait until after the Oriental war, as a new census will probably be taken.

Efforts to revive interest in the two-tailed comet will be futile. It is more of a has-been than Patti, and, unless it can grow a third tail, will never again get on a front page.

The country papers are full of such attractive paragraphs as this from the Chehalem Center correspondence of the Telephone-Register: "It is nearing Spring, as the flowers are blooming and the frogs are croaking."

The flowers are blooming,
And the frogs are blooming,
And the Spring is at hand,
And the soft chinook,
From its farthest nook
Drives the snow from the land.

The flowers are springing,
And the frogs are singing,
And cheering country fellows;
While here in town
The rain comes down,
And raises but umbrellas.

This is how the young man from the Victoria Colonist begins to tell who won the wrestling match between the Indian, "Two Feathers," and McMillan, of Nanaimo:

One giant alabaster, muscled like Antinous, model such as often stirred the sands of the Circus Maximus Flavianus; stripped to the ridgy waist and thereunder clad in dun worsted trunks. The face of him harsh with racial harshness of the stubborn Scottish Highlander, bristly black moustache and with the prognathous jaw that advertises grip in the lay hold anywhere. In his moves the hint of the light toes that make sword dance and shean truibhas the wonders of torpsichorean art.

The other a bronze giant, with face as expressionless as stone; one eye masked with a fell of midnight locks waving free from the Medusa crop over the crown. The other eye calm, dark, but alert as the eagle's. Aquiline nose and lank jaws, and a chin like a sabre sweep, but the mouth of a woman. The jaws busy with a quid of—perhaps gum. Arms of prodigious length; a torso not muscular, but sinewy, like that of the long Montana wolf that nibbles the bait at the Winter traps; plenty of bone and that sort of gliding muscle that seems to move sleepily but arrives with the eye at the spot. Slender hands that do not make much in the way of a fist. The shining bronze trunk does not strike the critical as herculean; indeed, rather out of proportion in its slimness to the height; but in action all that was rectified and the great strength bound up in the bronze skin came forth mightily. The lower limbs of the noble red man were massive and trained to do helpful things in the grim efforts of the setto.

Which of them won—the giant alabaster or the bronze giant? That doesn't matter much anyway, but the winner is announced at the foot of the column.

WEXFORD JONES.