PRAISE AND CRITICISM MADE BY READERS ON TIMELY TOPICS

MR. BRYAN'S VIEW IS SCORED

Policy Regarding Flag Is Declared One Lacking in Principle.

VALE, Or., Aug. 6.—(To the Editor.)—At the Jackson Club Mr. Bryan is quoted thus:

"We must depart from the old doctrine that our flag must be feared and adopt the new doctrine that our flag shall be loved."

Fine! Pretty! Very pretty! But, after all, how absurd! Who loves any flag? Who but those who dwell under its fold love and venerate any flag? Do we love the Lion and the Unicorn? Do we doff our hat at the Union Jack with love, or is it not with respect? What is it that stirs the soul of a Frenchman, an Austrian, an Italian, or an Englishman, when royal bunting is displayed? His own loved banner, and that alone! Under the flag of Germany, of England, of France, Italy and Russia, the people live with certainty that the flag floating above their heads will be their protection throughout the world. Who fears the flag of England? Only those who defy its power to protect its citizens. Harm a citizen of England and their flag will be unfurled at the masthead of a war vessel. That is why the nations of the world find their flags respected; as yet none of them have been feared.

Today the flag we all adore, the beautiful Stars and Stripes, is the only insulted flag on earth; it is the only flag which is no protection to its citizens in a foreign land. The flags of England and of Germany have been used by private citizens to protect them in Mexico; private citizens of our country have sought safety under those flags. Under our Mexican policy our flag has received no respect in that country and it has protected no citizen. Why? Let Bryan answer! He has eliminated himself, so he says, from the inside to the outside of the Cabinet because he can do more good. More good for what? More good for whom? Is he helping to make our flag loved in foreign parts? Is he making friends for himself or for whom? So much for the flag statement. Such sentences hurled forth with grandiloquent gestures and magnificent eloquence will call for applause and loud clapping of hands, but examined in cold print they show for what they really are—superficial bids for political advancement.

"The Causeless War" is another epigrammatic sentence which draws attention. While we are quoting aphorisms and showing their absurdity and use, let us take the old one of "It takes two to make a quarrel." Not so! It is easily made by the desire of one of the parties, and if the other won't fight it can be eliminated and sometimes is eliminated when it does fight, witness Belgium.

"No reason for this war." All right! But the war is! Is this the last war for which there will be no reason? Suppose Germany attacks us without reason? What, then, shall we do? Fight or be eliminated? Ah, but Germany will not attack us! Why? Because there is no reason? She attacked Belgium without reason, for Bryan has just said so; then why may not Germany, or England, or Japan, do the same thing? And what will our much-vaunted flag do to protect our rights? "Might makes right" is another ridiculed aphorism. Yet might makes and unmakes kings, builds and destroys nations. Wrong for the giant to squeeze so hard? "But," said Napoleon, "that is the nature of a giant."

Those of us who are endeavoring to have the country made possible of defense are neither endeavoring to secure peace nor to provoke war; they are making efforts to place this country in such position that no one will jump on us either with or without reason. We are endeavoring to mind our own business, and if there were no patriots endeavoring to set all precedent aside, including the Holy Scriptures, that same would be done and the future "peace at any price" descendants of those now rampant on our shores would have their opportunity to save the country with their "lungs," while, if those now at work have their way, there will be no country except a province of some European monarch to save.

Great treaties those signed with some 30 countries. Those who could not attack us, were they even inclined, could lose nothing by having us wait a year before preparing for war, while those already armed in a superlative degree—England, Germany, France, Italy—could lose less by having us wait a year. Just digest that proposition. We have made 30 treaties with 30 governments which tie us hand and foot and those other governments not at all. Let us examine these arbitration ideas a little. Where lies any benefit to the United States whether Nicaragua, for instance, should wait one or seven years before commencing hostilities in case of a disagreement with us, but she might well make some coalition with an European government meanwhile that would give us trouble. If again England should have a grievance, or Germany disposed to find some causus belli with us, we must wait a year before we even commence to begin to get ready. Do you wonder at Roosevelt flying off the handle at such puerile alleged statesmanship? It is a marvel and one of the modern miracles that a number of sane men in the United States can be found willing to subscribe to such nonsense.

Mr. Bryan says all the "fools are not in the United States," and, while this is true, the converse is also true that all of the fools are not in Europe. If no man broke a lay there would be no need for law. If nations were just, honorable and peaceful, arbitration treaties would be unnecessary while now they are useless. The millennium is not here, and the offering of our country to destruction will not hurry it along. Quoting again: "Let him (the President) know that the peaceful sentiments of this Nation can no more be measured by the utterances of the jingo press than the depth of the ocean can be measured by the foam on the billows." Reads well and no question that pronounced with oratorical fervor, accented with appropriate gestures, it would sound better; but we might let him (the President) know that the sentiment for peace in this country cannot be measured by the great oratorical efforts of politicians more than can the depths of feeling of his opponents, who are loyally standing behind him, be measured by the foam and froth on forensic buncombe.

JOHN RIGLEY.

MUNITION TRADE AND NEUTRALITY

Germany Practiced American Policy in Russo-Japanese War.

RAYMOND, Wash., Aug. 4.—(To the Editor.)—In reading The Oregonian, August 2, I noticed an article headed "Policy Is Rapped," and it is this article that is responsible for these remarks.

This article presents Dr. C. J. Hoxamer's criticism of the American munition policy, in which he states: "I must say I have not been proud of my country lately," and goes on to say, "A nation which prays for peace on Sundays and supplies England with arms and ammunition all the rest of the week is, to say the least, hypocritical."

In other words, he says the United States is wrong in allowing her citizens to supply England and her allies with munitions of war. If this is so, it certainly is an evil that should be corrected; but I believe I voice the opinion of the American people when I say such a statement is false. The United States is a neutral country, and as such she is bound to respect certain laws and precedents, and only by respecting and adhering to these can she remain a neutral.

A neutral country's citizens have always had the right to sell munitions of war to belligerents. Germany upheld this attitude during the Russo-Japan war by supplying them with vast amounts of war materials. Now, a no less person than Dr. C. J. Hoxamer criticises the United States for doing what Germany did scarcely ten years ago. The United States does not say to England, "We will sell you all the war supplies you wish to buy," and then to Germany, "We will sell you nothing." Our policy is equality to both. Our American manufacturers will sell supplies to Germany just as soon as to England, but the difference is, England controls the high seas and can get these supplies, while Germany cannot, because England has control of the high seas.

Recognizing that a neutral country is bound to uphold certain prescribed laws and precedents, it follows to divert from these would be an unneutral act. In view of this fact, any action on the part of our Government to prevent the citizens of this country from supplying belligerents with munitions of war would be unneutral. Hence, we are doing our duty as a neutral by allowing war materials to be bought in this country. Dr. C. J. Hoxamer and others of that caliber do not blame the United States because Germany can get no supplies here; they should blame Germany for being so weak on the high seas that she cannot come and get them.

Dr. C. J. Hoxamer also ridicules the American public because we pray for peace and allow munitions to be shipped. It is true we pray for peace, every man of us, and the person who does not is not deserving of the name, man. The American people, however, are not a people to let their sympathies and emotions blind their sense of justice, and that is why we allow the shipment of war materials. I have no doubt but what Dr. Hoxamer has prayed for peace, and also to let no peace come until Germany wins. Even if he has not, I have heard many German-Americans, not American-Germans voice that sentiment and I must say that it is a fine example of German consistency.

The Honorable Dr. C. J. Hoxamer declares, "I must say I have not been proud of my country lately." I think that our country has more grounds to be less proud of him than he has for her.

CLAYTON A. FENLASON.

FORM OF EXAMINATION JUSTIFIED

Written School Test Should Be Made Without Bearing on Promotion.

PORTLAND, Aug. 6.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian last Sunday entitled "Summer Resolutions for Teachers" suggests the following ideas along the same line. The day of the old-style final examination, upon which alone depended the promotion of the pupil, and hence, in his mind, the success or failure of the whole term's work, in the writer's opinion, happily is rapidly passing away. For years, in the Portland schools, the formal examination counted for one-half in the matter of promotion. Under the present administration it counts for about one-tenth and must be added to the marks made during the entire term. This, together with the fact that pupils making an average of 80 per cent are passed without any final examination at all, practically abolishes the whole plan.

In the writer's opinion, there is justification for a form of examination. And the principle which determines whether it is good or bad is this: Does it assist in the process of teaching? When a class has covered a certain subject it is essential to know how much of an impression has been made. A test or a written review at this time helps the teacher to determine how well her work has been done and whether it is best to proceed or review.

A test of this kind should be given along with the regular classroom work, without any special stress or excitement and with the clear understanding on the part of the pupil that it does not determine his standing for the month or the term and that it does not have more than a general bearing on the matter of his promotion.

Some pupils become very skillful in the oral recitation and learn to make a little knowledge go a long way. A review or test at the end of the subject, not at the end of term, brings this out and gives the teacher clear and exact knowledge of just what each pupil has really learned.

And then, too, some little knowledge of the manner of conducting examinations is likely to be of value in his later experiences, since entrance to so many professions, not to speak of the civil service, depends upon the showing he can make in a written test.

The thing that should determine the matter of the pupil's going along with his class or taking a term for review is whether he can profit most by going ahead or reviewing. And in settling this important question quite a good many things should be taken into consideration aside from the tabulated record of his work.

I believe, at present, that the needs of the individual child are being pretty carefully considered. With the freedom that teachers and principals are allowed this ought to be increasingly possible.

B. E. HUGHSON.
222 West Sumner street.

SPEED MANIACS USING BEACHES

Ocean Visitor Complains of Danger to Children and Bathers.

PORTLAND, Aug. 6.—(To the Editor.)—Permit me to call attention to the "sand hogs" now operating in full blast on our nearby beaches, especially on the beautiful stretch of sand from Long Beach to Ocean Park and Nahcotta.

I refer to the speed maniac in his auto who makes life miserable to those who have gone to the beaches for a few days' rest from the city's turmoil. These "sand hogs" have got the speeding habit pretty well developed and they race up and down the beach at a speed easily of 60 miles, utterly unconcerned apparently of the dozens of little youngsters whose life they are endangering by their recklessness and utterly marring the peace of mind of the parents of the little people.

As bathing time is considered safest when the tide is within an hour of its high, naturally it's the time when all the youngsters and others are disporting in the sea or playing along its edge. High tide leaves very little of the hard surface sand that the "sand hog" enjoys; therefore, in order to keep up speed, he has to graze the very edge of the ocean, scattering sea and sand over anyone who fails to get out of the way, causing alarm and fright to bathers and spectators.

Apparently the fact that there is no peace officer or anyone clothed with authority to regulate the slanting forehead, grinning "sand hog" is taken advantage of.

The attention of the Constable or Sheriff of the bailiwick that this particular beach is located in is respectfully drawn to this condition, and I am sure he will have the heartfelt gratitude of the thousands of visitors who annually make the beach pilgrimage if he will take a hand in bridling the "sand hog" nuisance, so that life and limb will be safe and the pleasure of the beach will be enjoyed by all. M.

BRYAN'S UTTERANCES ANNOY

Advocacy Against Preparedness for Emergency Declared Crime.

OSWEGO, Or., Aug. 6.—(To the Editor.—As a common, every-day American, I protest against the inconsistent utterances of men like Bryan. I have not noticed these remarks in your columnns, but I have read them in dailies that ought to think twice before printing them. America first, and we always should be willing to apply the principles of logic to every statement and then with all the force with which we can muster crush down the erroneous.

"To go to war with a mad nation at this time would be like challenging an insane asylum." To prejudice the minds of the rising generation against preparedness for any and all emergencies amounts to crime, and yet such statements amount to that, for if we listen to all he says we are not to educate a false standard of heroes.

Suppose that mad nation challenges us? Suppose we are taught by powerful oratory that it is wrong to fight, that we have higher ideals. Then comes the insane asylum. We could blame our downfall to the utterances of men like Bryan.

He says the searcher of holy writ would not find any mention of the big stick. No, for they were ruled by kaisers in those days and the instrument wielded is as then, a sword. We have no record that Christ had a stick or sword when he cleared the temple of the grafters; we do know that he did not use the logic of the mollycoddle.

Our National life, embracing all that constitutes worth living, all that the greatest of the world's greatest who fought, that institutions which contained happiness for all might live, this peculiar leader is trying to undo. He does not wish to challenge.

He seems to forget that the insane asylum has broken loose and where it will go or what it will do no human can predict with certainty.

It seems strange and almost suggests a mental unbalance that leaders of reform can be as illogical as the president of the National Peace Society, who is quoted as saying that in the event of Germany winning we must prepare for war. We all know the danger. The insane asylum has broken loose in Europe and we need more than peace advocates to bring these back into captivity. It is the work for men and not mollycoddles.

The doctrine of peace and good will as taught by Jesus is so beautiful that it contains within itself evidence of its divinity; but we cannot preach it to a maddened nation; they will not listen and could not understand if they could hear. Germany, France and England—those are the countries for Bryan and Mr. Thwing to expend their energies for peace upon, not here where our only wish is self-defense.

There is one cure for the advocate of a false doctrine that may find too many adherents, for all are not gifted with the power of reasoning carefully from cause to effect. That cure lies with the cartoonist, for while the subject is very serious, the ridiculous side, pointed out, would be the best argument.

There are all kinds of traitors to a country, but surely the false teacher is the worst.

V. F. COOPER.

MILITARY TRAINING PROPOSED

Militia Pay Bill and Discipline in High Schools Are Suggested.

DALLAS, Or., Aug. 6.—(To the Editor.)—I was somewhat interested in your editorial entitled "But What Are We Going to Do About It?" in which you call attention to the surplus of vocal energy being used in calling attention to the Nation's unpreparedness for war or defense, and an utter failure on the part of those most actively engaged in this diversion to point out the remedy.

That we are unprepared for war, and that for a Nation as great and prosperous as is oure, we are almost criminally negligent in our failure properly to prepare ourselves for all emergencies, seems to be admitted by all "red-blooded" Americans, though some of our "grapejuice" peace advocates would have us think otherwise. Peace is all right; it is a noble and inspiring thought; but peace at the sacrifice of National honor and integrity is absolutely out of the question if we, as the greatest republic on earth, are to maintain our standing in the court of nations.

Man is but one species of the animal kingdom, and he partakes of the fundamental principle of animal nature. Might is right. So long as the spirit prevails which prompts the young boy who is struck by another to strike back, just so long will there be war and danger of war, for men are but boys grown up and nations are but aggregations of individuals.

What makes our judgments obtained in the civil courts good? What is there that makes the judgment of a civil judge binding and effective? His word does not do it. It is the fact that his order is backed up by force, even by the arms of the United States, if necessary. Therefore, there will always be a necessity for some military strength, even if the ultimate goal of peace advocates be attained. But the goal is far distant; we must worry along under existing conditions for awhile; we must face the problem as it actually exists and not as we would have it exist. Then what are we to do?

I believe that the National Guard organizations of this country should form our first reserve for defense. They should be placed under Government supervision and be subject to call of the Government in case of need, with the power in the Government to move them from place to place within our own country, as well as outside the territorial limits of our country, if necessary. They should be subject to the same orders and regulations as in the regular Army. As a means of recruiting the National Guard to its full strength and keeping it there, a militia pay bill should be passed by Congress by which citizen-soldiers shall receive pay according to the service they render in times of peace, as well as in times of war. In other words, the Government should not expect them to give their time to military service for nothing.

In the second place every public high school and every public university in the United States should be placed under military discipline; do not leave this entirely to the agricultural colleges. Military discipline in the high school would be a most excellent thing for the youth whose character is just then framing. Drill the high school student; give him a gun and make him take target practice; make it a habit in him to be regular and punctual in his hours of study, recreation and sleep; make him broad-shouldered, full-chested, shoulders back, chin in and body erect. Make him clean, healthy and wholesome. Give him something to do to take the place of the billiard-room; do away with the cigarette and give him independence and manliness; make him take the "setting-up" exercises and the "Butt's Manual"; teach him to care for his person and health; give him plenty of outdoor sports.

This but makes his study easier and more pleasant; that it will make him independent and manly cannot be questioned successfully. And we do not even have to confine it to the high school student. From first grade or primer class to university sheepskin, military discipline will be of benefit to the youth of our country. If conditions such as these existed our country at all times would have plenty of well-trained men who, in cases of necessity, could be depended upon to furnish the Nation the defense that all great nations must have if they are to maintain their standing among nations. The people of the United States will never stand for a large standing Army, but what objection could the mothers and fathers of our country have to the development along proper lines of their offspring? Just and proper discipline in youth is the making of successful men, and military discipline is just and proper.

"Peace-at-any-price" advocates say this would create in our youths a spirit of militarism, something to be avoided. But what if it does? What harm is done? Admitting that it does, it at the same time will make of these youths men of judgment and discretion. But then we need not fear on that score. Every American boy with good, rich, red corpuscles in his blood has more or less of a martial spirit without the aid of anything else. If he does not have, he is not worth the space he occupies. Any boy or man whose blood does not literally boil when his country or flag is insulted, and who is not willing to stand by his nation in time of need, even to the extent of giving his life, if necessary, is not fit to be a citizen and under the protection of this or any other nation.

Fear of developing too much martial spirit in this country should have about run its course by now. Let us have as much regard for our Nation as we have for our home, for our home is no more safe than is our Nation. Let us not forget the far-sighted advice of Washington.

WALTER L. TOOZE, JR.

POPULAR FALLACIES CORRECTED

Oregon Circulars Contain Numerous Errors, Geographic and Otherwise

PORTLAND, Aug. 7.—(To the Editor.)—Now that tourist season is in full swing, civic bodies, transportation companies and others are issuing all manner of folders and booklets calculated to impart to visitors facts about Portland and Oregon. Some of this publicity literature is excellent, but much of it shows signs of not having been carefully edited.

The Oregon geographic board has been trying to go over various state maps and booklets with the idea of correcting the statements and figures presented therein. There seems to be a great tendency on the part of the compilers to accept as a fact, without formality of investigation, something that has appeared elsewhere in print.

For instance, most of the 1915 crop of circulars state that the Oregon Historical Society's historical museum is at the City Hall. The Historical Society moved to Second and Taylor streets several years ago, and the City Free Museum at the City Hall is composed mostly of natural history specimens.

Then there are a number of geographical fallacies that always bob up. One of these is that Bull Run water comes from melting ice on the slopes of Mount Hood. As a matter of fact it has nothing to do with Mount Hood, as an inspection of the Mount Hood topographic map will show. If the water did come from glaciers, it would be unfit to drink. The Bull Run water shed is quite separate from Mount Hood.

Another error is that the Cascade Range is supposed to be a continuation of the Sierra Nevada. These mountain systems are in no way related, either geographically or geologically. They are separated by a gap south of Lassen Peak. Lassen Peak and Mount Shasta are members of the Cascade Range, and are not part of the Sierra Nevada.

Mount Mazama, which is presumed to have stood at the site of Crater Lake did not "blow its top off" or explode and leave a hole in which water accumulated. If there was a mountain there it collapsed and sank. There is no trace of any large amount of exploded material in the neighborhood, and there is ample geological evidence that the peak collapsed. Also please note that Wizard Island in Crater Lake is not the top of the original mountain. It is the result of much later volcanic activity.

The statement was made at a public gathering recently that Mount Hood was Oregon's most important scenic wonder. Now Mount Hood is a beautiful mountain, but it is far from being a scenic wonder. It is not unusual. If Oregon has an important scenic wonder, it is Crater Lake, for Crater Lake is unusual from many points of view, particularly geologically, and even all of its geological history has not been worked out. There are many mountains, but only one Crater Lake.

Then there is the matter of elevations. Guess work has been particularly prevalent in making up altitude tables. There is presented herewith a list of many important points, with the latest altitudes computed by the geological and the coast and geodetic surveys. These computations are highly accurate and may be depended upon.

Elevations above sea-level:	Feet.
Mt. Rainier	14,408
Mt. Shasta	14,162
Mt. Adams	12,326
Mt. Hood	11,225
Mt. Baker	10,730
Mt. Jefferson	10,522
Lassen Peak	10,466
South Sister	10,352
Mt. St. Helens	9,697
Mt. McLoughlin	9,491
Mt. Thielsen	9,178
Mt. Scott	8,938
Diamond Peak	8,792
Mt. Bailey	8,356
Mt. Washington	7,769
Cowhorn	7,666
Mt. Ashland	7,535
Sawtooth	7,205
Crater Lake surface	6,177
Marys Peak	4,097
Larch Mountain	4,045
Chehalem Mountains	1,447
Council Crest	1,073

The statement is often made that Eagle Cap in the Wallowa Mountains is higher than Mount Hood. This is not true. Clyde Aitchison made a careful determination of Eagle Cap and found it to be about 9675 feet. The probability is that Eagle Cap may not even be the highest point in the Wallowa Mountains, though it is the most conspicuous and impressive. It is believed that other nearby peaks are about 9800 feet in elevation.

Then we have misspellings such as Latourelle, when it should be Latourell, and objectional possessives that are entirely out of place in geographical names, for persons cannot own scenic features. Mitchell's Point should be Mitchell Point. As a matter of fact we have to accept Grays Harbor, Grants Pass and Youngs Bay because they are established, but we should stop starting new possessives, and when they are used the apostrophe should be eliminated. Pikes Peak is correct, not Pike's Peak. Shepperds Dell is the way to write it. Also Wahkeena Falls are the falls in Benson Park, not Gordon Falls.

The United States Geographic Board has devoted considerable attention to Oregon names and has made many decisions as to correct spellings, such as Calapooya, Illahe, Mount McLoughlin and not Mount Pitt, Tualatin and not Tualitin, Cascade Range and not Cascade Mountains, Coast Range and not Coast Mountains, Wallowa Mountains and not Powder River, Eagle nor Granite mountains, Sauvie Island and not Sauvie's Island, Guild Lake and not Guild's Lake, Milwaukie, etc. The O.-W. R. & N. Co. and the Northern Pacific Railway Company have co-operated with the Oregon Board in eliminating possessive names from their stations and getting together with the Postoffice athorities so that discrepancies between the station names and the postoffice names might be eliminated. The action of these railroads is appreciated. The writer will be glad to furnish any available information if addressed at the Spalding building.

LEWIS A. M'ARTHUR.

DEFENSE SOLUTION OFFERED

Tear Up Constitution and Start All Over, Says Writer.

SUTHERLIN, Or., Aug. 6.—(To the Editor.)—This letter is written in response to your editorial under heading, "What Are We Going to Do About It?" in which you ask suggestions for a remedy for the unpreparedness of the United States for war. The letter is addressed to you and your readers and to the citizens of the United States generally, in all seriousness and in the hope that the National Government will, in the near future, undertake the work proposed.

By way of preface I want to ask a few questions of the average man, and have a little heart-to-heart talk with him.

The average man is 40 years old; he has a home and family; he has a trade, business or profession and is making a living; he hasn't made a hundred-yard run in 20 years; he hasn't hit a punching bag or had on a pair of boxing gloves in ten years; he doesn't play tennis; he doesn't golf; he doesn't bowl; he walks an average of two miles a day, and throws back his shoulders and expands his chest with good, pure air on an average of once a week.

Now, Mr. Average Man, right now, while you sit reading this, your son comes to you with his face bruised and clothes torn, and tells you that a man, who is now standing in front of your house, attacked him while he was coming in from an errand to the grocer's over the way. You are indignant; you at once go out to look for that man; you feel that you will be justified in knocking him down and giving him such punishment that he will not repeat the offense; there he is, waiting for you—not running away; he is big and strong and athletic and looks you over contemptuously.

Well, what do you do about it? Do you take a licking? Do you go back and phone for a policeman? Or do you tell the bruiser what you think of him and that he had better not do it again? Being only an average man you "tell him." Well, how do you feel about it? What does your son think about it? What does the offender care about it?

Now, a government sometimes finds itself in exactly your predicament, Mr. Average Man. Today it is your Government and mine that is confronted with just that problem.

Three foreign governments are now engaged in wronging citizens of our country. One of these governments controls the strongest naval force in the world. It has interfered with and partially destroyed our commerce; has stolen merchandise belonging to our citizens and refuses to give it up or to pay for the goods. This government is an old offender; we have had trouble with it on previous occasions and ought to know what to expect from it.

Another government, ranking second among the naval powers, has caused the destruction of the property and lives of American citizens.

The third offender is not a government at all, but a nation divided against itself; the victim of half a score of treacherous, unscrupulous leaders of brigands, who rob and pillage wantonly. They have murdered American citizens, both in their own and in our country, besides destroying millions of dollars worth of our citizens' property.

Well, what is our Government doing about it?

In the case of the first mentioned offender nothing has been done. The second has been told officially what our Government thinks of this action and that he'd better not do it again. In the case of the third offender, our Government has presented to the various brigand leaders a series of demands, commands, proposals and threats, which have excited ridicule, contempt and defiance, but have had no other effect.

Why is our Government handling these cases in this way? What do you care about it all, anyway, Mr. Average Man? Being an average man, you don't care a tinker's dam about it, and that mental attitude of yours, coupled with your physical weakness, is the reason our Government is doing just nothing at all, but inviting more serious trouble later on.

There are three strong minorities among our citizens. The first and strongest minority looks upon war or the preparation for war, or the preparation for defense, with horror; places convenience above National honor, and wants peace at almost any price.

Second in strength is the minority that stands for Nationalism, patriotism, protection of life and property for all our people, at home and abroad.

The third minority has no apparent power. Its members have been exploited, mistreated, robbed, neglected. Most of them sleep by the roadside in Summer and in "charity" bunkhouses and jails in the Winter. They come to your door asking for a meal. The chief of police escorts them to the city limits and orders them to "move on."

They migrate from steel mill to mine, from harvest field to hopyard, from logging camp to railroad construction camp. They have no homes, no property interests. Wherever the "black list" flourishes, wherever the militia is called out for strike duty, there the ranks of the third minority are recruited. Whenever a coalpicker or a cotton mill starveling gets old enough to jump a freight train and has spirit enough left to do it, the third minority gets a recruit. When your son gets to hitting the booze too hard in a licensed saloon and "gets into trouble with the police" and "disgraces himself" the third minority will get another recruit. The attitude of this minority toward government is one of bitterness, hatred or fear, depending upon the individual experience, but rarely reverence, devotion or even respect.

Now, Mr. Average Man, what do you think of these minorities? The first and second you read about in the daily press and in magazines (you seldom read a book, unless it be sentimental fiction—anything else makes you sleepy). Well, you guess the first bunch are all right enough—some of them may be mollycoddles; anyhow they do not disturb the status quo, and they never disturb your peace of mind with prophesies of evil days; with hints of a yellow peril; with glaring confessions of the country's weakness in means of defense, as do the members of the second minority, whom you term "jingos" and "militarists." The third minority is an annoyance to you, "a menace to society, with their soapbox sedition and anarchistic effervescence. Something ought to be done to get rid of them."

And you, Mr. Average Man, are the majority. Yours is a big majority. Why don't you rule? Because you are drilled in subservience; educated to do a certain task; you idealize mediocre success; you worship the "captain of industry"; your one ambition is to get money enough to live without working; you are a moral and physical coward; you would rather live out a lie in your own life, or suffer restraint and injustice from others than to chance an empty belly and a cold back. In your liberality you are governed by sentimentality, not by principle. In politics you vote to the dictates of narrow, self-interest when "times are good" and to the dictates of a braying ass or a "right-thinking" demagogue when "times are bad." You never think. You don't know how to think. You don't want to know how. You are a sentimentalist, not a patriot. You stand before the Liberty Bell with your hat off and forget the events that gave it fame. You become maudlin over "ties of blood," "hands across the sea," "the mother country" (God save the mark), and forget Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill; the River Raisin is a myth, to you; the impressment of American seamen, a legend; the battle of New Orleans was a mistake; the Alabama is rotted and rusted long ago; the Venezuelan boundary, a mark on the map.

You read a press agent's dope on a "war for civilization" and forget the Opium War and the Crimean War; you read of demands for the freedom of Poland and forget Ireland; of a great nation "never having gone to war for conquest," and forget India and South Africa. You shed tears and coin over "heroic Belgium" and forget the Belgian Congo. You read protests of friendship from the second naval power and forget Manila Bay. You listen to the "silver-tongued" orator and forget "16-to-1." You "stand back of the President," but you never ask him the mysterious reason that prompted him to give the lie to his party platform in the matter of the Panama tolls question. This is a good time to ask him, by the way.

Ah, well, Mr. Average Man, you live in your hope for enough money to live without work, with your eyes focused on a dollar and your ears open to a siren song. And the state lives in the expressed will of the majority—indifference.

You may not believe it, Mr. Average Man, but you are the menace of the life of this country of yours. Yours? Sure it's yours. Of course it's yours. How big is it, Mr. Average Man? You own it. Tell me the length of its coast line. By the way, how many states are there in the Union? Who is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States? Who is the Congressman from your district? How long has he served? What has he done? What is the per cent of illiteracy in the population of your state? What in your country? How long since you visited the school your children attend? When did you last vote at a school election? Quote me, please, one complete sentence from the Constitution of the United States; one from the constitution of your state. Who are the members of the President's Cabinet, and what are their duties?

Any intelligent schoolboy ought to answer all that and a whole lot more besides, but the average man can't even explain to you what a republican form of government is.

You don't even know how many soldiers there are in your Army or the fighting strength of your Navy. You haven't one general officer capable of handling 100,000 men, nor one who has had any experience in handling one-half that number. And you want to know a remedy for your country's unpreparedness for war. I begin to understand how it is that Charles Chaplin has so many "doubles."

Now patriotism is born of intelligence and what I have to propose is that the next generation of average men shall be intelligent men; strong men; men who know their country; men who love their country; men who are willing to live day by day and hour by hour for their country; men who will work for their country, think for their country, dream for their country; men who, if need be, will gladly die for their country, and to that end my suggestions are:

1. That the National Government acquire the ownership of all public school property in the United States, including state universities, agricultural colleges, normal schools, etc., etc., and manage and control, through its department of education, a public school system which shall be absolutely free to all pupils—no fees, no charge for textbooks, no expense to the pupil.

2. That attendance at the Government's public schools be compulsory for all children between the ages of 6 years and 17 years.

3. That in connection with the public schools, gymnasiums be established and maintained by the National Government and that rifle ranges, equipped with latest model U. S. Army rifles and ammunition be a portion of the gymnasium equipment in every school district in the United States.

4. that attendance at gymnasium and military drill, once each week, be compulsory for all men between the ages of 17 and 27 years and optional between the ages of 27 and 100 years.

5. That no pledge or promise of enlistment in the United States Army be required of the pupils in the public schools or of attendants at the gymnasiums.

6. That all instructors and teachers and drillmasters in the Government's schools, universities, gymnasiums and rifle ranges, and all officers, assistants and employes, be American citizens and be required to take an oath of loyalty to the Government as binding as that administered to officers in the United States Army or Navy.

7. That the system be under civil service rule.

8. That the National Government acquire possession of all the buildings, arms and equipment, now the property of the several states, and used by the states' militia.

9. That the right of the states to establish and maintain military organizations be abrogated.

10. That the United States Government establish and maintain three new military schools, similar to the school at West Point; one of these schools to be located at a place selected by the Secretary of War, in the State of Texas; one in the State of Montana, and one in the State of California.

11. That the United States Government establish and maintain three new Naval academies similar to the one at Annapolis; one to be located at Honolulu, one at some place on the North Pacific Coast of America, and one at some point on the Coast of the Gulf of Mexico.

12. That the United States Government establish and maintain a school of science for investigation, experiment and invention of new methods of defensive and aggressive warfare.

13. That the Government, through its Secretary of Labor, foster and encourage trades unions and other organizations of working men.

14. That the Government require arbitration agreements between all employers and their employes and that in all cases of violation of this agreement, resulting in "strikes," "walkouts" or "lockouts," the business affected be conducted, so far as labor conditions are concerned, under supervision of an official appointed by the Secretary of Labor, pending the settlement of dispute; that all policing of the areas affected by such disturbance be done by officers and men of the United States Army, under supervision of the Secretary of War.

15. That the Sherman law be at once repealed, together with other similar legislation, both National and state.

16. That the United States Government, through all its departments, foster and encourage trade, manufacture and commerce.

17. That the Government establish and maintain a school of science, the chief function of which shall be the invention of machinery and appliances to promote the safety of workmen and to do the work now done by men, women and children in mills, mines and factories.

18. That the National Government undertake the advertisement and sale of patents on investions, when requested to do so by inventors.

That is all for this time.

What do you think of it, Mr. Average Man? Do you believe that the compulsory education proposed, and the compulsory physical training proposed would improve the stock of average men in the next generation? Do you believe that it would go a long way toward solving the problem of the third minority? Do you believe that the presence of ten or twelve million men in this country, who have had intelligent patriotism instilled in their minds from early boyhood, who have been made physically fit by gymnasium work, who have been under constant military discipline in young manhood, who know how to shoot straight, could be quickly mobilized and well officered—do you believe that that would be in a measure an insurance against injustice from foreign governments? Do you believe it would be a good thing to take all the pale-faced, stoop-shouldered, crawling, slouching, shambling boys and young men one sees in American cities and towns and country places and make them into bright, intelligent, robust, full-chested men, who walk erect and whose minds are clean and whose brains are clear and active?

There's a lot of this dope, but it's no small job to formulate this "remedy." It means taking a lot of sentimental "old women of both sexes," a few million corner grocerymen, grocery clerks, bank presidents, "respectable citizens" who ride in streetcars, "first citizens" who ride in automobiles, hobos who ride on freightcars, poor, half-fed, half-clothed, half-paid, ill-housed members of the "common labor class," floaters, prosperous farmers, bookkeepers, river niggers, "hill people," hired men, burglars, pimps, pickpockets, policemen, politicians, bartenders, table-waiters, Chautauqua lecturers, timber thieves, teachers, preachers, railroad "magnates," chauffeurs and newspaper editors, and millions and millions besides. It means taking all the riffraff that go to make up the citizenship of our country, the big majority and the three minorities, and making them into a nation.

"Why," you say, "you couldn't do what you propose without changing the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of nearly all the states besides!"

Well, what of it? They'll stand a change if they're any good. Paper is cheap. Do you know, Mr. Average Man, you could take all those constitutions and casually drop them in the river. Yes, you really could, you know. My, think of it! And you wouldn't notice the loss. You don't know one iota of what they contain. Look here, Mr. Average Man, those constitutions are yours to do what you please with. They won't hurt you. They don't bite. Take hold of one of them sometime and look it over. Honest, now, it will be all right. Walk right up to it and pick it up.

This Government is yours, Mr. Average Man. It is a tool for your hand; with it you can shape a nation the the like of which was never seen on this earth before, a nation every mother's son of you will be proud to live and die for. Will you do it?

Besides, if things go on as they're going now, so very much longer, someone will come along, or maybe he's growing up among you now, who won't see any need for any constitution at all for you, and may have ideas about the government of what are left of you that are distasteful in the extreme. Good night to you.

A. S. JOHNSON.

Park Tract Is Given Vader.

CHEHALIS, Wash., Aug. 7.—(Special.)—Joshua Pierce, the well-known Tacoma pioneer and capitalist, who is one of the principal owners in the Little Falls Fire Clay Company, has just donated to the town of Vader, Wash., three and one-half acres of land near the Stillwater Railroad bridge for public park purposes. The tract is admirably situated for a park.

Take a $15
VICTROLA
to the Country
Fits in Your Grip

¶ This $15 model is a genuine Victrola—only smaller than the wonderful original—it will fit in a suit case or grip—no cumbersome horn to bother with. Just the thing to take to the Summer camp or country cottage. You'll dance just as much in the country as you did in the city. This little Victrola will always be ready — will never get tired—will play the best dance time.

¶ And besides, the Victrola is the greatest Summer time entertainer—you and your visitors can listen to bands, great singers, popular songs and comedians. It will fill in, offering a world of entertainment during otherwise dull moments.

Victrolas $15 to $250—Easy Terms

Sherman, Clay & Co.

STEINWAY, WEBER AND OTHER PIANOS. PIANOLA PIANOS
VICTROLAS AND ALL THE RECORDS

Sixth and Morrison, Portland, Or.

I: 108.2