ANALYTICAL VIEWS OF CURRENT TOPICS GIVEN BY READERS

MR. WEST'S POSITION AMAZES

Championship of Tax Limitation Measure Causes Surprise.

TOLEDO, Or., Nov. 3.—(To the Editor.)—It is somewhat surprising to find ex-Governor Oswald West expounding the theory of the so-called mandatory tax limitation and championing this proposed amendment to our state constitution limiting the expenditures of public money. The most surprising part of his statement is the implied assertion that the cause of all public extravagance is through and on account of the public officers of Oregon, thereby appealing to the prejudices of the people. It is well known to this same Oswald West that at least three-fourths of all public expenditures originate with and are demanded by the people and not through, nor by, the public officers. Of this he is fully informed.

Seventy-five per cent of all money now collected by direct taxation in the state is by the will of the people through initiative or direct vote for some specific purpose; the remaining 25 per cent is made necessary largely on account of the past and present actions of the voters of Oregon. Every taxpayer should stand for economy in public expenditures, not only because it is good business, but because the rule of right and the law of justice demand it of a self-governed people.

This proposed constitutional amendment will bring very little, if any, relief and that little is obtained at the expense of the citizenship of our state. It proposes economy by adding further expense. It says to the extravagant taxing district or subdivision, "You are right and the law is with you"; at the same time it says to the economical taxing district or subdivision, "Since you have heretofore been careful and conservative, you must continue to be so." That alone should defeat this measure. By its provisions it induces the extravagant and forces the conservative taxing districts or subdivisions to keep their levies up to the limit each year, because if they do not, the law will not permit an increase beyond 6 per cent. Also they must levy each year, because, if they should fail to levy just one year for any cause, according to this proposed constitutional amendment, they have lost the ability to do business as other taxing districts absolutely and forever. They may call a special election and through that means levy and collect 10 times the amount needed, under this proposed amendment, and this may be done each year, but never can they be reinstated as a regular organized taxing district; they are outlawed. Sounds ridiculous and is so, but such, in practice, will be this proposed measure.

Suppose some taxing district or subdivision failed to make a levy in 1915 or in any subsequent year; how could that district or subdivision raise any money thereafter except by calling a special election each year?

Some constructive legislation is needed, which will obtain results through a sane and practicable method, bringing every department of state, county, district and municipal government to the same level. The following plan is given, not purporting to be evenly balanced or correct as to amounts, but to illustrate a method that will bring results without detracting from or lowering our standard of citizenship:

1. State purposes, an amount not exceeding 2 mills on the dollar of the actual value of the assessable property of the state as determined by the proper process.

2. County purposes, an amount not exceeding 6 mills on the dollar on the assessed value of the county.

3. School purposes, an amount not exceeding 6 mills on the dollar on the assessed value of the district.

4. Road purposes, an amount not exceeding 6 mills on the dollar on the assessed valuation of the district.

5. Cities, an amount not exceeding 10 mills on the dollar on the assessed value of the city.

The above plan, together with the budget system now in actual practice, will furnish a safe method of levying and collecting public funds. While the levies for any purpose in any year may be below the amount stated, it cannot in any case be higher, and a lower levy would not disrupt the future business of such taxing district. The law pertaining to bond issues and extraordinary expenses is now taken care of by providing special sections. This law need not be disturbed. Also, in any emergency, our State Legislature can meet it as an extraordinary condition. This is a part of the fundamental law of self-preservation and cannot be repealed. Should the voters distrust our Legislature, which I do not believe is true except in rare cases, they have the referendum, which will cost a great deal less than calling a special election. Our Legislature could meet an extraordinary condition in one week's time, costing not to exceed $10,000, while the calling of the special election as provided under this proposed amendment would take three months and cost $120,000.

This effort is made in the interest of good government, an appeal to the common fairness and comon sense of the voters of Oregon. While at this time I am one of the public officers of Oregon, yet on January 1, 1917, my term will end, and, so far as now known, never again will I be anything but a private citizen, which, after all, is the most desirable and the most honorable title to hold.

W. E. BALL,
Assessor of Lincoln County.

WALL STREET AGAINST HUGHES

Republican Leaders Preclude Influence of Interests.

DALLAS, Or., Nov. 2.—(To the Editor.)—The result most feared from the split in the Republican party in 1912, that automatically let the Democrats into power, and that seemed certain until the outbreak of the war in Europe, was that the deplorable condition of the country would make it possible for "Wall street" to dictate the nominee of the Republicans in 1916.

The war, however, had the effect of a protective tariff and of so greatly increasing our exports of food, clothing and ammunition to the nations at war that business in many lines became active and prosperous.

This prosperity strengthened the hand of the people as a whole and the Democratic party in particular. And instead of "Wall street" being in a position to name the rules under which they would play at the June convention, the masses of the party were able to and did force the nomination of Mr. Hughes, whose public record and conduct on the supreme bench commanded the approval of both factions of the party and the active support of such eminently patriotic statesmen as Roosevelt, Taft, Lodge, Root, Borah, Burton, Beveridge, Cummins and Robins, who are leading the party today.

I want to urge upon you that it was the patriotism of these men while the country is approaching a crisis that led them to join hands in an effort to defeat the forces at work.

Disregarding the facts surrounding the nomination of Mr. Hughes and that the only state in the Union (Oregon) placing his name on the Presidential ballot gave him (Hughes) five votes to one over Wilson, the President of these United States is daily making the obviously false statement that Mr. Hughes was nominated and is controlled by "Wall street" interests. On the same pages of the press publishing these statements the Democratic papers are parading the news that the president of the Harriman railroads, the president of the Erie Railroad and the president of the Wabash have come out for Wilson and that their campaign contributions have amounted to $150,000 in five days and that Shadow Lawn is bursting with optimism and joy.

Now it is perfectly clear to all who have kept themselves informed that "Wall street" is and has been opposed to Hughes and that the names first and always associated with the term are Rockefeller, Morgan and Harriman. They control that group of railroads headed by R. S. Lovett since Mr. Harriman's death. It is the leaders now in control of the Republican party who preclude any possibility of Wall street dictating the policies of that party. If Mr. Wilson would lend the entire support and power of the Administration to force a law through Congress, regardless of the merit and justice of the law, for a possible 300,000 votes, what would he not barter for the electoral vote of New York, without which it is impossible for him to be re-elected? That state is decidedly close and the one most susceptible to the influence of "Wall street."

E. E. ELLSWORTH.

POST-WAR PERIOD PICTURED

T. T. Geer Points Out Difficulties That Will Face Industry.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—"Some sweet day, bye and bye," the European war will come to a close—possibly and probably within a year. On that very day every factory in the United States now engaged in producing munitions of war for the fighting nations will close down. There are approximately two millions of men employed in such factories and the question is, what will we do with that vast army of unemployed men thrown toward new channels now already filled?

That is one phase of the situation. Another is that there will be several millions in Europe, now on the battlefields, who will be returning home, seeking employment, and when they get it the products of their labor will be hurting a market, a foreign market, and since we have, by enacting the Underwood tariff law, invited the importation of foreign-made goods, we will present the most attractive field to be found anywhere.

It is well to bear in mind that the plea for a lower tariff is based on the other plea that we want cheaper goods—we lower the tariff in order that foreign-made goods may come into the United States in larger quantities. Even the Democrats admit this. Then what?

This is no fanciful picture, drawn for political effect. Any 10-year-old schoolboy can understand this state of facts. With Mr. Wilson and the Democratic party continued in power for another four years, with the Underwood tariff law unrepealed or unmodified, conditions in store for this country will be appalling. The year of bread lines and free soup houses, which were the portion of our people under that law until the European war gave us a blood-red foreign market for our foodstuffs and guns and bullets, was but a feeble forecast of what we may expect under another term of Democracy and free trade.

A "tariff for revenue only" always produces just this result. And why not? Besides, the most disastrous effect of such a tariff law is that while it is a bid for the products of foreign laborers, it doesn't produce any revenue.

With this condition inevitably facing us, together with the fact that Wilson has blunderedited and intervened in Mexican affairs; has kept us at war with that country for three years—in a much worse condition today than when he first decided not to butt in—with no American lives or property in that country, or any other, protected in the slightest degree; with the promise to exempt American vessels from tolls while going through our own canal at Panama thrown to the winds, with presidential primaries sent to the same junk heap where the one-term plank lies in mangled decomposition, with not a single trust busted during the past three years and the cost of living advanced fully 25 per cent and class legislation illustrated in its most flagrant form in the passage of a law, under the direst threats and timed by a stopwatch, which gave additional pay to a few who were already the highest paid, while a proposition to make its provisions general in order to include all working men was voted down—with everything in a mess that Wilson has touched, the plea that he should be reelected "on his record" is so utterly void of rational support, is so barren of even the faintest semblance of sincerity on the part of those who presented it that one wonders at the gullibility of a part of mankind.

Such a plea is so transparently diaphanous, is so hazy in its composition and its covering is so amusingly inadequate that the word "thin," if applied to it, would convey the idea of a steel armor plate.

T. T. GEER.

SUFFRAGE QUESTIONS ASKED

Mr. Ross Asks If Republican Attitude Is Conditional.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—I desire to thank you for the space given my letter of October 23 and for your editorial in answer thereto. Your reply suggests other thoughts in connection with the present suffrage discussion and I trust you will allow me to mention them through your columns.

I neither had, nor have, any intention of taking up the cudgel on behalf of Dr. Pohl-Lovejoy nor of having a "dispute" with anybody. Your editorial of October 23 merely suggested certain questions, which I have asked and which you have very kindly answered.

In your answer to one question you ask why would not the members of Congress from a given state support an amendment when the majority of the people of that state were opposed to it, and then calls attention to the vote of Oregon's Senators on the Underwood tariff bill. In this you are misleading, since these are not parallel cases. A tariff bill does not have to be ratified by the state after passage, as does a constitutional amendment, and further, the Oregon Senators had every reason to believe that the majority of their constituents did favor the Underwood act, since all parties in 1912 were demanding a revision of the Payne-Aldrich law. That they were justified in such belief was shown in the re-election of Mr. Chamberlain in 1914, after the Underwood law had become effective.

In answering another question you say, "We think there is no more reason for basing voting qualifications upon sex than upon color." Most certainly there is not, but permit me to ask why the Republican party allowed the bar to stand against the intelligent white women of the United States when it was enfranchising a few million ignorant negroes?

In another answer you say: "The point is this: No Republican Northern state not now having woman suffrage is likely to give the cause any aid if it should happen that the women's vote puts normally Republican states like Oregon, California and Washington into the Democratic column. And the South is so hidebound that no Democratic victory due to woman will now change its course of opposition." I was not prepared for, and I regret to find, such evidence of partisan bias in the mind of the editor of a great newspaper. One naturally wonders if this is the sentiment of the Republican party and its candidate for President.

The suffrage question is in no sense a partisan one and any attempt to make it so should be, and ultimately will be, rebuked. A woman has the same inherent right to vote that a man has, regardless of her political opinions, and the law should recognize the fact. But your words would apparently give us to understand that in the event the women of normally Republican suffrage states should, in the exercise of their political opinions, place those states in the Democratic column, that fact will be seized upon by Republicans in non-suffrage states as an excuse to withhold the ballot there.

In other words, the result of woman's political emancipation in one state will be used as a weapon to defeat her in another state. That simply amounts to a warning that if her political convictions run counter to the interests of the Republican party, and normally Republican states are thereby reversed, she may expect no aid or sympathy in states where that party is dominant. Under such conditions political liberty becomes a hollow mockery.

The days of political coercion are over in this country and if political vassalage must be the price of suffrage I am inclined to think that most self-respecting women will prefer not to have it.

It appears that one party is as strongly pledged to the suffrage cause as the other and that it has become largely a question of how best to proceed to secure its adoption by the states. After it has been adopted by three-fourths of the states no President or Congress would dare defeat a constitutional amendment. The moral effect or educational value of the passage of an amendment by Congress at this time would amount to little or nothing and the effort to secure such passage would better be directed toward placing the question squarely before the people of each state, since that will have to be done in any event.

Woman suffrage is right and it will ultimately prevail, but it should be presented and considered on its merits and not ever be made a partisan question, as has been attempted in this campaign.

R. M. ROSS.

INSULTS TO FLAG BEMOANED

Conditions Along Border Compared to Those in Cuba Years Ago.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—A decade and eight years ago there was at Montauk Point, on the eastern extremity of Long Island, a camp of United States troops, as you see along our southern border today. It was a camp for recuperation and convalescing of the men who had been in Cuba and finished their work. The waves were beating on the rock-bound coast in response to the wind, whispering softly, as if it were a requiem for the dead on a nearby hillside, and incidentally a requiem of Mathew Arnold's lines of "Westward the course of Empire takes its way." They appeared to be saying, "Westward! Westward, and westward!" trying to push, as it were, this country of ours ever forward. Far across the Pacific were the comrades of these men echoing the whispers of nature's sweet voice and doing the work from which the men were resting now that far eastern projection of the United States. The flag had been hauled up anew in Hawaii, where it has been hauled down by Commissioner Blount in Cleveland's Administration. They were now in the Philippines, bringing liberty to the far ends of the earth.

Far to the south on the Cuban hills, from which a hundred camp fires were burning, were other comrades of the men in the States and the Far East. You could hear regimental bands playing "The Star-Spangled Banner," at "retreat" on those hills. Ah, I tell you it meant something to be an American then! There was a something about the air which I never felt before or since. Cuba Libre was an accomplished fact, while Porto Rico had passed under the Stars and Stripes.

I was there on those Long Island hills. I watched those men with those haggard and wan faces. Aye, I was one of them myself. The President was in camp that morning. No review was given him. Mr. McKinley was too much of a man to ask it, as he drove down the main street of that camp and saw the eager faces of those men, saw them rush to the ends of those company streets. I saw him remove his hat and bow to those men. To me it appeared a benediction. I can hear the cheers of those war-worn men echo over those hills yet, as they removed those ragged campaign hats and waved them with that characteristic snap and vim a soldier only knows.

Mr. McKinley saw his duty, and much as he dreaded it, he did not shirk it. War came. We left some of our dead behind. More because of illness than enemy's fire. The Medical Department, the Quartermasters' Department and Commissary Department had all fallen down, a result of our poor and mistaken military policy, and for which the Army was not to blame. The watch dogs of the country have to be content with what is given them. They saw, as necessities went from year to year, into the pork barrel, where they are still going under the policy of our Congressmen, which is "I tickle you and you tickle me." But Mr. McKinley saw his duty and we honored him for it. We had done ours and had accomplished much for the country. The prestige of the Nation was at its height. Destiny had brought new opportunities and responsibilities, which some of our people would shirk. But destiny of our country. Truth crushed to earth will rise again. Aye, to haunt those who would crush her!

So much for the "then"; a word for the "now." I was "somewhere on the Mexican border" this Summer. Some of my comrades were men who were with me in the days of '98. We have a larger Army down there now than we had at any time in Cuba or in the Philippines. It is a fence, as it were, a grandstand if you please, with the whole country for an audience looking on the Mexican show, with the ushers—our troops—and those who would venture a little too close getting a pot shot now and then. A word from an old regular will not be out of place. "We have been," said he, "down here ever since President Taft went out of office. In that time we never slept under a roof except what a tent furnished. Never a comfortable bed. We have been jeered, laughed at, spit at, shot at from across the line, and haven't been allowed to fire back, let alone to talk back." Ah, this is a fine show our Democratic friends are giving us.

It is the same show which continued in the Island of Cuba for three years and of which President McKinley said, when he replied to the European diplomats, that this country could not remain insensible to a situation at our very doors which had become insufferable.

I have listened to the men in the ranks as they talked and expressed their opinions; I have talked with the men of the fleet when it lay at anchor in the bay at San Diego. It is not a far cry from McKinley the beloved, for he was loved by the men in the service, to Woodrow. I must refrain from a title, for the attitude of the services is but contempt. But, oh, the change!

Mr. T. T. Geer, unintentionally perhaps, slanders the men when he says Pershing and his men are afraid to move in Chihuahua. If the truth were known, and I know the men of the service, they are like a nervous steed which has to be held in check. If the truth were known, they are not held because they are afraid to move, but held under orders from Washington.

Ah, it is a grand show! Thus we have "kept the country out of war." Have they? Ask the men on the Rio Grande. Ask them what they think of our Democratic friends' conception of honor. They would compare Woodrow Wilson with Lincoln the sorrowful and McKinley the beloved! We know what duty meant to these men. That they paid the cost in suffering, grief and sorrow. And you have the gall to ask the men who answered the call of duty of these leaders for their vote. You slander the intelligence of brave men. Woodrow the hesitating has no place in our hearts. Go on and tell it to the marines!

SOLDIER.

LABOR ATTITUDE IS DOUBTED

Action by Mr. Wilson Is Declared Unfriendly to Cause.

AIRLIE, Or., Nov. 3.—(To the Editor.)—How often we hear our Democratic friends claiming a victory on November 7 for various reasons. One of their claims for sufficient gain in votes to offset the usual number of Republican votes is Wilson's attitude toward labor. Are you on? Well, let's take a joy ride. Wilson's attitude toward labor. Now, just what is this attitude, anyway? We infer that it is favorable, but let us look. Would an officer of Mr. Wilson's rank be assisting the cause of labor if he robbed labor of an opportunity to labor? Hardly. Did he do it? Let us look at the first year of the present Administration during normal conditions of peace, which Democracy claims itself to be the creator and perpetuator of. Some dandy year for labor, we should agree. Chucked full of hollow days, of course, but precious few paydays.

But it is said these "bad times" are caused by Republican money men, who were going to punish the people for making their honest choice; punish the people by shutting down their factories. In fact, lose heavily financially just to punish ignorant voters. Looks reasonable, doesn't it? Let us suppose you worked in a sawmill, just to bring it within range of your feelings. Would you bubble over with enthusiasm at the mention of a man's name who helped your cause by making it possible for British Columbia lumber to undersell Oregon lumber to the extent that your boss started in to lose orders so fast that he had to shut down his mill, just for the sake of revenge on Democratic doctrines? There should be a law compelling Republican employers to continue the operation of their plants during a Democratic Administration. That would be democratic. Wonder why Democratic employers don't shut down their mills during Republican Administrations and show people that the rule works both ways? Are they too kind-hearted? No, not by a great deal. They haven't any mills, simply because they manage their own business as badly as they would like to manage ours.

If Democracy favors labor, then they must favor capital, because the two work better together than apart. Then why don't they protect American capital instead of blindfolding, hobbling and hogtying it until it is afraid to invest in 10 cents' worth of labor for fear the mule will break out and trample all under foot? If labor wants to be favored it had better vote for a party that will guarantee protection to Americans.

If any single class of voters should not favor Wilson it is the laboring class. And, fortunately, the majority of this class is intelligent enough to know that Wilson's attitude toward labor was the prime cause of that awful year before the war. Now, they say, the golden tide of prosperity is flowing our way. Is it possible that there is anyone who does not want to recognize the fact that it is caused by the very thing that Wilson folks claim they abhor, and that is, war? What Democracy needs is to keep war abroad and peace at home to insure prosperity. If peace is good, it is good all over the world, and with universal peace and Democratic rule in America comes poverty.

I should say that Wilson's attitude toward labor should be the very reason that every man who works for a living should vote against him and guarantee his own safety.

E. B. BIRKENBEUEL.

TARIFF IS VITAL OREGON ISSUE

Lumbering, Chief Industry, Hit Hardest by Democratic Policy.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—There are certain factors in the coming political crisis which are of paramount local importance and which it appears to me are not given due consideration by the average voter.

The most important probably is the matter of the tariff. Those who have lived a long time in this part of the United States know that it is hit harder during a Democratic administration than any other part of the country, and the depressions are longer continued, the reason being that the Democratic party appears to lack interest in the welfare of the district and on the other hand pursues a tenacious policy of hampering our struggling industries.

In the Eastern states there are many varied industries and during Democratic times these industries are more or less disturbed by the partial reductions made in the tariffs, but on the whole business goes along with a limp and the injury wrought is not to be compared with that in this section.

In this section, however, the Democratic policy has been to strike at the roots of our principal industries by cutting out the tariff altogether and the result is widespread and long-continued demoralization.

All of our principal products, lumber, wool, wheat, etc., are sold on a free trade basis and our purchases are paid for on a protected basis.

By reason of this peculiar policy we are made to suffer financially for the benefit of Eastern manufacturing interests whose products we consume and the question arises, would it not be manifestly to the betterment of our local interests if the whole country was put on a free trade basis during Democratic times? We would realize the same amount for our products as at present and our money would buy a far greater amount of Eastern manufactured goods.

Naturally as a result of the good times which have come to the East by reason of the war we shall expect a sympathetic improvement in our local conditions while the influence of the war lasts, but if we elect Mr. Hughes we know that the Republican party will look after us as it always has and restore to us our tariffs. We will then prosper by reason of the added value of our products with a resultant increase in our payrolls and an assured confidence in continued prosperity after the close of the war.

E. H. COLLIS.

SUNDAY REST LAW HELD NEED

Writer Declares Unrestrained Competition Eventually Will Destroy Trade.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—I read an article in a daily paper rejoicing over the prospect of the repeal of the Sunday closing law, telling how delightful it will be when all business is wide open on Sunday. I also read the statement of the secretary of the Oregon Retail Grocers' Association in which he laments the opening of grocery stores on Sunday, truly urging the need of a rest day for the overworked grocers and their assistants. I also heard a woman, a church member, too, say that it would not make any difference whether the present law was repealed or upheld as to stores being open on Sunday. It seems from these two first quoted sources that it will make a great change in business, that the rest day will be destroyed. Do we want this to occur? Laying aside all religious views, let us look at it solely from an economic standpoint. In this busy age we need a rest day. If it is not protected by law business interests will completely destroy the opportunity for such a day. If part of the stores are open, all must be, or be injured in trade.

The supposition that each grocery or other business can be open as he pleases will not be possible. All that anyone desires is that all be closed on Sundays. If all are open, competition will require no rest any time. The profits which now accrue to those keeping open on Sunday will be done away with. It will be a ceaseless grind. Employes will, of course, be required to work Sundays. They can neither go to church or to a moving picture show or have a rest in the country. There will be no general rest day in which families and neighbors can carry on any religious or other change from employment. In the excitement of a strenuous political campaign I fear we are overlooking the far-reaching consequences of an open Sunday. Can we afford to make such a change? The present law is not in the interest of any religious sect or organization. It is solely for a rest day for man and beast and machinery. It is a physical necessity, without which everything will suffer and decay. Socially and morally, this is also true. Let us retain the present law. It can perhaps be improved in some particulars. Do not forget to vote 313 No next Tuesday.

S. I. LYMAN.

ORIGINAL SABBATH DISCUSSED

Correspondent Tells of Early Church and Its Observances.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—The spirit that animates those Oregonians who seek by legal enactment to coerce people's consciences is the reincarnation of the spirit that kindled the fires of Smithfield, that lit the fagots for Savonarola, for Servetus. His life might have been spared had Servetus been willing to say, as the flames consumed his body, "Jesus, thou eternal Son of God, have mercy on me," instead of "Jesus, thou Son of the eternal God"! And Servetus' death, history lays at the door of John Calvin.

Today public libraries abound, books of reference and history are plentiful and easily accessible; there is no excuse for bigotry and intolerance, the horrid fruits of superstitious ignorance.

In the Bible and in secular histories of ancient Oriental peoples we learn that our first day of the week was a weekly pagan festival dedicated to the worship of the sun, hence the name Sunday, while Saturday, our seventh day of the week, was the weekly festival day of the Israelites, dedicated to the worship of their God, Yahweh (Jehovah). Surrounded on all sides by sun-worshiping nations, the seventh day Sabbath of the Israelites was not only the sacred badge of their religion, but the distinctive mark of their nationality as well—an invisible barrier hedging them about, a "peculiar people," and at the same time serving to keep them from participation in the worship of Baal and Ashtaroth. Thus the Israelites had good cause to take their Sabbath seriously and death was the penalty for its infraction. In New Testament times the Romans had deprived the Jews of the right to inflict the death penalty. But in Mark's gospel, third chapter, is dramatically told how the church leaders resolved upon the Master's destruction as a dangerous revolutionary because he healed a man on the Sabbath day.

After the ascension, in addition to the observance of the seventh day Sabbath, the early Christians met on the first day (Sunday), either late in the evening or early in the morning. Work was not suspended; the early Christians were too poor to afford two days of cessation from labor. As pagan converts increased we find observance of the first day (Sunday) becoming more accentuated, causing controversy between the pagan Christians and the Jewish Christians, hence Paul's admonition, "Let no man judge you in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or the Sabbath days." And so matters stood until 321 A. D., when the Emperor Constantine by legal enactment ordered his subjects to embrace Christianity and commanded the observance of the venerable Christian Sabbath. Of Constantine history records neither his intellectual nor his moral qualities were such as to earn the title "Great." His claim to greatness rests mainly on the fact that he divined the future which lay before Christianity and determined to enlist it in the service of his empire."

At the time of the Reformation some question arose as to whether Sunday was a divine or a human institution. To prove its divinity severe laws were enacted to force its observance. The clergy of the Reformation may have had some grounds for their ignorance regarding the origin and history of sun's day, but our clergy of today have no excuse for ignorance of the fact that from time immemorial the day of which they seek to make a "divine institution" by legal enactment was a day dedicated to the orgiastic rites of the debased cults of the gods of the Canaanites; they have no excuse for not knowing that sun's day was enacted the Christian Sabbath by a clever, sun-worshiping, pagan politician.

"Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot away with—they are a weariness unto me. Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to undo the heavy burdens, to deal thy bread to the hungry, to bring the poor that are cast out into thy house, when thou seest the naked that thou cover him. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

MARION B. CLEVELAND.

PEACE PROPHETS ARE GRILLED

Writer Points Out Wobblers Shown Up by Campaign.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—There is one great blessing that stands out so prominently in the local and National life that even the dullest must profit by it, seeing it towering over the manifold curses of the present political campaign, and that is the revealing of the false peace prophets who have in the past sought to guide us into the paths leading to freedom from war.

It was my privilege to listen a few months ago to Colonel C. E. S. Wood in Library Hall, where he scored in bitterest terms the monster militarism and its forerunner, preparedness; he denounced these as instruments for the oppression of the workers, and was vociferously applauded. It was such an exact voicing of my belief that I pinched myself to see if I were not dreaming, for here was an ideal champion for an ideal cause. But once outside the demon doubt assailed me and whispered, "Beware! This is an acknowledged genius, and genius is proverbially erratic and unreliable."

Then another genius and idealist, Henry Ford, also voiced exactly similar sentiments by buying whole pages of the press, wherein he exhorted us that the preparedness brand advocated meant "prepare to meet thy God through an early death" in battle" to the workers, and he breathed peace and plenty, minus preparedness.

About the same time another genius and idealist, President Wilson, who at one time declared against "making this country into an armed camp," had assumed the privilege of a genius and was touring the peaceful State of Kansas, whose citizens had almost unanimously declared against preparedness, striving to scare the Kansas farmers into the "armed camp" of preparedness he once denounced.

And now prepare to laugh! Colonel Wood has been touring Oregon imploring the people to vote for Wilson, who "gave us peace, prosperity and preparedness." And Mr. Ford will for the first time in years exercise his right of franchise by voting for Wilson and will again bless the press of the country by buying pages of advertising imploring us to save the country by electing Wilson, who gave us—ditto Mr. Wood's arguments. The moral seems to be, give a false prophet a little time and he will expose himself.

Neither of these ardent peace prophets remind us that Mr. Wilson signed the Army bill that empowers the President to draft the citizen of this country into the Army in time of war; a power never possessed by any President except Lincoln, and who refused to again use it on account of the riots and bloodshed it provoked during the Civil War; a law that even England during the present war had the greatest difficulty in fastening upon her citizens, and which Australia will defeat in the coming referendum vote on that measure.

Yet here are two anti-militarists and erstwhile peace angels espousing the cause of Mr. Wilson, who failed to keep us out of war in Haiti, Santo Domingo, Vera Cruz; these being helpless countries, there was no need to keep the sword sheathed. But happily the Kaiser kept us out of war with Germany, in spite of Mr. Wilson, for obvious reasons of his own. Hence consistency demands we vote for the Kaiser.

But Mr. Wilson failed to keep us out of war at Ludlow, Colo., where the workers were shot by the Rockefeller militia, nor in Virginia, Calumet, and, above all, in Wilson's own state, where, at Bayonne, N. J., the authorities gave Standard Oil the right to use machine guns, and two women and several men were killed for striking, victims of the Wilsonian peace, plenty and preparedness that has devastated homes and embittered the workers. Did Mr. Wilson condemn this as an outrage against humanity?

Sad to say, both Colonel Wood and Ford have flirted with the growing maiden, Socialism. But when, through to assume the functions of maturity, and calls all anti-militarists to help her create a true and lasting peace based on the co-operative commonwealth, by incidentally voting for Mr. Benson, these erratic gentlemen embrace the Democratic donkey, as his voice is more penetrating, his shape comelier and his ears longer and furrier. They have learned the obvious precept that if you would tickle the popular ear, select those with the most hair therein. Yet Mr. Benson's arguments are the sum and substance of the earlier utterances of both these gentlemen, and Mr. Benson's voting strength will be an exact numbering of the anti-military population; but they as geniuses consistently refuse to support this peace prophet who remains true to his convictions in time of stress.

LOUIS HONSTEIN.

CAPITALISM RISE IS DISCUSSED

Socialist-Labor Party Is Declared Only Way to Emancipation of Labor.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—When capitalism first stepped upon the stage of history it did so in the interest of the majority and in the interests of right and morality.

Capitalism smashed the iron and enslaving grip of feudalism upon the minds and bodies of the people; it protected science, opened up wide fields for education, and gave abundant opportunities to all. Capitalism shattered the power of kings, princes, lords and barons. The new social actor laughed in the face of "Divine Right" and went dramatically on with its revolutionary performances with a speed and a daring unparalleled in the annals of man.

Feudalism was soon put down and capitalism had the floor. The social change was necessary. Capitalism was progressive and constructive and an indispensable link in the chain of evolution.

But the new social system, owing to its very nature and to the fact that it was able enormously to increase the volume of production for sale, had no alternative but to keep full speed ahead with the result that enormous wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, while opportunities receded out of the reach of the many.

The belief arose that this competitive system was not final but merely a stepping-stone to the next system, the co-operative commonwealth. This belief was based upon facts, for capitalism has already, in America at least, fulfilled its historical mission. It has brought about education, political liberty and has developed that wonderful engine of production, the trust, the collective ownership of which ends capitalism.

The capture of the trust for the people is the next great revolutionary step forward. The Socialist party, an organization composed of sentimentalists who imagine themselves Socialists, is attempting to capture the trust with the vote alone backed up only by revolutionary utterances. The Socialist party denies the necessity for the economic organization, the only conceivable force with which the ballot can be backed up, and the only thinkable means by which production can be administered when capitalism is abolished. This economic organization (industrial union) is the embryo of future society; it is the permanent thing, while the political organization though indispensable is, contrary to the Socialist party's idea, merely a means-to-an-end thing. It is therefore obvious that the Socialist party, guided only by sentiment, is trying to lead the workers into the blind alley of right without might, which would mean defeat and disaster for labor.

The anarchists on the other hand rush to the other extreme and repudiating political action advocate the capture of the trust by physical force alone. This is the advocacy of might without right, which is not only foolish and useless, but also socially criminal.

While the Socialist party and the I. W. W. are thus acting as lightning-rods to run labor's revolutionary forces into the ground, the capitalist class (plutocracy) is adroitly marshalling its forces preparatory to reaching out for absolutism in government.

Of all the parties in the field the Socialist-Labor party is the only one that lights the path to the emancipation of labor. The Socialist-Labor party is organizing industrially and politically to take over the trust for the people knowing that the industrial organization (union) is the undeveloped form of future society and foreshadows its administrative powers.

PATRICK O'HALLORAN.

REPUBLICANS ARE CAUTIONED

Voters Urged Not to Be Misled by Deceptive Issues.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—There is a well-defined and marked distinction between the policies and principles of the Republican party and the policies and principles of the Democratic party.

Charles E. Hughes is the nominee of the Republican party and Woodrow Wilson of the Democratic party and each stands for and represents the policies and principles of his own party. Both were fairly and honorably nominated and one of them will be elected.

Be not misled or deceived. Any person voting for Mr. Wilson is voting for the policies and principles of the Democratic party and any person voting for Mr. Hughes is voting for the policies and principles of the Republican party. There is no valid or intelligent reason why anyone who claims to be a Republican should not vote for Mr. Hughes and any person claiming to be a Republican who votes for Mr. Wilson thereby becomes a Democrat and a supporter of the policies and principles of the Democratic party.

If you are a Republican you will vote for Mr. Hughes and if you do not vote for Mr. Hughes you have no right to claim that you are a Republican. Your Presidential vote is the true test of your political faith.

People who have registered as Republicans and who live in the City of Portland in particular should not forget there has been a material change in business conditions in this city since 1912. President Wilson's most ardent supporter must admit that business conditions in Portland were much better under either Taft or Roosevelt than they have been under Wilson.

I want again to see business conditions and values in Portland the same as they were in 1912, when Wilson was elected. It is said the money in the banks is an evidence of prosperity, but that does not help the poor devil who is in debt and cannot sell his property or who has a mortgage on his home and cannot pay the interest.

Do not be fooled or led astray by false or deceptive issues. Portland grew and prospered under both Roosevelt and Taft and will do it again under Hughes.

Why should any registered Republican vote for Wilson?

CHARLES A. JOHNS.

DEMOCRATIC RULE IS ASSAILED

Statistics Are Cited to Prove That Prosperity Is Due to War.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor)—A table of statistics based upon information furnished by the United States Department of Commerce has just been issued by the school of commerce of the University of Oregon.

It shows that under the normal conditions of 1914 we exported in "war materials" $244,753,025, and that in the fiscal year of 1916 we have exported $1,645,263,022, an increase of over $1,400,000,000. Is that Democratic or war prosperity? In foodstuffs in 1914 we exported $192,199,252. In the years 1915 and 1916 we exported $1,425,886,364. Is that Democratic or war prosperity?

In horses we exported $3,388,819 in 1914 and in the two years of 1915 and 1916 we exported $137,577,680. Of this amount it is said that a half million dollars went into our own county of Harney alone. Do the horseraisers call this Democratic prosperity or war prosperity?

In wool manufactures we exported $4,790,087 in 1914. In the two years of 1915 and 1916 we exported $61,311,196. Do the woolraisers of Eastern Oregon give credit for that to the Democratic party, or to the European war that has acted the part of a protective tariff in this crisis?

In wheat we exported $87,953,456 in 1914. In the two years of 1915 and 1916 we exported $349,094,907. Are the wheatraisers of Eastern Oregon such consummate fools as to attribute this excess of wheat exports and the present high price of wheat to Woodrow Wilson?

In oats we exported $757,527 in 1914. In the years 1915 and 1916 we exported $105,463,060. Our total excess of exports in 1915 and 1916 over 1914 on rye was $28,552,896; on barley, $34,594,483; on corn, $63,111,913; on canned beef, $30,885,059; on fresh beef, $49,828,956; on bacon, $100,062,689, and on wheat flour, $127,762,673. On these seven staple exports and other articles listed here appears an excess of exports in the last two years over 1914 of over a half billion dollars. In the face of all this, Democratic campaigners are out in Eastern Oregon and running up and down the Willamette Valley and Southern Oregon telling the horseraisers and the sheepraisers and the hog raisers and cattleraisers and the raisers of corn and rye and barley and wheat and other foodstuffs that it is the Democratic party that has made them prosperous. Pinned down to a bill of specifications, they cannot show any piece of Democratic legislation that has put a single dollar into the pocket of the American farmer or given a single day additional employment to American labor.

Meantime the business failures under Wilson have never even been approximated in any Republican administration. In 1913, 1914 and 1915 there were 17,456 more business failures than in the first three years under Taft, aggregating in amount $385,445,005 more than did those years of failures under Taft. All this in spite of the tremendous impulse given to business by the European war. Will Postmaster Myers and Collector Burke and Collector Miller and Chairman Colonel Sam White and other distinguished Democratic apologists tell us what the Democratic party has had to do with bringing about the existing war prosperity and who is responsible, if the Democratic party is not, for the fact that in every single year under Wilson there have been more business failures than in any single year under any Republican administration? They can get valuable assistance in this work by consulting the great commercial agency of R. G. Dun & Co.

CHARLES B. MOORES.

SINGLE TAX BILL ATTACKED

Many Hold Worthless Land Because They Cannot Sell, Says Writer.

PORTLAND, Nov. 4.—(To the Editor.)—For years I have been writing farm and labor letters to the editors and have found them published just as I worded them, for years I have tried to write one on single tax, but each time when it is finished and I look it over I have decided I can't control my wrath sufficiently on this subject.

On October 2 in a letter Mr. U'Ren gives a birdseye view of the jealousy he possesses of the landlord who collects $18,000 for a bare lot. Well now, there are thousands of other bare lots in Multnomah County. No one is forced to rent that lot. He may have paid a small sum for it 50 years ago. I held one 40 years because it was too valueless to sell.

Suppose Mr. U'Ren should go to Alaska and find a valuable gold mine. Then one of those I Won't Work gentlemen came along and informed him that this land belonged to the state.

A woman on the street asked me to sign a petition to get a Farmers' Land and Loan bill before the people. I said I did not understand it, therefore should not sign it, but she said it was a boon to the farmer and it sounded that way.

So I signed it. I think that is fraud. If a man steals or robs he is sent to the penitentiary.

I know of a certainty that many wealthy Eastern farmers have passed up Oregon because of single tax. We have now had nine years of chaos and people who have toiled past the half-century mark would hail with joy anything like peace.

Some people are born crying. They go through life medd