MANY PROBLEMS OF THE DAY BRING OUT ASSORTMENT OF VIEWS

Questions Before City, State and National Governments Discussed by Various Writers Who Seek to Shed New Light on Situations.

CRITIC HELD INCONSISTENT

Why Criticise Harding and Hughes and Uphold Wilson?

PORTLAND, Jan. 14.—(To the Editor.)—The writer has read, with considerable amusement, a letter in The Sunday Oregonian by William Bittle Wells scoring the rejection of the league of nations by America and laying it all to ignorance (by inference) of the American people and to "partisan politics."

Mr. Wells probably will recall that somewhat over a year ago there was a "solemn referendum" called by the greatest player of partisan politics who ever occupied the presidential chair and that after due and careful consideration "partisan politics" was repudiated by several million voters, many of whom must have voted for the great partisan politician some four years previously.

Mr. Wells is already dooming to failure the present statesmanship of President Harding and Secretary Hughes, but dooming to failure is a chronic habit of his. He has been full of dooms and gloomy forebodings since Willie Jennie Bryan was defeated in his 16 to 1 campaign, when Mr. Wells cast his first vote. In fact all republican administrations have been great failures (in advance) and the country under each successive one has been doomed to go to the eternal bow-wows, but still we have wagged along pretty well during the past 25 years.

Mr. Wells belongs to a party which has always believed in states rights and has a record as opposed to a strong centralized federal government, but where in all our history have we an example of a president who took, through his party in congress, every vestage of power that was to be had and became in fact a greater autocrat than the czar of all the Russias, and to top it all, tried to found a super-government through "my league of nations and refused to listen to a single reservation which would protect our republic.

The people knew pretty well what they were doing in the last election and had probably studied the question pretty thoroughly before voting, and were certainly ready to have done with partisan politics and to get back to a democratic form of government, and I believe but few are ashamed of the result.

When President Wilson ran for office the second time on his fake cry of "he kept us out of war," I can still recall Mr. Wells' awful prophecies of war and desolation if Mr. Hughes should be elected, and that the only known man who would keep us out was President Wilson. Yet less than five months later Mr. Wells was hailing Mr. Wilson as great and noble for his declaration of that same war he, and he only, was to keep us from. "Oh consistency, thou art a jewel!"

As a prophet I will have to class our letter writer as among the false ones and am willing to go into a prophesying contest with him and let future generations judge the winner. My prophecy is that Woodrow Wilson will go down in history as a man who had one of the greatest opportunities ever presented to a human being and who made the greatest failure—through partisan politics.

Mr. Wells speaks of "combinations of nations" which this country is trying to form. In what particular is the present combination different than the one which Mr. Wilson "sat in" with. Call the roll—England, France, Italy. The representatives of those nations were the only ones presumably, with which he cared to match minds, the other and lesser ones cooled their heels on the outside and could gain no information even with the promise of "covenants openly arrived at." Yes, the present administration has splendid precedents in its "combinations."

I would recommend that Mr. Wells read carefully Secretary Lansing's book, and then with equal care, that of Private Secretary Tumulty, and use as explanatory notes the able editorial in The Oregonian of January 8, before again writing on partisan politics. READER.

CRIME GETS LEGAL IMPETUS

Courts and Lawyers Blamed for Much of Lawlessness.

PORTLAND, Jan. 19.—(To the Editor.)—In reading the papers one cannot help but reach the conclusion that the most prolific cause of crime in this country is the court and the lawyer. The average lawyer or judge does not look at the moral side, but the legal. No lawyer is condemned by his colleagues for the means used in winning his case.

No matter what the crime, you can always find a lawyer to take the case if the client has the money. A man will have confessed to murder, yet as soon as he gets a lawyer he changes his plea to not guilty by advice of his lawyer (perjury?) and that same lawyer will put a witness on the stand, knowing that the witness has been "seen" and also knowing the guilt of his client. He will fight for days to get a man on the jury, who will "hang" the jury; sometimes for money and again for political, racial, or religious beliefs. If he wins his case the other lawyers congratulate him.

The courts, instead of mixing in a little common sense, stick right to the letter of the law. In this connection I cite the case of the judge in the trial of Governor Small of Illinois, on charges of embezzling state funds, who quashed all the indictments against him, except one, on the following grounds: "A missing word"; "the position of a name"; three errors in drawing indictments and the shuffling of a pile of papers. We do not know as to the truth of the charges against Governor Small, but the place to disprove them is before a jury and not by technicalities.

Another instance is where the foreman of the Sangamon county grand jury signed his name in the wrong place on the back of an indictment, and so it went into the discard.

In the neighboring state of Washington we have the edifying spectacle of seeing the lawyer who framed the capital punishment law appearing in court on behalf of a client attempting to prove that that same law is unconstitutional. We have three murderers in our penitentiary who were convicted by juries and yet we cannot hang them because someone scraped up enough money to hire a lawyer to carry the matter to the supreme court, and although we voted in favor of hanging, and the law was framed by lawyers, yet we cannot hang the guilty. Is it any wonder that life is cheap and that crime is rampant, when all you need is the money to hire a smart lawyer?

I have many good friends among lawyers and would take their word or lend them money, or even trust them with a bottle of bonded goods, but all this outside of the courtroom. "Win your case" is their motto. I believe in the intention of the law, but not in the way it is generally interpreted and executed and when it comes to a lot of lawyers I am like Gabriel in the story that John Hays Hammond tells:

"A millionaire who had died and started to heaven was met at the gate by St. Peter. 'What have you ever done,' asked Peter, 'to give you an excuse to be let into heaven?'

"'Well, answered the rich man, after some thought, 'I once gave a poor old woman a nickel.'

"'I guess that's worth a little to you,' said Peter, and, turning to Gabriel, who was keeping the record, said: 'Put that down.'

"'Now, rich man, what else?'

"'One cold, rainy night,' answered the millionaire, 'a little newsboy, who was crying because he hadn't been able to sell any of his papers, came up to me, and I bought a paper.'

"'Well,' said Peter, doubtfully, 'I don't know. How about that, Gabriel? What do you think?'

"'Oh,' snapped Gabriel, 'give him back his 6 cents and tell him to go to hell.'" C. L. ELLIOTT.

ALL MEN HELD POLYGAMOUS

Wives Advised to Rear Families So as to Have Company When Old.

PORTLAND, Jan. 21.—(To the Editor.)—We were all glad of Eve's good luck and sorry for the poor fellow confined to his bed, and I read with interest the letter signed "LXI." Why is it that girls like "LXI" tells of do not meet 'men of their own class' at their churches or at their work? Personally I know a lot of young girls who have met very fine young men and later married them. They had worked in the same offices and stores. Of course our country needs just these girls, these good girls, for wives and mothers, but I am not so sure as "LXI" seems to be that 'such folks never find the divorce court.' I happen to know women who were just that kind of girls who have been forced into the divorce courts because the men they married found a "prettier face" or perhaps a woman who "understood him better." What is the matter with such men? When "Mary-Sit-by-the-Fire" finds her man she had better rear a family, for very likely she will have a lonely old age and 'sit by the fire' alone again, unless she has some children for company.

I think "LXI" will agree with me that a man needs "to be disgraced for life" who will let a "hussy" mulct him for thousands of dollars for "breach of promise." If men were not such big fools about trying to get a "young" girl for a wife, they would not be sued for "breach of promise" so much. Don't you suppose that a nice old man could find some 'nice old lady' who would make him a real companion? I do. Yes, indeed, "the young folks should marry." I first read it "The young fools should marry", and that is as good as the other way. "Where ignorance is bliss 'twere folly to be wise." By all means let them marry, and let them be happy in their "home" and "babies" and "big plans" for a delightful future, and let us hope they may find "all their dreams come true," but I must tell these girls that, perhaps, some day they will have a big job on their hands to convince "friend husband" that it is just "one wife" he wants, instead of three or four.

A friend of mine told me that she and her husband could live, and live well, on what it cost him to live by himself, so that is no excuse for a man being a bachelor. Man is a polygamist by nature. "Let the man who is not one (in his heart) heave the first brick. VI.

MR. BRYAN IS CRITICISED

Writer Declares There Is Harmony Between Science and Religion.

ASHLAND, Or., Jan. 13.—(To the Editor.)—If Mr. Bryan would read the Bible as it is written I think he would find there is harmony rather than discord between science and religion in the story of man's creation as recorded in Genesis. History is truth. If it isn't truth it isn't history. Science is truth. If it isn't truth it isn't science.

Christians of today, instead of "searching the scriptures" as commanded, are prone to accept and hold fast to doctrines and dogmas of the middle ages, when civilization was at its lowest level; when one had to go about in a black robe and a face like a cemetery gate to prove that he was religious.

We are carried to Sunday school in the arms of our parents. We are placed in the infant class and hear the teacher read the story of man's creation. Our childish mind can only grasp the idea of the making of a man out of the dry dirt (probably having in mind the snowman made by boys), then God blowing at it and seeing it jump into life. Ask the teacher to explain it and he or she will express the same idea. Go right down the centuries and we get a similar story from every generation. Josephus, the Jewish historian, about the time of Christ, said "Adam was a red man because the red clay was the purest kind of clay," showing the same thought.

And God said, "Let us make man in our own image." "So God formed man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." If "God is a spirit;" if "No man hath seen the Father at any time" then by making man in God's own image we must infer that man thus created would have been invisible, were it not added that he was also of the dust of the earth.

Fact is, up to that time man was not imbued with mental and spiritual faculties, but was only a creature with animal instincts, and the culmination of God's handiwork was a man with a living soul, capable of discerning the difference between good and evil. So if instead of putting stress on the creature-making as the childish mind does, we emphasize the other words in the sentence, such as the "dust of the earth" to indicate that his development was after the land became dry, and "breath of life" or "living soul" we may find a deeper meaning in the narrative which will harmonize with both science and religion. W. D. RILEY.

OFFICIALS NOT DOING DUTY

Too Many Judges Declared Patrons of Bootlegger.

PORTLAND, Jan. 13.—(To the Editor.)—I am not given to promiscuous letter writing, but I desire to make an exception this once, and commend The Oregonian for its timely and true observations in its leading editorial January 12.

Too many well-meaning people regard the 18th amendment as a joke, and too many of our peace officers and judges are patrons of the bootlegger and not doing their sworn duty in the enforcement of the prohibition law. Prohibition is not the only law that is difficult to enforce. The public officer who cannot fearlessly enforce the law has no place in our system and should confess his failure and resign from an office he is not fit to occupy.

Well, thank you again, and keep up the good work. SAMUEL CONNELL.

DEBS WELCOME DEPLORED

Terre Haute Newspaper Declares Greeting Sets Bad Example.

PORTLAND, Jan. 13. — (To the Editor.)—I was somewhat chagrined when I read in the daily papers of Portland about the immense crowds that gathered in my old home town, Terre Haute, Ind., to welcome Eugene Debs back from federal prison in Atlanta. While Mr. Debs has always had splendid friends in his home city, he has never had a large following, and this outpouring mystified me.

I was glad to learn the "true inwardness" of the reception tendered Mr. Debs as given in the inclosed clipping from a thoroughly reliable Terre Haute paper, and feel that this part of the world should be informed thereof.

The pathetic picture given in the press of the aged white-haired wife bowed with grief and suffering awaiting her husband in their plain and simple home gave the wrong idea of Mrs. Debs, who is one of the handsomest women I ever met. Very tall, ruddy, youthful face, crowned with wonderful white hair—gray or white for many years—commanding in appearance, handsomely dressed, there is nothing about Mrs. Debs that would even remotely suggest age or suffering. Loyal to her husband, of course, Mrs. Debs holds her own council and goes her own way in the midst of old friends with wonderful calmness at all times.

The Debs home is not a poor, plain structure by any means, but quite the contrary. Situated in one of the best residence sections of the city, it is a substantial home with all modern conveniences, built some 20 years ago. Its ultra-modern architecture created quite a sensation at the time, I remember.

Perhaps it would not be out of place for me to remark that my husband and I have known the Debs family for over 35 years, living within a few blocks of their home for 15 years. CARRIE B. ADAMS.

The clipping from the Terre Haute Saturday Spectator follows:

Reading wrongly the attitude of the public mind, Mayor Charles R. Hunter made the last act of his administration one of his worst official blunders, ordering the fire bells to be rung for Gene Debs. It has come to pass that the outside world may well look at this city as one that has reverence only for men who have been garbed in prison stripes.

Less than 1500 men and women gathered from the surrounding territory assembled in the Debs parade. A large part of this number carried banners to show their allegiance to foreign governments.

In the crowd of the curious at the union station there were 8000 to 10,000, mostly people who had flocked there to see, as a free show, the movie cameras work, to hear the bands play, and to be on hand for whatever excitement that might be presented. It was by no means a crowd composed wholly of citizens doing homage to Debs. The cheering when Debs appeared was not great, nor was it prolonged. It was a hearty welcome from a fair portion of the crowd, but not one of wild enthusiasm.

While possibly 3 per cent of the population of Terre Haute sympathized with Debs' attitude during the war, the mayor ordered the fire bells to peal an official joyful acclaim that Terre Haute had a townsman who knew no loyalty to the flag when his country was in trouble. And thus when children asked their parents what the ringing of the fire bells meant, they had to be told their city's official attitude toward patriotism was to ignore the soldiers who died in the trenches that there might be the appearance of great homage for a citizen of strange traits, a citizen who would conduct himself so conspicuously against the nation's welfare that the Germans themselves could not have planned his leadership to be more in the interest of the Huns.

Not an American flag was borne in the parade for the man that the fire bells acclaimed. Not an American flag was in evidence at the union station. The one exception was a boy with flags and horns to sell. The horns were bought readily. But the Debs folks did not think enough of the American flag to bother about the stars and stripes, which might detract from the red so much in evidence on the person of every marcher.

Such was the occasion for young America to hear the pealing of the fire bells, and to make a great majority of citizens who had signed a petition for Debs' release regret their action.

It was sympathy for an old man, reported to be in bad health, a burst of generous impulses and also of keen judgment for the effect of every action on the multitude that lead half of Terre Haute to join hands to liberate Debs. The homecoming was so sickening and smacked so much of making a hero of a disloyalist who could not have served Germany better, that it cast a gloom over Terre Haute.

For the mayor to seize the opportunity to make a last misguided bid for popularity only to misjudge sentiment, sent to the world a false impression of the people of this city.

May we have no more affairs of the Roberts, Debs, Clark brand to do irreparable harm.

NEED OF CREATOR OUTLINED

Biologist's Admission Declared to Be Real Advance.

WASHOUGAL, Wash., Jan. 12.—(To the Editor.)—The recent dispatches of Professor Bateson's declaration concerning the origin of species and evolution, together with your editorial of recent date on the origin of life have been of such worth-while interest that perhaps you will grant me brief space to consider the subject from a different point of view. Unlike the statement in your editorial, the introduction of obscurantism of the biologist is not a loss, but rather a gain to mankind if we put any value on the thought that it is impossible for the finite brain to grasp the infinities.

The stone pages of the book of nature have been carefully separated and interpreted and the history of our globe may be indexed in the chapter of evolution, paragraphed into geological ages and periods. For the materialist protoplasm probably represents the peak line of human reasoning, beyond which, however, there is an abyss of profound depth that no chemical formula or combination of same may bridge, as there is no abutment on the farther side for the bridge to rest upon.

The separation of radium from its ores and the observation of its behavior by investigation shook the atomic theory to its very foundation. The results of these investigators added ions and electronic corpuscles, force as much as matter, thus indicating that our conception of matter may be erroneous.

Professor Einstein brought the infinite within finite limits, but he does not tell us where the boundary of the universe is, nor what there is on the other side of the fence. The telescope of the astronomer reveals cosmic dust thrown into mighty vortices, worlds in the making, we are told, but even if so, we do not know the why and wherefore of this star dust, but we do know that it took an impulse to overcome the inertia of this matter forming the worlds.

Since there is always an "if" it would seem that any line of human investigations having for its endpoint the solution of the riddle of the universe with the aid of the microscope and the analytical balance must be always terminated with a big question mark. It would seem then that the biologist obscurantism and his admission of his inability to account for the origin of species is not a loss to mankind, but rather a gain. Humanity will eventually be forced to the acceptance of the belief that there is a governing divine mind and wisdom back of it all, responsible for our being here and that man is not an accidental product of the concurrence of brute forces acting without design, to flash into conscious being of the briefest moment only to be extinguished in eternal darkness, but a being infinitesimal in comparison, but yet infinite. This belief brings a breath of warmth in which evolvement is possible just as great as that which marks the difference between the bizarre and grotesque forms of the upper paleozoic and mesozoic life and the Neanderthal man, an evolution of mind perhaps rather than of physical body. The theory of referring the origin of life to the protoplasm is cold and unresponsive as though it had been born in the temperature of absolute zero of interstellar space. H. BUECHE.

SMALL FARM PLAN DEFENDED

Movement to Provide for Needy Persons Declared Vital.

NEW YORK, Jan. 15.—(To the Editor.) — The Oregonian editorially takes exception to my comparison in "Three Acres and Liberty" between average yields of potatoes in the United States and in "a prize acre of potatoes in Belgium of 14,000 bushels" as theory.

But "let us have the facts." In the United States the average yield is about 100 bushels, as stated; in Maine and in eastern Long Island yields of 400 bushels are common.

From its "theory" The Oregonian infers that "the movement to place needy people on farms, which was at its height about a decade ago, was a failure, not because land was lacking, but because the human factor was ignored." "It is a mistake," says the editor, "to assume that the land is the principal part of the farm. The man who works the land is even more significant in production." Taxes are more significant still.

I have not advocated men going "back to the farm." With farm lands which produce 25 bushels of wheat boosted up to $300 or $400 an acre, as in Iowa today, the man who goes "back to the farm" cannot stay there.

What I advocate is that the unemployed in the cities should be allowed to cultivate intensively small areas in or near the city limits. At present the extravagant prices of those lands, mostly held idle in idle hands, make this impossible.

Relieve the farmer from taxation by taxing only the trifling rental value of his land, and not taxing his improvements; and you will make it possible for the man who wants to work to get low priced farm land.

Then put all the taxes on city lots, not on houses, and you will squeeze out the holders who neither use them nor will allow any one else to use them—unless they pay inflated and extravagant prices. You will solve the problem of unemployment in the cities; you will reduce the cost of living and you will have enough money to pay for the needed expenses of the cities.

Is that "theory?" If any one thinks so, I will give him more facts.

Finally, the theory of "back to the land" came to several millions of war gardens; a considerable number of which you can still see in cultivation from any suburban car window. So they never "came to naught." BOLTON HALL.

MR DIE HARD TAKEN TO TASK

"An American" Replies to Wail as to Who Started War.

STAYTON, Or., Jan. 19.—(To the Editor.)—Looking through The Oregonian January 17 I saw a letter written by "Die Hard." I am surprised that any person writing thus might aspire to call himself an American citizen. The editorial concerning the allied debt, I think, correctly stated the opinion of the majority of the American people. It is but one among many which represents your fairness in dealing editorially with leading questions.

In his statement concerning the President Wilson his attitude is similar to that of the kind and gentle William Hohenzollern, Hindenburg and the ruthless, murdering Huns who followed them.

I am a republican, but above all I am an American citizen. I have the deepest respect for Mr. Wilson. I firmly believe in all his work. He put forth his whole soul for the good of the American people and the world.

As to the starting of the war, we see the mighty Belgians invading unprotected Germany, while Holland and Switzerland stand ready to pounce upon and pillage the kultured cities of the gentle Teutons, which were darkening under the black clouds of the mighty English and French hordes.

Oh, that you, too, Mr. Die Hard, destroyer of civilization, might have been able to march beside your brother Huns across Belgium into the heart of France. You, too, could have pillaged innocent homes, shot the little child, run your cruel sword through the breast of the grief-stricken mother and then set a match to what remained. You could wave your bloody sword and shout in your innocence, "Gott is with us. We shall win."

There are too many like you, Mr. Die Hard, in our nation now. You poison the minds of our children. You undermine all that is good and righteous. You have no place among free American citizens. AN AMERICAN.

FARMER UPHOLDS POLL TAX

Washington Law Declared Relief and Rounds Up Floaters.

CAMAS, Wash., Jan. 20.—(To the Editor.)—I respectfully protest your gentle thrust at Washington's poll tax law. While taxes are more than twice as high as in 1914, there are thousands of farmers who, after deducting 1 or 2 per cent on their investment, find that there is absolutely nothing left for the many long days of work during the last year, taxes far overreaching the rental value of their property.

It is a notorious fact that they who pay little or no taxes are the noisest supporters of schemes for saddling additional taxes onto tangible property, on the theory that it will "make better times," and hasten the millenium of state socialism.

As no system of taxation yet devised is equitable in every individual case, some of your readers on this side of the Columbia believe that our legislature, through an indirect method, did pretty well in calling a halt to this rapid confiscation of property values by introducing thousands of voters to the pleasure of paying a tax in support of the various governmental "activities." C. L. HOOVER.

HOPE HELD OUT FOR MARY

No Need of Sitting by Fire Alone, Says Contributor.

PORTLAND, Jan. 21.—(To the Editor.)—After reading with keen interest the letters written concerning Mary-Sit-by-the-Fire, I, a woman who knows from experience, must have my say.

Why, oh why, does May sit by the fire when the men of today are so easy to catch? She cannot be a wide-awake modern American girl.

Men will fall for almost any sort of girl as long as she is attractive, has plenty of pep and a good line of conversation. Men want to be rushed and made over. The girl that chases them by phoning them, taking them riding if she happens to have a car and complimenting them on their good looks and so forth, always gets the men. Even bachelors who are supposed to be good sound men, are as bad as the boy of the foolish age. One bachelor, when asked by a young woman why she hadn't heard from him lately, calmly remarked that he never phoned or took out young women who did not do likewise to him.

Of course there are exceptions, but the ordinary girl of today will not have anything to do with the fellow who is afraid to tell a good joke, who will not dance but would rather stay home and read or play cards. The girl of today is looking for excitement, so she naturally picks up the fellow that can show her a jazzy time. She refuses to be bored. The butterfly is the ruling queen of the age. The old man chases her, as does the young, and even the married man. She knows what they want and she gives it to them.

I actually feel sorry for Mary, but she has no one to blame but herself. She can be popular if she wishes. She should make herself as attractive as possible, even bob her hair and wear her skirts to her knees, but, above all things, show a little pep. She can then walk down Washington street and cast a few "come-hither" glances at the classy dressed fellows in front of the drugstore or attend one of the public dance halls. She won't lose her reputation by such actions, as daughters from some of Portland's best families are doing it continually. All she needs is a little nerve and confidence in herself.

If she succeeds in picking one up, she must show him a good time, let him take his time about taking her home, let him think she believes all he tells her and even sit on the front porch with him when he suggests it. Let her head fall on his shoulder, pet him a little and she can figure on seeing him again within a few days.

The Portland boy is indeed a good mixer, but, as a rule, he mixes with the butterfly type. If Mary is not a butterfly or does not wish to be, she can easily join a club and attend church. Mary, indeed, has no one to blame but herself. ONE WHO KNOWS.

ACCUSATIONS ARE RESENTED

Franklin High Y Club Denies Corset and Other Charges.

PORTLAND, Jan. 20.—(To the Editor.)—Dancing in our high schools cannot be abolished. It constitutes the only form of social activity that all students may have a part in.

The many clubs in our schools raise money through the source of dancing. Take it away and these clubs, who contribute much money to the student body fund and athletic fund, will cease to exist.

Do the ones who want it abolished exactly know what they are talking about and know our position? We must keep our present reputation, which is one of the best. An observer at one of our dances will find our morals up to the highest standard and that we are properly chaperoned. They (the observers) see a couple whose morals are low, and they judge the rest by them. Most every time—yes, every time—they are not students of any school at all. During the past three years only one couple has been put off our floor. Why judge the rest by one illiterate couple? But that is the way of some people; they see only their side of the question.

The creed of the Methodist is prohibitive. "Thou shalt not do this, and thou shalt not do that." The creed of one church cannot be the creed of all. This may affect the members of the Methodist church, but when they enforce their creed on others they are going too far. A few who do not favor dancing have no right to stop enjoyment of the majority. The duty of a church is to raise people to a high standard, yet this must be done on a constructive, not destructive, policy.

They who are doing this have 18th century ideas, not 20th century ideas. Let them look at our side of the question for a moment and they will see where they are getting quite radical in what they say and do. The statement quoted in The Oregonian that our girls park their corsets in the cloak room before going to the dance is absolutely untrue. When they start to slander the girls of our school it is time to stop. FRANKLIN HI Y CLUB.

SCHOOL DANCES ADVOCATED

Charges of Moral Degeneracy Are Declared to Be Untrue.

PORTLAND, Jan. 20.—(To the Editor.): Half truths supported by isolated examples of moral delinquency may make the world believe that our youth are moral degenerates, but will they support the contention that dancing shall not be permitted in our schools?

If Dr. Wilson is correctly quoted in your paper, he accuses all the young people of our city of moral delinquency; an accusation he cannot sustain by proof.

Shall we close our churches because occasionally a minister takes advantage of an innocent young girl and wrongs her? Shall we say that all ministers are moral degenerates because occasionally one goes wrong? Shall we close our churches because boys wait outside after service, hoping for the privilege of escorting home the girl?

But let us return to the accusation. Let us grant for the purpose of argument that all Dr. Wilson says is true; then doesn't it follow that the way to correct the evil is to inspire our youth with the ideals of the duty of a man to a woman. How are we to have the chance to inspire these ideals if we take away our only opportunity by denying the right to give entertainments or dances in our schools—entertainments that afford the best opportunity to put into practice the precepts of a gentleman and a gentlewoman.

However, the broad accusation of Dr. Wilson is untrue. It creates an entirely wrong impression and one which the parents of Portland's youth should rise up in anger and smite, and smite hard. When one boy in my class stole money from the school, his act did not make my classmates and myself thieves. No more has any act of moral degeneracy made the classmates of the guilty ones the same, or given Dr. Wilson the right to make the broad statements he is reported to have made.

It is more than 30 years since I attended school, and I can look back on those days with longing—the same longing for permission to attend the school dances which was denied me by my good Methodist mother. I have heard the stories of these dances. I have heard the boys who attended take to task one of their number who had not conducted himself as his fellows thought he should. I have even known of instances where one boy was practically barred from the dance by the refusal of the other boys to fill his programme.

These questions had better be left to our boys and girls. They are equal to it, and as it is only by exercise that we develop strength, so it is only by conquering our temptations that we develop character; and the purpose of our schools is to develop character. So let them function, and maybe we will eventually develop a race of men and women who will realize that good comes from within the individual, and not from statutes commanding. "Thou shalt not." HARRY L. MARSHALL.

DRY LAW FAILURE IS SEEN

Ex-Soldiers Feel Like Something Was Put Over During Absence.

PORTLAND, Jan. 21.—(To the Editor.)—I read your remarkable editorial in The Oregonian on the enforcement of the prohibition amendment to our constitution. A great number of our soldiers who were in France feel in the same way as some of our United States senators have expressed themselves, that it was a well and thoroughly organized minority that forced the prohibition amendment through the two houses, and some of us soldiers feel like we had something put over on us while we were away defending our country against its enemies. The latter term means all of our enemies (reformers included). The latter must have their own way, regardless of the mischief they make, and it would appear that they are now witnessing the mischief that they have committed, to-wit, that long line of lawbreakers that your editorial calls attention to—bootlegger, thief, dope peddler and the greatest criminal of them all—the one who aids and abets them by buying from them.

Viewing it from the reformers' standpoint he has reformed the old toper and his ilk. Now, who is left to reform the reformer, and I make a motion that the whole people tackle this job and pursue it to a finish, and after that job is completed start a movement for sane and just laws that can be enforced, always remembering (the very thing that the reformer forgot) that the laws are made to govern human beings. Every thinking man knew or believed that prohibition enforcement as the law that is now on the statute books reads would be a failure, for it overlooked the human element, in the human family, and it has done the very thing your editorial so ably points out—made minor and major criminals galore.

Read Will Sheppard's article in the Cosmopolitan, "What Are We Drinking?" Read United States reports covering the withdrawal of proof spirits from the United States bonded warehouses. From the latter you will learn more proof spirits were withdrawn in the first ten months of 1921 than in any like period in their history. United States shipping board vessels sold liquor aboard their vessels, placing the United States in the position of not obeying its own laws.

In the past four years we have passed from the fifth narcotic user among the nations of the world to the first, and now our nation's statistics report that we use 25,000 tons of narcotics per annum.

The reformer knew that he wanted to reform somebody, somehow, but it is evident he never stopped to figure the results of his reforming and how it would work out. He wanted what he wanted and when he wanted it. It is really pitiful the lack of reflection that he has shown. He had his big chance to make the United States a better place to live in. Did he do it? JAMES H. SMALLEY.

POEM FINE BUT INADEQUATE

Correspondent Queries Mr. Stunz, Author of "The Cure."

OREGON CITY, Or., Jan. 20.—(To the Editor.)—The Oregonian published a poem which has rare merit. I refer to "The Cure," by J. S. Stunz. But like many poets he is careless in his statements. I question his right to call love a formula. My dictionary says "formula" is "a prescribed set or special form of words in which anything is stated or declared." If love is a formula will Mr. Stunz kindly tell me what are its several components and where I may obtain them and where I may find a chemist who can compound them and give me love?

It is something of a fad nowadays to talk of what great things love will do. It is the greatest force in the world, humanity has no ill it will not cure; but no one, it seems to me, is able to tell or attempts to tell us where or how we may be able to obtain or develop this balm of Gilead. That it is the proper remedy I am also sure; but where can I find it? If it be a force, as some assert, can I buy it as I might buy a well charged battery? Can I generate it by personal efforts? Can I call it from the clouds, or mine it from the earth? Can I distill it from the dogmas of theology, or find it in the apothecary's mortar? Is it a slave that I may command to do my bidding? Can I force myself to love someone I do not like? I have loved and been loved enough to know some of its joy-producing power, and I find it easy to love my own.

From these warm springs of love I drink my fill,
But find the over-run, a tiny rill,
Is lost, soon lost, in just a little way
From self.

Kindly tell me, Mr. Stunz, how I may bring within the circle of my affections those whom I do not like. F. W. PARKER.

SCHOOL DANCING APPROVED

Mother, 60, Says Children Need Chance to Vent Energy.

PORTLAND, Jan. 13.—(To the Editor.)—In regard to school dances let the Methodist ministers go to the school for one week and sit in the hard, cramped benches. If they don't feel like dancing at the end of the week I'll give it up. Those young, growing children have a lot of surplus energy to get away with in some way, so let them dance.

I am a mother of 60 years and have five children. I attended a number of the school dances and enjoyed seeing the children enjoying themselves so much. I think I grew several years younger. If more of the old folks danced there would be less rheumatism. MRS. MARY BROWN.

FAIR IS BOOSTER'S CHANCE

If You Can't Help, Don't Knock, Is Writer's Suggestion.

PORTLAND, Jan. 21.—(To the Editor.)—I have traveled the whole world over, I have lived and participated in the civic activities of every state in the union, with the possible exception of one or two of the southernmost states; I have seen fairs and expositions such as the Alaska-Yukon, the Panama-Pacific and numerous others of less note. Even from the time of the origination of the embryonic idea of holding such an exposition, the idea was met with no opposition. The path of the enterprise was aglow with the prospects of a happy future. The noble work was given the right of way. Everyone lent a helping hand. Take for example, our wonderful government of the United States. Unified we can, have and always will, stand out in base relief as "the" nation of nations, but, divided, we with our enormous strength and population would dissolve, even as a grain of salt would dissolve in a glass of water. Our peoples would part and we—well, we wouldn't be. Therefore, to get to the main issue of this—my wheezing. You have, no doubt, already gleaned the fact that I am going to say something about the Oregon exposition to be held in the near future and I surely am.

Just a word to those who, deep in their heart of hearts, know that Oregon will profit in every way as a direct result of after-affect of our fair and are outwardly opposing it. In plain-spoken English my feelings are thus: If you are not and will not be an Oregon booster, a booster for a bigger, better Oregon, now, in the future and all the time, surely then you will refrain from voicing your bizarre opinion in the opposite manner.

In a way, the future Atlantic-Pacific-Highways-Electrical exposition to be held in or about Portland is "Oregon's cup of fate," and upon the degree of success with which we put over the big fair depends the future of our state of Oregon. Heeding this then let us all give our unadulterated faith and our undivided efforts and attention to the aiding of the growth and development of this, our greatest enterprise of all time. Remember if this fair is an absolute success—and it surely will be—Oregon will reap a golden harvest; its growth and the development of its untold natural resources will be meteoric. And all of this, my friends, will come as the indirect result of the marvelous foresight of Julius Meier and a few other master minds of Oregon. However, should we fail to put the exposition over big, Oregon would be but a big blot or blur in the eyes of our sister states and the rest of the universe, nearly all of which have already signified their intentions of participating in the exposition.

Therefore, let us endeavor to make the coming exposition 100 per cent successful; we must also turn a deaf ear to the few "old fogies" who wish to besmirch the fair name of Oregon in the eyes of the world by trying to put as many obstacles in the way of the exposition as are possible. ARDENT BELIEVER.

MORE HOLIDAYS ARE WANTED

Memorial to Congress for Fried Liver and Onion Day Considered.

VANCOUVER, Wash., Jan. 13.—(To the Editor.)—Comes a complaint from the city of "Round-Up" fame, subscribed to by Stephen A. Lowell, against the muchly overworked legal holiday. He opines that we have too many of them, etc. As far as I am concerned, I think that we ought to have about 300 more of them and then we'd have one for every day in the year. I have been considering for some time memorializing congress to legalize the following days as legal holidays: Prune day, apple day, potato day, fried liver and onion day, ground hog day, buttermilk day, flower day, mother day, father day, brother day, sister day, cousin day, step-mother day, music day, automobile day, old friends' day, etc.

Of course I'll admit, like Mr. Lowell, that the idea of observing New Year's day and also Thanksgiving day is far from what it used to be. In fact, we older ones can hark back to the days when these days stood for something; in the days before Volstead became a household by-word, when the sleuthing "dicks" didn't soft-pedal around along the byways and highways with nostrils upraised to scent the desert air; when we used to don the long-tailed coat and high silk tile, and the egg-nog and Tom and Jerry flowed like water down a mountain side, and after we'd finished making our "calls" we went home and tried to unlock the front door with a cigarette, but alas today the thing has resolved itself into turkey and cranberry sauce.

If someone could only arrange these holidays so they wouldn't invariably fall on Saturday, Sunday or Monday, thus throwing two days together when a man is living on a rural route and you can't get your mail for two days because it's George Washington's birthday he will have conferred a lasting favor on mankind. I say again that we should have more holidays and then if mail carriers and school teachers got the sleeping sickness it wouldn't inconvenience the holidays. THE MAJOR.

SCHOOL DANCES UPHELD

Married Woman Voices Sentiments as Portland ex-Student.

PORTLAND, Jan. 21.—(To the Editor.)—Please permit me, as an ex-student, who is now a married woman, to voice my sentiments concerning the question of putting a ban on school dances.

There seems to be an element which is continually trying to take the "joy out of life" with its "blue laws," "18th amendment," "anti-tobacco leagues," etc., and now with this idea of "no school dances." Since time began there have been dances—some of them good, some of them bad. We are told that history repeats itself. Even in the Bible we are cited many examples of dancing, drink, etc., which were not debaucheries. Of course, we all know that drink, carried to an excess, is a sin and should be curbed. The same is true of dancing when people with low mentalities or moral standards are the participants.

But the average high school student is honorable and possesses at least a fairly clean mind. Approximately 75 per cent of the students dance. After days of recitation and study, how eagerly they look forward to a school "hop," "prom," "jitney dance," etc. Properly conducted dancing is considered one of the best forms of exercise, and it is one of the simplest forms of recreation or pleasure. Right here, for the benefit of our esteemed Methodist clergy and for those who are not acquainted with the truths, I wish to ask "How can a school dance be other than properly conducted?" Before a dance is permitted on the school premises or elsewhere under the auspices of some school organization, the principal, dean of girls, a few teachers and a host of "notables" and fond parents must be secured for patrons and patronesses — plainly speaking, "chaperons." The pupils are not likely to be indiscreet before their instructors and fellow-classmen. I have seen the teachers on the floor as thoroughly enjoying their dances as did any of their young charges. And, yes, I have seen the dean herself indulging in the same temptations and "sin"! These good people are deemed above reproach, and I am certain that the services of Mrs. Baldwin and other inspectors were never needed.

If I had sons or daughters in high school, I would want them to be able to partake of the pleasures of school dances. I have attended dozens of them, and, even now, after marrying and changing many of my old ideas, I can see nothing improper in these little social activities. Besides being a clean and healthy form of amusement, these dances are a great help in becoming acquainted with the majority of the students. Every year at Washington high school the seniors give a "freshman frolic." After a welcoming address and a short programme, there was always dancing. No introductions were necessary, and thus the shy freshmen and the sedate seniors laid the cornerstone of friendship.

If the worthy Methodist ministers are so opposed to the dancing in public institutions of learning, why do they not have their own schools (as the Catholics do), where they can allow only those things which harmonize with their beliefs? I think that any one who is the least bit fair or broadminded will readily agree that in schools where all races and religions mix there must be no favoritism of any creed. The public schools do not favor the teachings of any sect. They try to be the happy medium. MRS. CHARLES HENDERSON.

STUMP BURNING ABANDONED

Best Methods of Clearing Land Dynamite and Pulling.

SCOTTS MILLS, Or., Jan. 20.—(To the Editor.)—An item appearing in The Oregonian January 14, headed as follows: "Stump Burner Tried Out; Official Committees Experiment at Kenton; 40 Hours Said To Be Necessary to Consume Large Tree Base."

Having been born and raised in Oregon, and having cleared many acres of the big stumps, and having taken keen interest in the different modes applied to their extermination, I cannot help but take issue against all burning methods.

In the first place, any system which is not a "time saver" and does not completely put the "grub hoe" and axe in the discard, is hardly worth mentioning.

Burning methods, in many forms, were tried in the early days and were found too slow and were abandoned.

Life is too short, and "40 hours" too long to look a stump in the face. Here in the Scotts Mills country, we yank them out in less than "40 minutes."

We are perfectly willing to give a demonstration before any officials, and are satisfied that we can convince the most skeptical that our methods are more up-to-date and far more practical in the line of eliminating stumps,