

## The Ford Proposition

Henry Ford's proposition to take over the Muscle Shoals plant and operate it with a view to public service is arousing opposition from big interests. Mr. Ford's plans are so different from the plans of big business that his operation of the great power plant at Muscle Shoals would be likely to draw attention to the difference between work done for the public and work done for purely private ends.

The one real objection to the Ford proposition is the length of the franchise. But this can be cured by a provision permitting the government to take over the plant at any time on terms that are equitable. Mr. Ford would be the last man to object to a provision which would protect the government against future contingencies. He cannot be expected to be alive when the franchise ends and no one knows who will fall heir to his power when he dies. A simple clause, a few words long, permitting the government to protect the people by taking over the plant whenever such a policy seems wise would remove the one objection which can be raised against the proposition in its present form.

W. J. BRYAN.

### SELF GOVERNMENT SPREADING

On another page will be found a Washington press dispatch giving an account of Great Britain's surrender of sovereignty over Egypt. This is an epoch making act. Egypt was taken over by Great Britain in accordance with the colonial policy of the Imperial Governments of Europe. First a loan and then enforced security; and then super government to collect the security.

It will be remembered that there was a secret treaty entered into by Great Britain and France when France, following the same policy, took Morocco. The surrender of Egypt is another evidence of the dawning of a new policy; the doctrine of self determination is spreading and self government goes with it. First Ireland becomes free; next Egypt, and last—will it be India?

### SPENCER VS. KENYON

On another page will be found the attack of Senator Spencer on Judge Kenyon. The senator seems to think that the confirmation of Senator Kenyon by the Senate sealed the lips of the gentleman from Iowa. Senator Spencer does not know Judge Kenyon if he thinks he would sell his right to free speech for a seat on the bench. The reactionary senators may be shocked many times by the utterances of Judge Kenyon. Let us hope so.

The commission of inquiry that recently went on a profiteer hunt in Nebraska has reported that it costs twice as much to build a house now as it did before the war. This will come as a surprise to a great many persons, of course, and illustrates the value of the politicians' services on behalf of the people.

Just to show how democratic and how much they dislike all this flubdubbery and king business, none of the metropolitan newspapers printed more than 578 columns about the marriage of Princess Mary of England to a wealthy commoner.

It is said that in Russia, under the new regime, persons who borrow books and do not return them are being imprisoned. We suppose that by and by the punishment will be increased so that it really fits the crime.

### THE IRISH FREE STATE

It is to be regretted that the establishment of the Irish Free State does not bring peace, but a continuation of friction and clashing should not disappoint those who believe in self-government. Jefferson thought the troubled waters of Democracy better than the stagnant pool of despotism. Out of the turmoil will finally emerge a government that will be satisfactory and that is the only kind of government that is permanent.

It is not strange that the Irish people who have for so long a time been hostile to Great Britain should be unable to lay aside at once their fighting spirit. The momentum which they have acquired through generations will carry them on until the power that generated the momentum has ceased to act. The clashes between Ulster and Ireland will naturally delay union of these two sections under one government.

W. J. BRYAN.



### MRS. ASQUITH'S CRITICISM

Mrs. Asquith seems to have been quite unfortunate in the company she has kept in the United States. She is very much shocked at what she hears about young men and young women drinking. Of course, it must be a rude awakening for one coming from high society of London to find drinking among men and women.

She has not found any bar-maids serving drinks in this country, as she finds them all over her own city, she has not discovered a thousand drunken mothers smothering their children in a year by lying on them (as Dr. Saleeby says is done in Great Britain) but she has heard enough to make her think that prohibition is a failure in the United States. Possibly she heard that from the wet papers in London before she came.

It is to be hoped that Mrs. Asquith will not be content with what she hears from the "wets" with whom she associates; if she is interested in taking back a true report of the situation she ought to call on Commissioner Haynes and acquaint herself with the statistics he has gathered. He says that seventeen and a half millions of people have quit drinking since prohibition went into effect; that two billions of dollars formerly spent for intoxicants is now available for better uses and that the number of arrests for drunkenness has decreased about sixty-six per cent. The facts may not be pleasing to her London society friends but there are many people in Great Britain who know of the change wrought in this country by prohibition and are praying that our example may save England, Scotland, and Ireland from their greatest curse—drink.

### MR. BRYAN'S STATEMENT

The following statement was given out by Mr. Bryan at Miami, Fla., February 15:

To those who have been kind enough to write me in regard to the Senatorship: Greeting: I have been actively in politics for more than thirty years; with the exception of less than seven years my work has been done as a private citizen and I prefer to continue to serve the public without the cares of office. If the Democrats of Florida felt that as a Senator I could render a service to the state and to the party in the nation sufficient to justify them in calling upon me to represent them at Washington I would consider the matter from the standpoint of duty and in connection with other claims upon me, but I have no thought of entering into contest for the office.

The nominations that I have received—for Congress, one for Senate, and three for the Presidency—have been tendered me practically without opposition and I have prized them as expressions of confidence. No friend will expect me, at my period of life and when my political record is known to all, to solicit support or to take the risk of alienating those pledged to aspirants. I am looking forward to congenial associations here with Florida Democrats who have been my co-laborers for a quarter of a century—I am sure that our relations will be pleasant so long as my plans do not conflict with the ambitions of others or with their personal preferences.

With profound appreciation of the expressions of friendship and esteem that have come to me, I am,

Very truly,

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

## Evolution as Applied to Man

The Editor,  
New York Times,  
New York City.

Dear Sir:

I appreciate your invitation to present the objections to Darwinism, or evolution applied to man, and beg to submit to your readers the following:

The only part of evolution in which any considerable interest is felt is evolution APPLIED TO MAN. An hypothesis in regard to the rocks and plant life does not affect the philosophy upon which one's life is built. Evolution applied to fish, birds, and beasts would not materially affect man's view of his own responsibilities except as the acceptance of an unsupported hypothesis as to these would be used to support a similar hypothesis as to man. The evolution that is harmful—distinctly so—is the evolution that destroys man's family tree as taught by the Bible and make him a descendent of the lower forms of life. This, as I shall try to show, is a very vital matter.

I deal with Darwinism because it is a definite hypothesis. In his "Descent of Man" and "Origin of Species" Darwin has presumed to outline a family tree that begins, according to his estimate, about two hundred million years ago with marine animals. He attempts to trace man's line of descent from this obscure beginning up through fish, reptile, bird and animal to man. He has us descend from European, rather than American, apes and locates our first ancestors in Africa. Then he says, "But why speculate?"—a very significant phrase because it applies to everything that he says. His entire discussion is speculation.

Darwin set forth two (so-called) laws by which he attempts to explain the changes which he thought had taken place in the development of life from the earlier forms to man. One of these is called "Natural Selection" or "Survival of the Fittest," his argument being that a form of life which had any characteristic that was beneficial had a better chance of survival than a form of life that lacked that characteristic. The second law that he assumed to declare was called "Sexual Selection" by which he attempted to account for every change that was not accounted for by Natural Selection. Sexual Selection has been laughed out of the class room. Even in his day Darwin said (see note to "Descent of Man" 1874 edition, page 625) that it aroused more criticism than anything else he had said, when he used sexual selection to explain how man became a hairless animal. Natural Selection is being increasingly discarded by scientists. John Burroughs, just before his death, registered a protest against it. But many evolutionists adhere to Darwin's CONCLUSIONS while discarding his EXPLANATIONS. In other words, they accept the line of descent which he suggested WITHOUT ANY EXPLANATION WHATSOEVER to support it.

Other scientists accept the family tree which he outlined but would have man branch off at a point below, or above, the development of apes and monkeys instead of coming through them. So far as I have been able to find, Darwin's line of descent has more supporters than any other outlined by evolutionists. If there is any other clearly defined family tree supported by a larger number of evolutionists I shall be glad to have information about it that I may investigate it.

The first objection to Darwinism is that it is only a GUESS and was never anything more. It is called an "hypothesis" but the word "hypothesis," though euphonious, dignified and high sounding, is merely a scientific synonym for the old-fashioned word "guess." If Darwin had advanced his views as a GUESS they would not have survived for a year but they have floated for half a century, buoyed up by the inflated word "hypothesis." When it is understood that "Hypothesis" means "guess" people will inspect it more carefully before accepting it.

The second objection to Darwin's guess is that it has not one syllable in the Bible to support it. This ought to make Christians cautious about accepting it without thorough investigation. The Bible not only describes man's creation but gives a reason for it; man is a part of God's plan and is placed on earth for a purpose. Both the Old and New Testaments deal with man and with man only. They tell of God's creation of him, of God's dealings with him and of God's plans for him. Is it not