

has behind it a much larger majority than supports most of the laws.

The Prohibition Amendment was adopted after a fight of nearly fifty years. More than two-thirds of the states banished the saloon by their own separate act; over two-thirds of the members of the Senate and the House voted to submit a prohibition amendment and forty-six states out of the forty-eight have formally ratified this amendment, leaving two of the small states, Connecticut and Rhode Island, as the only ones that have not ratified. One branch of the Connecticut legislature has voted for ratification. The magnitude of the majority in favor of prohibition is seen when it is remembered that ninety-three of the ninety-six separate branches of the forty-eight legislatures have given a majority vote in favor of ratifying the Prohibition Amendment.

To make the argument in favor of acquiescence still stronger, attention is called to the fact that two congresses have been elected since prohibition was submitted; one of them enacted an enforcement law by more than a two-thirds vote of both houses and the succeeding congress, elected after the Prohibition Amendment actually went into effect, passed by more than a two-thirds vote of both houses a bill prohibiting the use of beer, even as medicine.

In addition to this, the question has been passed upon indirectly in all the large states since the saloons were closed by Constitutional Prohibition. New York elected a governor and legislature in 1920 pledged to prohibition as did Pennsylvania and Ohio. Illinois and New Jersey have elected dry legislatures and put their states back of the federal government in the enforcement of the law for prohibition. In fact, there were only five states in which beer could be used as a medicine when the anti-beer law was passed.

And yet, in spite of the accumulating evidence that prohibition represents a permanent determination on the part of the people to rid the nation of the curse of alcoholic beverages, many of the metropolitan papers deliberately encourage lawlessness by editorials criticising enforcement and defending conspiracies against law. This is the habitual attitude of some of the New York papers. They give large space and big headlines to each new plan devised for outwitting the government. They describe, as if it were permissible, the proposed opening of a palatial floating saloon just outside the three mile limit. A Philadelphia paper, ordinarily regarded as respectable, impudently warns the government against attempting to interfere with rum-runners when three miles from shore. With such editorial encouragement from the United States it is not surprising that a corporation is being organized in London, with public offering of stock, to carry cargoes of alcoholic liquors to the three mile limit for delivery to smugglers.

While the smugglers are being thus encouraged by editors too cowardly to do what they advise others to do, men, and even some women, consider it smart to give their patronage to the lawless vendors of liquor—they boast of it.

Is it not time for the law abiding people to notify the wet newspapers that it is as criminal to advise crime as to actually commit it. Is it not time to remind these would-be editorial authorities on international law that the high seas do not belong to pirates or to conspirators against any other law? The geography tells us that three-fourths of the earth's surface is covered with water—are the smugglers to understand that they reign supreme over three-fourths of the earth's surface? It would be a mockery to civilization to say that it must confine itself to one-fourth of the globe and let lawlessness reign everywhere else.

A man who makes himself an outlaw cannot find protection under any flag when he uses the paths of the ocean to carry into any country that which the conscience of the country has condemned.

If the "Drys" were as quick to resent editorial attacks on virtue as the vicious are to resent editorial attacks on vice, the "wet" papers would soon learn that it is good policy to bow to the public will and respect the laws of state and nation.

W. J. BRYAN.

#### DARWINISM TO DATE

A Cornell professor has found, so he says, that, while alcohol weakens the immediate descendants of guinea pigs, it strengthens the fourth generation by killing off the least rugged. This is Darwin's doctrine of the survival of the fittest. That is why the bolder followers of Darwin call Christianity the doctrine of the degenerate—it substitutes love for hate and cares for the weak.

## Dr. Birge, Autocrat

Dr. Birge, head of the University of Wisconsin, has for about a year been hiding in the bushes, so to speak, and dodging questions raised by his attitude on evolution. Finally he has come out into the clearing and expressed himself on two propositions. In the first place, he admits that he believes himself to be a descendant of the ape. In a recent letter given to the Capital Times of Madison he says:

"Mr. Bryan is pleased to ask would-be facetious questions about 'ape ancestry.' He repeats in a cheap fashion the question which Wilberforce asked of Huxley on a memorable occasion sixty odd years ago, and I am quite content to give him Huxley's reply; 'A man has no reason to be ashamed of having an ape for his grandfather. If there were an ancestor which I should feel shamed in recalling it would rather be a MAN . . . a man of restless and versatile intellect . . . who, not content with equivocal success in his own sphere of activity, plunged into scientific questions with which he has no real acquaintance, only to obscure them by aimless rhetoric and distract the attention of his hearers from the real point at issue by eloquent digressions and skilled appeals to religious prejudice.'"

This may be fairly accepted as evidence that he is proud of his brute ancestry (proof also that he does not accept the Mosaic account of man's creation.) It is also evidence of his willingness to endorse Huxley's slur on the ministry. Wilberforce was a great preacher. It is interesting to observe that Dr. Birge carries his evolution so far as to be willing to use with seeming relish Huxley's contemptuous reply to the minister's criticism. He would rather be a descendant of an ape than a descendant of a great preacher like Wilberforce.

But it will be still more interesting to the tax payers of Wisconsin to note his insistence that he has a right to teach to the students the Darwinian hypothesis even though it does make the Bible a lie and he insists that he has a right to do it regardless of the wishes of the tax payers of Wisconsin. In discussing the impudence of certain professors, I gave utterance recently to what would seem to be a self evident truth, namely, that the hand that writes the pay check rules the school. I had not supposed that any teacher would be bold enough to put in writing a denial of the right of those who employ him to direct the course of study. But we seem to have one educator—we shall know later if any others agree with him—who resents the very suggestion that he is a hired man. He says:

"There is, however, one significant statement in Mr. Bryan's letter, which shows up the general policy that he is advocating and that he and his friends are trying to force upon us in both church and school. This is made in several ways, but it culminates in the noble maxim, 'The hand that writes the pay check rules the school.' I question whether there was ever advocated a more cynically immoral purpose. Mr. Bryan here tells us plainly that the power of money is to determine what shall be taught in the schools. Religion, science, history, economics, sociology—these are all to be taught as the 'writer of the pay check' demands.

"Mr. Bryan is at work to make the teacher into the hired man of money—teaching not the truth as he sees it or as God progressively reveals it to the world, but repeating in parrot fashion the doctrines that his paymaster calls for. This is the basis on which Mr. Bryan wishes our youth instructed in school and church and he tells us that he is at work to secure this result."

Dr. Birge is the president of a state university. Every dollar which he receives in the way of salary comes from the tax payers; they sign the pay check but he denies that they have any right to rule the school. The teachers, according to his views, are to decide what they shall teach and how they shall teach it. He proposes to set up the most autocratic form of government ever proposed. It is to be composed of professors who will draw their salaries from the people and yet decide arbitrarily, without instructions and without appeal, what they shall teach the children entrusted to their care. No matter what these children have learned at home the teacher is to have sovereign power to substitute what he calls truth for that which the parents of the children believe to be truth. No

matter what effect it may have upon the morals of the child, the teacher's opinion is to be substituted for the parent's opinion.

Public sentiment has brought about in nearly every state the enactment of laws compelling the child to go to school. This is a wise provision, but if the teacher is to be the sole judge of what the child is to be taught in morals, as well as in science, compulsory education adds to the omnipotence of the instructors and to the helplessness of the parents.

Dr. Birge's statement is all that is necessary to awaken the public to the fact that such an ATTITUDE is so hostile to the highest interests of the state and of the nation that it will not be tolerated for a moment. The people are not disposed to return to the discarded system of "taxation without representation."

W. J. BRYAN.

#### THE BONUS

The Republican leaders are like the business man who subscribed for the building of a church and then FOUGHT THE LOCATION to avoid paying the subscription. All the Republicans want the bonus, but they can not agree upon the way to raise the money. Democrats will vote for it and then find a better way when a Democratic congress is elected.

#### FORD'S PAPER MONEY PLAN

On another page will be found Henry Ford's interview on the issue of paper money to pay for Muscle Shoals improvement. The government non-interest bearing notes would do all that he says, but the reactionary leaders of the Republican party will never consent to government paper—bonds are better for the big financiers.

#### LIQUOR TREATIES

Commissioner Haynes is talking of liquor treaties with neighboring nations. Why not? Why should any friendly nation allow its flag to protect rum runners? The smugglers are pirates—they sail under the black flag. They are outlaws and should be dealt with as such.

#### FARM TARIFFS

The Republican leaders are trying the old flim-flam on the farmers. They are putting a useless tariff on farm products in order to induce the farmers to bear a burdensome tariff on the things they have to buy. It is a very one-sided game and the farmers are on the losing side.

#### BIG NAVY MEN WIN

The big navy men won in the House. Too bad, but wait until the voters get a chance. They will vote for the smallest navy and the smallest army possible. On any proposition the people will vote for the least number proposed.

#### MR. BRYAN'S STATEMENT ON SENATORIAL CONTEST

Believing that, as a United States senator, I could render valuable service to the state of Florida and to the Democratic party in the nation, I stated about two months ago, in answer to inquiries, that I would consider a call from the Democrats of this state from the standpoint of duty, but that I had no thought of entering into a contest for any office. Since that time petitions, numerous signed, have been received from every part of the state asking me to file as a candidate. I am profoundly grateful to these friends for their generous confidence and am happy to know that I can count on their cooperation in Florida politics. But no assurance of success, unless it were overwhelming, would justify me in entering into a contest for office. My fights have been made for Democratic principles and policies and I have made them as the representative of voters who desired me to act as their spokesman. Nearly all of these principles and policies have been written into the unrepeatable law of the land. I cannot at my age turn from such enjoyable work to personal politics. It is only fair to others who may desire to file that I at once announce that I shall not be a candidate.

As a private citizen I shall be just as active in all that concerns the welfare of the state as I would be in office and shall, as soon as possible, visit all the counties in the state. These visits will be the more pleasant because I can become acquainted with all the people regardless of their views on political questions.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.