

But the Albany Medical College can hardly accomplish a great deal outside of New York State. A similar program is needed in nearly every State in the Union.

Miss Tarbell Is Troubled

IN this issue The Outlook publishes the story of a woman who used to believe that prohibition would prohibit; and, picking up the current "Delineator," we find that Miss Ida M. Tarbell is similarly disillusioned.

The historian of Standard Oil wonders if prohibition is not actually becoming a menace to temperance; if it "is any longer serving as a guaranty of temperance, whether it may not be that, having accomplished its revolutionary purpose—the destruction of the saloon—it is not actually becoming a hindrance to further progress and may not in a few years, if things go on as they are, become a menace to the degree of temperance by choice which the country had achieved before the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted."

The trouble seems to be that Miss Tarbell, as a traveling lecturer, can't escape contact with actualities. She sees liquor in the Pullmans, smells it on the porter's breath, and is kept awake by the carousers in hotels and staterooms.

"Over-Sunday drinking parties in Western and Southern towns—I have never run across them elsewhere—are sometimes of dreadful proportion."

Mrs. Sabin, in The Outlook, asks for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Miss Tarbell believing, as do so many, that it is fixed, is inclined toward modification of the Volstead Act—the light wine and beer theory.

"Modification would at least give a firmer ground on which to fight law violations," she says. "It would put us in a better case to use the appeal to self-respect, and to try to win the co-operation of dissenters in working out a society of men self-controlled from choice. Is any other form of temperance worth the name? Can prohibition as we now have it make any further contribution to this goal?"

Miss Tarbell refers her question—Is prohibition a menace to temperance?—to the Conventions about to open.

"It must be considered," she says, "by the gentlemen who gather in Kansas City and in Houston . . . if they are to frame platforms on which candid Democrats and Republicans can support with some degree of self-respect the candidates for the Presidency which they nominate."

Miss Tarbell's suggestion may have no effect on politicians scheming for victory; but as the discussion of prohibition gradually comes out into the open it becomes apparent that there is a "wet" as well as a "dry" argument.

Mr. Raskob to Colonel Callahan

MR. JOHN J. RASKOB, Chairman of the Finance Committee of General Motors, came back from Europe the other day and found a letter on his desk. It was from Colonel Patrick H. Callahan, of Louisville, and in it the Colonel took Mr. Raskob to task for his connection with the National Association Opposed to Prohibition.

Colonel Callahan is the same Colonel who two years ago wrote a letter to the Pope asking him to help enforce prohibition in this country. The Pope's answer, if any, has not been made public, but



Weed in the New York Evening World
Copyright, Press Publishing Company (N. Y. World), 1928

Teaching the Young Idea—to pay

Mr. Raskob's reply overran a newspaper column. Said he:

"I am not a drinking man (this does not mean that I never take a drink), am a director in corporations employing over 300,000 men, and have a family of twelve children ranging in ages from five to twenty-one. . . .

"My experience is that children like to be with older folks, are quick, alert, and particularly keen in listening to what their elders say and do. What impressions are registering on the minds of my sons and daughters when they see thoroughly reputable and successful men and women drinking, talking about their bootleggers, the good 'stuff' they get, expressing contempt for the Volstead Law?

"The menace of prohibitory laws is the spirit of intolerance underlying their adoption, and this is bound to result in

rebellion. . . . A large number of people feel that a majority in this country have no more right to curtail their freedom with respect to drinking beer, wines, or even spirits, than they have to deny free religious worship. These people feel that they do no wrong in the eyes of God when they buy and consume beer, wines, and liquors, in spite of the law. They feel that those who have the money to pay for such beverages and have them analyzed can drink without risk of health, while those who cannot must either do without or take great risks of being poisoned.

"It is for this reason that the great mass of our workmen and poor people feel that prohibition does not prohibit, but is a scheme to deny them something which their more fortunate brothers with money can have almost at will. Is it any wonder they should rebel? . . .

"Mr. Hoover thinks and many others did at one time think prohibition a great and noble social experiment. But it has failed, and I personally cannot conceive of any experiment founded on intolerance and not on good morals being noble."

Mr. Raskob resents the charge that he and others who are working for the repeal of the Amendment are "in any way lawbreakers or show any lack of respect for our great Constitution."

"On the contrary, we are engaged in a noble effort to restore to our people a feeling of independence and liberty and the right to the pursuit of happiness so earnestly sought, prayed for, and finally secured after the Revolutionary War."

Modify Divorce Rules

DIVORCE became an issue in the closing hour of the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in session twenty-nine days at Kansas City, and victory rested with those who would liberalize the rules.

Heretofore ministers of that large and influential denomination have been forbidden to marry a divorced person, except the innocent partner in a divorce resulting from adultery.

The amended Methodist Discipline now reads:

"A minister shall not solemnize a marriage of a divorced person whose husband or wife is still living, except for the innocent person, when it is clearly established in his own mind that the true cause of divorce was adultery or its moral equivalent."

The concession to the liberalizers is in the last three words. Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, President of Boston University, made the argument for that faction.

