



3-1-1929

Destiny by Statute

Sidney Whipple

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sidney Whipple, *Destiny by Statute*, 4 Notre Dame L. Rev. 358 (1929).

Available at: <http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndlr/vol4/iss6/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by NDLScholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Notre Dame Law Review by an authorized administrator of NDLScholarship. For more information, please contact lawdr@nd.edu.

DESTINY BY STATUTE

By SIDNEY WHIPPLE

If we were asked to name the outstanding characteristic of the human race in this glorious Twentieth Century, the answer would have to be mental laziness.

Rather than stimulating the exercise of brain power, the mechanical and scientific age in which we live, the ease with which we move, the facility with which necessities and luxuries may be acquired all have conspired to pour in our veins the virus of mental indolence.

In our care to avoid the pain of thinking—and thinking has always been peculiarly painful to all but a very few humans—we accept whatever pleases our fancy from the philosophy of the past, without attempting to create a new and better philosophy. Because it would entail thinking, we refuse to dispute tradition; we quote dead men as authorities on modern conditions; and we base our very action upon a mass of legend, superstition, gossip, fear, precedent, prejudice and passion.

We decline, as a rule, to make use of our intelligence, if we have any, in a discriminatory capacity, and any fiat, dictum, bull or ukase issued by Henry Ford, Babe Ruth, 'Gene Tunney, Lydia Pinkham, Wayne B. Wheeler or the successors, heirs and assigns of P. T. Barnum, finds ready acceptance in that rag-bag of odds and ends of misinformation we call our minds.

There has been, through fifty centuries of known history, some flickering hope that mass intelligence was on the upgrade. We have argued, of course, that the world was growing intelligent. Instead, it seems that the world has merely become better schooled in dogma. Instead of having dogma preached at us, we are now risen to such heights that we can read dogma for ourselves and, in our abysmal ignorance, imagine we are thinking.

During these fifty centuries, we have been more or less concerned with individual destiny, and we have swallowed various theories regarding methods of altering what it was manifest we were to become.

We have gone to war because somebody told us it was a glorious thing to die for one's country. And yet we have never had any proof of the truth or falsity of that saying because no one who ever tested the theory ever came back to confirm it.

Mental laziness rather than mental incapacity has been responsible for most of our slavery to ancient shibboleths. Unwillingness to think rather than inability to think has permitted the creation of such historic figures as Wilhelm Hohenzollern and Lenin, Mussolini and Primo de Rivera, Hiram Wesley Evans and William Jennings Bryan, D. C. Stephenson and E. S. Shumaker.

It has remained for the Twentieth Century, however, to reverse all our previous conceptions of the individual's right to work out his own destiny, and to turn the process completely over to a common agency which we call government.

Buddah, sitting under the great Bo tree and reflecting upon the natural gift of God that enables a man, by introspection, to be captain of his soul and master of his fate, would today be jailed as a vagrant; Mohamet would be forced to submit his civil code in the Koran, including its precedent for the eighteenth amendment, to the hands of congressional lobbyists; and the founder of Christianity would be imprisoned as a dangerous radical.

But what have we to do with the philosophy of those three? They taught that only from within, only from individual and conscientious effort, only by proper thought and pure desires, could there come spiritual advancement, while we have swept away, overturned, shattered beyond mending the theory that man, the individual, has any duty—any, any RIGHT—to assume for himself the task of governing even his thoughts, let alone his actions.

In our desire to take the line of least resistance, we have of course perforce had to become great apologists. Rather than think correctly, which is difficult, we manufacture excuses to think incorrectly. We justify all our actions by quoting precedent and so-called authorities. The law has become our goal and our god and unreasoning precedent sits on the Law's right hand.

Where the Englishman used to justify everything he did on principle, we justify everything we do on Law, and confound our enemies by quoting statutes at them. Of the Englishman, Bernard Shaw said, as long ago as 1898:

"He is never at a loss for an effective moral attitude. As the champion of freedom and national independence, he conquers half the world, and calls it colonization. When he wants a new market for his adulterated goods, he sends a missionary to teach the natives the gospel of peace. The natives kill the missionary; he flies to arms in defense of Christianity; fights for it; conquers for it; and takes the market as a reward from heaven.

"He does everything on principle. He fights you on patriotic principles, he robs you on business principles, he enslaves you on imperial principles; he bullies you on manly principles; he supports his king on loyal principle and cuts his head off on republican principles. His watchword is Duty, and he never forgets that the nation which lets its duty get on the opposite side of its interest is lost."

Today, we have substituted a new word for "principle" of which Mr. Shaw spoke so scathingly nearly thirty years ago. The new word is the Law, and it makes not one whit of difference whence the law originated, from what curiously unbalanced brain it sprang, or by what dark method it was written into the bulky code book. And to suggest a needed change in the law is treason.

Discarding the previous belief that sincere reform cannot be imposed from above, but that it must come from the individual, we have without knowing it revolutionized every process of moral and social government, piling up a superstructure of law, statutes, codes, regulations, rules, conventions, and restrictions that bids fair to topple upon us and crush us with its weight.

Until this century, the whole trend of government was towards greater liberalization of human rights. Until this century the political constitutions of the world, including our own, were agencies interposed between the government and its citizens to protect the latter in his freedom of thought and freedom of expression. The mandatory clauses, the "thou shalt not's" of the American constitution were directed at the government—not at the citizen. Until this century every piece of political philosophy in that document was directed towards safeguarding the citizen against both oppression and paternalism.

And then we accepted the eighteenth amendment which imposed its restraint not upon the government but upon the citizen.

This was revolution.

It is not my purpose to discuss, within the limits of this paper, the general effect of the passage of that law, for good or evil. That was merely part and parcel of a changing political conception which has been gradually coming about for a quarter of a century.

But it does illustrate the weird belief on the part of some law givers that men may be made good by law, altruistic by law, moral by law, decent by law, generous by law, and even intelligent by law, and nothing is more absurd or ridiculous than that.

So it seems that our age-old struggle for the right to express individualism has ended in the suppression of all individualism and the attempt to mold all citizens in the same chaste pattern of thought and appearance. And these patterns, forms and molds are provided not by the sober design of the whole people, but by the fantastic aberrations of a motley crew of professional puritans and paid puppet politicians.

Our children go to government schools and are schooled in dogma sanctioned by the government. They are taught thrift, by law, and sewing by law, and domestic science by law and music by law, regardless of whether they will ever sew, keep house or play a piano.

Our institutions of education, so-called, are so interested in making children conform to a single standard, a single pattern, that they are rapidly crushing every particle and every spark of individual spirit or talent in the student, and as a result, by these statutory limitations and regulations we are turning perfectly good poets into peasants, bricklayers into bond salesmen and factory automatons into preachers.

If we are so unfortunate as to be brought up in the enlightened state of Tennessee, where soggy food, fried in grease, may be in part responsible for soggy official minds steeped in ignorance, we are permitted no mention of single-celled animals, and the law stamps all science treason.

And all over the United States we erect schools to educate our offspring and then forbid perceptors by law to teach anything that will upset the equilibrium of ignorance in which they must pursue their way through life.

When we passed the eighteenth amendment, we discovered

something brand new in the lazy art of shucking off moral responsibilities.

Confessing ourselves so mentally weak and morally unstable that we ourselves could not correct our faults, we shouldered the entire burden upon the United States government and said, with a sigh of relief, "Well, that's one more job off our chests—the job of keeping sober".

That was the beginning of complete surrender to the government of our individual jobs as caretakers of our own personal morals. We discovered that we need not be our own keepers, let alone our brother's, for here was a ready-made agency that was not only willing but anxious to assume the responsibility.

Accordingly, in addition to its already manifold duties, the government became in a sense the custodian of our morals and charged itself with the duty of pointing out the road to heaven. Thus, in spite of our original intention to keep religion out of the state, we discover that the state has become an ordained minister of a peculiarly offensive and bigoted round-head type.

It may be argued here that prohibition is not a moral question, nor can I dispute that argument. But for the sake of this thesis, I am merely accepting the common pulpit view of the question, which is that the drinker is bound for hell because he is offending God rather than merely that he is abusing his stomach.

So, at least in the eyes of the average theologian, we must admit that the state has entered the church's province.

That was merely the beginning of the movement, a forerunner of abject surrender of all other duties and responsibilities, and today we have, in our laziness, found it so convenient for the government to take all responsibilities from us as individuals that we are perfectly contented to put our minds in wheel chairs and let the government push them about.

The cost of all this is enormous, in more ways than one. There is the monetary cost, mounting to staggering totals. And there is the spiritual cost, for having lost responsibility, we have lost initiative.

The United States government consists at the present time of 63 departments, of which all but two or three are useless appendages and have nothing to do with the commonly accepted fundamentals of government.

The government is engaged in 25,000 different enterprises, ranging from control over commerce to feeding narcotics to monkeys.

It regulates traffic between and within the states; owns a merchant marine; assumes guard over the morals of the people; undertakes to promote markets for the farmer; operates a sales force for American industries abroad; determines the age of workmen to be employed and regulates their sanitation; sits at the bedside of expectant mothers; publishes more than 50 weekly and monthly magazines; inspects all food sold in interstate commerce; runs mammoth hotels; plots the course of waters under the earth and on the earth; forecasts earthquakes and measures tides.

The government measures the heat of the sun and may some day apportion that heat to each of us; seeks the lost perfumes of apples, traps the boll weevil; paints the parasites that live on a flea's hind leg; punishes joyriding across state lines; prohibits the use of railroads for immoral purposes; determines the amount of fat that butter must contain; inspects the drinking water on Pullman cars; operates an ink factory in Washington; and sends an employe annually to live with a family of polecats for a time, the better to study their peculiar whimsies.

The government will make up your family budget or fix your kitchen scales and yardsticks. It will check your carburetor and test your gasoline. It drags the bottom of the seas for more information and inform you what salary you may pay your son, for purposes of the income tax.

The government of the United States counts the cigarettes smoked annually by advanced ladies, measures the wool content in blankets, inspects advertising that it may be truthful, runs the biggest job printing plant in the world, and keeps some 2,000,000 men and women busy the year round.

Government physicians standardize vaccines and diphtheria antitoxins. Government chemists take daylight pictures of stars and play dirty tricks on plants and animals.

The government innoculates live fish with a disease that causes them to grow pearl buttons in their tummies.

It has the greatest rogues' gallery in the world and operates the largest detective force.

If there is any single element of modern life, if there is any phase of our every day existence in which the government does not in some way interpose a meddling and officious finger, I have yet to find it out.

This wholesale socialism of the nation has begun to alarm even the cautious Calvin Coolidge. I dislike intensely to quote any man, much less Mr. Coolidge, as an authority on anything whatsoever. It is a part of my theory, at least for the purposes of this paper, that the views of no other man should be crammed down your throats, or anybody's throats. But if people will consistently refuse to think for themselves, I suppose somebody must do the thinking for them.

So in the present instance, at the risk of injuring an otherwise unassailable paper, I am going to repeat some words he spoke at Williamsburg this summer:

"We must recognize that the national government is not and cannot be adjusted to the needs of local government.

"It is too far away to be informed of local needs, too inaccessible to be responsive to local conditions.

"The states should not be induced by coercion or by favor to surrender the management of their own affairs.

"The federal government should resist the tendency to be loaded up with duties which the state should perform.

"Artificial propaganda, paid agitators, selfish interests, all fall upon members of legislative bodies to force themselves to represent special elements rather than the great body of their constituency.

"When they are successful, minority rule is established and the result is an extravagance which is ruinous to the people and a multiplicity of regulations and restrictions for the conductance of all kinds of necessary business which becomes little less than oppressive.

"Unless bureaucracy is constantly resisted, it breaks down representative government and overwhelms democracy."

That is the end of the quotation. And when conditions have become so bad that they cause a republican president of the United States to utter such blasphemous democratic principles, we must have reached the limit even of reactionary endurance.

We are a wealthy nation, at least in natural resources which

are the basis of our prosperity. And because we are wealthy, we little count the mounting cost of this fad for government. In fact I sometimes think that with our American reverence for gigantic figures, we are rather proud of our spending capacity.

So we gladly pay, for our various national, state, county and municipal governments, about \$80,000 a minute, the most expensive piece of wet-nursing to infant intelligences in the history of civilization.

Eighty thousand dollars a minute, \$5,000,000 an hour, \$40,000,000 for each eight-hour day, six days a week, to the staggering total of eleven billions of dollars a year.

So we arrive at our grand total of \$11,000,000,000 a year for what?

For laws and statues and codes and regulations and restrictions, for boards and departments and commissions and committees and sub-departments and sub-commissions and sub-committees. For police forces and detective forces and coast guard forces and constabulary and prohibition forces and spies and snoopers and informers, for armies and navies and sheriffs and deputy sheriffs, for custom guards; for armies of clerks and statisticians and tabulators and secretaries and sub-chiefs and chiefs, for 3,500,000 men and women whose jobs are created by law so that another law may become effective.

The American government thus has become the greatest single employer in the world.

On the rough ratio of 2½ persons dependent upon every worker, we have 10,000,000 people in the United States either working for or dependent upon the government for sustenance. And that means one government agent to look after each ten infantile minds in the country lest the ten go astray.

We have gone far from the original conception of government, the basis for which is laid down in the United States Constitution.

"In order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," reads the preamble of that forgotten document, the United States Constitution was ordained and established.

The founders of the nation made the legislative branch of the government powerful enough, but stipulated what those powers should be. And they were carefully insistent that proper limitations were placed upon this particular department of the government, lest the Congress should do the very things it has seen fit to do since the first of the century.

The Constitution provided that the Congress might impose and collect taxes, regulate commerce, coin money, establish a postoffice, issue copyrights and patents, punish piracy, institute lower federal courts, declare war, raise and support armies, and make any other laws deemed necessary to the carrying out of those previous powers.

And so fearful were these founding fathers that the Congress they set up might some day seize autocratic powers involving the inherent rights of citizens, that they established another set of regulations which recited what Congress might not to and which, by inference, no other branch of the lesser government might do.

Each of these restrictions upon the power of Congress was a restriction in favor of the liberty of the individual to think and act as he pleased within the limits of the common police powers of the society in which he lived.

Congress was forbidden to establish any religion or to curtail the rights of free speech or a free press; the right of petition; the right of citizens "peaceably to assemble"; the right to keep and bear arms; the right of a citizen to be immune from illegal search and seizure; the right to be safe from the deprivation of property without due process of law; the right to a speedy trial, confronted by his accusers and with freedom of a jury trial; immunity from excessive bail or cruel and unusual punishments—all of these provisions demanded by a people who had felt the bitter experiences of oppressive government and who wanted forever to render their descendants free from like oppression.

So here we have a document which from its beginning to the anti-climax in Article Eighteen of the amendments, is devoted to a single political theory—the preservation of the rights of the individual against the encroachment of a super-government.

It is true that this theory was not established without bitter quarrels. It is true that it was not accepted by many of the political leaders of that day until the temper of the people forced its

acceptance. But it is also true that without this theory we would have had no federal constitution.

It was not until the close of the last century, that the passion for law-making began to assume dangerous proportions and the whole nation became aroused to the mistaken belief that public conduct can best be controlled by statute. And it is a peculiarly significant coincidence that the one man who perhaps had more to do with preaching the gospel of law as a panacea for all evil was himself a statutory religionist, so to speak, measuring his faith by written words from an apocryphal and legendary past.

The party in power is never the party of progress. It is always the party of opposition that, through its constant attack upon the citadel of entrenched power, forces, reforms or pseudo reforms upon a nation.

William Jennings Bryan, as the real leader of the Democratic party through almost twenty years of its existence, contributed more to molding public philosophy than any man of his time, even including the spectacular Mr. Roosevelt.

It was Mr. Bryan who swept the popular mind with his first appeal to the emotions in the now historic cross of gold speech. The public did not know, it is true, what he meant. But they knew that he was a great orator, and that he promised new laws to cure all their financial difficulties, to prevent the piling up of great wealth and to provide a better distribution of this world's goods. They did not know how he was to accomplish all this, save that it was to be done by law, and the law is, of course omnipotent.

Bryan did not win an election, it is true, but that is unimportant. He did fire the popular imagination and he started in motion a train of thought that has not come to rest today.

This man was in the forefront of four great movements—the election of United States senators by popular vote; the levying of an income tax; the establishment of prohibition; and the institution of woman suffrage. And to him whatever credit is due for these reforms should go more than to any one politician in the United States.

It is true that none of these reforms has accomplished what its framers planned or boasted for it, but they are nevertheless

on the statute books and there they stay, a moment to the principle that men's natures may be altered by statute.

Let us take up the matter of the election of Senators by popular vote. That is a splendid thing. It did away with the ancient and honorable practice of buying legislatures and governors. It made the practice more expensive, because it entails to-day buying an electorate.

We need quote only the purchase by Mr. Vare of the nomination in Pennsylvania, the purchase by Mr. Samuel Insull in behalf of his friend Frank Smith of the nomination in Illinois, and the various other purchases that have from time to time disgraced the union, to prove that this law, which was to give us a pure and high-minded and honest Senate has merely made the acquisition of seats in that august body a more venal and baser transaction than ever—sincere more people are corrupted.

In the matter of the income tax, which was certainly a needed venture during our late unpleasantness with His Imperial Majesty, Wilhelm, that has been used chiefly as a ladder by which men could climb into office. It has resulted in no better distribution of wealth; it has not prevented the rich from getting richer nor the poor from getting poorer, though it has provided one other means of raising money to pay for the administration of this and other laws.

I need say hardly anything about the greatest panacea of all—the prohibition amendment, which was to have provided each of us with wings and a halo, and which had provided us with nothing but embarrassment, poison, disease, crime, political debauchery, and murder.

And as for woman suffrage, though we owe a certain deference to the other sex, we can still courteously aver that the entrance of women into this field of action has by no means purified the stables.

This passion for lawmaking followed Bryan even into the cabinet where he held his first important government post, and where he found his opportunity to apply the theory that law will correct every ill from war to stomach trouble, by compounding a flock of arbitration compacts between this and other nations, which may or may not be taken seriously if we ever have any trouble with those countries. We are safe, however, because

nearly all of the treaties are with nations much smaller than ourselves.

But before leaving Bryan and his influence upon the consciousness of the American people, it is pertinent to refer to the last act of his busy and compelling life—which was to hurry to Tennessee and there support, by the majesty of his voice and the power of his oratory, the southern fundamentalists in their orgy of witch-burning.

The Scopes trial, involving the right of the state to impress its religious or scientific beliefs upon the children, was exactly the type of case that appealed to the great commoner. For here was an opportunity to prove the superiority of statute over mind.

With this crusade for law, regulations, restriction, statutes, limitations and curtailment of the power of the individual, came the twin theory that where statutes may sometimes fail to regenerate a people and make them wise, censorship will at least club them into insensibility so that their numbed brains will not function as these leaders of alleged thought would have them function.

From being the freest people on earth, we became the most enslaved. Convention, superstitions, customs, and habits of thought were written into the code books, and we were required to adopt a uniform standard of moral conduct that was confined within the narrow limits prescribed by self-appointed guardians of our individual destinies.

But does the censor invoke the statutes when he goes out to drive noxious publications from the public stands? No. He bids the policeman gather up the offending publications, a list of which he—and not the law, has declared bad—and without trial or discussion condemns them to the fire.

We may have no sympathy with the aims, ideals or purposes of the I. W. W.s, but is it not an interesting commentary on the state of the union to note that mere membership in that misguided organization is proof of crime sufficient to send a man to jail in California?

I hold that proof of sedition or treason must be found in a man's actions. I hold that proof of indecency must be found in the working or the illustration of a book or magazine or newspaper. And I hold that there is a proper method by which these

manifestly evil things can be driven from a community, nor is that method one of autocratic censorship by self-appointed masters of our morals and minds.

The average reformer insults the intelligence of the American public every day of his life. He will not give the American citizen credit for possessing either discrimination or decency. He will not credit him with being honest or sincere or imbued with any sense of righteousness whatsoever.

I have recently had the opportunity of watching the effect upon an American audience of two wholly dissimilar entertainments. One was a Broadway review revelling in a display of feminine cuticle and adipose tissue. The other was a clean comedy of pure American life.

And the comments I heard after each production, together with the effect on the theatrical box office, were such as to convince me that the American public is perfectly capable of doing its own censoring and that it needs no whip-wielding master of morals to determine the issue for it.

I find this true in every phase of life. I find the bulk, the vast majority of people overwhelmingly, preponderantly decent and clean. Therefore, I repeat, the constant attempts at forcing new standard of censorship upon them is nothing short of an insult to their intelligence.

What are the plays the American public delights to see? Abie's Irish Rose is one—perhaps not a credit to their intelligence, but at least a credit to their clean minds. Lightnin', and Turn to the Right, and The First Year. The greatest successes on that street which to some minds is the symbol of all sin, are not the bath-tub parties, but the homely comedies of real American life. And if Broadway rises to that standard, then there need be no fear for the rest of the country.

I have also been vastly amused recently, at a considerable municipal full that was raised over the appearance of some frankly indecent magazines and pamphlets on local newsstands, to the consternation of many good people. I asked a news dealer about them. He said:

"Well, you know it's a strange thing, but people don't buy them. I don't sell a copy. They were put in as an experiment by the distributing agency and we had to take them. But people

are pretty decent, I guess after all. They don't care for that sort of stuff."

If our statute mills had ceased operation a generation ago, we would still have had a basis of law upon which we could have found ample precedent for action by the state against any and every new evil that appeared in society.

We had remedies against drunkenness even then. And we had remedies for the injuries that might have been caused by drunkenness. We have had, for ages, remedies against intemperance, immorality, dishonesty, and evil of every imaginable nature. Nor do we need the host of new statutes that pour annually from legislative hoppers the country over to overwhelm us.

Law, all law, is an instrument providing a basis for equitable adjustment of differences between individuals and between the state and the individuals composing the state.

Human society determines that certain actions by its individual members are detrimental to others and constitute an injury against the community. So a law providing punishment for the offender is passed. It has been even held in England that an attempt at suicide is detrimental to society, as well as being injurious to the would-be suicide—and therefore the man who tries this method of escape from the burdens of living if arrested (if he lives) and is put under bonds not to try it again.

In fact, in serious cases of attempted suicide, it has been found efficacious to send the man to jail for two or three months, whether on the theory that this severe action will forever dissuade him from making another attempt or whether as a punishment, I do not know.

The flood of sumptuary laws, of thou-shalt-nots, of moral commandments imposed upon us by the government is more than a confession that we are incapable of ruling ourselves.

It is a confession and pitiful admission that all our agencies for education, all our agencies for ethical culture, all our agencies for teaching the merits of decency and man's duty to his fellows have miserably failed of their purpose.

Therefore we arrive at the unfortunate conclusion that we, who were once so competent to govern ourselves, have sunk so low in morality, intelligence, and understanding, that our govern-

ment must be taken from our hands into the care of that Frankenstein we have created and call The State.

Nor is there any flexibility to the thing we call government and law. The law is inexorable, immutable, changeless. It is so fixed and rigid that not only is it unable to discern the difference between one case and another, but between one century and another. Once on the statute books the law is the law and it is there to stay.

Hence there is a considerable body of the law that consists of outworn theories, outgrown philosophy and out of date ideas. Yet no man dare attack them or attempt to revise them or he is striking at the government.

We follow the same unwavering path in our education. He teach dogma rather than theory. Until 1914 our economists were teaching that there never could be another great war because finance would not permit it. They aren't teaching that any more, but many of us recall when that particular saying was accepted as an axiom in every college.

We give our children schooling rather than education. We teach them that everything in this life is exact, that everything follows certain devnite laws, and we lay down those laws before them. We do not teach them that discoveries often times make our laws, even those we call natural laws, ridiculous. We do not teach them that these things are merely theories, to be accepted or not as the intelligence may dictate. W do not, in other words, teach them to think.

There is no science, whether astronomy, mathematics, chemistry, biology, or philosophy, that is not subject to change from time to time. There is no exact science. Yet we continue to prate to exact sciences and we endeavor to press the minds of our children into the narrow confines of the molds we have constructed.

Each succeeding generation adds its weight of doctrine and dogma and decree and fiat to the already bulky code of the past. We never subtract, we continually add.

Every new council meeting, every new legislative assembly, every new Congress carries on the work. Every gathering of men who have talked, cajoled or purchased their way into legislative seats is marked by the passage of a host of new restrictions

and new impositions, until there is today no man, woman or child in the country who does not, at some time in his career, wittingly or unwittingly violate the law.

We have had from time to time the criticism of investigating bodies that we are becoming a lawless race, that our disregard for an disobedience of the law has made us a nation of criminals.

Unfortunately that is true. For each succeeding year has turned honest men into criminals. Then men have not changed, but the law has encompassed them in its toils.

There is a growing disregard for the law it is true, and that disregard is due to the undeniable fact that we have ourselves cheapened the law and made it absurd. And disregard for any law, however bad it may be, leads to disregard for all law.

It is high time that we resolve to declare a moratorium on the passage of new laws. It is time that we recast those we have and see what is their effect upon the psychology of the race. It is time that we hammer off the shackles that the law has bound about our minds and regain the freedom of action that is the bitterly won heritage of a free people.

For if we do not, then exactly as the use of automobiles and elevators will one day cause us to lose the use of our limbs, so will our growing addiction to the use of governmental crutches cause our capacities for self-government to atrophy and shrivel into nothing.