

**Comment. - - and
Discomment**

The Rev. Lucian Johnson, rector of a high church somewhere in Baltimore, has broken into print. Better still, he has been given a place in the Hearst Sunday supplements, which means that the reverend gentleman will address a larger audience than he has had in all the rest of his life put together. Concealing his pardonable pride at the distinction, and putting aside his natural diffidence, he launches forth into an attack against the present tendency of women's dress, which doesn't seem to suit him.

Lucian goes back to the glory and pomp of ancient Rome for an illustration of what such things as indecent dress leads to. And this is what he finds: "Well, the testimony of all, from satirists like Juvenal down to historians like Tacitus, is to the effect that women then was playing the game of sexappeal; that so far from bettering man she made him worse. And so we read the same old monotonous tale of indecent dances, shameless theatres, brazen rouging and easy divorces, which are so familiar to us now. The home-loving Cornelias of simpler days had given place to the new woman of the type of an Agrippian or a Poppea. In a word, woman then proved an utter failure as a moral force."

Arguing from this sort of a text, it isn't surprising that the Rev. Lucian should say this sort of a thing: "Therefore, it seems to me that it is high time for women to look at this debauch of flesh more seriously than they now seem to do. Womanhood is on trial. Women now has complete emancipation, and men are looking on closely to see if they were justified in giving her such emancipation, to see whether or no female suffrage and all the other manifestations of the new womanhood are, after all, only a bluff and meaningless and injurious to society, instead of being, as women predicted, beneficial. If she proves her predictions man will be deeply grateful. But if she shows that, after all, she knows only the same old classic sex-game, then man, in his disgust, will eventually thrust her back to her position in the days of the Caesars and Ptolemies."

"She is on trial. Her capacity and willingness to be a substantial civilizing factor hang in judgment. And, to repeat, there are many serious and good men who are sorry to admit that they must suspend judgment in view of the prevailing indecency to which so many women are contributing; sorry to admit that they are not yet sure of being able to take women seriously, considering the widespread frivolity of so many of that sex."

"Doubtless many readers will think this a 'much ado about nothing,' as if a certain freedom of dress was, after all, only a rather more or less innocent feminine prank or whimsey. Possibly they are right. But, at least so far, I cannot see it that way. I know enough (little though it be) of history to know that indecency in feminine attire has

always gone hand in hand with loose morals; that it was as much a sign of social corruption as the sacerdotal robes are of spiritual dignity and purity. Clothes are not only a protection from the cold and heat, but are as well the outward expression of a state of soul.

"So much so that you simply cannot picture a Martha Washington of simpler days being garbed as any present-day debutante or opera-box tenant; still less picture a girl of the days of Roger Williams going out into the street as any woman goes now."

With all due deference to the doth, we must insist that Lucian is talking the rankest kind of nonsense. Those who gibber about present-day dress and present-day dances and present-day habits undermining the moral stamina of the fair flower of womanhood are articulating through their Stetsons. If you doubt this, do a little thinking. Since the days when you were young, have you ever known a time when more women were working than right now?

It hasn't been so many years since only the unmarried girls would think of accepting employment. If a man's wife worked, folks used to think there was something wrong with the man, or the woman, or the romance. Look about you—you'll see families where both the heads are holding down good jobs. It's a trifle hard on the well known family freddie, but it shows that it takes more than the high cost of living to discourage the modern Cupid.

Now, when people work hard, they play hard. Normal humans require so much diversion and amusement—and women by nature and custom demand a little more than men. If they are working eight to ten hours a day, it means that when they do go out to play, they crowd a whole lot of playing into a few minutes. This goes far to explain the dresses, which aren't any more indecent than have been worn for the last twenty-five years. It also helps to explain the jazz music, and other things that have been hard for the stern moralists to countenance.

Quite true it is that Martha Washington didn't wear low-necked dresses and French heels. It is equally true that the girls in the days of Roger Williams dressed plainly. They had to. The men wouldn't stand for display. But the good old days had their monstrosities in the way of styles. What self-respecting woman today would think of appearing in public wearing a bustle? What sweet young girl would care to be seen walking down the street in those long pantalettes that used to be considered in the cream of fashion? Our advice to the Rev. Lucian is to confine his advice to realms spiritual, and let temporal fashions alone.

Arthur Brisbane prodded the lions to the point of growling some little time ago when in his column, "Today," published in the New York American, he had this to say: "Senator Harding's management says that his twelve-word slogan will be advertised on billboards all over the country. Poor advertising. Better use small country newspapers such as Harding and Cox themselves own, and especially the country weekly newspapers. They cost less than

billboards and are worth a thousand times more—the people believe them."

The truth hurts quite often. Moreover it is a little unusual. This truth so shocked the gentlemen who have their millions invested in billboards that they waxed wroth at the statements of the Hearst editor. But there are few keener observers than Arthur Brisbane, and few editors who have a more incisive way after making a statement of answering those who criticize that statement. Following the squeal of the poster men Mr. Brisbane had this to say:

"This column criticized the plan of Senator Harding's advertising management to use billboards extensively. It was suggested that political advertising be done in the smaller newspapers, especially country weeklies and small dailies."

"The Poster Advertising Association, which says it does 'about forty million dollars a year in poster advertising,' protests against the criticism of poster advertising."

"There was no such criticism. But a man's views are influenced by what he reads sitting down, not by big letters on a billboard. And, as this writer has pointed out to Senator Harding, advertising should go first of all to the editors of country weeklies and smaller local dailies. Every one of them has his important following. No billboard posting concern has any following."

It must always be remembered that the newspaper is read by the people because the people want the newspaper and buy it. There is no panting public waiting with its tongue hanging out for someone to let a vacant billboard. Also let it be remembered that the newspaper would be read even if there were no advertisements in it, though it is a fact that good advertisements attract readers. Eliminate the advertising from the billboard and the rest is material for the bonfire.

Some interesting stories of real life have been enacted by the famous emotion picture stars.

**What Will You Do With
YOUR BACK PAY**



When Your Check Comes In?

Many Railroad Man will soon receive very substantial amounts of money as back pay from the Burlington. Have you considered the wisest thing to do with this money? Perhaps you have long wanted something that you never before thought you could afford. Perhaps you have already permitted yourself the pleasure of selecting the desired article.

"What Will This Purchase Pay Me?"

Will your expenditure be an ASSET or a LIABILITY? Will it COST YOU MONEY or MAKE YOU MONEY? These are the questions you should ask yourself before letting your back pay go.

It is a very satisfying feeling to collect money that comes to you simply by possessing other money. That's the secret of present-day success.

Make Your Money Work For You

If you commence the habit of working your funds for your gain NOW, you need never worry about your old age when you can no longer work for yourself.

Start a good thing by bringing your Back Pay to us and placing it in a SAVINGS ACCOUNT. We will pay you 5% interest, and the principal is absolutely safe. Do yourself the justice to talk this thing over with our officers before you make a decision.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK

Alliance, Nebraska

**Goodrich Tires today
cost 25% less than they
did in 1910
and give approximately
100% greater average
mileage**

Compare these prices:

Adjustment Basis:
SILVERTOWN CORDS, 8000 Miles
FABRIC TIRES, 6000 Miles

FABRIC TIRE PRICES		
SIZE	1910	TODAY
30x3	25.45	19.10
30x3½	33.85	23.20
32x4	48.65	36.80
34x4½	65.35	53.15
35x5	82.75	65.35

Goodrich Tires
Best in the Long Run

SOLD BY

SCHAFFER AUTO SUPPLY, Alliance, Nebr.
FRANKE MOTOR COMPANY, Mullen, Nebr.
HEDGE COCK AUTO CO., Hemingford, Nebr.

Notice

after

September 15

We conduct our Wholesale and Retail Coal, Feed, Flour and Grain Business on a

**Strictly
Cash Basis**

Stephenson & O'Bannon