

The Commoner

ISSUED MONTHLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN CHARLES W. BRYAN  
Editor and Proprietor Associate Ed. and Publisher  
Edit. Rms. and Business Office, Suite 207 Press Bldg.

One Year . . . . . \$1.00 Three Months . . . . . .25  
Six Months . . . . . .50 Single Copy . . . . . .10  
In Clubs of Five or more, per year. . . . . .75 Sample Copies Free.  
Foreign Post, 25c Extra

**SUBSCRIPTIONS** can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where such agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps, or currency.

**RENEWALS**—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 15 means that payment has been received to and including the issue of January, 1915.

**CHANGE OF ADDRESS**—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

**ADVERTISING**—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to—

THE COMMONER, LINCOLN, NEB.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, ETC.,

of The Commoner, published monthly at Lincoln, Nebraska, required by the Act of August 24, 1912:

Name of— Postoffice Address

Editor and Owner— William Jennings Bryan . . . Lincoln, Nebraska

Associate Editor and Publisher— Charles W. Bryan . . . . . Lincoln, Nebraska

Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities: None.

CHAS. W. BRYAN, Publisher.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 21st day of October, 1915.

(Seal) J. R. FARRIS, Notary Public.  
My commission expires July 19, 1918.

Reckon the days in which you have not been angry. I used to be angry every day; now every other day; then every third or fourth day; and if you miss it so long as thirty days, offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving to God.—Epictetus.

Friends of Former President Taft, who say they speak with authority, declare that that gentleman is entirely satisfied with his present status and can not be lured again into a presidential campaign as a candidate. A great many republicans whose sleep is much disturbed by spectres would enjoy life a whole lot better if they could be assured on equal authority that Former President Roosevelt is of the same mind as his successor in the presidency.

Let somebody come forward in congress with some such plan as increasing the income tax or levying an inheritance tax or any other scheme of increasing the revenue to meet the additional expenses contemplated in a large "preparedness" budget—and then note the quick subsidence of the demand in Wall street for a bigger army and navy. That's a tax they can't pass on to the general public, and that's why they would oppose anything of the kind.

PROHIBITION IN OHIO

Advocates of prohibition have reason to rejoice over the showing made in Ohio. Last year prohibition was defeated by 84,000; this year the majority was reduced by about one-half. Last year the so-called "Home Rule" amendment was adopted, disfranchising farmers of Ohio by return from the county unit to the city unit. This year the so-called "Stability" amendment, intended to grant immunity to the saloon-keeper for six years, was defeated by something like 50,000 votes, a distinct rebuke to the liquor interests. It will now be possible for the opponents of the liquor traffic to submit a prohibition amendment again whenever they desire to do so, and the growth in sentiment will encourage them to make the attempt at an early date. Ohio is to be congratulated on its progress toward emancipation from the evils of alcohol.

W. J. BRYAN.

Two Interviews by Mr. Bryan

Below will be found interviews given by Mr. Bryan to the various press associations; one of November 5 in response to a request for his views on the President's Manhattan club speech and the other given to the press associations on November 6, in answer to an inquiry as to whether he had made any plans for opposing the preparedness program. On another page will be found the speech delivered by President Wilson at the Manhattan club outlining his views on preparedness, as he intends to present them to congress.

INTERVIEW BY MR. BRYAN, NOVEMBER 5

"I have read the President's speech at New York with sorrow and concern. He is doing what he believes to be his duty and so long as a man follows his conscience, and judgment, we can not criticise his motives, but we may be compelled to dissent from his conclusions. I feel it my duty to dissent, and as he has given his views with clearness and emphasis those who differ from him are under a like obligation to express themselves with equal clearness. He says that his position is different from that of the private individual in that the individual is free to speak his own thoughts and risk his own opinion. This sentence is a little obscure. Insofar as he expresses his own opinion he does not differ from the private citizen, except that he speaks under a sense of official responsibility, but where a nation's fate is involved in a policy every private citizen who loves his country and tries to serve it, is conscious of responsibility. The President will not assume that he is more deeply interested in the welfare of his country than the millions who elected him to be for the time being their spokesman. And if, as he evidently believes, he is giving voice to the opinions of his countrymen, he is, of course, anxious to have them as frank with him as he has been with them—how otherwise can he know whether he represents or misrepresents their views?"

"He has announced a policy which has never before been adopted in this country, and never endorsed by any party in the country. And he has no way of knowing, until he hears from the people, whether he has correctly interpreted the will of the public. His appeal is not to any party but as he says, to men of 'all shades of opinion.' He asks for the hearty support of the country, meaning, of course, that he wants the support, PROVIDED the people favor the policy which he has outlined. He could not, of course, ask them to support a policy which they did not endorse, especially if they considered the policy dangerous to the country.

"From my view of the subject, the plan which he proposes is not only a departure from our traditions but a reversal of our national policy. It is not only a menace to our peace and safety but a challenge to the spirit of Christianity which teaches us to influence others by example rather than by exciting fear.

"The president says that we should prepare 'not for aggression but for defense.' That is the ground upon which all preparation for war is made. What nation has ever prepared for war on the theory that it was preparing for aggression?"

"It is only fair to assume that the European rulers who are involved in the present war thought that they were contributing toward the maintenance of peace when they were making elaborate preparations for defense.

"It is a false philosophy and, being false, it inevitably leads into difficulties. The spirit that makes the individual carry a revolver—and who ever carries a revolver except for defense?—leads him not only to use it on slight provocation but to use language which provokes trouble. 'Speak softly but carry a big stick' is one of the delusive maxims employed by those who put their faith in force. There are two answers to it—first, the man who speaks softly has not the disposition to carry a club, and if a man with a soft voice is persuaded to carry a club his voice changes as soon as he begins to rely upon the club.

"If there is any truth in our religion, a nation must win respect not by carrying arms but by an upright, honorable course that invites confidence and insures good will. This nation has won its position in the world without resorting to the habit of totting a pistol or carrying a club. Why reverse our policy at this time? The President himself admits that there is no

reason for change. He says 'The country is not threatened from any quarter; she stands in friendly relation with all the world. Her resources are well known and her self-respect and capacity to care for her own citizens and rights.'

And to make the statement more emphatic, he adds 'there is no fear among us'

"If we're not threatened by any nation, if our relations with all nations are friendly, if everybody knows that we're able to defend ourselves if necessary, and if there is no fear among us, why is this time chosen to revolutionize our national theories and to exchange our policy for the policy of Europe? Why abandon the hope that we have so long entertained of setting an example to Europe? Why encourage the nations of Europe in their fatal folly by imitating them? Why impose upon the western hemisphere a policy so disastrous? May we not expect all Latin-America to be stimulated to preparation if we enter upon a new era of preparation? And will not such a policy make conflicts between those republics more probable? We shall do infinite harm to the neighboring nations as well as to ourselves if we are drawn into this policy which provokes war by a preparation which is impossible without a large increase in taxation and the arousing of a military system which sets up false standards of honor. We are now spending \$250,000,000 a year on preparedness—ten times as much as we are spending on agriculture; and I feel sure that the taxpayers are not in favor of increasing this sum at this time, when a change is not only unnecessary but a menace to our national ideals. There has not been a time in fifty years when there was less reason to add to the expenses of the army and navy, for we are not only without an enemy, but our preparedness is increasing relatively as other nations exhaust themselves. And there never has been a time in our whole history when our duty to the world more imperatively demanded self-restraint and the counsels of peace. I hope the President will not be deceived by the atmosphere of the Manhattan club. That is the one place in the United States where the Mammon-worshipping portion of the democratic party meet to exchange compliments.—there is no group further removed from the sentiment of the masses whether you measure that sentiment by economic, social or religious standards."

INTERVIEW BY MR. BRYAN, NOVEMBER 6

"I have no plans formulated. I am doing what I believe it the duty of every citizen to do. How can the President know what the people think unless individuals express themselves? Those who approve of his plan do not hesitate to express themselves. Why should those who disapprove be silent? The editors of metropolitan newspapers, who daily swing incense before the special interests, do not hesitate to express an opinion as to what the country needs. Why should a country editor like myself be denied the privilege? And why should a democrat's friendship for the President be questioned because he differs from the President on an issue like this, which has nothing in the history of the country or the party to commend it? The President's appeal was not to members of his party but to people of 'all shades of opinion.' When did it become unpatriotic for a citizen to differ from a president and when did it become disloyal for a democrat to differ from a democratic president on an issue which the President declares to be non-partisan? The President said he would ask those who differed from him to express their opinion. He certainly will be the last to complain because his request is complied with. A great many people—no one can definitely state the number, but they are quite a multitude—believe that we can not insure the nation against war by adopting the very policy which brought Europe into war. They believe that it is more reasonable to assume that peace can be promoted between nations by the same philosophy which promotes peace between individuals and communities. We are now spending \$250,000,000 a year for preparedness. A great many think this is enough and are opposed to any increase at present. The burden of proof is on those who say that an increase is necessary, and it will be hard to prove this in view of the President's statement that we are not threatened from any quarter; that our relations with all nations are friendly; that everybody knows of our capacity for defense and that there is no fear among us."