

years—will prove too short. Still, he has set himself the task, and has begun operations with the best wishes of a great many people.

This visit of Mr. Bryan to Washington has been a veritable personal triumph. He divided honors with the President in the chamber of the house Tuesday. He was the President's guest at luncheon yesterday. At last night's dinner the President in a letter paid tribute to Mr. Bryan's part in the recent campaign. It was read to a large and distinguished company of democratic office-holders and politicians. Seated at table were both Bryanites and Wilsonites, hobnobbing in admiration of the man who has his lance in rest against the saloon. In all his twenty-one years of national life, Mr. Bryan can recall no occasion, numerous as such occasions have been, of a heartier character than that of last night in testimony of his influence as a public force.

Will the politicians associate this demonstration with 1920? Has it any bearing on that important year? Mr. Bryan is still a young man. He has taken no resolution against standing for another presidential nomination. There are Bryan men galore who think he will ultimately reach the White house, and are at his service at all times. He and they think that New York has been permanently eliminated from the national democratic question, and that in future the west and the south, where he has already found his strength, will dominate the democratic party. A new Bryan boom may have been released; and, if so, its progress will be watched with much interest by both democrats and republicans.

**BRYAN LAUNCHES DRY CAMPAIGN**

[From The Indianapolis, Ind., Star, Nov. 19.]

William Jennings Bryan launched a movement in Indianapolis yesterday to force the democratic national convention of 1920 to declare in its platform in favor of prohibition.

The new prohibition movement within the democratic party was started on its way at a conference of 125 dry democrats which Mr. Bryan addressed at the Claypool hotel. James H. McGill of Valparaiso presided. The democrats attending the conference, after listening to Mr. Bryan's message, adopted a resolution which declared in favor of obtaining state and national prohibition "through the democratic party at the earliest possible time," and arranged for a state meeting of democrats favoring prohibition, to be held late in December or early in January and to be addressed by Mr. Bryan. The Commoner gave his promise to return for the meeting, providing a satisfactory date can be arranged.

Mr. Bryan declared his opposition to the democratic party "being buried in a drunkard's grave" and predicted that prohibition will be a prominent, if not the dominant, issue of the 1920 campaign. He urged that democrats "beat the republicans to the prohibition issue." He said that neither side can avoid the prohibition issue; that the issue is here and the parties must decide whether they are for or against it.

Mr. Bryan scored Indiana democracy for having been represented on the resolutions committee at the democratic national convention last June by a brewer. His reference was to Stephen B. Fleming of Fort Wayne.

After having recalled that seventeen of the twenty-three dry states gave democratic majorities in the recent election, Mr. Bryan lamented that Indiana had not come up to democratic expectations.

"I remember that Indiana put on the resolutions committee a brewer who was one of four to sign a minority report against woman suffrage," said Mr. Bryan.

"That brewer took the position that a bartender and a bar bum are more fit to vote than the democratic wives. His action was a disgrace and an insult to every woman of Indiana."

Political party organizations that have been deriving their principal sustenance at the business end of a beer barrel will have hard sledding in future years, with the barrel gone and the pipe line connection rusting away.

The republicans are endeavoring to extract a measure of joy over the belief that they have secured control of the lower house of congress by a narrow margin. When a man's determined to be happy, why try to minimize his opportunities?

**Prohibition in 1920**

[From The Christian Science Monitor.]

In Denver, three days after the national election in the United States, William Jennings Bryan made this statement: "Prohibition is sweeping the country. It will be a presidential campaign issue in 1920 if a constitutional amendment is not submitted by congress to the states by that time. The political supremacy of the east, especially New York, is broken. The west can elect a President; it has done so." If this means anything, it means that, in the event of the failure of congress to submit an amendment to the federal constitution prohibiting the liquor traffic in all the states, or in the event of the submitted amendment being defeated or held up by a bare third of the states, the western and southern democracy in control of the national convention of that party, will probably make prohibition its paramount issue. \* \* \*

What support is there for Mr. Bryan's position? The south and west are almost solid prohibition sections today. With the five states added last Tuesday to the seventeen in the list when Virginia became "dry," on November 1, the total number of prohibition states at present is 23, as follows:

- |             |                |
|-------------|----------------|
| Alabama     | Montana        |
| Arizona     | Nebraska       |
| Arkansas    | North Carolina |
| Colorado    | North Dakota   |
| Georgia     | Oklahoma       |
| Idaho       | Oregon         |
| Iowa        | South Carolina |
| Kansas      | South Dakota   |
| Maine       | Tennessee      |
| Michigan    | Virginia       |
| Mississippi | Washington     |
|             | West Virginia  |

The territory of Alaska also is under prohibition law. Utah and Florida, in addition to extending widely their prohibition territory, on Tuesday, elected "dry" governors. In at least a dozen other states, "local option" and "high license" operate to exclude the liquor traffic over wide areas. Restrictions difficult for dealers in intoxicants to meet are in force in the District of Columbia, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Tennessee, Texas and Wyoming. One of the most hotly-contested prohibition campaigns that have ever been carried on in the United States was that which ended in Maryland on the 7th

**BRYAN**

[From the Chicago Tribune.]

Mr. Bryan, we suspect, is the most powerful single individual in the United States. J. P. Morgan, Billy Sunday, and Theodore Roosevelt might be thought of as challenging his pre-eminence, but we doubt that they are to be considered as serious rivals.

Morgan can break eggs for a million people and carry off the omelet, leaving them the shells, but he could not make a chautauqua address. Whatever power he has will die with him. Bryan's will live twenty years after he is dead. He will have directed the thoughts of men and women and their children. It will take at least twenty years to eliminate Bryan. Twenty days may eliminate Morgan.

Exasperated American patriots will be encountering the Bryan sirup of life at least twenty years after this amiable man has been gathered to his fathers. Billy Sunday operates violently on a restricted area. He stands a community on its head. Boston now offers the spectacle of the Brahmins on theirs. The bean not being the natural resting place of the human race, there is a gradual resumption of the normal business of standing on the feet, but while Mr. Sunday is effective he is very effective.

He has no such influence as Bryan. He is no such power. People can not always be running to a fire, as Charles Elliot Norton (or was it he?) said of reading Carlyle. Bryan does not turn out the fire department. He uses a sausage stuffer, fills it full of sirup, and fills the people so full of sweetness that they are ready to burst.

The business of beating folks over the head with a good solid club is Roosevelt's. The more the sound indicates solid bone or protected va-

of this month. Prohibition was defeated, but the voting showed tremendous gains for the anti-liquor element. The contest may properly be regarded as a preliminary skirmish. All the indications tend to show that the liquor interests will be routed in the next battle.

As the situation stands at present, nearly half the states of the American Union are in the prohibition column, and, at the present ratio of increase, the time when two-thirds of the states, or the number necessary to ratification of a prohibition amendment to the federal constitution through their respective legislatures, will be reached. The present congress is in harmony with the administration, and the administration owes its success in the recent election very largely to the prohibition states. Policy would seem to dictate recognition of this fact by the President and his party supporters, even if no higher motive should impel them to take sides with the prohibitionists. The administration, as a matter of fact, may not, during the term of its new lease, have an opportunity of getting through a measure submitting an amendment if it neglects to do so in the congress that expires on March 5, 1917. It can not now be definitely stated that the next house will be democratic; even if so it may not have a free working majority, and, if the rule that applies to the second congress in nearly all administrations holds good in President Wilson's second term, it is not at all likely that the Sixty-sixth congress will do for prohibition what its predecessors failed to do.

Numerous contingencies are possible which might prevent the submission of a prohibition amendment before the next presidential election. Mr. Bryan has a long-range political vision. He is often credited, even by his enemies, with being ahead of his times. He has seen for a long time that prohibition was one of the most important questions before the people of the United States. He advocated prohibition throughout the northwest in the recent campaign. The five states that have just been added to the prohibition roll were unquestionably influenced by his speeches.

In view of the widespread growth of anti-liquor sentiment, in and out of prohibition states, it seems well within reasonable bounds to say that Mr. Bryan's comprehension of the 1920 issue is in harmony with the public opinion of the nation.

cuity the more enraged the colonel becomes and the stouter his raps.

People will stand on their heads for a while, but they never like to be pounded on them. Therefore Bryan with his sirup squirt is more deadly than Roosevelt with his club.

It is no accident that now while Colonel Roosevelt considers himself in the position of the mate of the New Bedford whaler whose skipper wanted silence, and a little of that, Colonel Bryan is the cock of the walk in Washington.

He is talking, as always, without thinking. He typifies the impulse to talk without thinking. We have nothing but admiration for this amiable man, but the damage he does is enormous. He has permeated the west. His mood is the mood of the west. He is more responsible for President Wilson now than he was four years ago. He is the most powerful living American, and our only wish is that he had been a German or a Jap, or even a Canadian or a Mexican.

Twenty years after his last word has been uttered the effect of what he has said will have to be combated by Americans who wish their country well.

One explanation of the result in California is that the women out there who can vote resented the attempt of a crowd of eastern women whose husbands don't think them competent to mark a ballot to instruct the western women as to their duty. It sounds reasonable, too.

So far as our observation went there did not seem to be any disposition on the part of the voters of Nebraska to confuse the Prosperity league with the republican party in the campaign.