

The Commoner

ISSUED MONTHLY

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

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, Editor and Proprietor  
CHARLES W. BRYAN, 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 13 means that payment has been received to and including the issue of January, 1918.

**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.**

It is probably the irony of fate that just at the time when the roster of European battlefields becomes available for the use of the man who picks out names for the sleeping cars, the government orders their production halted for the time being.

That at bottom we are a charitable and just people is proved by the fact that nobody has called attention to the fact that the trouble did not break out in Russia until after the Hon. Elihu Root had made a few speeches and bowed himself out.

The war has made a splendid opening for the bad-tempered men in our midst. They can act the role of the grouch to their perfect content and pass it off on the rest of us as patriotic fervor and a desire to make everybody as patriotic as they believe they are.

Considerable mystery seems to surround the new invention which is said to be capable of driving a battleship without fuel. If it can be also harnessed up to the domesticated furnace a grateful people will be glad to do the handsome thing in the way of a monument for the inventor.

The process of weeding out the incompetent among the officers of the various guardsmen now in the regular army has been going on steadily and clearly shows the purpose of the general staff is to put none on guard except those who can make good with the maximum of ability. A politician may have pull enough to get commissions for his relatives, but it takes capacity to command to hold them.

**BRYAN'S DISCOVERER**

Another achievement for the renowned Colonel House is claimed. A Washington correspondent says that he it was who brought William Jennings Bryan's name to the attention of President Wilson and suggested him for a cabinet position.

We have often wondered who dragged Mr. Bryan from obscurity and brought him to national notice. Outside of serving a couple of terms in congress, scaring Wall street into permanently better behavior, leading the democratic party as candidate for president in three national campaigns, delivering addresses and lectures in every city, town, village and hamlet in the United States and snatching the democratic nomination from Champ Clark in 1912 to bestow it on Mr. Wilson, he had never done anything to attract the public eye.

Somehow we had an idea that Mr. Bryan's name on the democratic national ticket might have caught President Wilson's eye two or three times, but this evidently is an error. The President is one who shuts his eyes and votes for straight. It was Colonel House who discovered the timid, shrinking William Jennings by the wayside and acquainted the President with the fact that such a man existed.—Shreveport, La., Times.

"Dry" America Only Question of Time

[From The Asheville, N. C., Times.]

A Raleigh, N. C., dispatch of Dec. 20, says: Ratification of the prohibition amendment passed by the house of representatives is not a matter of chance any longer. The only question now is time within which the states will ratify the measure and make national prohibition a fact, is the opinion expressed by former Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan while in Raleigh.

"I was very much gratified," Mr. Bryan said, "at the submission of the prohibition amendment. The fact that we had 27 more than the necessary two-thirds and more than the friends of the measure counted on, shows how the tide is rising. The movement has now reached a point where the momentum carries it on with increasing speed and many are swept along with the movement who would oppose it if opposition promised success.

"There were doubtless a number who voted for the amendment who would have voted against it if they had seen a chance to defeat it, but these were offset by as many who voted against it because of previous pledges and who were really desirous of seeing the amendment carried."

"What are the chances of its ratification," Mr. Bryan was asked.

"It is not a matter of chance any longer," replied Mr. Bryan; "its ratification is certain. The only unknown quantity is the time. I think it will be ratified within three years, although the resolution gives seven years' time. The states are likely to enter into a rivalry as to priority in ratification. I heard of five states last night which are likely to try for the first place, and four of them are states which have not yet adopted prohibition themselves.

"This is the third amendment submitted in recent years. The first, the income tax amendment, is now being used to collect something like a billion dollars a year in war taxes and the rate runs up to 50 per cent on large incomes. Nobody is objecting to this high rate now, although a two per cent rate was denounced as anarchistic 23 years ago.

"The second of the recent amendments provides for the popular election of senators. It has made the United States senate as representative a body as the house and no one would think of voting for a return to the old system.

"The prohibition amendment is more important than either of the amendments mentioned. It is economic as well as moral and its adoption will prove as satisfactory to the country as the adoption of the income tax and popular election amendments.

"Twenty-five years from now we will wonder how the saloon could have been tolerated so long. The world moves—never more rapidly than it has during the past 20 years."

"Do you take any stock in the argument that the agitation of prohibition will divide the people in the support of the government in its war undertakings?" was next asked Mr. Bryan.

"No," he said, "congress did not seem to take any stock in it. I think it is safe to say that every man who gave that as his reason for voting against the amendment would have voted against it for other reasons in time of peace. You will find my answer in my reply to Mr. Gompers."

"What about the state's rights argument, then?"

"My observation is that the state's rights objection disappears whenever the state declares for prohibition. If a state wants prohibition it doesn't object to having the federal government help to enforce it. Those who oppose national prohibition on that ground as a rule oppose state prohibition on some other grounds. This is not a universal rule but it is almost universal. Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Virginia and Florida are all good state's rights states but they voted solidly for the amendment. South Carolina and North Carolina were nearly solid and the amendment had its supporters in every southern state. In Alabama, where there was the largest relative opposition, they have statutory prohibition instead of constitutional prohibition, and the fact that the state had voted down constitutional prohibition and had

also elected Mr. Underwood to the senate on an anti-prohibition platform, probably had weight with those Alabama members who voted against the amendment."

"Was there much interest shown in the wine and beer amendment?" was asked Mr. Bryan.

"It received less votes than the resolution that was finally passed and those who voted for it refused to join in a request for a roll call when the roll call was asked for by one of those who opposed it.

"Let me add that Congressman Webb deserves a large share of the glory because of his able, intelligent and persistent effort in behalf of the amendment. His closing speech was a splendid specimen of clear thinking and condensation in expression. He covered the whole ground and did it most effectively."

"What is the next move, Mr. Bryan?"

"Woman suffrage. It will bring into the arena of politics an ethical element which will aid every righteous cause. While the vote for these two amendments is not quite identical, it is largely the same. Taking the country over, I think 75 per cent of those who vote for prohibition will vote for woman suffrage, and probably a larger per cent of those who vote for woman suffrage will vote for prohibition."

If the small list of congressional friends of the liquor interests thought they were throwing an anchor to the windward when they tacked on the amendment providing a seven year limitation on its adoption, they have another estimate coming. The longest time recorded for the adoption of an amendment, really desired, falls slightly under four years. The fact is that when the movement for a constitutional amendment attains such impetus that it can secure the necessary vote in both houses of congress it is of sufficient strength to take the remaining hurdles without any difficulty.

With the world greatly in need of foodstuffs and sugar, the brewer is pushing his production and the people whose sensual gratifications he panders are swallowing his stuff. If this war continues very long this brand of disloyalty will be stigmatized in as harsh terms as it now deserves.

**SENATOR NEWLANDS**

The death of Senator Newlands removes from the political arena one of the nation's most notable statesmen. He had a genius for public life, a passion for the science of government. With an income sufficient to relieve him of the necessity of laboring for himself, he devoted his entire time to his country's welfare and found a sufficient reward in the consciousness of service rendered.

He was at heart a democrat; his sympathies were broad enough to include the race. He was untrifling in industry—his research covering every department of government. And he brought to his task rare ability and an inexhaustible courtesy. We shall not soon see his like again.

Mr. Bryan prized his friendship and shares the sorrow and sense of loss which his demise has brought to his collaborators and the country.

Francis Griffith Newlands, democrat, of Reno, (Nev.) was born near Natchez, Miss., August 25, 1848; entered the class of 1867 at Yale college and remained until the middle of his junior year; later on attended the Columbian College Law School at Washington, but prior to graduation was admitted to the bar by the supreme court of the District of Columbia and went to San Francisco, where he entered upon the practice of law and continued in the active practice of his profession until 1888, when he became a citizen of the state of Nevada; was elected to the Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, and Fifty-seventh congresses; and served on the committees on irrigation, foreign affairs, banking and currency, and ways and means; was elected to the United States senate to succeed Hon. John P. Jones, republican, for the term beginning March 4, 1903. In the general election of 1908 Mr. Newlands submitted his candidacy for re-election to a popular vote, under the election law of Nevada, and received a large majority over the votes of all competitors. The legislature, being pledged in advance by the party platforms to carry out the popular will, thereupon, without opposition, re-elected him United States senator for the term ending March 3, 1915. He was re-elected to the United States senate for the term beginning March 4, 1915.—The Congressional Directory.