

Published Every Thursday by  
The Herald Publishing Company.  
F. A. PIERSON, PUBL. LLOYD C. THOMAS, SEC.  
JOHN W. THOMAS, MGR.

JOHN W. THOMAS . . . . . Editor  
J. B. KNIEST . . . . . Associate Editor

Entered at the postoffice at Alliance, Nebraska, for transmission through the mails, as second-class matter.

Subscription, \$1.50 per year in advance.

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1909.

1909 APRIL 1909						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

Let's all get together and stand up for Alliance.

Will the editors of papers in neighboring towns that have been slandering Alliance kindly take it back?

Says the Gordon Journal: Tally one for Governor Shallenberger. He placed his veto on the Gates bill which provided for permission of saloons at Fort Crook.

Last week The Herald said it looked like the water wagon would again be the band wagon in Alliance, but we can't sometimes most always tell. The beer wagon is the band wagon.

We firmly believe that the series of articles which The Herald began publishing last week on experimental farming in Box Butte county will be worth much more to any farmer in this county who reads it than the price of the paper for a year.

The vote of Alliance compared with a year ago indicates an increase in population of about 250. One of the Crawford papers has been publishing the absurd statement that this city decreased 1,000 since the saloons were voted out a year ago. But a discrepancy of 1,250 isn't much for a member of the Annanias club.

Northwestern Nebraska does not claim to be a great corn country yet, although we are coming to it. According to the Oshkosh Herald, the Oshkosh Lumber company recently shipped a car load of corn out of Deuel county to an eastern market. This speaks well for this part of the state when the large amount of corn that is used in home consumption is taken into consideration.

Every citizen of northwestern Nebraska, whether farmer or business man, should keep posted on the agricultural development of this country. We know of no better way to do this than to follow closely the work being done this year in Box Butte county under supervision of Prof. E. W. Hunt. The editor of The Herald will, during the spring and summer, furnish an occasional write-up of this work to the Twentieth Century Farmer; other papers will also probably make some mention of it; but the most complete description will be found each week in The Herald's department, "Agricultural Experimentation in Box Butte County." If you have neighbors who are not now subscribers to this paper, you will confer a favor upon them by calling their attention to this matter so that they can subscribe and get the benefit of these articles. We are printing some extra copies so that a limited number of new subscriptions can begin with this number.

It is a truism that wise men sometimes change their opinions, but fools never. It is no reflection on a man's judgment if he changes his opinion on the question of licensing saloons. There are arguments on both sides, but of course those on one side or the other predominate. In towns and cities where the no-saloon policy has been given a fair trial it has, so far as we know, proven universally satisfactory. It is not uncommon for men who have been strongly in favor of high license policy to change their opinion and favor the no-saloon policy when once it is given a thorough trial in their own town or city. There are good, level-headed business men in Alliance who have honestly believed that to license a few saloons here would be better than to try to prohibit the sale of liquors.

## AN EPOCH MAKER.

The city election Tuesday marks an epoch, not only in the history of the Alliance but also, because of her commanding position and the influence that naturally goes out from here, it marks as well the beginning of a better condition for northwest Nebraska. Although the city goes wet, a campaign has been inaugurated that we predict will not end till licensed saloons will be an institution of the past here. For some years past it has been apparent to the student of history and current events that the doom of the licensed saloon in America is sealed. Slowly but surely the temperance sentiment of the country has been gaining force, and whether we desire it or not, the time is not far distant when it will predominate in a majority of the states, and eventually in the nation as a whole. The state or the city that wishes to be truly up-to-date will be found in the van in this movement.

They call it a "prohibition wave," but strictly speaking it is not. There are thousands upon thousands of people who do not call themselves prohibitionists, who do not believe in absolutely prohibiting the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, they believe in leaving to the individual conscience the question as to what each shall eat or drink, in short they do not favor "sumptuary legislation" in the abstract; but they are tired of saloon domination. Fostered by a license system that has created a liquor monopoly which is the most powerful in politics and the most arrogant of any trust in our land today, the allied liquor interests are not content to attend to their own business and the matters that directly affect it, but would if they could, and do where they can, dictate in matters of legislation and public policy that ought to be left to the people or their untrammelled representatives.

"The State" is the name of the official publication of the Nebraska brewery interests. In a recent issue it published the following editorial:

Nebraska must get away from all populistic and paternalistic dreams like the initiative and referendum and the Sink bed-sheet bill. When the republicans wrested control of state government from the populists, they put a stop to all such vagaries which had during populist supremacy marked Nebraska as a fool's paradise. Upon the advent of a rejuvenated democracy made radical by the infusion of populistic serum, we see the state made odious in the minds of eastern men whose opinions are worth much to Nebraska financially and commercially. If our democratic legislature shall continue to make the state the butt of ridicule the country over, the best minds of the nation will wipe Nebraska off the map until our people show signs of returning sanity.

Tell us, please, what right the brewers' official organ has of interfering in these matters? The initiative and referendum are designed to give the people who are the sovereigns in a republican form of government the right to pass upon matters that affect and concern them: but the beneficiaries of the license system fear to trust to the people as a whole. They can more easily accomplish their desigus by dealing with a few than with the many. The principal champion of the bill for the initiative and referendum was no less a personage than William Jennings Bryan, whose personal influence in Nebraska is acknowledged by opponents as well as by supporters to be incomparably greater than any other man; and yet that bill was defeated by a democratic legislature. Why? Don't blame the democratic party; it would no doubt have been more overwhelmingly defeated had the political complexion of the legislature been republican.

Mr. Bryan while personally an abstainer from the use of intoxicating liquors, has always been liberal in his views on the subject of personal liberty, so liberal in fact that he failed to receive the votes of thousands of ultra temperance advocates that would otherwise have been given to him. He has publicly as well as privately expressed himself as in favor of the Slocum high license law of Nebraska; but the influence of his example tends to lessen the consumption of alcoholic beverages, especially the poisonous kind sold under the license system; the lineaments of his countenance suggests temperance. Conservative advocates of personal liberty are pleased with his attitude and are willing to grant him and others the privilege which they ask for themselves, and that is the right of individual, personal choice in matters pertaining to private life; but the liquor trust, not content with the profits that come from a moderate demand for their goods, would crush if possible not only those who would put them out of business by legal process, but also those whose personal example if universally followed would leave them without customers.

The writer has always been an admirer of Mr. Bryan. Although he voted the democratic ticket for the first time last fall, he had previously, as a populist, voted for the Bryan presidential electors. In our home at Omaha last fall were five children, from nine to seventeen years of age, all boys and all enthusiastic "Bryanites." The Bryan sentiment in that city was so overwhelming that they supposed it was so elsewhere and of course naturally were confident of his election to the presidency. Appearance seemed to indicate that three or four votes would be cast for him to each one

vote cast against him. Even men of mature years and judgment believed he would receive a majority in Douglas county of two to one. He did receive a majority there, but what a paltry majority it was compared with the sentiment there was for him during the campaign. In New York City he received ovations never accorded any other man in the nation's metropolises. The multitudes of that great city believed in him, admired him, wanted to see him made president of the United States. If the money and the influence of the liquor interests had kept out of the fight, he would have swept Greater New York with a majority that would have given him the state.

Much has been said and written as to what caused the defeat of Bryan, with the tide of popular sentiment so overwhelmingly in his favor. After all the causes have been enumerated and summed up, it remains an evident fact that the deciding factor was the licensed liquor oligarchy.

But wait. Tomorrow is another day. There'll be a reckoning by and by.

Richard L. Metcalfe, the celebrated editorial writer, formerly of the Omaha World-Herald but for some time past on the staff of The Commoner, a conservative of conservatives on the liquor question, who has never been accused of being a "prohibitionist" or "temperance crank", has a correct estimate of the situation. In the article from his pen which we are publishing in this issue of The Herald under the heading, "The Future of Democracy", he says: "I know, too, that right here in Nebraska there are enough democrats who are in favor of doing away with the liquor traffic to make it a difficult matter to have the democratic party espouse the wrong side of this question. One bugle blast would call these democrats to arms for the prettiest battle that has taken place in many a day."

All right, Mr. Metcalfe, the bugle blast has been sounded. Now let the merry war go on.

### The Future of Democracy

It was the Herald editor's good fortune to attend the state convention of Democratic editors, held at Lincoln, March 19th. Richard L. Metcalfe, the well-known writer who gained a wide reputation as managing editor of the Omaha World-Herald but who is now a part of the editorial force of Mr. Bryan's paper, The Commoner, read a paper on the subject, "1910 and 1912". In this paper he handles a question that has come to the front and which must be given consideration, and in handling this question he does so in such an unbiased and unprejudiced manner and with a knowledge of the subject so accurate and thorough that it is indeed refreshing to read it, especially in these times when there are those on both sides of the question who try to settle it with clamor instead of reason.

Following is the paper read by Mr. Metcalfe at the convention:

One would be better able to discuss future campaigns if the liquor question were out of the way. In my view it is idle to discuss American politics without giving some consideration to the part the liquor question may play. In the first place the public is treated to a great deal of buncombe from both sides of that question. A great noise has been made concerning the help either of the two great political parties is alleged to have received, in Nebraska and elsewhere, from the liquor element. It has been charged that at last election the democratic ticket in Nebraska had the support of that element. But we remember that it has also been charged that two years ago the republican ticket was elected by the help of the liquor dealers. A great noise has been made because two democrats, who were conspicuously affiliated with the temperance forces, gave their support to the democratic ticket in the last campaign while at the same time that ticket was looked upon with favor by the liquor element. On this point it is "six of one and half a dozen of the other". I have noticed that the leaders of the temperance forces in Nebraska have had the habit of looking upon candidates for state offices through the spectacles of the particular political party to which they happened to belong. It may be that they have learned from actual experience that neither of the two great parties has a right to a monopoly on the label of "temperance" and that neither has a right to a monopoly on the label of "whiskey". Men who appeared to be greatly wrought up because two democratic temperance leaders supported the democratic ticket during the last campaign, never seemed disturbed by the fact that in 1906, in 1902 and in 1900, when the republican state ticket had the support of the liquor interests of this state, some of the most distinguished republican temperance leaders were found working for the same ticket that was being supported by the liquor forces. And it is likewise true that when, in 1907, both of the opposing candidates on the state ticket—Judge Reese and Mr. Loomis—were stalwart temperance men, the most conspicuous officers of the anti-saloon league visited various places in Nebraska and charged Mr. Loomis with being the candidate of the liquor element. The fact was that in that campaign there was absolutely no choice between the two candidates, both

of them being avowed opponents of the liquor traffic. I do not say these things for the idle purpose of critising any one but in order that in the examination of this subject as it may affect us in future campaigns, we may have a clear understanding of the situation in the beginning. In my opinion the temperance leaders in Nebraska would aid their cause materially if they did not require more at the hands of democrats than they do of republicans. Charges concerning past campaigns will be found of little avail because an honest statement of the situation would show that it is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. It is true that in Nebraska as elsewhere the democratic party has often been called the whiskey party. But in Nebraska, as in other states, it is no more entitled to that label than the republican party, for it has often been the case that while the democratic party was called the whiskey party the republican party was getting the whiskey votes. And it has been the rule that among the officers of the anti-saloon league in all the state campaigns, whatever the attitude of the liquor element might be, democratic temperance leaders supported democratic candidates and republican leaders supported republican candidates.

I think some of the conspicuous representatives of the anti-saloon league in Nebraska would contribute to their own peace of mind and to the cause they represent if they did not seem to make it a point to attack every one who happens not to agree with them. It has been my observation that great causes suffer rather than advance when their advocates build a reputation for heated personal attacks upon their fellows who may not see things exactly as they do. We have the right to expect from the advocates of temperance dignified argument and manly appeal rather than the diatribe that belongs (if indeed it has any place at all) to the speech of those who have a bad cause.

The importance of this question, at this time or in future campaigns, is not and will not be due to the charges or of the counter charges of democratic or of republican temperance leaders. The figure it will play in our politics will not depend upon the heated exclamation of the radical who finds nothing but the saint in the man who agrees with him and nothing but the sinner in the man who differs with him.

The figure this question will play in our politics does not depend upon the diatribe of men who are republicans or democrats first and consistent temperance leaders later, and who, being utterly inconsistent themselves, demand, in heated language, that other men purge themselves of inconsistency. The figure this question will play in our politics does not entirely depend upon its emotional or its moral quality. I call your attention to the fact that so long as the slavery question seemed a purely emotional question (as it was always a moral question) Garrison was dragged through the streets of Boston with a rope around his neck and the abolitionists were derided, even in the north, as "long haired men and short haired women". It was when the question assumed the proportions of an economic question that men, who had not been stirred by emotion or actuated by the purely moral element, recognized it as a question that must be disposed of—and, as history records, it was settled and settled right as all questions will, in the end, be settled.

Men who imagine that the liquor question as it presents itself to the American people is a mere recurrence of the emotional or the moral question which made Maine a prohibition state with varying and perhaps unsatisfactory results, fail to make careful investigation of the present day situation. Sobriety is demanded in all commercial circles. Railroad managers forbid the use of intoxicants by train men and other employes to whom the lives of passengers are entrusted and the railroad men themselves are learning, as individuals, that they are better off without the use of intoxicating liquors. It is a dangerous experiment for the commercial traveller to invite his patron for a drink; and the commercial traveler, as an individual, is learning that the thoroughly sober man gets the best out of life. There is not, today, the drinking at political gatherings, or at state legislatures, or in congress, that there once was. As individuals, men, regardless of political prejudice, are learning that sobriety is the best policy. It is dawning upon business men that the saloon is not a necessary adjunct of commerce and that the brewery and distillery are not essential to the business interests of the country. Taxpayers are learning that it is not good business policy to license, for a comparatively small sum, the operation of a great criminal cost producing system like the liquor dispensary and at the same time tax themselves heavily to pay the bill. Fathers are learning, just as mothers knew when "they felt, for the first time, their first born's breath" that the saloon as an institution is an enemy to the home; and in this light the liquor question is rapidly pressing itself upon the attention of the American people.

I have no sympathy with the attacks made upon individuals who happen to be engaged in the liquor business. I know among them many good men, kind fathers, faithful husbands and true friends. Some of the best temperance lectures that have ever been given have been administered by bar tenders to reckless patrons. And it is the fact, also, that sobriety is demanded among bar tenders. I think you will find among this class of men that temperance in the use of drink is the rule of the majority while total abstinence is the practice of a considerable and an ever increasing number. I believe in following

one example set by these men when they refuse to take their own medicine. I think the man who spends the day behind a bar listening to the prattle of crased drink men is entitled to the sympathy rather than the condemnation of his fellows. And I think, also, that when we are tempted to engage in personal attacks upon the individual we ought to remember that we and our fathers and grandfathers are responsible for the business in which these men are engaged and aim our shafts at the system rather than at the men—ourselves and our ancestors among them—who are responsible for that system.

I would not undertake to say just what the result of this contest would be, say in Nebraska. I think I can see clearly enough that the contest is coming. I do not know either what the position of the two great political parties will be on that question. I decline to take it for granted that the action of any member of a legislature states my party's position on that question. I decline to take it for granted that the vote of republican legislators in favor of a bill which they new was doomed to defeat, proves their party's position on that question—even any more than it proves the real position of all the members who voted for the measure. I want to read in the platform of my own party, as in the platform of the republican party, the position of each organization upon this question. I know that in Nebraska the republican party has, as often if not oftener than the democratic party, had the support of the organized liquor element. I know that it was the organized liquor element, controlling four democratic votes, that gave a republican senator to Kentucky. I know that in all the pivotal states in the union, during the last campaign, the influence of the organized liquor element was thrown to the republican national ticket even though in some states its influence was given to the democratic state ticket. I know that the growth of the temperance sentiment in the democratic party has been one of the remarkable facts of recent history.

When you talk about making a temperance party out of the republican party I cannot see how you can overcome the grip which the great special interests of the country have upon that party—and it has been my observation that, as a rule, special interests fight shoulder to shoulder.

It may be that in a few states of the north and the west you may line up the democratic party as a liquor party, but I cannot see how you are going to transform the democratic party of the nation into a whiskey party until you can overcome the great temperance wave now spreading throughout the southern states. Men who smile at the suggestion that the democratic party may become the leader of the temperance sentiment should remember that when all the southern states go dry it will be but a logical result that temperance delegations will be knocking at the door of the democratic national convention. And who will say that when we have a "Solid South" on this great question the democratic party will have passed under the control of the breweries and the distilleries.

I know, too, that right here in Nebraska there are enough democrats who are in favor of doing away with the liquor traffic to make it a difficult matter to have the democratic party espouse the wrong side of this question. One bugle blast would call these democrats to arms for the prettiest battle that has taken place in many a day. Make no mistake about the growth of this sentiment among the rank and file of democrats everywhere. They may not be well represented in the legislature but they will be heard from at the primaries and at the polls—and their right to the title of "democrat" cannot be questioned.

From early boyhood I have been "a hewer of wood and a drawer of water" for the democratic party. Long ago I learned that, theoretically, it stands for the best in society. As one who loves it for its splendid principles I want it to become practically, as well as theoretically, of service to mankind. I have four boys whom I hope will become faithful defenders of democratic doctrine. These are four democratic reasons why I want the democratic party to be true to itself when the great battle shall begin. These are four business reasons why I want my party to lead along the lines of truth even though it mean, temporarily, defeat.

I hope that in this somewhat frank discussion of the great question that is coming before us, I have not given offense to any one who may differ with me. I hope I have not left a scar upon any heart. But, as a democrat speaking to democrats, I will say that if it be the decree of fate that my party free itself from the system that is responsible for the blood of maddened men, for the sobs of grief-stricken women, for the tears that have stained the pallid cheeks of little children, then as one democrat I say—and in all reverence—God speed the day of democratic deliverance and God bless the the New Declaration of Independence!

## BREAD

We are sure you will like our Bread for its wholesomeness. Nutritious and made from the purest materials—scientifically put together and baked to a turn.

## NOHE'S

makes anything to order. We please others, we will please you.