

Christian, will feel so deeply interested in his brother's welfare that he will paraphrase the language of the apostle, and declare that if drinking maketh his brother to offend, he will not drink. And, if one is resolved not to drink, the signing of the pledge is an open acknowledgment of the fact, informs a larger number of people, and extends the influence of the example.

It is hardly necessary to present to the readers of the Christian Endeavor World the arguments in favor of total abstinence. The signing of the pledge is recommended on the theory that total abstinence is not only recognized as desirable, but is resolved upon. If it were necessary to say anything in favor of the non-use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, I would suggest two reasons in addition to the reason based upon man's duty to live so as to discourage the formation of habits by others that may prove demoralizing.

I would not say that the taking of a glass of liquor as a beverage is necessarily a sin, but that it is unwise. An international congress held at London last July, in which twenty-five nations participated, declared the use of alcohol injurious to the race; and this conclusion will hardly be disputed except by those who find a pecuniary profit in cultivating an appetite for strong drink.

Drinking is an expensive habit, and the money expended on liquor could be expended more profitably on other things. One is appalled at the nation's bill for whiskey, beer, and wine. Money is not only expended for that which satisfieth not, but for that which is likely to leave the person the worse for the drinking. Even moderate drinking brings no real benefit to the drinker to compare in value with the money expended.

But even if one could afford to spend money on liquor—if any one can under any circumstances afford to use money in such a way—there is a danger that ought to restrain a cautious and prudent person; namely, that the habit grows, imperceptibly, it is true, but surely. The ranks of the drunkards are replenished from the ranks of the moderate drinkers, and all of those who at last reached the point where they were unable to withstand the temptation began drinking with entire confidence in their ability to control their appetite. No one who has ever watched a young man go down the time-worn path from tipping to the gutter can fail to understand the great risk that one takes when he begins to use liquor at all.

Why take the risk? What advantage is to be gained? When a fireman loses his life in an attempt to save the inmates of a building, we call him a hero. We recognize his business as hazardous, but it is a hazard that he takes for the benefit of others. The man who risks being consumed by a burning appetite takes the risk unnecessarily and without recompense. No hero's crown rewards his life; there are no rescued ones to sing his praises. If we only recognized that the tragedy of a wasted life is even more pathetic than death in a conflagration, a more earnest appeal would be made to the young to beware of the cup.

That the liquor traffic is the cause of unspeakable woe will not be questioned. How to deal with the subject has interested the thoughtful, the sympathetic, and the patriotic in all ages. Whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the success of regulation from without, no one can question the success of that method of regulation which locks the door from within. The strongest advocate of personal liberty must admit man's right to use that personal liberty to refuse to touch, taste, or handle; the most rabid opponent of regulation will confess that a man not only may, but can, so regulate his own life as to reduce the demand for liquor to the extent of one man's consumption; no matter how bitterly opposed a man may be to prohibition in theory or in practice, he can not deny that a man can absolutely prohibit the use of liquor so far as he himself is concerned.

I am very glad that the Christian Endeavor Society has taken up the work of urging total abstinence. There is no doubt that the organized effort that the society will put forth will result in securing hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of signers; and that means a very perceptible decrease in the total amount of liquor consumed, and a very considerable increase in the strength of the temperance sentiment of the country. One can not do much to encourage total abstinence so long as he drinks himself; the moment he becomes enlisted under the banner of total abstinence his influence becomes a factor in the spread of temperance.

Success to the Christian Endeavor Society in all its branches in the laudable effort to rescue the country from the evils of intemperance through the appeal that is being made to the hearts and the consciences of the young people of the nation.  
W. J. BRYAN.

#### ANOTHER FAKE

The following dispatch appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer and other newspapers:

"Omaha, Neb., January 17.—William J. Bryan will be a candidate for president in 1912. The announcement was made this afternoon by the Omaha Bee, with the explanation that the statement is attributed to Richard L. Metcalfe, editor of Mr. Bryan's Commoner. The statement is further made that the democratic leaders in Nebraska are being called to The Commoner office and told the news, with the order that they get out and work for his nomination. Under no circumstances will Mr. Bryan be a candidate for the United States senate, is another announcement. It is said he believes that this state will go democratic at the next election and that he would be the natural choice of the party for United States senator, but that he fears that this might injure his chances in the next national campaign."

There is no truth whatever in this statement. It is a raw, unadulterated fake.

#### "MR. BRYAN'S GREATEST SPEECH"

Mr. Bryan was in Havana last week on his way to South America, and at a dinner in his honor given by the American minister he addressed many of the leading Cuban public men. It was the best speech Mr. Bryan has ever delivered. It was the best because it was the truest and at the same time the most needed by his audience. No other American could have said the same thing with equal force, because no other American could have embodied in his own person so pointed an illustration of the truth which the speech conveyed. Mr. Bryan said:

"Resort to violence is always deplorable, and will, I think, become less frequent as civilization advances. As man rises in intelligence and morals reason will more and more be substituted for force and violence in the settlement of difficulties. The day will come when the world will see the folly of the doctrine that you can justly settle a difference of opinion by shooting a man who may differ with you. There is a growing acceptance of representative government, and a fundamental doctrine of representative government is acquiescence in the will of the majority. That was the doctrine taught by Jefferson, the greatest exponent of representative government who ever lived, and it is necessary to the existence of all republics. You will recognize my right to emphasize this doctrine, for I have three times met defeat when supported by more than six million voters, but I congratulated my opponent on each occasion, and had any attempt been made to deprive him of his victory no one would have supported him more loyally than I."

All Latin America should hear that excellent doctrine preached by so distinguished a victim of majority rule. If Mr. Bryan could repeat the speech, in substance, in every revolution-infested capital south of 30 degrees north latitude, he would perform the greatest service of his life.—Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

"The best speech Mr. Bryan ever delivered," the Springfield Republican calls the address which the commoner delivered at Havana last week on his way to South America. It is high praise to give to this speech first rank among the speeches of a man who, whatever his doctrine, perhaps is the first orator of the day in America. We wonder whether the superlative adjective is deserved.

Of one little campaign address delivered in a small Iowa village we chance to have vague remembrance. Mr. Bryan had lived to see many of the reforms which he had championed accepted as "Roosevelt policies" and embodied in the republican national platform. Yet the very spellbinders who were preaching these reforms were denying him credit for them. With this thought in his mind he began to tell his audience of midwestern farmers the old Bible story of Joseph and his brethren.

Mr. Bryan told it, they say, with wonderful art, playing upon the fact that his audience knew and loved the story, and making it evident by a fine inference that when he spoke of Joseph he spoke of himself. He told how Joseph had been rejected by his brothers; how they cast him in a pit; how he was sold down into the land of Egypt and how those that had

thrown him off got along very well without him during the seven years of plenty. But when famine came things were different. The contemptuous brothers were forced to turn for food to the man they had rejected. In their hour of need they went down into Egypt to Joseph, and—"Joseph had the corn!"

Even the jaded newspaper men present jumped to their feet as the immense crowd "came up" to this climax. It is their testimony that the parable explained itself to the listening thousands at the exact instant that Mr. Bryan wished, and that the dramatic effect was absolutely overwhelming.—Chicago Evening Post.

## Afraid of the Truth Afraid of the Light

Some curious things happened at Washington with respect to the investigation of Secretary of the Interior Ballinger. One Associated Press dispatch from Washington tells part of the story in this way:

Washington, D. C., January 18.—A new and decidedly interesting turn was given to the "insurgent" movement in the house today, when Representatives Hayes of California, Murdock of Kansas, and Gardner of Massachusetts, hastened to the White House to tell the president in effect that they were afraid they had been "used" by the democrats in the matter of the Ballinger-Pinchot investigating committee, and that the democrats were taking advantage of the opportunity to put two of their most partisan members on the committee for the purpose of making political capital out of the affair.

Mr. Hayes told the president that while he was an insurgent, he did not intend to be placed in the position of helping the democrats to "throw mud at a republican administration." This, he was afraid, was going to happen unless some means of changing the democratic selections for the investigating committee could be devised.

Messrs. James of Kentucky and Rainey of Illinois were selected by the democratic caucus for appointment under the action of the insurgent-democratic combination, which took the power of appointing the committee away from the speaker.

Messrs. Murdock and Gardner reiterated much that Mr. Hayes had said, and admitted they did not see exactly how they were going to get out of the difficulty.

The republican caucus met on the evening of January 19. The democratic caucus had chosen, as the democratic members of the investigating committee, James of Kentucky and Rainey of Illinois. The republican caucus insisted upon nominating all of the members and they finally voted to reject Rainey and substituted for him Lloyd of Missouri. After this result was reached Cooper, Lenroot and Carey of Wisconsin, and Davis and Lindburgh of Minnesota, bolted the caucus. Following are extracts from the Associated Press report of the republican caucus:

#### They Spoke for Taft

Several speeches, strong objections to both James and Rainey were voiced, the objectors claiming to express the views of President Taft. There was no objection to either of them personally, but it was urged, especially against Rainey, that their alleged extreme partisanship would unfit them for a judicial investigation.

Against Rainey was cited activity in "stirring up trouble," for the republican administration in Panama canal matters. The matter will probably come up in the house, and it is expected that the democrats to a man will vote to repudiate the republican caucus action. Incidentally there is the question which can not be answered tonight, whether Mr. Lloyd will consent to serve. After the vote nominating the four republicans had been taken, resulting in practically unanimous approval, a separate vote was ordered on the democratic members of the committee. At this juncture Mr. Cooper arose and declared that he was authorized by a number of his colleagues to say that they were opposed to naming democratic members of a committee in a republican caucus.

"It would be harmful to the republican party to do so," declared Mr. Cooper. "Who is afraid?" he constantly repeated. "Who is afraid that harm will come to us from James and Rainey? With all their harangues have they ever been able to hurt the republican party or any member of the republican party? What chance have they against men like Root or Olm-