

vote for an attorney-general, who will have much to do with enforcing the laws carrying out the amendment. Friends of the prohibition amendment should see that a dry democrat is nominated for attorney general, and also a dry republican. Vote for George W. Berge for attorney general.

While some of the state officers do not deal directly with the prohibition amendment, the candidates who come out openly and give their aid to the amendment ought to receive the support of those who desire to see the amendment adopted. And those who are free from obligations to the liquor interests are not likely to be controlled by any other special interest.

(On another page will be found the names of progressive democratic candidates for state and national positions.)

Let me take, for instance, the case of Mr. Keith Neville of North Platte, and what I say of him applies to democrats and republicans alike. Mr. Neville, in his public statement, declared: that he was opposed to prohibition and would vote against the amendment, but said that if elected he would enforce the law. This statement, however, does not add any strength to his oath of office. Before becoming governor he must raise his right hand and swear that he will enforce the law. He should be willing to make the following promises: First, that he will not veto any law passed by the FRIENDS OF PROHIBITION to enforce the amendment. Second, that he will not use his influence to prevent the passage of such laws. Third, that he will use his influence as governor to assist in the passage of such laws. In the statement which he put out Mr. Neville did not make any of these promises. In one of his speeches he says he will favor legislation to make it effective.

In case the amendment carries, this is not sufficient for a man who is himself against the amendment, he can not be trusted to decide what legislation is necessary for the carrying out of the amendment.

In other words a man who is himself against prohibition and who owes his nomination and election to the support of those favorable to the liquor traffic, can not be trusted to join heartily in the passage of necessary legislation. He would not be trusted by the liquor interests if he was likely to join the friends of prohibition in making the law effective. If the people of Nebraska are in favor of the prohibition amendment they should select a governor who is in favor of it, and who will look at that question from the standpoint of a friend. I therefore urge both democrats and republicans favorable to prohibition to support candidates who are themselves in favor of the amendment so that which ever party wins, the governor will be in favor of prohibition.

CHARLES W. BRYAN FOR GOVERNOR

I could speak more freely about the dry candidate for governor at the democratic primaries if he were not my brother, but it is only justice to him to say that we have been associated together in business and politics for twenty years.

He has published my paper, The Commoner for fifteen years and before that was my secretary for five years. We have worked together on all political questions, state and national, during that period.

If I have been right on these reforms, he has been right also.

While I have been discussing public questions by pen and voice, he has been busy organizing our forces, and the work of organization, as you know, is scarcely less important than public discussion. But while he has shared my work in state and nation he has made a record of his own in the matter of municipal reform. He has taken the side of the public against the schemes of franchise-holding corporations, and has won victories for the people.

When he could not find a candidate to make the fight for mayor on a reform platform, he made the fight himself, and you may be interested to know that he carried the city of Lincoln by a larger majority than I have ever been able to carry it. The best I have done after several trials was to get a majority of 780 in the city in 1908. He won by 1,400 on a platform of his own. That platform has been carried out, and the city commissioners have joined unanimously in approving it.

With this record you may rest assured that if nominated and elected he will join heart and soul in the enactment of all laws necessary to make the prohibition amendment effective, if adopted, and will then execute those laws after they are enacted.

You can count on his opposing the special

interests on all subjects, as he has for twenty years.

TODAY AND TWENTY-SIX YEARS AGO

Let me now call your attention to the difference between conditions today and 26 years ago, when a similar amendment was before the people. Those who voted for the prohibition amendment in 1890, will of course vote for it now. I will address myself, therefore, to those who voted against the amendment at that time or, who have become voters in the state since that time. I was one of those who voted against the amendment in 1890, but who will vote for prohibition this year.

We have a great deal more light on this subject than we had 26 years ago. In 1890 the "Slocum law" had just gone into effect and we believed it to be the best high license law in the United States, and many thought it only fair to give it a trial. You remember, too, at that time only very few states had adopted prohibition, and the law was not fully enforced. Since that time the "Webb-Kenyon" act has been passed, making it easier to enforce the prohibition laws than it was 26 years ago. Liquor advertisements are excluded from the newspapers of dry states, and this is not only helping to enforce the law but it releases the newspapers from the influence of the liquor interests, and gives them an opportunity to tell the truth about prohibition. Twenty-six years ago we were in the foremost rank among the states on liquor legislation, today we are in the rear rank. Seventeen states have adopted county option, which gives to the farmers a voice in determining whether towns in their county shall have saloons. Nineteen states have adopted state prohibition.

Twenty-six years ago the saloon was generally owned by some one in town amenable to public opinion; today nearly all of the saloons are owned by breweries or holding companies, who send agents into a town to operate their saloons, and who care little or nothing for public opinion. Twenty-six years ago, the fight in a town was between the wets and the dries of that town, but today the fight is between the dries of the town and the great National Liquor organization with unlimited money.

POLITICAL RECORD OF LIQUOR INTERESTS

Then we know more about the political records of the liquor interests than we did 26 years ago, at least I do. Seven years ago I learned that the liquor interest controlled a sufficient number of state senators to prevent the passage of the initiative and referendum. In 1910 a democrat whose name you would know if I gave it to you, came to my house and told me that he had been offered \$10,000 by a national liquor organization for ten months' work, and all that he had to do was to pick out candidates for the state senate who would be friendly to the liquor interests, and after election betray the people who had elected them. When I proposed that our party take a stand against the liquor interest I found that democrats who had stood with me for sixteen years on every national issue were with me no longer. Since then, if any democrats aspire to any office in the democratic party from constable to governor without first asking permission of the liquor interests he faces their opposition. The leader of this crowd, Senator Hitchcock, even objected to me going as a delegate to the national convention in 1912 because I had refused to take my opinions ready made from the brewers. Until the liquor interests are driven out of the democratic and republican parties in Nebraska, those parties can not be free to work for the good of the people.

The Pennsylvania legislature was at one time described as a body of men, owned by a Pennsylvania railroad and loaned to Standard Oil when the railroad did not need them. And so when a legislature is controlled by the liquor interests, the members are loaned to any other special interests when the liquor interests do not need them.

We shall not be able to secure any reforms until Nebraska is set free from the influence of the liquor interests. It will then be easy to protect the state from the other special interests.

Again, note the difference between the alternatives that are presented today and 26 years ago. A majority in the national house of representatives has voted for the submission of an amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage, and the amendment will be even stronger in the senate when it comes to a vote there. The fed-

eral government would now be closing saloons but for the constitutional provision which requires a two-thirds vote for a resolution submitting an amendment. A minority is now able to resist the will of the majority because of this constitutional requirement, but if there is any moral force in the doctrine that the people have a right to rule, the saloon is now an outlaw, and must be considered as a fugitive from justice until the majority is able to secure a two-thirds vote in both houses and put an end to its existence.

EUROPE FURNISHES NEW EVIDENCE

The question before Nebraska now is, therefore, whether the state will join the posse which is pursuing the fugitive, or join the fugitive in resisting the posse. Senator Hitchcock, Mr. Neville, and Mr. Mullen want to make Nebraska the partner of the outlaw, while the dry democrats desire to put the state on the side of home and humanity.

I remind you, also, that the war in Europe has furnished new evidence against the evils of alcohol. It has been found that patriotism is no match for alcohol, even when the nations are in a death grapple. Russia has abolished the sale of alcohol, preferring to surrender in time of war the \$450,000,000 formerly derived from the sale of alcohol rather than risk its evil influence. France has prohibited the sale of absinthe; Germany has shortened the hours of the saloon, and lowered the alcoholic contents in beer, and Great Britain has issued order after order, one forbidding treating, and the last one taking over the distilleries for munition factories. Why not profit in peace by the bitter lessons which they have learned in war? If any enemy ever attacks us, our supreme need will be men—men whose brains are clear, men whose nerves are steady, men who have no appetite that will rob them of their love of country in their nation's crucial hour? I think the fear of attack is groundless, but there is one kind of preparedness that would be good in peace or war—let us drive alcohol out of the United States and then, whether war comes or not, every American will be a man.

But this kind of preparedness does not appeal to the manufacturers of munitions. They are selling more than three hundred millions of war material a year to Europe, selling it at an enormous profit, and they know that their dividends will dwindle when this war ends unless they can fasten themselves on the taxpayers of this country and grow fat as the people grow poor. No preparedness appeals to them unless it gives the few a profit at the expense of the many.

Opposition to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors rests upon the proposition that alcohol is a poison which, taken into the system, weakens the body, impairs the strength of the mind, and menaces the morals. This proposition is either true or false; if it is false, then the cause of prohibition fails, and not only the cause of prohibition, but all regulation of the liquor traffic. If this proposition is sound, it will be difficult to find a valid reason for permitting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors as a beverage.

THE LESSON OF HISTORY

We challenge the opponents of prohibition to meet us on this fundamental proposition. Will they accept the challenge? No! Because all history supports the doctrine that alcoholic drinks are injurious. If you will consult your Bibles, you will find that 2,500 years ago Daniel, a Hebrew captive in Babylon, asked that he might be permitted to prove the superiority of water over wine. The prince who was charged with the care of Daniel and his three companions was instructed to feed them with the meat from the King's table and to furnish them wine such as the king used, but, yielding to the eloquent appeal of Daniel, the prince gave them 10 days for the test, and when the time was up he was compelled to admit that Daniel and his companions were "fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat." From that day to this the test has been going on and never once has it been decided in favor of alcohol.

But you need not rest on the experience of the past; you can test it today. Select 100 young men from any country or from any clime—no matter under what form of government they live or what language they speak. Divide them into groups of 50 each; let one group use alcoholic liquor and the other group drink water only, and those who drink water will win the honors in the colleges, take the prizes on the