

The Commoner

ISSUED MONTHLY

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

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, CHARLES W. BRYAN,
Editor and Proprietor 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 21 means that payment has been received to and including the issue of January, 1921.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

Address all communications to—
THE COMMONER, LINCOLN, NEB.

OF COURSE THEY OBJECT

On another page will be found a press dispatch from Washington saying that Secretary Mellon and Governor Harding, of the Reserve Board, oppose the bill giving the farmers representation on the Federal Reserve Board. The reason advanced is, of course, not the real one. The Secretary of the Treasury was not even willing to have the Secretary of Agriculture made an ex-officio member. Such an increase of membership "would have a tendency to make the board unwieldy." Well, why not substitute the Secretary of Agriculture for one of the other members?

But the farmers are going to have a member—let us hope that the selection will be made from those who have whiskers so as to scare the rest of the board as much as possible. Farmers represent one-third of the population of the country and the board can by a majority vote reduce the value of their crop by billions; why should not the farmers have a voice?

And why not give the laboring man a voice? The board can close the factories and bring about a condition that will result in a reduction of wages.

On what meat doth this banker-director feed that he hath grown so great? Should there not be a director to represent the business men who are not in the banking business? They far outnumber the bankers. The bankers made their profits largely out of these business men. Why should the entire business of the country be at the mercy of a board which has no non-banking business men to represent the rank and file of those in trade? The movement to compel the selection of a farmer who farms is just beginning. The time will come when the board will also contain a laboring man who labors and a business man who is not a banker. When these three groups; the farmers, who constitute a third of the nation; the laborers, who are nearly as numerous as the farmers; and the business men, who borrow instead of loan (who, with the farmers and laborers, make up nearly three-fourths of the nation) have each a real representative on the board, panics will be less likely because trade squeezing will be impossible.

W. J. BRYAN.

REPUBLICAN MAJORITIES GREATLY REDUCED

An Augusta, Me., dispatch, dated March 21, says: Republicans retain their hold of the Third Maine congressional district, but by a margin greatly reduced from the record Republican vote of 1920. John E. Nelson, Republican, was elected over E. L. McLean, Democrat, by a majority of over 6,000. In 1920, the Republican majority for congressman in this district was 19,257.

A Corning, N. Y., dispatch, dated April 11, says: With the Republican normal plurality greatly reduced, the Thirty-seventh congressional district elected Lewis Henry, Republican, of Elmyria, to the house of representatives, to the vacancy caused by the resignation of Alanson B. Houghton, now United States ambassador to Berlin. Henry's plurality over Judge Frank Irvine, Democrat, of Ithaca, was 3,087.

In Defense of a Friend

The New York Journal of Tuesday, March 21, 1922, in the column which is conspicuous because the name of Arthur Brisbane is published at its head, contains the following reference to myself:

"Sunday was the birthday of William Jennings Bryan, sincere, useful soul. He celebrated it with a speech denouncing evolution. As he spoke, just at the bottom of his waistcoat, on the right side of his body, there snuggled a tiny veriform appendix that could have refuted all his arguments. Evolution has made it vestigial, only a nuisance, but in some of Mr. Bryan's herbivorous relatives that appendix is more than twenty feet long, as compared with three or four inches in humans.

"And the ear with which Mr. Bryan listened to applause is only an evolution of the gill with which his ancestor, the fish, allowed water to escape, after extracting the oxygen.

"The hand with which Mr. Bryan points and waves has five fingers, because that was the number of toes on the foot of the salamander in the carniferous age—millions of years ago.

"It's a pity, too, for the five fingers gave us the imperfect decimal system. Six fingers would have made it duodecimal—much better, as mathematicians will tell Mr. Bryan. Ten has only two divisors, five and two. Twelve has four; two, three, four, and six. Read Wallace's book on Darwinism. You'll admire Mr. Bryan's power, knowing all about evolution without having studied it. Darwin was a slowpoke. He devoted thirty years to his study of earthworms before announcing the part they play in soil formation."

Arthur has so often disclosed and discussed the secrets of my anatomy that I may have seemed lacking in courtesy not to have made before this an acknowledgement of his friendly interest, expressed in his own peculiar way. Arthur is a unique creature. Besides being a highly paid writer on subjects political and social, he seems to have spare time to devote to biology, psychology, zoology, and several other 'ologies. But he is not impartial, bestowing his affections equally upon his intellectual companions. On the contrary, he shows a marked tendency to specialize in man's family tree. He has looked into the subject carefully, and having minutely inspected himself, externally and internally, finds so many resemblances between himself and the brutes that he has reached the conclusion that he has in him the blood of the beast instead of the breath of the Almighty. Having decided this question, and having adopted a philosophy that teaches that "whatever is right," he glories in his lineage and loses no opportunity to express his pity for anyone who can find pleasure in imagining himself made in the image of God.

Whenever a man has a dominating impulse, he gradually brings all of his activities into harmony with that impulse. So with Arthur. Instead of twirling a mustache, he pats the point in his ear which Darwin tells him is so much like the point in the ape's ear as to leave no doubt of a common ancestry. When he chews his food he shifts the burden to the "canine teeth" because by so doing he feels that he is, in a way, paying his respects to distant relatives.

Those who have noted with awe and admiration the wrinkles that, like miniature Alps, rise at his will from his massive brow may have imagined that he was trying to look wise. Not so. Arthur knows, as his friends do, that his wisdom manifests itself without any conscious effort on his part. Those wrinkles are simply a way he has of reminding himself that he possesses some of the rudimentary muscles with which the horse is wont to wiggle his ears. Arthur has learned from Darwin that only a few have inherited this physical characteristic of some of the lower animals. It "survives" only in "the fittest."

I might mention other survivals, but as he only refers to my appendix, my ear and my fingers, I would not want to boast of a greater familiarity with him than he does with me.

The trouble with Arthur is that, in his hurry to establish blood connection with the jungle, he has tried to trace the pedigree of but one-third of himself, and that the lowest third. He has given less time to man's brain and soul than Darwin (if we can trust Mr. Brisbane) gave to

worms. Arthur's friends, even though, like myself, they may be denied the delights of constant companionship with him, suspect him of having an intellect that reveals no similarity to a simian brain. When we visit the zoological gardens we never say of a gorilla, "He reminds me of Arthur."

Darwin says that everything in the human mind can be found in miniature in the mind of the brute, but Darwin did not know Arthur. No monkey can ever hope to use his tongue as Arthur does, much less aspire to the written language in which Arthur is so proficient.

Man is the possessor of a soul, as well as a mind, and here too, Arthur can find no hint of kinship with the brute. When Arthur surveys the handiwork of man and contemplates the measureless vision that travels faster than the mind can run and siezes upon high ideals that elude the grasp of reason, he forgets the baboon and the chimpanzee and is absorbed in man and his destiny. Arthur is too wise of brain and too big of heart to boast of being a son of an ape or brother to a wolf or cousin to the monkey. It is only his modesty that leads him to hide in a cage in a menagerie—he belongs on the hill-top where worshipful man builds temples to Jehovah.

W. J. BRYAN.

A LAW-ABIDING GOVERNOR

On another page will be found a letter written by Governor William D. Denney of Delaware to the City Council of Wilmington, Delaware, in response to a request from the city council that the governor aid in amending the Volstead Act. The governor's reply is worth reading. Surely few city councils would be guilty of so open a defiance to the Constitution and it is to be hoped that if there are any more such, the governors of their states will answer in the same way as did the governor of Delaware.

The prohibition amendment was adopted in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and surely the "wets" had advantage enough in the fight that resulted in the ratification of the amendment. If they had been able to control ONE MORE THAN ONE-THIRD in either House of Congress they could have prevented submission. But the "drys," obtained more than two-thirds of both houses in Congress, which means that the representatives of more than two-thirds the population of the United States voted to submit prohibition.

If the "wets" could have held one branch of the legislature in thirteen states they could have prevented ratification, but they have been able to hold only three houses out of the ninety-six—two in Connecticut and one in Rhode Island.

No other reform has ever been adopted by so large a vote. In order to take prohibition out of the Constitution the "wets" would have to secure two-thirds of both houses and three-fourths of the states, just as the "drys" did. If they could not hold one-third of one House how can they hope to get two-thirds of both houses? If they could hold but three branches of the legislatures out of the ninety-six how can they hope to secure seventy-two branches in thirty-six states, the number necessary to ratify a repealing amendment even if they could succeed in submitting such an amendment?

And again, if the "wets" could not prevent the adoption of prohibition when the women voted in but a few states, how can they hope to bring back the saloon when the women are voting in all the states?

The "wets" know that they cannot repeal the prohibition amendment; their only hope is to secure a majority of Congress pledged to violate the Constitution. Could lawlessness go farther? Even if they secured a majority base enough to attempt to violate the Constitution by authorizing the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, the Supreme Court would be in duty bound to nullify such a law.

All that a "wet" Congress could legally do would be to increase the alcoholic content from one-half of one per cent to a higher per cent but below an intoxicating per cent. If the "wets" can not get enough alcohol to make them drunk, why do they make such a struggle to get more than one-half of one per cent? What they really hope to do is to get a Congress that will refuse to make the appropriations necessary for the enforcement of the law and thus inaugurate a reign of lawlessness. Even the most ardent advocates of prohibition have never brought against the "wets" as grave an incident as they boastfully confess to, viz., that of favoring lawlessness.

Strange that a city council should take the position that the Wilmington Council did, and fortunate for the state that it had a law-abiding citizen for governor. What would New Jersey's governor have done in such a case?

W. J. BRYAN.