

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 Foreign Post. 25c Extra
Sample copies Free.

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 22 means that payment has been received to and include the issue of January, 1922.

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.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912

of The Commoner, published monthly at Lincoln, Nebraska, for April 1, 1922.

State of Nebraska }
County of Lancaster } ss.

Before me, a notary public in and for the state and county aforesaid, personally appeared Chas. W. Bryan, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the publisher of The Commoner, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, postal laws and regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, associate editor, and business managers are:

Publisher: Charles W. Bryan... Lincoln, Nebraska
Editor: William Jennings Bryan... Lincoln, Nebraska
Associate Editor: Charles W. Bryan... Lincoln, Nebr.
Business Managers: None.

2. That the owner is: William Jennings Bryan, Lincoln, Nebraska.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders holding 1 per cent or more of the total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

CHAS. W. BRYAN, Publisher.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 18th day of March, 1922.

J. R. FARRIS, Notary Public.
(My commission expires July 19, 1924.)

Iowa Republicans are to choose a senatorial candidate at primaries to be held in June. At the beginning several old warhorses of the familiar type had the field to themselves. A little later the farmers drafted Col. Brookhart, an outstanding, hard-hitting man who is opposed to control of politics by selfish influences, and he was making such a cleanup that the old guard rustled around and secured the entry of Clifford Thorne, who has been prominent in reform movements. Having thus pulled off one of the oldest tricks in politics, the party leaders are gravely deploring the fact that no one will be able to get a majority, and that a state convention, as provided by the Iowa law, will have to pick a candidate. It is safe to predict that that candidate will be neither Brookhart nor Throne.

The Democrat who imagines that because the administration at Washington is at sixes and sevens, with a president unable to command congress or a congress that cannot agree with the president, all that is necessary is to name a full ticket and everybody will be elected is due to be rudely awakened. The Democrats will neither deserve nor achieve success at the coming election if they do not range themselves under leadership that has the confidence of the voters and a program that gives promise of better conditions.

Elinor Glyn voices a common delusion of those who do not like prohibition, when she says that more people drink now than before just because they are told they must not. If this were good logic and represented fact, it must have been that after every "thou must not" law of the past the violations of it increased greatly. No other evidence of the foolishness of this statement is needed than the act that criminal laws are added to yearly and none are ever repealed.

A Rising Protest

On another page will be found a news item taken from the New York Times of Sunday, the ninth of April. Attention is called to it because it is proof of the rising protest against assaults which have been made upon the Bible in public schools. The New York papers were loud in their criticism of a bill introduced in the Kentucky legislature and defeated by the narrow margin of one vote. My name was usually linked with the measure and the bill was made the basis of criticism. I was represented as favoring severe penalties for the teaching of Darwinism. As a matter of fact, while I advised legislation on the subject I advised against the including of ANY PENALTIES in the law, on the ground that they were not dealing with a criminal class but with persons who would obey the law if it were merely stated. I thought it would be sufficient to declare it unlawful for any public teacher or other person connected with the public education to teach or permit to be taught atheism, agnosticism, Darwinism, or any other hypothesis that made man a descendant of lower forms of life.

The people who rejoiced over the defeat of the bill either did not know (or did not mention) the fact that the president of the state university and professors in the university joined in a written statement declaring that DARWINISM WAS NOT TAUGHT IN THE UNIVERSITY.

The object of this editorial, however, is not to answer criticism made against the measure proposed in Kentucky but rather to emphasize the fact that the superintendent of public instruction in New York City went far beyond those who supported the bill introduced in the Kentucky Legislature. The proposition before the Kentucky Legislature dealt; first, with TEACHERS or others RECEIVING PAY FROM THE PUBLIC; second, with doctrines believed to be harmful to students in public schools and colleges. Dr. Ettinger did not permit the use of SCHOOL HALLS by a lecturer (not a teacher, but an outsider) who intended to criticize the Bible and his criticism was not to be made before STUDENTS but before ADULTS OF MATURE minds who would attend the lecture for the special purpose of hearing him.

Dr. Ettinger was entirely right in what he did but his course was much more radical than the course of those who merely attempted to prevent the undermining of the religious faith of students in their classes by teachers paid by public taxation.

The New York incident is interesting because it denotes the rising tide against these insidious assaults upon the Bible, the foundation of Christian faith.

W. J. BRYAN.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

March 9, 1922.

Mr. Charles F. Jones, Editor,
The Observer,
Jacksonville, Florida.

My dear Mr. Jones:

I congratulate you upon the stand The Observer has taken in regard to law enforcement, and take pleasure in submitting, in compliance with your request, a word upon the subject.

Law enforcement is one of the subjects which has only ONE side. No argument can be made for failure to enforce the law or for a refusal to observe it.

The prohibition law cannot be separated from other laws and made an exception, merely because some people can make money by violating it, or because others put their appetites above their respect for government. No argument can be made in favor of the violation, or law enforcement, of prohibition that will not apply with equal force to every other law upon the statute books.

It is absurd to say that the Volstead Act should be repealed because there are still violations of it. The laws against murder and theft have been on the statute books for thousands of years and yet we have both murder and stealing, and not all of the criminals are caught and punished.

Prohibition is the greatest moral reform ever attempted by law and the progress made has been not only satisfactory but remarkable considering the difficulties that we have had to overcome. Of course leaks have been discovered and they are being closed. For instance, whisky was stored in several hundred different places where it was difficult to guard it. It is now being concentrated in a few places and sham thefts will be less frequent.

When the law went into effect there were

many wet officials who were put in charge of enforcing the law; these men were recommended by wet senators and wet members of congress and had no sympathy with the law. These are being weeded out. Common sense would seem to require the appointment of enforcement officials who believe in prohibition and want to see it enforced. How can a wet be expected to cut off his own supply by enforcing a dry law? I think we will come finally to the appointment of total abstainers only as enforcement officers.

The smuggling of liquor in from the outside could, of course, be expected in the beginning. Vice pays a high price to those who pander to it. Liquor came in from Canada, from Mexico, from Cuba, and most of all, from the Bahamas. When Ontario went dry our problem was made easier along a considerable part of the northern boundary line. It will not be long before our government will inform Mexico, Cuba, and Great Britain that there are other ways in which they can show their friendliness to us besides allowing their flags to protect conspiracies against our laws. It is possible for these countries to supply their own people with liquor, if they think that is best, without becoming partners with those who smuggle liquor into the United States from adjacent territory.

But the success of prohibition must finally depend upon the strength of total abstinence sentiment in the United States. This is growing. When a great doctor's association shows by a vote of its members that seventy-five per cent do not regard beer as a medicine, that sixty-five per cent do not regard wine as necessary as a medicine and that only fifty-one per cent include whisky among the medicines necessary, the nation is making progress.

Congress has, by more than a two-thirds vote, excluded beer from the list of medicines and has restricted the use of wine and whisky. This law is in response to the growing prohibition sentiment of the country.

In the cultivation of total abstinence the churches must take the lead, ably supported by the W. C. T. U., the Anti-Saloon League and other temperance organizations.

If it be said that one like myself, who has been a total abstainer from youth, is prejudiced on the subject, I reply that total abstinence rests upon unanswerable arguments.

First; God never made a human being who, in a normal state, needed alcohol.

Second; God never made a human being strong enough to begin the use of alcohol and be certain that he would never become its victim.

Third; God has fixed no day in a human life after which it is safe to commence the use of alcohol.

Fourth; a Christian being a Christian because he has given himself in pledge of service to God and to Christ, what moral right has he to take into his body that which he knows will impair his usefulness and MAY destroy even his desire to serve?

Fifth; a Christian must be interested in every good cause; he prays to the Heavenly Father, "Thy kingdom come,"—what right has he to rise from his knees and spend for intoxicating liquors money that he can spare to hasten the coming of God's kingdom on earth?

Sixth; the Christian is responsible for the influence of his example as well as for his own acts; how can he bring himself to the point of being willing to lead others astray? We shall have enough to answer for before the judgment bar of God without having drunkards among our accusers. If Paul could refuse to eat meat lest it make his brother to offend, cannot the Christian refuse to drink for the same reason?

Commissioner Haynes reports that seventeen and a half millions of people have quit drinking since prohibition went into effect. With this growth of total abstinence we shall soon have a sentiment back of the law that will insure enforcement and give the country all the benefits that flow from prohibition. Then we may expect that our example will shake the strong holds of intemperance in other lands and enable us to lead in the great crusade that will drive the use of intoxicating liquors off God's footstool. "He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat."

Very truly yours,
W. J. BRYAN.

The experts tells us that we will all learn to appreciate good music if only we take time and opportunity to hear enough of it. With seats priced at \$2 and \$3 it would seem that something more than time and opportunity is needed to get enough of it.