

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

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

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to—

THE COMMONER, LINCOLN, NEB.

Private Monopoly Rejoices

On another page will be found an editorial in which the New York Tribune rejoices that government competition with privately owned ships is ended. It welcomes the news that the emergency fleet has withdrawn ten government ships from the Hamburg and Bremen routes. These ships, the Tribune says, were in direct competition with privately owned American ships and then adds that their operation represented the principle of government owned shipping in its most baneful form.

This note of exaltation comes a few days after the press dispatches announced that the steamship companies had raised the rate on coal upon learning that seven hundred thousand tons of coal had been contracted in Great Britain as a means of escaping from the dearth of coal in the United States. Nothing could better illustrate the heartlessness of big business than the two facts, first, the extortion by the privately owned companies and, second, the abolition of government competition.

The New York Tribune is a large journal and is representative of what passes for patriotism among the big financiers. There is no conscience whatever in the predatory interests and it seems never to occur to their journalistic champions that conscience has anything to do with the subject. These masters of finance take "all that the traffic will bear." When business increases, instead of lowering rates because full cargoes reduce the cost per ton, they raise rates because they CAN, and they demand that the government shall not interfere with their piracy.

Is it possible that a farmer, just because he is a Republican, can ignore the injustice—not to say, immorality—of such business methods and such party policies? Can the laboring men be blind to the injustice that this must work to the country? And what about the small business man? Is he so sympathetic with big business that he cannot use his influence for the protection of the public?
W. J. BRYAN.

What's become of all that talk around the halls of congress about investigating Attorney General Daugherty? A few months ago it was the opinion of the editors who affect to interpret events for us and to ring up the curtain on the going-to-be that Harding could not any longer carry so heavy a burden. When Daugherty was selected he was described as the politician of the cabinet. It begins to look as though he has been exercising his chief talent most effectively.

PROGRESSIVES STILL WINNING

The great victory of La Follette in Wisconsin and the smaller but decisive victory of Johnson in California show that the progressive wave has not spent itself. There may be enough progressive Republicans in the Senate to help pass the measures formulated by the next Democratic House.

The Philosophy of Self

The dispatches have recently given us a good illustration of the philosophy of self. There is such a philosophy and it is the basis of much of the sin and most of the sorrow in the world. Happiness is made the end of life—not the highest form of happiness, but purely physical happiness. Some months ago a man eloped with his secretary, leaving his wife and nine children; he and his companion have recently been arrested and the papers are interviewing the three parties to the triangle.

The wife says, "I freely and of my own accord forgive my husband and Miss _____ and ask him to come home and live happily with myself and the nine children."

The man says, "It is all very unfortunate. No man should be eternally damned because he seeks love when he has not possessed it. Life is but a trip through a great wilderness and somewhere in the wilderness there is a rose for every man. That is the rose of love; its possession means happiness and success. If a man plucks a thistle by mistake, should he be prevented from plucking a rose should he later chance upon it?" He says his wife was a "heathen," and could neither read nor write, and embarrassed him by "eating with her knife at church suppers."

The girl with whom he eloped says, "I don't blame Mr. _____ for leaving his wife and nine children and running away with me. We love each other and that is the first requisite to happiness in this world."

Here we have the views of the principals stated in their own language, if the interviews are accurate. This is not all that they say, but enough to indicate the attitude of each. The wronged wife is willing to forgive her husband if he will come back and live with her and the nine children which they, together, have brought into the world. Surely this is generous enough to satisfy the most exacting requirements.

What of his attitude? He puts what he calls his happiness above his duty to his wife and the nine children for whom he is responsible. He says he found "a thistle" and, after joining her in bringing nine half-thistles into the world, he leaves the thistle and the nine half thistles, and plucks "a rose" that he found growing by the wayside. His philosophy of life centers in himself. The fact that he THOUGHT he loved the woman he married and, under this delusion, led her to sacrifice opportunities to be married to a better man and also led her to assume responsibilities (to nine children) from which she cannot honorably escape, has no influence upon him. What are her rights to him, or the rights of the children when they stand between him and his idea of happiness? The wrecking of her life seems to be a trivial incident and the fate of the nine children a matter of unconcern.

He called nine human souls out from the unseen world to live their lives on earth—nine souls with infinite possibilities for weal or woe—and yet, he leaves them to fare or fail—what are they to him compared with the possession of "a rose?" Can selfishness go farther or more conclusively prove its turpitude? What a world this would be if ALL men lived on as low a plane and were as bestial in their conception of life?

The theory that one cannot control his affections, but must follow them whithersoever they may lead him, is quite attractive to the passionate. No wonder some dispute the doctrine that we should love our enemies. If a man cannot love his wife, how can he be expected love his enemies? The man in question is not the first man who has fallen under the influence of a woman younger than his wife and become blind and unfeeling. His sin began in encouraging the attachment until it overcame his will. Christ strikes at the root of this evil by warning against the beginning of evil.

And the young lady; he has certainly found a congenial spirit in her, for she is as supremely selfish as he is. She does not blame him for leaving his wife and the nine children. What is the happiness of a wife and mother and the welfare of children to her? If happiness is so sacred a thing, why should her happiness or the happiness of the husband whom she stole be so much more valuable than the happiness of the other ten parties involved? She says that she is willing to take the nine children and care for them, but what mother would be willing to entrust her children to a woman who was willing to destroy

a home. And what assurance would the children have that she would not desert them if she found a man more pleasing to her than the other woman's husband? And what assurance has she that when she grows older and becomes the mother of a family, her fickle husband may not find a younger and fresher "rose?"

The moral in the case is plain. Obligation is more than inclination; duty is more than passion. The home is an institution ordained of God. The rights of many have to be considered when it is once established and the rights of the children are not least, for in each child there are latent possibilities. Because of these unmeasured and immeasurable possibilities no court can estimate the guilt of those who disregard them or adequately assess punishment. But we do know that in any court where justice is administered the RIGHTS of one child outweighs the PLEASURE of any parent. We need a law protecting the home from burglary by the lustful—it is a sacred institution and about the only valuable thing that is not protected.

W. J. BRYAN.

BRYAN OF MINNESOTA

There is another member of the Bryan family who is receiving some newspaper publicity these days in Minnesota and adjoining states. Silas M. Bryan is a practicing attorney at Minneapolis. He is the only son of Charles W. Bryan, and was named after Judge Silas L. Bryan, the father of William J. and Charles W. Bryan. The Minnesota member of the Bryan family grew up in Lincoln, Nebraska, was educated in the public schools, and was graduated from the University of Nebraska in 1915. He entered Harvard Law School in the fall of that year, and at the close of his second year in the law school enlisted in the army as a volunteer, and was commissioned as a captain of infantry at the first officers' training school at Camp Snelling. After serving as an instructor in the second, third and fourth officers' training camps, he took a company of colored troops to France, and saw active service the last few weeks of the war. After being in the army two and a quarter years, he was discharged just in time to enter the law school again in the fall of 1919, and completed his law course the following spring and located in Minneapolis.

Silas M. Bryan is the Democratic candidate for lieutenant-governor, being on the same ticket with Mrs. Peter Olesen, who is the Democratic candidate in Minnesota for United States senator. Mr. Bryan was married during the war to Miss Fanny Schibsky of Minneapolis. He did not seek the nomination for lieutenant-governor, but it was given to him by the Democratic state convention and no other candidate filed against him in the primary.

Silas M. is a progressive Democrat in politics, is a good public speaker, is well equipped in every way for the position of lieutenant-governor, and The Commoner wishes for him and the Democratic ticket of Minnesota success at the November election.

WET ADVOCATES REBUKED

Two men were entered in the Republican primary in Nebraska as candidates for congressman on a light wines and beer platform. The association against the prohibition amendment fostered their candidacy and was responsible for their appearance as contestants. They picked out two districts in the state wherein reside a considerable number of men of foreign birth or descent. Neither one of the candidates had a look-in at the nomination. They ran so far behind the other candidates that their total vote was not even carried in the election returns. This fact ought to be conclusive of the question sometimes raised by the wets that if the people ever got a chance at prohibition they would snow it under.

If the House follows the Senate lead—and there is not the slightest reason to doubt that it will—this country will be saddled with the highest protective tariff in its history. The one and only object of a high tariff is to prevent foreign goods from competing with American goods, and this is done by making the tariff so high that the American manufacturer is left in possession of the home market, and may charge whatever he can get. The Fordney-McCumber tariff will add two billion dollars annually to the price burdens of the consumer of the country, and that at a time when every interest dictates lower prices. Upon so clearcut an issue as that the Democrats should sweep the country by majorities greater than ever before in its history.