

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......35
Six Months......50 Single Copy......10
In Clubs of Five or Sample copies Free.
more per year75 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.

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 October 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 20th day of September, 1922.

J. R. FARRIS, Notary Public.

(My commission expires July 19, 1924.)

It will be rather difficult to convince a number of esteemed Republicans that so far as this election is concerned there is enough glory to go round.

The opinion exists in some quarters that if some arrangement could be made with respect to clothes with the football players and the bathing beauties there might be a much better equalization of attire accomplished.

The railway labor board says that it does not believe there is anything such a thing as a living wage, and has declined to fix one for employes of the transportation company. In view of the fact that a living wage is very plainly a wage large enough for the person who receives it really live upon, the question does not appear so difficult to answer.

As President Harding looks over the political news covering events that happened on the 7th of November he will be able to understand how the sultan of Turkey, who has just lost his job because the people didn't like the way he ran things, feels just now, even though the president is still on familiar terms with the man who pays salaries in this country.

Not the least enjoyable of the chuckles that a Democrat gets from reading the election returns is in noticing that the election of Smith W. Brookhart as senator in Iowa is listed as a Republican victory. Anybody who knows how the Republican leaders of that state feel about Brookhart's election can readily get the point. Mr. Brookhart was elected because the corporation and reactionary Republicans of that state said that he was too close to the people. This was a good year for candidates who had proved that they were close to the people.

Progress Versus Conservatism

(By W. J. BRYAN)

Many of the visitors to Japan carry home with them a pair of Korean lions. It seems almost farcical to call them lions because they have nothing of the fierceness of the menagerie lions—being comical rather than fear inspiring. They are to be found at the doors of temples—one on one side, and one on the other. One of the lions has its mouth open while the other has its mouth firmly closed; they are said to represent the eternal conflict between the positive and the negative—between the progressive and the conservative. Both of these groups are necessary; if it were not for the conservative the progressive would go too fast—if it were not for the progressive the conservative would not go at all.

This is the fundamental conflict that is being fought out everywhere. In traveling around the world I inquired, upon entering a new country, what political issue was paramount there, and found that everywhere the most vital issue was between those who wanted to go forward, and those who contended for existing methods and conditions. No two countries stand upon the same level in the matter of progress; that which is progressive in one country, is conservative in another,—the line being drawn between that desired and that secured.

The line does not always separate the same people; the progressive in one generation may be the conservative in the next. Having won the fight he began in his youth, he may leave others to lead the next fight.

The conservative has several advantages over the progressive. In the first place, one is constitutionally inclined to prefer that with which he is acquainted to that which is new; ignorance, therefore, is on the side of conservatism. One must understand a proposition (at least he must think he understands it) before he will endorse it. The progressives must rely for their numbers and strength upon those sufficiently well informed to prefer a proposed reform to existing laws. The conservatives, on the contrary, include not only those who have studied the subject and decided against the reform, but also those who have not studied—the uninformed. Our governmental machinery gives the conservatives a very decided advantage over the progressives. We have in the nation, and in each of the states, an Executive and a Legislature; these must unite in the enactment of a law.

The progressive is handicapped still further by the fact that each legislature has two branches, which must concur in the passage of a law before it goes to the Executive for his signature. In other words, a measure in the line of progress must pass BOTH Houses and receive the approval of the President, while the conservative can block the measure by controlling either House or the Executive. In the national government, and in most of the states, the veto of the Executive cannot be overridden excepting by a two-thirds majority of both Houses. In the matter of Constitutional amendments, the handicap of the progressive is made heavier by the fact that two-thirds of both Houses must submit the amendment; and then three-fourths of the states must ratify it. Ratification requires the concurrence of two Houses—seventy-two in thirty-six states, while ratification can be defeated by thirteen Houses in thirteen states.

There are strong arguments in favor of sufficient enforced delay to compel deliberation. Changes should not be made under the spur of excitement, but there is no reason why any obstacle should be put in the way of the triumph of the will of the people when there has been sufficient time and opportunity for mature consideration of the proposed change.

It is worth while to note also that all reforms disturb so-called "vested rights," although it would sometimes be more accurate to describe them as "vested wrongs." Reforms begin with those who SUFFER and are always opposed by those who profit by the abuses to be reformed. Those who make money out of an abuse not only have the sinews of war with which to fight reform, but they fight with desperation and regardless of expense. They are able to organize those who are directly menaced, or fear a future attack. The contest is usually between the unorganized victims of injustice and those on the other side who are protected in the doing of injustice by some outgrown law or some antiquated method of government.

I have taken the trouble to call attention to the governmental handicaps placed upon those who seek to inaugurate changes in order that the reader may understand why reforms grow so slowly.

The progressive sentiment in this country is overwhelming but it takes time for it to find expression. The progressive sentiment not only controls the nation, but it in time controls all parties. It is so difficult to amend our Federal Constitution that constitutional changes are impossible without joint action by the great parties. Within the last twelve years, four constitutional amendments have been adopted. Neither the Democratic party nor the Republican party was strong enough to secure a constitutional change without the aid of the opposite party; and it is a fact worthy of notice that separate action is not usually necessary when an independent reform is ripe for triumph. The discussion necessary to secure two-thirds of both Houses, and three-fourths of the states unites the progressives regardless of party.

Take, for instance, the four constitutional reforms secured in the last twelve years. It required twenty-one years of agitation to secure the direct election of United States senators; the first resolution proposing the amendment passed the National House of Representatives in 1892, while the ratification was not completed until 1913. It passed the House six times before it could pass the Senate once. When it did finally pass, the House was Democratic and the Senate Republican. It was quickly ratified—Republican and Democratic states vying with each other in supporting it.

It required seventeen years of agitation to secure the income tax; when it was finally secured, it was by the cooperation of the Democrats and the Republicans—the two parties sharing in the glory of the victory.

And so with prohibition. While a Democratic congress submitted the prohibition amendment, a Republican congress passed the Volstead law which put the amendment into effect. More than two-thirds of both the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and the House supported the 18th amendment, and all the legislation enforcing the amendment.

A majority of the Democrats and Republicans in both Houses voted for the submission of the Suffrage amendment, and the two parties joined in furnishing the thirty-six states necessary for ratification.

While it is true that constitutional reforms required cooperation between the two leading parties, it is only fair to the Democrats to say that they have LED in the securing of every important economic reform of this generation. That does not mean that all Democrats are progressive, or that all Republicans are conservative—but a larger percentage of the Democrats are progressive—a larger percentage of the Republicans are conservative. This is a fact that can be easily proven.

Take the two constitutional amendments, for instance, which draw the line between progressives and conservatives. The direct election of senators made that body more responsive to the will of the people. Agitation began among the farmers and among the laborers. The opposition was strongest where wealth was most concentrated and most influential. The first House that passed the resolution submitting the amendment, was the Democratic House elected in 1890. The resolution was also passed by the congress elected in 1892, which was also Democratic. Then two Republican congresses adjourned without passing the resolution. After that, three Republican congresses passed the resolution and then it was passed by a Democratic congress at the time that the Senate concurred. It will be seen, therefore, that while three of the Houses were Democratic, and three Republican, THE DEMOCRATS TOOK THE INITIATIVE. Four Democratic National platforms endorsed the direct election of the senators by the people. In this connection it is significant to note that no Republican platform ever endorsed this amendment. In 1904, the convention that nominated Mr. Roosevelt rejected, by a vote of 7 to 1, and a resolution introduced by Senator LaFollette, endorsing the direct election of senators.

Justice to the Republican masses requires that I should state there was probably never a time between the proposal of this amendment and its adoption when a majority of Republican voters