

The Commoner

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 20, NO. 8

Lincoln, Nebraska, August, 1920

Whole Number 736

Mr. M'Adoo's Position

Below will be found a letter that explains itself:

McADOO, COTTON & FRANKLIN
Attorneys at Law
126 Broadway
New York

July 20, 1920.

Gentlemen:

"In your issue of July, 1920, you carry, in your first column, first page, a statement signed by Col. Bryan as follows:

"Mr. McAdoo signalizes his defeat by saying that the Presidential primaries should be abolished and the old convention system restored."

"You are entirely in error. I have never made such a statement. I have said that presidential primaries ought to be regulated by Federal authority, made uniform throughout the states and held on the same day. I have also said that I think the expenses of national elections should be paid out of the Federal Treasury, under proper regulations specifying the uses to which the money may be put and forbidding private contributions, so that the corrupt use of money in presidential elections, which is one of the gravest menaces to the Republic, may be prevented."

"Will you kindly publish this statement in as prominent a place in The Commoner as was the erroneous statement of Col. Bryan's to which I refer? Very truly yours,

The Commoner, W. G. McADOO."
Lincoln, Neb.

I am sorry the mistake was made and hasten to correct it. The Commoner has for some years advocated the presidential primary—a federal primary wherever state laws do not comply with federal requirements. They should all be held on the same day, as Mr. McAdoo suggests. The Commoner has also advocated the payment of necessary campaign expenses by federal appropriation—a plan suggested by President Roosevelt.

Some months before the convention Mr. McAdoo was quoted as advising AGAINST instructions for candidates. If his views were misrepresented on this subject I shall be pleased to so inform my readers. The Commoner does not intend to misrepresent any one and gladly corrects mistakes that may be made.

W. J. BRYAN.

PUT ONLY DRYS ON GUARD

Remember that both Cox and Harding virtually INVITE congress to change the Volstead act. Every dry in every state should be on guard to elect a dry Senate and House. Vote only for senators and congressmen KNOWN TO BE DRY. NO INCREASE IN THE ALCOHOLIC CONTENT SHOULD BE PERMITTED. No weakening of the law should be allowed.

W. J. BRYAN.

TO COMMONER READERS

Kindly send to The Commoner at once the names, mail address, and give the number of the congressional district of all candidates of all political parties for the United States senate and those for the national house of representatives.

QUESTION YOUR CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES

The combined liquor interests of the country, and all those who profit financially or politically from the liquor business or from the various forms of vice associated with the liquor business, are organizing their forces to attack prohibition. They will make a herculean effort to elect senators and congressmen in November who will vote to raise the alcoholic content or to weaken the enforcement provision of the national prohibition act, known as the Volstead law.

The friends of prohibition should require senatorial candidates and all candidates for congress to pledge themselves to prevent any backward step from being taken in the enforcement of the greatest piece of moral legislation that has been enacted during the past century. Where neither political party has a candidate for the senate or house who will pledge himself to uphold the dry cause, a dry candidate, where the law permits, should immediately be put on the ticket by petition.

Readers of The Commoner, friends of the home, and all newspapers that favor upholding the present prohibition enforcement laws without modification are urgently requested to immediately submit the following question to all candidates of all parties, for the United States senate or house and send their replies to The Commoner and a copy of their replies to your local papers for publication:

Question—Will you, if elected to congress, use your vote and your influence for the effective enforcement of the present prohibition law, honestly and in good faith, without any increase in the alcoholic content of permitted beverages and without any weakening of any other of its provisions?

The Commoner will publish in each issue until after the November election the names, politics and district of all candidates for the national senate or house who answer the above question in the affirmative. Candidates for congress need not wait to be questioned. If you are in favor of defending the home against the attacks of the liquor gang, send your names to The Commoner at once to be placed on the roll of honor for support by the temperance forces.

The Acceptance Speeches

The presidential campaign of 1920 is formally opened. The acceptance speeches are before the country; the candidates have interpreted the platforms upon which they are running, each endeavoring to support his party's declaration as strongly as possible.

Of the two speeches Senator Harding's is more sonorous while Governor Cox's address is more direct and emphatic. The difference in the length of the words will be noticed if one glances at the pages. The senator uses longer words and sentences; his style is somewhat like Burke's; Cox follows more nearly after the style of Victor Hugo. On many questions their positions are quite identical, only expressed in manner characteristically different.

Both favor woman's suffrage and express the hope that the one more state necessary for ratification will soon be secured. Senator Harding spends a little more time on the subject, but Governor Cox puts his views a little more forcibly. The party that furnishes the one state necessary will, however, present an argument stronger than either—the practical argument that "brings home the bacon."

On the subject of universal military training both are silent, although either one might have

made more votes with a single sentence on this subject than he could have made with the same number of words on any other subject. Governor Cox says that entrance into the League of Nations will enable us to reduce military expenses, and it might be inferred that he would not favor the addition of \$7,000,000,000 a year for the compulsory training of the youths of the country, but he did not avail himself of the opportunity to pledge his influence against such a policy.

Senator Harding did not say anything on the subject at all, unless he intended to convey this idea in one sentence, namely, "I believe in a small army, but the best in the world, with a mindfulness for preparedness which will avoid the unutterable cost of our previous neglect." What does he mean by "preparedness?" Some of his colleagues have insisted that the failure to train the young men previous to the last war resulted in unutterable cost. As neither party platform made any specific declaration on the subject, the candidates took refuge behind platform silence to excuse their own silence, although the menace of universal compulsory military training still hangs over the nation. It was recommended by Secretary Baker and en-