

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 20 means that payment has been received to and including the issue of January, 1920.

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, 1920.

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, Nebraska  
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 23rd day of September, 1920.

J. R. FARRIS, Notary Public.  
(My commission expires July 14, 1924.)

"This too shall pass away."

Here's to the "association of nations"—may it come quickly and stay forever.

The debating societies can this winter discuss with profit the familiar question, "Whither are we drifting, and if so, how far?"

Possibly the wet delegates who danced so enthusiastically over their triumph at San Francisco may be able to walk in a normal way now.

Governor Edwards, of New Jersey, heralded at San Francisco as the "emancipator" of the party and erstwhile champion of "personal liberty," somehow failed to make connection at the polls this year. Can it be that New Jersey does not really care to become "as wet as the Atlantic ocean?"

The American people, finding that the ship of state could not be steered with safety between "presidential arrogance" and "the senatorial oligarchy," decided to remove both objections to progress. Scylla was dynamited this year; Charybdis will be blown up four years from now.

Some of the President's friends resent the idea of resignation as they resented Mr. Bryan's efforts at San Francisco to restore the President to the moral leadership of the world. The resignation plan offers the President a chance to retire in an honorable way and at the same time test the depth of Senator Harding's interest in an association of nations.

An Editorial

IS IT 1904 OVER AGAIN?

(An editorial by Mr. Bryan in The Commoner of February, 1919.)

The World's bold effort to nominate Mr. Hoover in any old party recalls its activity in 1904. It picked out Mr. Parker as the candidate who could lead the party to victory. Of course, it knew that his financial backers were in reality J. Pierpont Morgan, August Belmont and Thomas F. Ryan—the men who in 1912 were mentioned by name and specifically excluded from the control of the convention by a resolution adopted by a vote of more than four to one. The representatives of the Parker organization made prodigal promises of campaign funds and by means of these promises secured enough delegates to give their candidate a majority of the convention, and this majority was soon swelled to the necessary two-thirds. It is not the purpose of this editorial to discuss the World's intimate connection with the Parker boom and its backers but rather to draw a warning from history. As soon as the convention was over, the National Committee was organized on a purely money basis. One of the most influential leaders in the party, after spending the day with the committee, wrote me expressing his disgust that money was the only thing talked about; no thought of principles or of the benefits which the people should receive from a Democratic victory—just money, money, money.

When the time came for the campaign contributions to roll in—they did not roll, and the financial burden of the campaign fell upon August Belmont and Thomas F. Ryan, who, it must be admitted, did their best to make good the promises made in securing the delegates. They informed the committee that the men from whom they expected to get contributions had refused to give and an investigation made some years afterwards showed that Belmont and Ryan had to bear almost the entire expense of the campaign. The World may be able to inform its readers about how much these two men contributed.

A few days before the election, Judge Parker learned from a friend that the financiers of Wall Street had met and agreed to throw their support to President Roosevelt, then a candidate, for re-election. To say that Judge Parker was astonished is stating the case very mildly. He was astounded to find that men who claimed to be Democrats and who had no personal, political or pecuniary reason for opposing Mr. Parker were going to join in making Mr. Roosevelt's majority as large as possible. The reason, of course, was that Wall Street financiers have no politics; their vote is entirely a matter of money—as much so as the vote of the man who sells his vote for a few dollars, only their price runs up into big figures and is measured by the advantage their business is to derive from the control of the government.

Judge Parker, unable to suppress his indignation, made a speech in New York, calling attention to the support that Wall Street was giving Mr. Roosevelt. I well remember the sensation Mr. Parker's speech caused. I was campaigning in Indiana at the time and met one of our speakers just after reading the morning paper. "Have you read Judge Parker's speech," said he. "Yes," I replied. "He brings a very strong indictment against Mr. Roosevelt." "It looks like we are not going to get any Wall Street funds," said the Democratic speaker. Not very long afterward, I met another prominent Democrat and practically the same dialogue ensued. Judge Parker's speech was pathetic but Democrats accepted it as notice that there had been some unexpected interruption in the flow of money from Wall Street to the Democratic Committee. Mr. Roosevelt at once replied to Judge Parker in very abrupt and offensive language. If Mr. Parker had been in position to challenge Mr. Roosevelt to have his committee join the Democratic Committee immediately in publishing the contributions received he could have silenced the Republican candidate, but the Democratic Committee was in no better position than the Republican Committee to show its books. That was before "publicity before the election" law went into effect. Election day came; all the so called Democratic papers were supporting the ticket; there was no division in the party; outwardly everything seemed harmonious. All the leaders were supporting the ticket, but among the voters there

was the greatest unorganized protest ever known in American politics. Judge Parker's vote fell one million and a quarter below the Democratic vote of 1900 and it was also one million and quarter below the Democratic vote of 1908, and the fall was nation wide—no section escaped the disastrous blight of that year.

A little while after the election I met Senator Daniels at the home of Congressman Jones. Senator Daniels, it will be remembered, was one of the leaders of the Parker movement. Senator Daniels was idolized by the South and admired by the party of the nation. He exerted more influence in behalf of Judge Parker than any other delegate in the convention. During the conversation at the table Senator Daniels said to me, "MR. BRYAN, MANY OF THOSE WHO TOOK AN ACTIVE PART IN URGING JUDGE PARKER'S NOMINATION SHOWED NO INTEREST IN HIS CAMPAIGN AFTER THE CONVENTION."

That is the lesson of 1904. Judge Parker's nomination was forced on the Democratic party by those who had no interest in electing him; their only purpose was to make a Republican victory easy, and that lesson ought not to be overlooked at this time when Wall Street is repeating the tactics of 1904.

In 1904 Wall Street succeeded in controlling the Democratic Convention and its candidate was defeated—any candidate would have been defeated whom it could nominate.

In 1912 Wall Street tried to play the same trick on the party. It was not interested in Mr. Clark; there was not a thing in Mr. Clark's record that could give Wall street any reason for loving him. Wall Street, finding that it could not get its first choice, Mr. Harmon, or its second choice, Mr. Underwood, threw its support to Mr. Clark, not that it had any special interest in seeing him nominated but because it thought it could use him to retire Mr. Wilson and then take advantage of the demoralized conditions to bring out some Wall Street favorite and use him to overthrow Mr. Clark. Then Wall Street would have proceeded to support the Republican ticket.

The situation is the same now as in 1904 and 1912. Wall Street has no interest in the Democratic party; it has no thought of supporting a Democratic candidate. Its Democratic candidate would have been defeated in 1912, no matter what his name, if Wall Street had been allowed to pick out the man. And so this year, Wall Street will disgrace the candidate if it nominates him and then desert him after it has disgraced him.

W. J. BRYAN.

THE VICE-PRESIDENCY

In view of Senator Harding's announcement that Vice-President Coolidge will have a place at the President's council table, The Commoner reproduces from the first page of its first issue, January 23, 1901, the following:

"It has been intimated that Vice-President-Elect Roosevelt is desirous of receiving more consideration at the hands of the President than has, as a rule, been given to those occupying his position. Whether or not the report is true is not material, but the ambition, if he does entertain it, is an entirely worthy one.

"Why has the Vice-President been so generally ignored by the Chief Executive in the past? It is said that Mr. Breckenridge was only consulted once by President Buchanan, and then only in regard to the phraseology of a Thanksgiving Proclamation. This incident was related to a later Vice-President who was noted for his skill at repartee, and he replied, with a twinkle in his eye: 'Well, there is one more Thanksgiving Day before my term expires.'

"According to the constitution the Vice-President succeeds to the office in case the President dies, resigns, is removed, or becomes unable to discharge the duties of the office. The public good requires that he should be thoroughly informed as to the details of the administration and ready to take up the work of the Executive at a moment's notice. The Vice-President ought to be ex-officio a member of the President's cabinet; he ought to sit next to the President in the council chamber. Receiving his nomination from a national convention and his commission from the people, he is able to furnish the highest possible proof that he enjoys public respect and confidence, and the President should avail himself of the wisdom and discretion of such an advisor. While the responsibility for action rests upon the