

"TWO VOTES FOR BRYAN AND KERN" THAT IS THE SLOGAN

The argument in this campaign is on our side. This argument may not have been presented to your neighbor, who intends to vote the republican ticket. Let everyone who advocates the election of Bryan and Kern make determined effort, between now and election day, to get one vote from among his neighbors. From now on let the slogan be "TWO VOTES FOR BRYAN AND KERN---MY OWN AND ANOTHER MAN'S."

LIKE BACON

Mr. Taft's plea, that his party can receive large contributions from the interests to be benefited without being obligated to them or influenced by them, recalls the plea which Francis Bacon made when impeached before the house of lords for taking bribes. He said that while he had taken them, they had never influenced his judgment, but he was removed in disgrace. It is a pity he did not know of the modern method by which one protects himself from influence, while at the same time getting the benefit of the contributions by merely saying that it is distinctly understood by the giver that the receiver will not be influenced by the gift.

But men are usually influenced by their benefactors. And this recalls the story of a discussion that was going on at Lincoln several years ago while the legislature was in session. A number of legislators, lobbyists and newspaper men were seated in a hotel office discussing the question, "What is an honest man." After several opinions had been expressed some one asked Herman Timme, a Douglas county member, to give an answer. Herman replied: "Vell I tink an honest man is one who will stay bought."

The great corporations finance the republican party's campaign and they will control the republican officials whom they elect.



AND WHY NOT ALDRICH?

President Roosevelt denounces Senator Foraker for his Standard Oil affiliations. Why not Senator Aldrich also? Is it because Foraker opposed Taft, while Aldrich is for Taft? Last winter the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a republican paper, said that Senator Aldrich has "capitalistic affiliations" and "openly consults with the men who control in that hazy, yet positive, element popularly known as 'the Wall Street crowd.'" It is said that Mr. Aldrich "seldom takes any step in or out of the senate without consulting with his New York connections," and that "he is related to the men who control Standard Oil, and has made millions in association with them."

Yet the Globe-Democrat says "he possesses the ability to apparently unite in common cause the incongruous elements of the senate and direct them along a common channel." The Globe-Democrat is now admitting what has for years been charged by democrats. Maybe Mr. Aldrich's success is not entirely due to his ability. Maybe the elements of the senate which Mr. Aldrich controls are not so "incongruous" as some would have us believe. Certainly he is not the only member of the United States senate who has "capitalistic affiliations." Why is President Roosevelt silent about Aldrich? Does any sane man believe that Aldrich is a supporter of the "Roosevelt policies?" He is the chief trust and corporation agent in the senate.

Mr. Taft's campaign manager says nothing about Aldrich.



SIGNIFICANT SILENCE

The republican party is silent on the question of publicity of campaign funds. Mr. Taft says that the list of contributors will be announced after election. Just now he desires to conceal the sources of the republican "slush" fund.

There are several instances on record of the willingness of republican managers to make public campaign contributions after election. One of these occurred during the insurance investigations in New York three years ago. The question of the donation made by the Equitable Life Assurance Society came up in connection with a mysterious loan of \$685,000, made by

the Mercantile Trust company to the Equitable.

Cornelius N. Bliss, who was treasurer of the republican national committee and also a trustee in the Equitable, was asked this question, according to the report published by the Chicago Record-Herald, a republican newspaper:

"Did you, as treasurer of the republican national committee, accept or receive a contribution of \$100,000 from the fund of \$685,000 which figures as a loan to James W. Alexander and Thomas D. Jordan, as trustees from the Mercantile Trust company, the existence of that loan being known to you as a director of the Equitable Society?"

Mr. Bliss' answer was: "I absolutely refuse to answer any such question. The question is a decidedly improper one."

This was the willingness of the treasurer of the republican national committee to make public the source of the party's contribution, nearly a year after the election. Subsequent investigation revealed the fact that not only the Equitable, but the Mutual, the New York Life and other big insurance companies had contributed tens of thousands of dollars of their policyholders' money to the republican campaign fund.

The \$260,000 fund which Harriman raised was not made public until two and a half years after the election and then through no voluntary action on the part either of Mr. Harriman or Mr. Roosevelt.

The Record-Herald's publication is an interesting chapter upon the question of the willingness of republican managers to publish campaign contributions, even after election.



PANIC THREAT BY TRUST BOOSTERS

From a Chicago Dispatch.—The republican national committee is sending out a letter asking for "cash contributions," in which the declaration is made that "the election of Judge Taft and James S. Sherman is essential to the welfare of the country."

The letter is of interest by reason of the character of the men whose names appear on the letterhead, and who make this appeal. Here are the men who sign the letter informing the people of the country that Bryan's election will be dangerous:

Charles F. Brooker, head of the brass trust, and vice president of the New York, New Haven and Hartford railroad, against which a government suit is now pending in the federal courts.

Charles Nagel, of Missouri, one of the general attorneys of the Standard Oil company. This Standard Oil representative is in charge of republican national campaign headquarters in Chicago.

Frank O. Lowden, multimillionaire son-in-law of the late George M. Pullman, and now the head of the great Pullman Palace Car trust, to which the traveling public pays tribute.

T. Coleman Dupont, the head of the powder trust, which is fighting a suit against dissolution. Boise Penrose, the political "boss" of the corrupt politician machine in Pennsylvania.

George R. Sheldon, the personal representative of J. Pierpont Morgan, in the capacity of director in all his trust companies, and who collected trust money for the election of Governor Hughes of New York.

William Nelson Cromwell, the legal representative of Edward H. Harriman, and probably the greatest trust lawyer in the United States.

Fred W. Upham, the "fat fryer" for the republican party in the west, and the man who wrote letters to corporations whose property he assessed by virtue of his position as a member of the board of review in Chicago.

This is a fine outfit to advise the farmers and business men in the west how to vote. Two of the signers are heads of corporations, which

are fighting for their existence in the courts. Of course these men think Bryan's election dangerous; that is natural when one becomes acquainted with their connections. But there is not a legitimate business man in the nation, small or large, who has any reason to fear a democratic victory.

The Nagel-Sheldon-Penrose-Upham et al letter appealing for "cash" was mailed from Chicago as late as October 8. A copy was sent to a prominent manufacturer in Iowa, who is a republican. He replied at once to the committee of "trust boosters," who are financing the republican campaign. The letter of reply is given herewith and it was not obtained at republican headquarters, where it was received today:

—, Iowa, October 9, 1908. Republican National Committee, 234 Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.—Gentlemen: We have your letter of the 8th inst. requesting an immediate subscription from us, and that we take a day off and ask subscriptions among our friends. We regret our inability to furnish you immediate assistance, but if you will tell us how we can explain to our friends the following questions, we will take the matter of raising funds for the republican campaign under consideration:

"Why did the republican convention at Chicago vote down the publicity of campaign funds, nine to one?"

"Popular election of senators, seven to one?"

"How can we expect Mr. Taft to prosecute the trusts when he granted a perpetual franchise to a corporation in the Philippines?"

"How can we assure the people that Mr. Taft, if elected, will not copy Mr. Roosevelt and use the office which belongs to the people to name his successor?"

"Why thirty republicans could not be found in congress, last winter, that would join the democrats in causing the many good measures, talked of by Mr. Roosevelt, to become laws?"

"That Mr. Roosevelt was and is in good faith in his attempts to prosecute the Standard Oil company?"

"What assurance can we give them that the many good measures talked of by Mr. Roosevelt were not like his bear hunts in the south last autumn—fame bear, as you will remember, shipped there for that purpose?"

"Many other questions might be asked but these are the most perplexing, and unless we are fortified with explanations, which we are unable to give, we must decline to assist you.

Most respectfully yours,
The _____ Co.,
By _____ Mgr.

JUDGE TAFT WAS NETTLED

The correspondent for the Cincinnati Enquirer, who traveled with Mr. Taft on his Ohio tour, wired his paper as follows:

"At Mingo Junction, Ohio, Judge Taft became nettled because he was permitted to make a prosperity speech from the front of the great Carnegie mills, which have been closed down for nearly a year with the consequence that nearly two thousand hands are out of employment. Upon hearing this I may know why Judge Taft just stop and informed him of the fact.

"Your speech was all right, but the conditions well,' was the thing response.

"I want to know the exact conditions in the future,' was the tart reply."

