

democrat is to be found on the board.

There is no objection to the organization of any association for the purpose of advancing any line of political thought, but a republican association ought to be known as republican, and not as non-partisan.

On the 19th of September, 1903, Secretary Gunton of the institute above mentioned sent out some letters appealing to persons who were supposed to be interested in this so-called non-partisan work in behalf of the republican party. The letter says: "It is felt that the strong and convincing writings of President Gunton will be of great value in the present campaign in Ohio, and arrangements have been made to send many thousands of bulletins and leaflets into that state." As Mr. Hanna is one of the high priests of the institute and indorses the work of the institute in a letter dated September 4, 1903, it is hardly probable that the institute will do any really non-partisan work in Ohio this year. The writer of the letter referred to seems to be afraid that "yellow journalism," "erratic ideas," and "doctrines detrimental to all sound business conditions" may "obtain too strong a hold among the masses."

The Institute of Social Economics is evidently a dishonest organization, because if it were honest it would not claim to be non-partisan. If any democrat has been led to give his support to this institute under the belief that it is non-partisan, he has a right to resent the deception, and if republicans who support it are not ashamed to make an open fight they ought to insist that the disguise be removed and that the Institute of Social Economics appear in its true light and advocate republican policies openly and above board.

In the campaign in Ohio this year Tom Johnson and his associates are making a fight for just taxation and home rule. If the Institute of Social Economics were non-partisan it would certainly be in sympathy with Mr. Johnson's purpose, but as it is a republican affair it is using false pretenses to secure votes for Mr. Hanna.

**Dropping the Mask.**

Although many republicans have insisted that the ship subsidy bill is not a wise measure and that there is little reason to believe that that measure may pass, it is now dawning upon many people who have heretofore been de-

ceived that the ship subsidy scheme comprises a very important part of the republican program.

Already there are indications showing a disposition on the part of the Roosevelt administration to come out openly in favor of the ship subsidy.

It is announced that the bureau of statistics of the department of commerce and labor is preparing tables for the purpose of showing the effect of foreign subsidies upon the merchant marine of the world. A Washington dispatch to the New York World says that "these tables are to be used at the coming session of congress in behalf of the ship subsidy bill which is now thought to be needed and which the friends of the measure have no doubt is going to be passed."

In his speech delivered at Toledo, O., October 13, Secretary Shaw came out boldly in defense of Mr. Hanna's ship subsidy bill and said that it was the only measure by which the American merchant marine could be built up. He complimented Mr. Hanna on the "statesmanship" that induced him to introduce the bill and said that "its results would be the carrying of American products in American vessels."

The conduct of the republican leaders with respect to the ship subsidy bill is in keeping with their conduct toward all measures of that class. In 1896, the republican leaders declared in favor of international bimetalism and then after they had won their victory, they interpreted the result as an indorsement of the single gold standard. Four years later they boldly declared for the single gold standard. Nearly every republican orator in the country has assured us for a number of years that there was no danger whatever of the passage of any measure like the Fowler bill. They hooted at the idea of asset currency and yet we find today that republican leaders very seriously suggest some form of an asset currency.

The republican habit is to keep these measures before the people, denying responsibility for them for a time and finally, when they think it opportune, they boldly embrace the plan, seeking to justify their position on the ground of "great national necessity."

So it is with the ship subsidy bill. Although republican leaders have for years protested that their party was not the champion of that iniquitous measure, we are now told by Mr. Roosevelt's secretary of the treasury that its introduction by Senator Hanna showed the highest form of states-

manship on the part of that gentleman and no effort is made to conceal the fact that the measure is to be seriously pushed at the coming session of congress.

**Newspaper Falsehoods.**

The eastern papers are constantly quoting prominent men (whose names are generally unmentioned) as coming out against democratic principles or persons identified with the recent movements of the democratic party. Harper's Weekly in its issue of October 10 spoke of the waning influence of certain believers in the Kansas City platform, and quoted one man who is described as "a well known lawyer and influential democrat of Denver." But now comes a Colorado judge and reminds the publishers of Harper's Weekly that the person described as a well known lawyer and democrat of influence cannot be found in the state, that his name is not upon the list of licensed attorneys of Colorado, and that no one can be found who knows him. This, however, will not prevent a continuation of the campaign of misrepresentation and deception.

In connection with this it may not be out of place to say that Senator Clay of Georgia was recently quoted as criticizing Mr. Bryan and saying "as soon as the newspapers drop him (Mr. Bryan) his occupation as self-constituted dictator of the democratic party is gone. We are not paying any attention to him in Georgia." The purported interview also quoted Senator Clay as saying that Mr. Bryan bolted the action of a majority of the democratic caucus who favored Representative Crisp, and stubbornly voted for Springer of Illinois, who was not regarded as a possibility at any stage of the contest.

Senator Clay, as soon as the interview was called to his attention, denounced it in both the Atlanta Constitution and the Atlanta Journal, and declared that the interview was a fabrication from beginning to end. This denial was not necessary from Senator Clay, because Mr. Bryan's knowledge of the senator from Georgia was such as to lead him to discredit any such an utterance without inquiry into its falsity. Any person who will take the time to examine the Congressional Record will see that Mr. Bryan on roll call voted for Crisp in both the Fifty-second and Fifty-third congresses. In the Fifty-second congress he supported Mr. Springer in the caucus, but voted for Mr. Crisp in the house, when he became the caucus nominee. In the Fifty-third congress Mr. Bryan supported Mr. Crisp both in caucus and in the house.

Attention is called to these things, however, to show how utterly unreliable are the partisan papers that are seeking to bolster up republican policies by aiding the reorganizers to spread false reports among the democrats.

**Preparing for the Great Battle of 1904**

The Commoner's special subscription offer was made public one week ago. Subscribers may be interested in knowing that within a few days after this offer was published, 4,500 cards were ordered and the requests are now coming in for these cards at the rate of from 1,200 to 1,500 per day.

This is placing The Commoner's subscription at the rate of 60 cents a year and is, as nearly as possible, at the actual cost of publication. As has been said, this offer is made with the view of increasing The Commoner's circulation and influence and not for financial profit, but in order that The Commoner may be more effective in its fight for the maintenance of democratic principles.

Although for a time there were those who imagined that democrats did not have sufficient interest in the time-honored principles of their party to do battle against the organized effort to republicanize the party, it must be very plain to people generally, as it is plain to the reorganizers themselves, that the democratic party is not to be surrendered to the trust magnates without a desperate struggle on the part of those who demand for themselves only equal rights and who protest against special privileges being bestowed upon any man or interest.

The lines are forming for the battle of 1904, and democrats in every precinct, county and state should go to work to the end that only real democrats be selected as representatives in democratic conventions.

Once aroused to the danger that confronts the

**THE COMMONER'S SPECIAL OFFER**  
Application for Subscription Cards

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 5  | Publisher Commoner: I am interested in increasing The Commoner's circulation, and desire you to send me a supply of subscription cards. I agree to use my utmost endeavor to sell the cards, and will remit for them at the rate of 60 cents each, when sold. |  |
| 10   |   |  |
| 15   |   |  |
| 20   |   |  |
| 25   |   |  |
| 50   |   |  |
| 75   |   |  |
| 100  |   |  |
| Indicate the number of cards wanted by marking X opposite one of the numbers printed on end of this blank.                               |   |  |
| If you believe the paper is doing a work that merits encouragement, fill out the above coupon and mail it to The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb. |   |  |

party loyal democrats will see to it that the integrity of the party is preserved. Arousing them to a realizing sense of this danger is one of The Commoner's chief missions. The Commoner's efficiency in this work is limited only by its circulation. That its influence may be broadened The Commoner has inaugurated this subscription campaign, and it asks democrats to enlist and help on the good work. The campaign is similar to the one waged a year ago and known as the "Lots of Five" plan. The plan, briefly, is this:

Subscription cards, each good for one year's subscription to The Commoner, are furnished in "lots of five" at the rate of \$3 per lot. This makes the yearly subscription rate 60 cents, which is as nearly cost as the publisher is able to figure it. Parties ordering the cards may sell them for \$1 each, thus earning a commission of \$2 on each lot sold, or they may sell them at the cost price and feel remunerated by having widened The Commoner's sphere of influence. The cards may be paid for when ordered, or they may be ordered and remittance made after they have been sold. A coupon for ordering cards in any amount is printed in this issue for the convenience of those who are willing to take an active part in the campaign.