

THE AMERICAN.

Entered at Postoffice as second-class matter.

JOHN C. THOMPSON, Editor. W. C. KELLEY, Business Manager.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1615 HOWARD STREET, OMAHA, NEB.

THE AMERICAN OFFICES. 1615 Howard Street, Omaha, Neb. 134 Powell Ave., Station 70, Chicago, Ill. P. O. Box 188, Cripple Creek, Colo.

\$2.00 a Year, Strictly in Advance.

THE AMERICAN From Now Until January 1, 1897. For the Small Sum of 50--CENTS--50 Pay Your Subscription at the \$2 Rate Up to Date, and Take Advantage of Our Great Offer.

Any Person Sending Us Ten New Subscribers will be Favoured With a Year's Subscription to THE AMERICAN. No personal check accepted unless made for 15 cts. more than the amount of subscription you wish to pay.

No Commission to Agents. If you deal with one you pay his price.

AMERICAN PUBLISHING CO.

TO THE PUBLIC. THE AMERICAN is not the organ of any sect, order, association, party, clique, faction or division of the population of this grand Republic, and repudiates and brands as false all claims or charges that it is such, let such claim or charge be made by any person or persons whomsoever.

JULY 17, 1896.

For Our Friends

At the last meeting of the Board of Directors of the American Publishing Company, it was decided to offer for sale a portion of its Treasury Stock at the par value of ten dollars (\$10.00) per share, which is to be devoted to liquidating all existing indebtedness.

PATRIOTS RESPONDING.

The following friends have said they would help take up the \$3500.00 which THE AMERICAN owes. We want 350. Who will be next?

THE Globe-Democrat, the great republican daily, refers to Roman Catholic Dick Kerens as Cardinal Kerens.

TEN misguided girls were inducted into the society of the Sisters of Mercy July 7, at Mobile, Ala.

BRYAN is a K. P.—McKinley is a Mason. The Pope hates both orders.

THE TICKETS.

REPUBLICAN.

For President, WM. MCKINLEY, of Ohio. For Vice-President, GARRET A. HOBART, of New Jersey.

DEMOCRATIC.

For President, WM. JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska. For Vice-President, ARTHUR C. SEWALL, of Maine.

PROHIBITION.

For President, JOSHUA LEVERING, of Maryland. For Vice-President, HALE JOHNSTON, of Illinois.

NATIONAL.

For President, CHARLES E. BENTLEY, of Nebraska. For Vice-President, J. H. SOUTHGATE, of North Carolina.

ATTENTION, FRIENDS.

There will be a special meeting of the John L. Webster Republican Club Monday evening, July 20, 1896. Every member who reads this notice is requested to be present, and is also requested to tell as many others as he can that there will be a meeting that evening and urge them to be present.

BRYAN AND SEWALL.

The Democratic convention has selected the standard bearers for its party. They are William J. Bryan of Nebraska and Arthur C. Sewall of Maine. Mr. Bryan is well known to most Nebraskans, and, personally, well liked by all who have had the pleasure of his acquaintance.

He served the state as congressman, and might have continued to represent his district indefinitely had he not been consumed with a desire to become United States senator, for which position he made a vigorous but fruitless fight.

That contest was probably the most memorable ever engaged in by aspirants for place in this state. His opponent was John M. Thurston, the idol of the Republican party, and one of the most brilliant and forceful speakers the West has yet produced. Bryan and Thurston toured the state, visited the most important towns and cities and spoke to thousands of our people every night, winding up the joint debates in Omaha before an audience of more than 20,000 electors.

Mr. Bryan did not sulk after defeat overtook him, but continued to urge his free silver views, and soon had a majority of the Democrats and a large number of Republicans following in his train; and when he was seen at the head of a free silver delegation from this state, it did not surprise anyone. The unexpected did happen, however, when he was nominated for president.

Mr. Bryan belongs to the new Democracy. He also belongs, from the best information we have been able to obtain, to a Protestant church. We have always understood that his wife was a Protestant, but a gentleman in whom we have the most implicit confidence informs us that she is a Roman Catholic.

While Mr. Bryan is a Protestant, his closest political friends have been Romans, and it is an indisputable fact that he wrote a friend of ours that he was not in favor of the organization (meaning the A. P. A.)

His delegation from Nebraska embraced Count Creighton (one of three men in this country whom the pope has honored with a title), Constantine J. Smythe, the attorney for the Roman corporation and himself a Roman, and who is believed to be, by many, a Jesuit, and others of the same stripe. Bryan has been a warm friend of Bishop Bonaccini, and only last year wanted to elect a Roman Catholic as a member of the Board of Regents of the Nebraska State University.

The candidate for vice-president on the Democratic ticket is as much an unknown quantity as is the Republican nominee for the same office; and the Democratic platform is not one whit better, for the patriotic orders, than the Republican platform. Both were framed by political trimmers and cowards, and unless the Populists adopt a ringing American platform and nominate thorough Americans as their standard bearers, there will be no candidates and no platform which will appeal to the A. P. A., and they will have to vote either as Democrats or Republicans.

COL. JOHN W. ECHOLS, supreme president of the A. P. A., spoke Tuesday evening, July 14, in the First M. E. church, Chicago, to members of the order in Cook county. There was a fair crowd in attendance considering the warm weather. When he spoke of

the order being instrumental in obliterating the Mason and Dixon's line and making this one united nation, the applause and cheers were deafening. He was well applauded all through his speech, which required more than an hour in delivery. Mr. Linton was unavoidable detained and was not present as advertised.

THE national council said McKinley would be acceptable to the A. P. A. Will the gentlemen who have charge of the business of the organization in the interim please tell us whether Mr. Bryan is acceptable to the A. P. A.? If he is, then we who have been Republicans and Democrats can go with our parties and support their nominees without having some two-by-four patriot jump up and howl "traitors" or "boodlers." As between Bryan and McKinley, it will not take us long to decide.

IN two weeks we have found two subscribers to THE AMERICAN who are willing to go in with 348 others and lift the indebtedness that is now hanging over this paper. Are there only two out of more than 30,000 who read THE AMERICAN who will help wipe out that indebtedness and buy stock in the company?

THE Populist convention of Nebraska which selected delegates and instructed them to vote for W. J. Bryan, had as temporary chairman D. Clem Deaver, a Romanist and ex-member of the defunct fire and police board of Omaha; and as permanent chairman, Captain Barry, another Romanist, and the head of our state militia.

THE national Republican committee-man of Illinois, Dr. T. N. Jameison, made a true statement, but a huge blunder, when he said Illinois was not yet in the Republican column, and that it would have to be won over before election. That statement coincides with the reports that reach this office.

ELSEWHERE in this issue appears an article under the heading "A. P. A. Blast," which is an interview had with Dr. Dunn of Boston. We do not know by what right or authority Mr. Dunn speaks for the A. P. A., but like any other member of the order has a right to be heard through our columns.

WE are being flooded with letters of inquiry about Bryan. Watch the columns of THE AMERICAN after the Populists have adjourned. Until then we shall not say whom we will support, although we shall give, impartially, the record of Mr. Bryan as we did the record of William McKinley.

SOME of the drunken Roman Catholic aldermen of Chicago have had a falling out, and have charged others of their number with offering them bribes. We suppose the gang is strong enough to whitewash the offenders, even if an investigation is had and the charges are substantiated.

IT is a grave question if the Populists can afford to endorse the Democratic nominee for president when nearly 3,000,000 Americans look to them to put up a platform and a candidate that will be acceptable to members of the A. P. A.

THE Populist convention meets in St. Louis next Wednesday. It looks to-day as if it would endorse the Democratic nominee for president.

BRYAN is not an A. P. A.

The Return of the Jesuits.

The recent effort and failure in the German Parliament to pass the bill allowing the return of the Jesuits has called forth considerable comment. The Catholic Standard publishes a letter of Frederick the Great on the subject, which is highly interesting. It says:

It is well known that Frederick the Great of Prussia, though a pupil of Voltaire, did not bear his master's ill will against the Jesuits, but that, on the contrary, when the order was suppressed throughout the world, he asked the pope to allow it to retain its organization in his dominions, a privilege which was granted. But long before that year, 1773, he had expressed himself against intolerance. When Silesia was ceded to him by the Empress Maria Theresa, she wrote to him asking him not to disturb the Jesuit college, and received a reply which has recently been found in the Breslau archives. In this letter "Old Fritz" thus expressed himself on the relations of church and state:

"I do not for a moment doubt that your Imperial Majesty will accord me the justice of believing me unbiased by any religious prejudice or predilection in administering the law or distributing favors. All that I demand of my subjects is obedience to the law and loyalty to the crown. As long as they fulfil their duties in this respect I, on my part, consider myself bound to impartially bestow upon them favor, protection and justice, no matter what sort of speculative notions they may sustain with regard to religion. To decide or to pass judgment upon these I absolutely resign to Him who alone rules the consciences of men and to whom I am incapable of forming so low a conception as to believe Him to

be in need of human assistance or pleased with being supported by violence, artifice, or any other human device."

This is all very well as an expression in favor of freedom of opinion in religion; but the trouble with the Jesuits is, and always has been, that they do not confine themselves to matters of religion, but meddle with the politics and government of every nation which has tolerated them, and on account of their secret plots and intrigues, treachery and devices, they have been banished from nearly every country in the world. That is the reason they are still kept out of Germany—and ought to be.—Lutheran Observer.

A Sample of Romanism.

Take a glimpse of a country in which the sway of the pope is absolute—Ecuador. No political organization or public sentiment contests with the church there. Everything is subject to the pope, and the population, occupying a fruitful land in the most beautiful country in the world, is the most ignorant, servile and degraded in the world. A correspondent writes from Quito describing the filth and degradation of the capital city, and accounts for all by saying that the church is the power behind the throne, and it controls the government and dictates its laws and sees to their enforcement. All the schools are taught by priests and nuns, and the scholars learn more about the saints of the church than about their own country. There is no reliable man of Ecuador. For years there has been on the statute books a law forbidding the importation of books, newspapers, or printed matter of any description without the approval of the priests. More than one-fourth of all the property in Ecuador is owned by the bishop. No religion save that of Roman Catholicism is tolerated. Protestants worship as they did in the days of the Inquisition. There is a Roman Catholic church for every two hundred inhabitants. Two hundred and fifty days each year are set aside as fast or feast days. Ten per cent. of the total population is comprised of priests and nuns.

Sixty per cent. of the births are illegitimate, because of the excessive marriage fees exacted by the church.—Primitive Catholic.

Uncle Sam's Aliens.

As an illustration of the sort of people Uncle Sam is employing in his headquarters in Washington, the following list, from the Washington Times, is in point. The following have only taken out their final naturalization papers within a month, but all are drawing salaries from the United States treasury:

Michael Gallagher, war and navy department; John Fogarty, office of surgeon general; Jeremiah Calahan, bureau of engraving; L. Morrissey, war department; Thomas McCabe, war department; W. H. Connelly, interstate commerce.

All the above give their birthplace as Ireland.

Then the following government employes have only taken out first papers within a month:

Timothy Sullivan, James Riddy, Patrick Corey, Marcy A. Kelly, Florence Pollock, Johanna Kelly, Daniel Garvey, James Galvin, Margaret Coleman, James Ronan, Johanna Collins, Lizzie Riordan, Michael McCormick.

These all give Ireland as their birthplace, and all have snug government berths, though not yet citizens.

We also find on the list of employes, who have just taken out first papers—Dominico Monrondello, Carl Blanbock, Camille Delecco, Tius Stang, Hyman Bernstein, Emile L. Cupfer, Gustav Rosseau, and many others, some of whom are drawing salaries of \$1,800 or more. Fifty-six have taken out papers within a month, some of whom have been drawing salaries for a long time.

And there are tens of thousands of American veterans out of work—none of whom can get a job, even though professedly patriotic congressmen.—Boston Citizen.

Control of the Priests Gone.

The hierarchy of Quebec have manifestly lost their hold in things political. They did all in their power to make the people vote against Laurier, and the people voted for Laurier in much larger numbers than they ever voted for any political leader. Right under the noses of some of the most violent prelates, the people voted just as they pleased. For years we have had grave doubts as to whether some of the statements made about political power of the French priesthood were correct. Scores of times the people of Ontario have been told that Quebec is the most priest-ridden country in the world. It may have been at one time; it certainly is not now. All the people needed was a leader who refused to allow the hierarchy to take him by the throat. They got that leader in the person of Wilfred Laurier, and last week showed the result. The hierarchy have been taught a lesson that should do them for the remainder of their lives. We in Ontario may well stop pitying Quebec, and ask ourselves whether after all there is more political freedom in this Protestant province, than in the province that has so often been described as in bondage to Rome.—Canada Presbyterian.

WEBSTER ON SILVER.

Continued from page 1.

or in the pocket of the country merchant. If one man cannot use it, neither can the other. It is because the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one creates a cheap dollar, which cannot be used in commercial trade, the Republican party condemns it.

When the cheap silver dollar has driven the gold into retirement, what are we going to live upon? If we cannot use the silver dollar on account of its cheapness, we would all be forced to retire from business, and this great nation would be a nation of idlers.

The difference between the intrinsic or bullion value of the two metals is so great that all men admit it. That being so, I cannot understand how any Democrat who believes in his national platform, and the traditions of his party, can be in favor of free silver.

For any Democrat to appeal to the memory of Thomas Jefferson in support of his free silver theories is enough to make the ashes at Monticello rise up and rebuke him.

It was Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton who first agreed upon which the two metals should be coined into money. They undertook to ascertain the relative value of the two metals as bullion, or commercial commodities, and it was upon the bullion values so ascertained that the coinage ratio was fixed. Thomas Jefferson adopted the sound financial principle that the value of the metal in one kind of money should be equal to the value of the metal in the other, so that the two should be at all times exchangeable.

Yet it so happened that when Thomas Jefferson became president of the United States he found that the ratio agreed upon had become unequal, and in order to prevent one money from driving the other out of circulation, and without any authority or act of congress upon the subject, Thomas Jefferson, as president of the United States, ordered the mints to stop coining the silver dollar. From that date up to 1835 silver was practically demonetized by the Jeffersonian executive order.

If the demonetization of silver is a political crime; it was a crime inaugurated and sanctioned by the father of the Democratic party. If it was an act of wisdom, it had the sanction of the Democratic party.

The Democratic platform of 1892 declared: "But the dollar unit of coinage of both equal intrinsic and exchangeable value." That declaration was the Democratic declaration of Thomas Jefferson as well as the declaration of Alexander Hamilton. The Democrat who to-day forsakes that doctrine and advocates the coinage of the 50-cent silver dollar has no place in the old political parties of this country.

Free silver men suggest that the free and unlimited coinage of gold has appreciated the value of gold, and that the free and unlimited coinage of silver would increase the value of silver so as to bring it to a parity with gold.

It is not true that the coinage of gold increased its bullion value. It is a well understood fact that gold in the form of bullion is just as valuable as gold in the form of coin.

Senator Jones, in his great speech on the silver question, complained of the fact, and said: "Nearly all the gold produced is consumed in the arts and manufactures, and hardly any is left for circulation."

If the coining of gold increased its bullion value, would not all this gold which Senator Jones complained of as being consumed in the arts and manufactures, be turned over to the mints to be coined into money? If coining gold increases its value, why is not all the gold bullion coined into American dollars? It is a well known and accepted proposition that gold which is used in the arts and manufactures has an intrinsic value equal to its value when coined. Let us state the case in regard to silver.

If the coining of gold does not increase the value of the coined dollar above the value of the gold bullion, there can be no logic in the statement that the coining of silver would increase the intrinsic value of the silver dollar above the silver bullion.

Do you need a national illustration? If so, we will point to India and to Mexico, where the merchantable value of coined silver depreciated to the value of silver as bullion.

But if silver is to be made a legal tender, as it would be by the free and unlimited coinage of silver, the man who works for daily wages would be compelled to accept depreciated silver. In other words, a man who now gets three dollars per day, measured by the gold standard, would get but three silver dollars, worth but \$1.75. By this process we should work a great hardship upon the toilers of this country—greater than the most imaginative free trade orator is ready to depict as a result of the McKinley tariff. They say the tariff is wrong because it costs the laboring man too much to buy what he wants, but in the same speech they advocate a theory of finance which would reduce his wages nearly one-half in money value.

It is a deception to say that the farmers of Nebraska are a debtor class, and that therefore cheap silver would benefit them.

Statistics show that the farmers of Nebraska last year paid off \$5,000,000 of mortgage indebtedness. Admitting, if you please, that if our farmers should pay off their mortgage debts to the amount of \$5,000,000 per year with silver money, that was worth but two and two one-half millions, and by that transaction—if it were a possible one—save two and one-half millions of money, nevertheless there is another side to the story. The farmers of Nebraska sell, from the products of their farms, of wheat, of corn, of oats, of live stock, \$100,000,000 per year. If they are to use cheap silver money in the payment of their mortgage debts, they must also accept the cheap silver dollar in payment for what they have to sell. The logic of the situation would be, if prices remain the same, they would lose \$50,000,000 per year in the transaction.

The question is, can the farmers of this state afford to advocate a financial scheme which might take from them \$50,000,000 per year for the sake of cheating their creditors to the amount of \$2,500,000?

My free silver friends may answer that, by the free and unlimited coinage of silver, we would have more money, and that therefore prices would go up, so that the farmer would realize more for what he has to sell. Perhaps that might be true.

But it is likewise true that it is not alone the quantity of money in circulation that determines prices. Prior to the so-called demonetization of silver in 1835 prices were high, and yet the fact is that there was not as much money per capita in circulation in this country at that time as there is in circulation to-day.

Again, the free silver farmer says that interest is too high, and that if we had free silver it would reduce the rate of interest.

Senator Peffer, in a speech in the United States senate, said that interest is too high. Senator Jones, of Nevada, the champion of free silver in the United States senate, and who knows more about the silver question than any man who has ever written or spoken on the subject, said: "Remonetization would increase the rate of interest that the people of this country would have to pay."

If cheap money would stimulate speculation, speculation would create a demand for money, and the rate of interest would increase.

The question comes back, do the farmers of this state, with their vast mortgage debt about which they complain, wish to inaugurate a financial system which would deprive them of the power to borrow money, or to extend a loan, or when so borrowed or extended, have the rate of interest increased upon this mortgage indebtedness?

It is freely urged that, if the free and unlimited coinage of silver would bring a profit to the mine owner, that profit would be no greater than that the demonetization of silver took from the mine owner. Demonetization did not take from the mine owner the value of silver. The value of silver, like that of any other commodity, was a changeable one, according to supply and demand, and according to the cost of production. The increased production of silver tended to depreciate its value, just as a surplus production of corn or wheat would reduce their value on a market. It was only a couple of years ago that we in Nebraska had more corn than we knew what to do with, and western farmers could not sell it for sufficient to justify the cost of transportation to market, and in many places it was used for fuel. The decreased production of corn in the last year or two has made it more valuable in the eastern markets than wheat. This same principle applies to silver. The moment that you have more silver than is demanded for use in money and in trade, it must diminish in value.

The diminution in the value of silver is an inherent diminution and not the result of demonetization.

A few years ago silver was mined at profit to the mine owner. It was looked upon as a great and unlimited source of wealth. If that silver has to-day the same intrinsic value that it had when silver mining was profitable, why did not the mine owners continue mining silver and exchange it in the channels of trade for other commodities, just as the farmer barter his commodities one for the other without loss to himself?

If it is true that silver has not depreciated as a commodity, then the mine owners could have continued the operation of their mines with as much profit since the so-called demonetization of silver as before. This whole subject resolves itself into one general proposition, that the free and unlimited coinage of silver is a device to enrich the mine owner, and without any corresponding benefit to the remainder of the people. Is it not a scheme to give him \$1.70 in money for a dollar's worth of silver, and then to force the rest of the world to accept 60 cents for one dollar's worth of labor, or for a dollar's worth of goods? Who is benefited by this scheme? The mine owner? Who is injured by this scheme? All the rest of the people of this nation!