

THE AMERICAN.

Entered at Postoffice as second-class matter.

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

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, 115 HOWARD STREET, OMAHA, NEB.

THE AMERICAN OFFICES. 115 Howard Street, Omaha, Neb. P. O. Box 1488, Cripple Creek, Colo.

\$2.00 a Year, Strictly in Advance.

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...

SEPTEMBER 18, 1896.

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. NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC. For President, JOHN M. PALMER, of Illinois. For Vice-President, SIMON B. BUCKNER, of Kentucky. PEOPLE'S PARTY. For President, WILLIAM J. BRYAN, of Nebraska. For Vice-President, THOMAS WATSON, of Georgia. SILVER PARTY. 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. SOUTHWATE, of North Carolina.

FIRST NOTICE.

It has become necessary for businessmen in all branches of trade to do a strictly cash business, and as that necessitates our paying cash for what we buy we have also concluded to go to a cash basis...

The Omaha Republican city primaries will be held October 9th and the city convention on the 10th.

It is not our intention, and will not be, to question the honesty of purpose or the sterling integrity of the A. P. A. who believes his duty is to assist in the election of Mr. Bryan. This is a free country. Every man has a right to his opinion...

READ! REFLECT!! THEN VOTE!!

A number of patriotic papers have declared that they have concluded to support Bryan and Watson in this campaign. Just how a publication which pretends to be an American paper and a supporter of the Little Red School House can conscientiously support W. J. Bryan when it knows his record in congress is more than we can comprehend.

Never since the day that W. J. Bryan was nominated has there been any question in the mind of the editor of THE AMERICAN as to who should be supported by patriotic Americans or who would receive the support of this paper. THE AMERICAN has been consistent since its first issue and it will be consistent in its last. It will not support any man, now or hereafter, who does not approve of the principles of the A. P. A.; and W. J. Bryan is on record as opposing the introduction of the English language into the public schools of New Mexico...

Consequently we have not and will not endorse the candidacy of Mr. Bryan. On the contrary we shall contribute to his defeat by giving his record on the A. P. A. and Roman questions as wide an airing as possible each week. In order to do this we shall print and circulate a large number of extra AMERICANS each week. These papers cost you nothing; they will be as free as water, and we ask you to read them carefully, and decide for yourself who nearest represents the American idea.

Another thing: Do not consider the copy of THE AMERICAN you receive as a sample copy. It is not. It will be sent to your address regularly until November 1. Unless you are an old subscriber your subscription is paid for until that date. It has cost ten cents—one cent and a half per copy—barely enough to pay for the white paper and the postage. If any of your friends want the paper until November 1st, tell them to send in their name together with a silver dime and we will forward it to their address.

We had hoped to be able to send out weekly 50,000 extra papers, but the friends who had to raise the fund to pay the expense found that on account of the stringency of the money market they were unable to raise enough to pay the expense of issuing the papers, so but a very small portion of that number will be printed weekly.

However, each friend of true Americanism can help some. There is no friend of the Little Red School House who does not have a friend who would enjoy reading THE AMERICAN during the remainder of the campaign, and there is no friend of the American flag, of free speech and a free press who cannot afford to send THE AMERICAN to that friend when it only costs 10 cents for the balance of September and October.

Are you interested in the defeat of a man who told a member of the A. P. A., when said representative remonstrated with him for toadying to Romanists, that he "would be a fool not to stand in with the Roman Catholics when they controlled his party and always supported him?" who had a count of the Roman church, and the son of a Jesuit, as his body guard on his trip to New York to be notified of his nomination by the Democratic party, and whose panegyric of a cross of gold has been accepted by Romanists as a rallying cry for the faithful of that religious persuasion.

TARIFF AND FINANCE.

In an editorial in another column we have agreed to discuss the tariff and financial problems for the benefit of our readers.

We begin the discussion with some misgiving, because these are questions which have been ably handled by but few men; still, firm in the belief that we have espoused the right cause, we shall devote to it our best effort and trust to an All Wise Ruler of the destinies of men and nations for guidance and aid in the presentation of the facts which are the foundation of our belief and argument.

By common consent the year 1873 is accepted as the date from which this discussion should proceed.

The statistics which we have been able to gather both as to the price of products, population and money, show some very strange things.

In the first place we find that the United States had a population of 41,677,000 in 1873, that the circulating medium the same year was \$751,881,809, or \$18.04 per capita, and that the price of wheat was \$1.25 per bushel.

We also find that the money of the country consisted of \$25,000,000 in coin and bullion in the United States treasury and \$749,445,610 in paper money. We also find that the population of the United States in 1895 was 69,878,000, that the circulating medium was \$1,601,908,473, or \$22.93 for every man, woman and child in this great big country—being an increase in the cir-

culating medium of more than 26 per cent for every man, woman and child. This circulating medium is derived from \$1,260,987,506 of coin and bullion in the treasury and \$1,137,619,914 in paper money, and shows our coin doubled itself more than 54 times, and our paper money almost doubled itself, while the population only increased a little over 66 per cent. According to this, then, our circulating medium increased a fourth faster than our population. In other words, if we had good times in 1873 and prior to that time when there was but \$18.04 for each man, woman and child in the country, and it was the supply of cheap money that made times good, how do you explain why times are not correspondingly better to-day than they were in 1873 since we have \$4.89 more for each man, woman and child than we had in 1873? If it is an abundance of money—an increase in the circulating medium—that improves business, why in the name of common sense are times not better now than they were in 1873? We think we can explain this point to your entire satisfaction. From 1861 to 1865 this country was in a turmoil—war was raging; improvements were being destroyed, fields were being laid waste, towns, cities and villages were being sacked and burned; hundreds of thousands of men, and millions of heads of live stock were killed; the granaries were empty, the stocks in stores were run down, factories and shops were idle, and the whole people were impoverished. Suddenly a peace was declared. The farmer went back to his field, the carpenter to his shop, the smith to his anvil, the painter to his staging, the printer to his case, the laborer to his work. On every hand a cry went up for men to do the work. From every quarter came a demand for the farmer's grain. The wheels of commerce were set in motion, the factories were reopened, the shops were in operation and labor was employed. There were few if any idle men. Everybody was working. Everybody was contented. Everybody was happy. The merchant was prosperous because the laborer was prosperous, and the farmer was prosperous because those two classes were prosperous and not because we had cheap money.

How is it to-day. Your country is in a turmoil. The mills are closed, the shops are empty, the laborer is idle, the merchant is doing but little business while the farmer has no market for his crop. Yet we have more money than we had in 1873. More money for every man, woman and child than we had then. Surely, then, it is not the scarcity of money that makes these times so hard. It must be something else. It must be because the laborer is unemployed. By opening the mills, starting the factories and shops and other avenues of trade. And how will that affect the farmer? It will give him a home market for his produce. How do we know this to be so? Because we have just demonstrated to you that labor of every character was not idle, but was enjoying the fruits of its toil during the years which the friends of free silver tell you they desire to return to. And the good times of those years were not the result of an abundance of cheap money, for we had less money then than we have to-day—a great deal less, 26 per cent less, or, to be plain, \$4.89 less for every man, woman and child in this country.

It is not more money we need to make us prosperous. It is more work for the laboring classes. Of what benefit to the farmer is a man in the city who is out of employment and out of money? Can he buy a peck of apples, or a bushel of potatoes, or a pound of flour or meat? No, sir; he cannot. He is of use to the farmer only when he has work. He cannot get work while there is any show of the country going to a silver basis, because capital will not seek investment in enterprises now struggling to exist or in those, in contemplation of establishment while this agitation for the free and unlimited coinage of silver continues.

Now, what is the difference between the way we have coined silver up until a recent date and the way it would be done under the free and unlimited coinage plan?

Under the law that the last congress repealed, the government bought monthly 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion of those having it for sale, principally from the silver mine owners in the states lying west of Nebraska, Kansas, Texas and Oklahoma, at the same price those mine owners could sell their silver for to any other customer. Would the farmer want more from the government for his products than he could get for the same thing from a private individual? Certainly not. But these mine owners do, and we will show you why in a minute.

Under the law that congress repealed the officials of the treasury department bought silver bullion at its market value—so much per ounce, and as the market price of silver was but a trifle over 92 cents per ounce the government would give the mine owner his pay in notes which were a legal tender for all debts, public and private, unless otherwise stipulated in the contract.

This law was enacted solely to benefit the silver mine owner. It was done to bolster up the price of silver, but

from the day of the enactment of that law until 1895 silver steadily decreased in value. As a consequence the actual value of the bullion in the dollar was not known from one day to another. In 1878 an ounce of silver was worth a little more than \$1.15. Ten years after it had dropped until it was not worth 94 cents, and in 1893, when the law was repealed, it was worth but a trifle more than 75 cents, while in 1895 it was quoted at 65 2/5 cents. Had the government continued to buy silver and had it dropped to 50 cents and less per ounce, we would have been able to coin two dollars out of one dollar's worth of silver—one of the dollars would have been paid for the silver used in both dollars and the other could have been hoarded in the United States treasury. Under free coinage how would it be? Silver was quoted at 65 5/8 cents last Saturday in the Cripple Creek Daily Times. That would mean that a dollar containing 37 1/2 grains of pure silver would be worth in the neighborhood of 53 cents. Then, if a silver mine owner, or a speculator in silver—not the laboring man, not the farmer, not the merchant or the artisan—but the money class which has grown almost as rich mining silver or speculating in it as the Goulds and Vanderbilts have in manipulating railroads; almost as rich as John D. Rockefeller has in manipulating the Standard Oil Trust, and almost as rich as Carnegie has by the management of his mammoth iron works—those people, the silver plutocrats, the silver barons, could take their silver to the mints and have it coined into dollars and every ounce of pure silver would net him—give him a profit—of another silver dollar, if the price remained as high as 65 cents per ounce, and if it fell below 50 cents, as it did in 1894, his profit would be even greater—about \$1.05 on each dollar's worth of silver he took to the mint and had coined. But the price of silver will go up if we get free coinage; you say. That is merely an assertion and proves nothing. We might contend with equal reason that free coinage would drive the price down. That also would be an assertion and would prove nothing. The thing that will regulate the price of silver will be the law of supply and demand, the same law that regulates the price of wheat, of potatoes and of cotton. If there is more silver produced than can be used the price will naturally go down; if there is less produced than can be used, the price will go up, because those needing it will bid one against the other in the hope of obtaining what they need; whereas if the supply exceeds the demand, those buying will jostle the owner of the product down to the lowest possible figure.

Let us look for a few minutes at the silver "crop" since 1792. From 1792 down to 1870 the output, the production, or the "crop" of silver did not exceed \$56,000,000 in value. From 1870 to 1894 it had increased, according to the United States currency statistics quoted on page 38 of Sound Currency, to \$213,000,000. In other words, for 78 years next preceding 1870, the mines of the United States produced but \$56,000,000 worth of silver, while from 1870 to 1894—twenty-four years—they produced \$157,000,000 worth of silver. To be plain, the mines of the United States produced \$717,948.72 each year up to 1870, and they produced \$6,541,666.66 each year from 1870 until 1894. And now, to further illustrate, the mines of the United States, prior to 1870, produced but one-ninth as much silver each year as they did from 1870 to 1894. Or, probably it would be plainer this way: The mines of the United States produced, after 1870, and up until 1894, \$5,823,717.94 more EACH YEAR than they produced each year prior to 1870. Do you wonder, then, why silver is cheap after reading these figures? Suppose each farmer in the United States for 24 years would raise nine times as much wheat as he raised this year, and the population of the country did not double itself once, would not the price of his product fall? Most assuredly it would. You could not consume nine times or even four and one-half times as much flour each year hereafter as you are consuming to-day. And if you did not wheat would be a drug in the market, the price would go down, and the farmer would be compelled to stop raising wheat or sell it at the then current price. We venture the assertion that if such a state of affairs did exist you would not hear of the farmers getting up a scheme to have the government pass a law authorizing the purchasing and grinding of all wheat in order to keep that cereal at a stipulated price, as you see the silver mine owners are doing to-day.

We might carry this discussion of the silver question to a greater length, but as this article has already exceeded the space we had allotted to it, we will bring it to a close in a few short paragraphs.

We will ask you, however, before we close, what you understand by free silver? If you do not own silver, or a silver mine, how will the free coinage of silver benefit you? If you get a dollar of it you will have to work and earn it, or you will have to sell something. That is the only way you will get it. And if you work you will get your pay in a dollar which you do not have the least assurance will be worth even fifty

cents six months or a year after it is coined. Money is worth only what people will give for it. Not a bit more. If we deal with a man in England or Germany or France and he will take our money only for what its bullion value is, and that bullion value is but one half as much as its face says it is worth and you desire to buy some of his goods from us, do you suppose we would sell them to you for one-half what they cost us simply because your coin said it was worth twice as much as the law of supply and demand said it was worth? No, sir; you would pay the difference—you would stand the loss. If you had sold your wheat or your stock, or if you had labored and had been paid in silver dollars which the markets of the world said were worth half as much as their face said they were worth, every merchant in the country would mark his goods up 100 per cent and you would have to pay twice as much for everything you use as you do to-day, and would be a loser from 25 to 30 per cent on every dollar you got for your wheat or for your stock or for your labor, since neither farm products or labor would increase 100 per cent. That would be a claim that the most blinded free silver advocate would not be brave enough to make. They admit that farm products will not increase as rapidly as silver and that labor will be the last thing to increase in price if their scheme to have the free and unlimited coinage of silver saddled on this country carries. They admit this. To contend otherwise would be an evidence of a lack of thought upon this subject.

In a preceding paragraph we have shown that the enormous output of silver from the mines of the United States from 1870 to 1894 had the effect of reducing silver from \$1.328 in 1870 to \$1.152 in 1878 and to 65 2/5 cents in 1894—less than one-half. Let us see what has been the effect of the same immutable law upon the price of farm products.

In 1870 the south produced 3,150,000 bales of cotton as against 9,900,000 bales in 1895, and cotton was worth 11 cents in 1860 and 12 cents in 1890-1.

The American hay crop amounted to 25,085,100 tons in 1870; and to 65,776 158 tons in 1895. More than two and a half times as much.

The oat crop for 1870 was 282,000,000 bushels; for 1895, 825,000,000 bushels. More than three times as much as was raised in 1870.

The wheat crop for 1870 was 288,000,000 bushels; for 1895, 470,000,000 bushels, or nearly twice as much as was raised in 1870. Take this in connection with the fact that Russia and India and Argentina have developed into great wheat exporting countries since 1870 and you have the solution of the problem of cheap wheat.

It will not be out of place to state here that the finance committee of the United States senate made a report in 1893 showing the price of farm products from 1840 to 1890. In that report barley was quoted, in New York, at 77 cents in 1860 and 95 cents in 1890-1; corn was quoted in Chicago in 1860 at 43 cents, and in 1890-1 at 58 cents; oats on the same market in 1860 at 34 and in 1890-1 at 58 cents; wheat, No. 2 spring, on same market was quoted in 1860 at \$1.02 and in 1890-1 at \$1.03. But, after all, prices are better to-day than they were before the war when we were under the beneficent provisions of the act which was repealed in 1873, and this fact more than anything else convinces us that the war and not the statute which was wiped off the statute books in 1873, was responsible for the good times which we enjoyed at that time.

Let some critic may say we have reasoned falsely as to the law of supply and demand in relation to either silver or farm products, we will say we have taken into consideration the fact that silver increased nine times while wheat increased less than one time. So from this we conclude that the secret of our prosperity was not in an abundance of cheap money but an abundance of work for all classes—when there was a market for all labor as well as for all products. Let us open the mills, and the shops and the factories, let us put the idle workmen back to work, let us enact a high protective tariff for his protection and for the protection of our farmers and our manufacturers, and we will have approached nearer the millennium than ever before.

Just one more thought, and then we will dismiss the subject for this week. Contrary to a general belief, the present silver dollar is a legal tender for all debts, public and private, of whatever amount, except where otherwise specified in the contract.

At some future time we shall take up the question of "Ratio, Protection and Labor."

The Kansas City dailies should have accused Rev. J. A. Dearborn with slugging and stabbing himself, and with afterward pitching himself over the fence into the yard where he was found in an unconscious condition, if they had desired to be consistent. A Roman thug attempted to assassinate Mayor Davis last spring, and they immediately raised the cry that he shot his own hat. The assault on Rev. J. A. Dearborn will convince the people that those papers lied about Webster Davis. But they may expect these

murderous assaults as long as they permit the Roman corporation to be recognized as a political power; and the Roman church is always with the Democratic party.

WE DO NOT believe that the best element among our free silver friends will acquiesce in the attempt of some of the friends of Mr. Bryan to interrupt the meeting at the Coliseum Monday evening. The American people believe in free speech. Every man has a right to be heard in the expression of his opinion. The Bryan shouters disgraced themselves, their candidate and the city of Omaha.

SEPTEMBER 29th and 30th are the dates set for large Republican rallies in this city. Hon. John M. Thurston, General Dan. Sickles, General R. A. Alger and General Horace Porter will address the meetings. The county central committee expects a large number of people in attendance from other parts of this state and Iowa.

THE election in Maine Monday resulted in a Republican majority of over 45,000, and the return of every Republican congressman by increased majorities. It is also noticeable that dispatches published in the World-Herald Tuesday morning contained no mention of the matter. Why this discrimination?

THE best paper that has reached this office for many a day is Light, published in San Francisco, by W. E. Price. It is brim full of original matter, and every line contains a bomb for the hierarchy. May it always prosper.

"Mr. Facing-Both-Ways."

Referring to Rome's methods of attempting to be "all things to all men," the Boston Transcript says:

"There are intimations that Dr. McGlynn will not be placed over a parish in New York, but will be transferred to the jurisdiction of Cardinal Gibbons or Archbishop Ireland, or some other 'liberal' prelate. Such a transfer would be quite in accordance with the policy of Rome. Dr. McGlynn and Archbishop Corrigan would not get along together very well, and there might be a renewal of differences at which the faithful would be scandalized. Wherever Protestants are, in an overwhelming majority, the policy of the Vatican is too smooth over such affairs as the McGlynn episode, and to stimulate an indulgent liberality. In this case the priest who has given trouble might well be put under superiors who are personally popular with Americans, and who are, as well, more of a tact, not inclined to the conspicuous severity of discipline which Archbishop Corrigan believes in. The wise man of the Vatican know when to see and when not to see, when to frown and when to smile—a trifling difference that cannot be settled without a notoriety that will be inconvenient to the church. They are shrewd politicians and nice judges of expediency. They are all advancing the cause of the church and enforcing its pretensions.

"In the United States they conciliate public sentiment; in Spain they shape and direct the intensity of Spanish Catholicism for their own ends. The Spanish government is hesitating now as to authorizing the establishment of a Protestant church in Madrid. The papal nuncio in Spain, has protested against it; so have many individual lay Catholics; but the example of the latter is not so much to the point as that of the former, who represents the Vatican. Spain is the only typical Catholic country in Europe. In 1887, out of her population of 18,000,000, only about 7,000 were Protestants. Even in this year of progress, under her present constitution, public Protestant worship is forbidden. Protestants may meet in private houses to worship, but all public notices of their services are prohibited. The present premier, less bigoted than most of his countrymen, has been inclined to relax the severity of the laws so far as to authorize the establishment of a Protestant church, and all the ecclesiastics are up in arms against him. The contrast between the attitude of the Vatican in Spain and its attitude in the United States is instructive, but is not particularly startling to those familiar with the history of the Roman Catholic church."

Which is Right?

The Rev. J. B. Daly, in a lecture on "The Jesuit in Politics," pointedly says: "I have this to say to the Protestant who apologizes for Romanism (and Romanism is Jesuitism): If Protestantism is right—Romanism is wrong, and if Romanism is right Protestantism must be wrong. Both are antipodes of religious opinion. If there must be apologies for Romanism among Protestants, the Protestant Reformation was a gigantic mistake, and the millions of martyrs who died for religious liberty and an open Bible died in vain. If they died in vain, they were not only fanatics, but they were also fools. If Rome is right, then Protestant apologists for Romanism make a mistake in remaining in this country. Let them be consistent, and go to Spain, Portugal or South America. We can spare them, and Rome is welcome to them.—Tyler.