

THE PEOPLE'S PILOT.

FOR THE FREE AND UNLIMITED COINAGE OF SILVER AND GOLD AT THE PARITY RATIO OF SIXTEEN TO ONE WITHOUT REFERENCE TO ANY OTHER NATION ON EARTH.

VOL. VI.

RENSSELAER IND., THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1896.

NUMBER 1.

The Republican Party's Abandonment of American Principles.

From the American (Republican).

The republican convention is of the past. Marked by a general listlessness and an utter want of enthusiasm, the St. Louis Convention, assembled, registered the will of the bosses and has gone. Contests over the political supremacy of this boss and that, and the bickerings over the phraseology of the financial plank of the platform were fought out between the old bosses and the new. The Convention ratified their conclusions and carried out without hitch or turn the cut and dried program laid before them.

Yet the adoption of the platform, with its financial plank pledging the Republican party to the maintenance of the appreciating gold standard, marked an epoch in the history of the party. Indeed, it marked the disruption of the Republican party as such. Only eight years ago the Republican party, by its representatives in National Convention assembled, pledged itself to bimetallism, the Republican platform of 1888 declaring that "The Republican party is in favor of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic (Cleveland) Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver."

But on this and all similar declarations pledging the party to bimetallism, the Republican party has turned its back and at the behest of the money cliques it has taken up the advocacy of gold-monometallism and pledged itself to maintain the present gold standard of value to the infinite injury of the producing classes, but to the great profit of the money-lending and credit-lending cliques.

The Republican party having thus become subservient to the dictation of foreign money cliques and their American allies, can no longer receive the support of conscientious bimetallists. The bolt of the silver Republicans from the Convention, though small itself, presages the defeat of the Republican party at the polls, for the great numbers of bimetallic Republicans who have hitherto acted with that party, but who are resolved to free our people from a financial policy dictated in the interests of the creditor classes, and that unperceived, is through gradual steps of poverty, suffering, degradation and despair, reducing our producing classes to abject dependence on the money cliques, cannot support the candidate of the Republican party.

Such bimetallists, as well as the great body of the Populists, will gladly support the nominee of the Democratic party if that party will make it possible for them to do so. To make it possible the Chicago Convention must rise above partisanship and act, not as a Democratic Convention, but as a Convention representing the bimetallists of all parties. If it does so and nominates a Presidential candidate who will be acceptable to all bimetallists, and whose nomination will be enthusiastically endorsed by the Populist and Silver Conventions to be held in St. Louis on July 22, the election of such candidate by a decisive majority will be assured.

The platform adopted by the Republican Convention can command little respect. The arraignment of the Democratic Administration is drawn up with little regard to fact. We are ostentatiously told that incapacity in the administration of our finances has led to a deficit in revenue and the piling up of an indebtedness of \$262,000,000 in time of peace, forced an adverse balance of trade and kept a perpetual menace hanging over the redemption fund. We are left to understand that the drain on our gold for export leading to a constant menace to the gold reserve arose out of the prospective and actual cutting down of tariff duties and a resulting adverse balance of trade. As a matter of fact, such adverse balance of trade has not existed. During the fiscal year 1893—nine months of which was under the wise and beneficent fiscal administration of President Harrison—there was an adverse balance of trade amounting to \$18,737,728. Since then the balance of trade has been much in our favor, \$237,145,950 for the fiscal year 1894, \$75,563,200 for 1895, and over \$90,000,000 for the first eleven months of the fiscal year.

The drain on our gold reserve cannot, therefore, be attributed to an adverse balance of trade resulting from the repeal of the McKinley law, for such adverse balance did not exist. It is true that an indebtedness of \$262,000,000 has been piled up by the present Administration, but such increase of our indebtedness is the result of a fiscal policy inaugurated by Mr. Harrison and his Secretary, Mr. Foster, not by Mr. Cleveland. In 1889, when Mr. Harrison was inaugurated, the gold reserve in the Treasury stood at nearly \$190,000,000. When he turned the Administration over to Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Carlisle found but little more than the traditional \$100,000,000 of gold in the Treasury and available for redemptions. The Republican party was only saved from inaugurating the policy of replenishing the gold reserve by borrowing by

the opportune ending of the Administration of Mr. Harrison, which enabled Mr. Foster to shift the responsibilities that confronted him on to the shoulders of Mr. Carlisle. It was Mr. Foster, not Mr. Carlisle, who sowed the seeds of financial chaos. It was the policy inaugurated by Mr. Foster of paying Treasury notes in gold, and discarding the silver in the Treasury as an available asset, that made our currency system too heavy—left our narrow gold reserve quite inadequate to support the increased burdens thrown upon it, and led to the drain on our gold reserve.

Mr. Carlisle merely followed in the steps of Mr. Foster. One step more in office and Mr. Foster would have issued bonds. That it was his intention to do so is proven by the preparation of plates by his order in anticipation of an early bond issue. Yet now the Republican Convention condemns Mr. Carlisle for following in the footsteps of Mr. Harrison and Mr. Foster.

It is true we have experienced during Mr. Cleveland's Administration panic, blighted industry and prolonged depression, closed factories, reduced work and wages, halted enterprise and general distress. But all the suffering, misery and distress through which our producing classes have passed had its origin, not in any policy inaugurated by Mr. Cleveland, for Mr. Cleveland has merely carried out the financial policy inaugurated by his Republican predecessor. Blame for the chronic hard times should rest equally with Mr. Harrison and Mr. Cleveland. It was Mr. Harrison and Mr. Foster, not Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle, who inaugurated the payment of Treasury notes in gold, who put silver as a money metal available for redemption purposes, and who put silver aside as a money metal available for redemption purposes, and who put, as near as might be, our currency on a gold basis. The export of gold, the drain on the Treasury gold, and under Mr. Cleveland the replenishing of the depleted gold reserve by borrowing, was but the logical outcome of this policy. Silver being discarded and an increased demand thrown upon gold, gold appreciated and prices fell, gloom, panic, distress, poverty, settled over our producing classes. And for this appreciation of gold Mr. Cleveland is no more responsible than Mr. Harrison.

All through Mr. Harrison's Administration, gold flowed away from our shores. And so, also has gone during the years of Mr. Cleveland's Administration. And why? Not because of high tariff or low tariff; not because of McKinley tariff or Wilson tariff, for gold went under high tariff and under low tariff, it went under McKinley tariff and under Wilson tariff, but simply because the fall of prices, resulting from the appreciation of gold, increased the burden of our foreign debts—simply because the fall in prices destroyed the debt-paying power of our exports. We increased the quantity of our exports, from year to year, but the increase in quantity was absorbed in the yawning gulf of falling prices; more wheat, more cotton did it take to pay our debts, from year to year, so in spite of increased exports, such increase fell short of meeting our interest charges on our foreign debt, and gold went to settle the balance.

It is the appreciation of gold, not tariff, that has led to the troubles of our Treasury and the distress of our people, and for the appreciation of gold Mr. Harrison and Mr. Foster are equally as responsible as Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle.

In view of the bounty conferred on exports from silver-using countries to gold-using countries, owing to the premium on gold, the Protection plank in the platform is farcical. Under the gold standard a protective tariff can be but a mere sham, and it is folly to advocate gold monometallism and protection at one and the same time. The republican party, as set forth in the platform adopted, proposes to protect our producers by levying tariff duties against imports from foreign countries. Yet, with the other hand, they hold out to the producers of silver-using countries a bounty on all imports from such countries equal to the divergence in the value of gold and silver. Thus, with one hand, they propose to build up a protective barrier, and with the other pull it down; for they declare their purpose to adhere to the gold standard with the inevitable result that gold must further appreciate, thus leading to a greater divergence in the value of gold and silver, and a still greater bounty on imports from silver-using to gold-using countries. Moreover, our surplus of agricultural products finds a market in Europe, where they are sold in competition with the products of silver-using countries, and the premium on gold has enabled our competitors to cut prices in half. Thus have our farmers and planters been impoverished, and being impoverished how can they buy freely of manufactured goods?

The home market for manufacturers must be made worth having before protection and the preservation of such markets to our manufacturers

Continued on Page 4.

Facts for Democrats.

From the Rocky Mountain News, June 15.

In selecting a presidential candidate, what is the wise course for the democratic party to pursue? If it does not care for success except it be with some life-long democrat at the head of the ticket, then the course is to nominate one, and take the chances of defeat—which are as five to one in its favor. If it regards the restoration of free coinage as the greatest boon that can be now conferred upon the country, and it champions it, and it desires to carry the country and give it free coinage, then a strong and popular candidate should not be rejected because he has not heretofore been a member of the party—provided he is a leader in the silver cause.

It is true we have experienced during Mr. Cleveland's Administration panic, blighted industry and prolonged depression, closed factories, reduced work and wages, halted enterprise and general distress. But all the suffering, misery and distress through which our producing classes have passed had its origin, not in any policy inaugurated by Mr. Cleveland, for Mr. Cleveland has merely carried out the financial policy inaugurated by his Republican predecessor. Blame for the chronic hard times should rest equally with Mr. Harrison and Mr. Cleveland. It was Mr. Harrison and Mr. Foster, not Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle, who inaugurated the payment of Treasury notes in gold, who put silver as a money metal available for redemption purposes, and who put silver aside as a money metal available for redemption purposes, and who put, as near as might be, our currency on a gold basis. The export of gold, the drain on the Treasury gold, and under Mr. Cleveland the replenishing of the depleted gold reserve by borrowing, was but the logical outcome of this policy. Silver being discarded and an increased demand thrown upon gold, gold appreciated and prices fell, gloom, panic, distress, poverty, settled over our producing classes. And for this appreciation of gold Mr. Cleveland is no more responsible than Mr. Harrison.

Let it be conceded that the democrats will declare for free coinage at Chicago and have votes enough to nominate a free coinage candidate. Is it not probable that if some old-time dyed-in-the-wool democrat is nominated he will be defeated? Opinions upon the result of the election in advance of it are matters of judgement, and such judgment will be sound or the reverse, as it is based on facts and occurrences that logically justify the deduction.

The total number of votes in the electoral college will be 447, of which it will require 224 to elect a president. It is conceded at the very outset that there are 172 votes which only a republican or gold standard candidate can receive. They are as follows:

Connecticut	3
Pennsylvania	3
Maine	1
Maryland	1
Massachusetts	15
Minnesota	9
New Hampshire	4
New Jersey	16
New York	23
Ohio	23
Pennsylvania	32
Rhode Island	4
Vermont	12
Wisconsin	12
Total	172

It is claimed by democrats that a democratic candidate will with absolute certainty receive 148 electoral votes, as follows:

Arkansas	1
Alabama	11
Florida	4
Georgia	13
Louisiana	17
Mississippi	9
Missouri	17
North Carolina	11
South Carolina	9
Tennessee	12
Texas	15
Virginia	12
West Virginia	6
Total	148

It is upon this basis that all democratic calculations commence. Starting here, democratic statisticians turn to the states not enumerated from which to fill out the complement of votes necessary to elect. These cast 127 electoral votes, and are as follows:

Colorado	9
Idaho	3
Illinois	2
Indiana	15
Iowa	13
Kansas	10
Michigan	14
Montana	3
Nebraska	3
Nevada	3
North Dakota	3
Oregon	4
South Dakota	4
Utah	4
Washington	3
Wyoming	3
Total	127

It is true that a democratic candidate can count with certainty upon the 148 votes enumerated in the second table, then he would require 76 votes from the states enumerated in the third table, or nearly two-thirds of them—a hard enough proposition at best; for all but Indiana are under normal conditions republican, and to secure more than one half the votes they

cast for a democratic candidate would indicate a phenomenal disturbance of the political balance as they usually exist.

But the basis of the democratic count is not sound. There are at least five of the fourteen states included in the second table which are very unlikely to vote for the democratic candidate unless he is a man acceptable to the populists and silver republicans in them. Without their assistance he cannot possibly carry more than one out of the five.

The states referred to are Texas, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, and Alabama. The vote cast in these states in 1894, and the relation of political parties in them, when they are fairly understood, emphasize this prediction.

In 1894 the democrats of Texas cast 214,882 votes. The populists cast 159,224. The democratic plurality over the populists was but 55,658. In Texas the democratic party is split on the silver question. The gold standard, or Cleveland wing, has organized to fight free coinage at every hazard. It is organizing in every county. It will nominate a separate state ticket and vote for republican electors. This faction constitutes not less than 25 per cent of the democratic strength. Deduct it from the democratic vote of 1894 and they would outvote the populists less than 2,000.

What will become of a democratic candidate in Texas who is not acceptable to the populists? The populist and the republican vote of the state would jointly exceed the democratic vote many thousands. There is no good feeling between the democrats and populists of Texas anyway, and it will require the wisest of counsels and the most acceptable of candidates to unite the vote as it should be, in view of the grave interests at stake.

In Tennessee the democratic vote was 104,356 and the republican vote 103,104. The republican plurality was 758. The populists cast 23,095. Tennessee is the home of Congressman Patterson. Under his leadership and the power of his administration, to put the defection of gold democrats at 15 per cent is conservative. This would take from the democratic vote more than 15,000 which added to the republican vote, as it most likely will be, would give the state to the republicans by 30,000. Must not, to make Tennessee safe, the nominee of the Chicago convention be acceptable to the populists and the silver republicans? It is foolhardy to assume that any free silver democrat, who ever he may be, will meet the requirements.

North Carolina was carried by united populists and free coinage republican votes in 1894. The democrats cast 127,593 votes, while the fusion ticket received 148,324. The moral of this condition in the tar-heel state is seen without enlargement.

There were cast for the people's party ticket in Georgia two years ago, 96,888 votes. Tom Watson and other influential men led the Georgia populists. In 1894 the democrats polled but 121,049 votes or less than 25,000 more than did the populists. Is a democratic candidate who is obnoxious to the populists certain to carry Georgia, however loyal he may be to silver? Hoke Smith and other administration democratic leaders will deter 35 per cent of Georgia democrats from voting the ticket. How can a majority vote be obtained for silver in this empire state of the south unless a candidate who can unite the silver vote is selected?

Alabama is not far behind Georgia in the precarious condition of its politics. In 1894 the democrats polled there 110,865 votes and the populists 88,283. There were at the last election but 27,000 more democrats than populists in Alabama. After deducting from the democratic vote of that year, say 15 per cent, a very low estimate, the majority is nearly destroyed. If any combination should be made there between populists and republicans, the democracy is in a hopeless minority.

So much for the south. The outlook in the west and northwest for a straight democratic

victory is even more discouraging.

Of the seventeen western and north-western states, casting 127 electoral votes, and out of which nearly 100 votes must be secured to make at all certain the election of a democrat, in eleven of them the democratic party is a bad third in the popular vote. The vote in these eleven states in 1894 was as follows:

Rep.	People's	Dem.
Colorado	86,957	66,712
Idaho	10,208	7,121
Kansas	148,697	118,329
Minnesota	147,944	87,531
Montana	22,163	15,505
Nebraska	18,095	70,596
Nevada	3,861	5,233
North Dakota	26,723	9,554
Oregon	41,084	26,083
South Dakota	40,401	25,568
Washington	34,221	25,146
		14,271
Combined		1,096,858
Rep. and		154,271
Populist		
vote		
Colorado	153,099	6,677
Idaho	17,339	7,057
Kansas	267,026	28,709
Minnesota	235,875	53,579
Montana	37,668	10,714
Nebraska	149,722	10,214
Nevada	9,034	678
North Dakota	33,077	8,118
Oregon	67,067	17,498
South Dakota	66,959	8,756
Washington	59,422	14,271
Total		

The above figures should suggest this question to democrats who place the cause of bimetallism above the gratification of party pride: "Is it reasonable to expect that the political party which cast but 154,271 votes in 1894, as against 1,096,858 cast by the other two parties in these eleven states, can secure even one-fourth of their electoral votes by nominating a free coinage candidate, if he shall prove distasteful to the populists and free coinage republicans, of whose votes they must obtain more than twice as many as they cast themselves in the last election at which they tried conclusions?"

How about the seven other out of the seventeen possible states in the west and north-west? They are California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Utah and Wyoming. California is by far the most certain of them for any silver candidate the party will name.

But in Illinois the republican plurality was 133,427. The populists cast 59,676. Deduct 20 per cent from the democratic vote for goldbug disaffection, and the democracy must win over from populists and republicans not less than 150,000 votes to carry the state. If the vote of 1896 should equal that of 1894, less the 20 per cent for disaffection, the democratic candidate would be more than 300,000 votes behind that of the combined opposition.

In Indiana it is not much more reassuring. In 1894 the republicans cast 238,405 votes, the democrats 238,732 and the populists 29,388. The democrats were beaten nearly 50,000 by the republicans. Deduct from the democratic vote of this 20 per cent representing the gold faction, and it would be over 100,000 votes behind the republican—if the republican vote is relatively the same as last year. Here are nearly 100,000 votes to gain. They must come from republicans and populists.

In the Hawkeye state the proportion is worse for the democracy. Upon a much smaller total vote than that cast in Indiana, the