

Republican Prosperity

A Republican Organ
Admits That it is a Sham
—Masses Not so Prosper-
ous as in 1897

The Chicago Inter-Ocean is a stalwart republican paper, and doubtless many of its readers were surprised to read in the Inter-Ocean of September 16 an editorial in which serious question is raised as to the genuineness of the prosperity concerning which republican leaders boast.

In the beginning, the Inter-Ocean says:

"Ever since 1897 this nation, on the surface, has prospered as never before. Farmers have found eager markets at profitable prices. Capitalists have added to their wealth. Labor has been able to use, as never before, the power of organization to raise wages."

Then this republican paper offends beyond all hope of pardon by saying: "Yet it may be doubted if one-half the heads of American families are in as favorable a position as they were in 1897." The Inter-Ocean's explanation is that "the third party—the majority who are neither capitalists nor able to fortify themselves behind labor union walls—is today giving more proportionately than in 1897, while getting only the same."

Then this republican paper points out that—

"When capitalists combine to raise prices, reduce expenses, or anticipate profits it is this third party that pays the higher prices, stands the reduction of expenses, and converts the anticipated profits into actual ones."

The Inter-Ocean says that "every flotation of corporation securities depends for its ultimate success upon the ability of men of moderate incomes to buy and hold the securities;" and according to the Inter-Ocean "the burden of every advance in wages secured by organized labor is ultimately shifted upon the unorganized third party."

Having gone this far, the editor of the Inter-Ocean evidently concluded that he might as well be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb, and so he added:

"The steadily declining prices of practically all securities are primarily due to the fact that this third party, or middle class, is unable to save as it was a few years ago."

"What the American people need to learn is that prosperity cannot be made permanent by artificial organizations of any kind—by neither trusts nor labor unions—which leave out of consideration the majority of the people."

"The plain truth is that fully one-half the workers of the United States—the men whose incomes are from \$600 to \$3,000 a year, the men who are neither in trusts nor labor unions, have not been getting their share of the national prosperity. They are working for the prosperity of capital and organized labor, but no one is working for them. And under this burden they are becoming exhausted."

Democratic editors have been read out of "good society" by republican newspapers because they dared to question the genuineness of present day prosperity; and some of the things which the Inter-Ocean has said would be worthy of widespread publication.

Let it be remembered that while this republican paper says "ever since 1897 this nation, on the surface, has prospered as never before," it presents several striking "buts."

For instance, "ever since 1897 this nation, on the surface, has prospered as never before."

But—"The middle class is unable to save as it was a few years ago."

But—"Under this burden fully one-half the workers of the United States have not been getting their share of the national prosperity."

But—"And under this burden fully one-half the workers of the United States are becoming exhausted."

But—"Whenever laboring men through the power of organization are able to obtain an increase in wages in order to meet the increase in

the cost of living, that portion of the people described by the Inter-Ocean as "fully one-half the workers of the United States" are required to bear the burden.

But—the middle classes, those who are not able to obtain increased wages, are today "giving more proportionately than in 1897 while getting only the same."

Although "ever since 1897 this nation, on the surface, has prospered as never before," according to the Inter-Ocean the American people "need to learn that prosperity cannot be made permanent by artificial organizations of any kind—by neither trusts nor labor unions—which leave out of consideration the majority of the people"

The Washington Post, while posing as an independent paper, is very generally regarded as a republican organ. The Post refers to this particular editorial in the Inter-Ocean as "the most serious arraignment of the republican party that has come under our (the Post's) observation for many a day." The Post refers to the Inter-Ocean as—

"One of the most intensely partisan and truly loyal of our (the Post's) republican contemporaries. We can name no other republican paper whose devotion to the party exceeds that of the Inter-Ocean. Something akin to that strong sense of duty which sometimes impels a fond mother to ply the slipper on the ampler part of her wayward little boy's anatomy must have forced the Inter-Ocean to inflict this flagellation on the back and shoulders of the g. o. p. If what our Chicago contemporary says be true, our boasted prosperity is not much of a blessing after all."

Quoting several paragraphs from the Inter-Ocean's editorial, the Post adds its own indorsement in this way: "That is, as the Inter-Ocean says, 'the plain truth.' But the men who control the dominant party still shout 'Let well enough alone,' 'Stand pat,' 'Hands off.'"

Malignant Partisanship.

President Roosevelt is rapidly acquiring an unenviable reputation as a malignant partisan. In his speech at the opening of the St. Louis exposition he studiously avoided giving any credit to Jefferson for the purchase of the Louisiana territory. The only reference he made to the great American who wrote the Declaration of Independence, added a vast domain to the United States, founded the democratic party and for twenty-five years was the principal factor in the political life of America—the only reference to this illustrious character was an incidental one. There could be no reason for this slight except the president's desire to avoid even a complimentary reference to a democrat.

In his speech at the battlefield of Antietam, however, the president went even farther in his attempt to ignore a democratic character. On that occasion he paid a tribute to the valor of the New Jersey soldiers, mentioned General Lee, President Lincoln, General Slocum, General Grant, and General Greene—going so far as to mention by name General Greene's son, who now holds a position by republican appointment—but in all the speech he never mentioned the name of General McClellan, who commanded the Union forces on that occasion and showed a military skill that gave him a fixed place in the military annals of the nation. General McClellan was the democratic candidate for the presidency in 1864 and his son is a democratic member of congress. These facts may explain why President Roosevelt so studiously avoided a mention of his name. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the

Hero of San Juan Hill to say that he did not know who commanded the Union forces at that time. As General McClellan's name was naturally and necessarily connected with the battlefield, the president can only excuse his failure to mention him by saying that a democrat, no matter how great or conspicuous, is not worthy to be complimented or even mentioned by the republican president of the United States.

There is at least one consolation to be drawn from the president's conduct at Antietam, namely, that he has reached the limit of malignant partisanship and that the public can rest easy in the belief that there is no depth beyond to which he can fall. He is at the bottom.

"High Silver and Cotton."

Under the above title the New York Commercial of September 10 discusses the effect of the rise in silver on the price of cotton and cotton manufacture. That paper points out that a rise in silver enables those who live in silver-using countries to buy more of American products for the same amount of money, and it is argued that this fact is stimulating our trade in the Orient. The editorial is presented in full on another page of this issue and it will be interesting reading to those republicans who argue that the silver miner is the only man benefited by a rise in silver. The advocates of the gold standard have all along contended that the silver question was merely a miners' question, and that the public generally had no interest in the rise of silver. The Commercial's editorial shows that one of our great industries is immediately benefited by a rise in silver bullion in the eastern hemisphere, and those who have studied the money question know that the farmer who exports grain and other farm products in competition with silver-using countries is also benefited by the rise in silver.

The bimetallicists can point to two recent vindications; first, to the fact that silver rose in price when the demand for silver was increased by the legislation that provided for the purchase of silver for Philippine coinage; and, second, by the advantage which higher silver brings to those who are exporting to Asia. And yet the blind representatives of plutocracy will go on prating about the impossibility of raising the price of silver by legislation.

"Asset Currency."

A constant reader wants to know the "plain meaning of an asset currency, and how it compares with our present system of currency." The term "asset currency" is used to describe the currency which the bankers are now proposing, namely, a currency which does not rest upon government bonds as the present currency does, but merely upon the assets of the bank. The currency is printed by the government and issued to the bank with no security fund back of it except a general lien upon the assets of the bank. As the proposition has not been embodied in a law yet it is impossible to speak of it in detail, but this much is evident: if the government does not guarantee the currency it may become worthless if the officials of the bank abscond with the assets. If, on the other hand, the government guarantees the currency, the bank gets the benefit and the people represented by the government run all the risks.

The Jefferson League of Indiana.

The Jefferson League of Indiana, which aims to "commemorate the birth of Thomas Jefferson and to promote in every legitimate manner the success of the democratic party, its principles and its candidates," has been organized in Indiana. Its officers are Edgar L. Maines, Zionsville, president; William J. Reister, Evansville, vice president; Claude G. Bowers, Terre Haute, secretary, and U. S. Jackson, Greenfield, treasurer.