

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1899.

Number 43.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

By what right does the administration at this time establish a censorship over political news between the United States and the Philippines? When a censorship was established last summer, no one complained. That censorship was for the protection of military secrets from discovery by a public enemy. But this one is totally different. There is no public enemy now, and the only possible object of the censorship is to protect political secrets from discovery by our own people. The censorship last summer was against Spain; the present one is against ourselves. How long does congress intend to allow the war department thus to govern in civil affairs in time of peace?

When the ballot is offered to women in some restricted way, as for school board officers, and the subsequent voting by women is light, opponents of woman suffrage chivalrously infer that few women want to vote. The fact is ignored that men stay away in large numbers from the polls on off years and at other unexciting elections. So on the other hand is the fact ignored that where woman suffrage is general, as in Colorado and Wyoming, women vote as freely as men. But ignorance cannot always prevail. The experience of Ireland is now to be added to that of Colorado and Wyoming. At the municipal elections which recently came off in Ireland the vote of women was very large. One of the London correspondents for the American press cables that among the most noticeable features of the contests was "the keen

desire displayed by women in the elections."

Eastern democrats who are democrats, and not mere partisans of a political machine, are beginning to congratulate themselves upon the election last fall of Roosevelt. There is not a little sense in the reasoning by which their conclusion is reached. Had Judge Van Wyck, the Tammany candidate, been elected, it is argued, he would have been heralded by Croker as the democrat who could carry New York; and then the whole east would have been invited to make him their presidential candidate. Through him, therefore, the Flowers and Whitneys might have stepped back into power in the national democratic party. Whether or not this would have been a result of Van Wyck's election, it is by no means unlikely that it is what Croker and his Wall street pals were playing for; and the wonder is that monopoly did not catch on to the idea, and give Roosevelt the cold shoulder, especially as Roosevelt's election could not but disturb the hopes for 1900 of McKinley, who is a far more adaptable tool of monopoly at the white house than Roosevelt would be. But monopolists as a body are not far sighted. They begin life every morning. The future, even the near future, they leave to take care of itself.

Senator Foraker, of Ohio, has now declared explicitly in the senate that when he spoke against the assumption by the United States of sovereignty over the Philippines in perpetuity, he spoke only for himself, and without any intention or desire of posing as the representative of the president. We had suspected as much. Nevertheless, Mr. Foraker succeeded wonderfully well in what his purpose probably was—demoralizing the administration in its Philippine policy.

Mr. Foraker's speech forced a halt in the president's headlong rush to make the flag float forever over a foreign people, regardless of their wishes. Under all the circumstances, inclusive of the well known fact that the other senator from Ohio, Mr. Hanna, does represent the administration, there was something delicious in Mr. Foraker's insinuating remark, when declaring he had not spoken for the administration, that the contrary supposition "was due, perhaps, to a misunderstanding as to which of the Ohio senators was speaking."

It is an old saying that "where there is smoke there must be fire." Duly impressed with the truth of this adage, we have looked expectantly, lo, these many months, for evidences of that prosperity which the plutocratic papers proclaim so vociferously, but to the presence of which among the people they bear no substantial testimony. We have looked in vain. Among the masses of the people there is an entire absence of any evidence of prosperity. The coal miners have been on the edge of a great strike for a slight increase of wages; but, confronted with threats of reduction, appear to have decided to take what they can get and risk nothing. And numerous minor instances of fruitless attempts to get higher wages are reported; while the "want ads" that fill the columns of the papers, indicate the eagerness of the unemployed for work. Even discharged soldiers find working opportunities exceedingly scarce. While they were at the front, their places were filled, and now they are hopeless beggars for jobs. Those at the relief barracks in Chicago have been cruelly accused of shirking employment from sheer laziness; but this the soldiers resent, and the superintendent of the relief barracks corroborates them. They

say it is almost impossible to get work, even for a day or so, much less a steady job. That they are telling the truth, every one who wants work knows and none who employ workmen will dare deny. Opportunities for work are scarce. If positive general proof were needed, we have it in the most convincing form. Wages have not risen. There can be no better proof. If there were any marked increase in the demand for workers, there would be an upward tendency in wages. Notwithstanding all the exclamations about our magnificent prosperity, there is no prosperity for the great masses of the people.

Nevertheless, there is a species of prosperity. Back of all the smoke there is indeed some fire. At last we have learned what the prosperity touters mean by prosperity. They mean that a few men, men who are little or nothing but industrial parasites, whose fortunes represent so much wealth extorted from its earners—they mean that these men are enormously prosperous. "It is raining gold in Wall street!" shouted one of the newspaper touters last week. "Stocks are towering!" "On every hand can be heard stories of millions made!" are exclamations that may be distinguished above the din. One man in New York who pawned his wife's jewelry a year ago, is now worth \$5,000,000. Another rose from comparative poverty to affluence in a few weeks. Corporation stocks have increased in value by the millions and tens of millions, sugar trust stock being well up in the list. Roswell P. Flower is richer within a few weeks by \$10,000,000, and James R. Keene by \$5,000,000; while John D. Rockefeller adds \$30,000,000 to his hoard, and the Vanderbilts, another Rockefeller, Russell Sage, one of the Goulds, and some of the smaller fry count their gains at from \$200,000 to \$20,000,000 apiece. The premiums on original subscriptions to some of the trusts are at 79 for steel and wire, 62 for biscuit, 80 for glucose, 37 for Federal steel, 35½ for tin plate, and 19

for carbon. And this is what the touters call prosperity! Prosperity it is, to be sure; but for whom, and at whose expense? Not for the workers, but for the few who know how to plunder them. Not at the expense of the labor of those who gain, but at the expense of the labor of those who must ultimately lose.

We say this in no reckless spirit. It is the sober truth. Aside from all the evidences on every hand of pinching poverty, which so plainly deny the presence of general prosperity, there is proof of general poverty in the very fact of these increased fortunes. What do the fortunes mean? If Roswell P. Flower has made \$10,000,000 does it mean that he has added \$10,000,000 to the world's wealth? He would not claim it. It means that he owns corporation stock which draws an increase of income in labor products sufficient to capitalize into \$10,000,000. Flower's increased power, that is to say, of annually extorting wealth from its producers, is worth \$10,000,000. It doesn't mean even that so much more wealth is or is to be produced; but only that he commands the power of taking that much more from current production, whether current production grow or not. It may mean, and probably does mean, that by so much as his fortune has increased, the earnings of unknown millions are diminished. It certainly means that their earnings are not increased. And to that they themselves can testify. Yet this is the magnificent prosperity we hear so much about!

Premier Reid, of New South Wales, did not wholly succeed, it appears, in reversing his free trade policy in order to make up a deficit, a subject to which we referred editorially in our issue of December 24. The New South Wales parliament resisted him, and to a degree held him in check. The tariff of 6 cents on tea, which he proposed, was reduced to 2 cents; his proposed rice tariff of nearly \$15 a ton, was rejected; and he found it necessary to abandon his proposition

to put a tariff upon coffee, cocoa, and chicory. The Melbourne Beacon speaks of "the refusal of so large a number of his followers, democratic free traders and labor members, to endorse his proposals in their entirety," as "a summary lesson to the refractory premier, and an indication of how deep is the hold of the free trade policy he has done so much to extend in New South Wales."

For lightning change artists, your real estate tax payer is without a superior. When questions of disbursing public revenue are up, he is in a front pew, insisting upon having pretty much everything to say, and even blandly proposing to shut off "non-taxpayers" from having any say at all. His argument then, is that as he alone pays real estate taxes he alone should determine their expenditure. But when it is proposed to increase the burden of taxes, presto! and no longer a tax payer, he pleads with tears in his eyes that this thing be not done, because the increased tax would be added to the rent of his tenants. Now, if the increased tax would be added to rents, then present real estate taxes must also be an addition to rent, and it is the tenant and not the owner who pays it. Upon that theory, to adopt the favorite argument of real estate men, all of them ought to be disfranchised and questions of the disbursement of real estate taxes be left to their tenants.

The simple fact is, that one part of a tenant's rent, that which he pays for house accommodations as distinguished from site, does include taxes. If taxes on houses were abolished, his rent would be by that much reduced; if increased, his rent would be by that much rise. As to taxes on houses, then, the occupants are the real tax payers. But not so with sites. If taxes on sites were increased, there would be no increase of rent; if they were completely abolished, there would be no decrease of rent. Taxes on sites, therefore, are a burden not upon tenants, but upon owners. But as the value of sites is produced by the