

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1899.

Number 40.

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.

Booth-Tucker's colonization scheme is an excellent subject for economic study. It appeals most forcibly to those self-styled "capitalists" whose capital consists of deeds to vacant land. They see money in it for themselves—unearned money—and are enthusiastic accordingly. Speaking in a newspaper interview of Booth-Tucker's scheme, the "industrial commissioner" of the Santa Fe, James R. Davis, explains that land purchased for the colony in the Arkansas Valley, "has doubled in value during the first year." There is the milk in this colonization cocoanut. As Mr. Davis puts it, "there is an enormous amount of idle fertile land awaiting colonization and development;" and "there is an enormous number of idle deserving people hoping for a future, and as many more eking out a miserable existence without a future." Booth-Tucker would bring these two economic forces together. It is the old idea to which Duganne gave voice when he sang: "Millions of hands want acres, and millions of acres want hands." But under the Booth-Tucker process, most of the profit will be garnered—as Industrial Commissioner Davis shows when he tells of the rapid increase in the value of the lands where colonization has begun—not by the hands that work the acres, but by the hands that monopolize them.

In a historical article in the Forum, intended as a special plea for American colonial governments in Spain's late possessions, Prof. McMaster, the historian, refers to the fundamental truths of the declaration of inde-

pendence as "ideals to be lived up to and gradually attained," but which were happily not applied by our predecessors and cannot wisely be applied by us. But what is the use of having ideals if it is never wise to act towards them at least if not up to them? And what kind of ideals must those be upon which we are to turn our backs whenever circumstances require us to act? If the ideals of the declaration of independence are truths, as McMaster admits them to be, then it is for us to live as close to them as we know how. If we fall short through ignorance, that is our misfortune; but if we fall short with premeditation and deliberation, it is our crime. Nor shall we find any palliation in the historical fact to which Prof. McMaster appeals, that our forefathers also fell short. We cannot attain to the ideals of the declaration of independence by ignoring them at every crisis. To attain to them even gradually, we must solve every new problem not in opposition to but in harmony with them.

In celebration of the New Year, plutocratic papers were crowded with facts and figures to show that the year 1898 had been extraordinarily prosperous. They certainly did show that trusts and monopolies had prospered amazingly. But there was not a word or a figure about workingmen's wages. To have said anything upon that phase of the subject would have completely "spoiled the preach." For in the midst of all the much vaunted prosperity of 1898, wages were nowhere raised, but in many places they were cut down; while strikes against reductions were numerous.

In the same issue of at least one daily paper which ostentatiously devoted a supplement to laudations of the prosperity of 1898, there appeared

a brief news item of a cotton mill strike in Augusta, Ga., against a reduction of wages. Wages were already so low that a man could scarcely earn a living, and children were working for 60 cents a week; yet the employers had undertaken to enforce a reduction of from 10 to 25 per cent. The consequent strike had been in progress four weeks.

In the face of their cry of prosperity the newspapers tell also of a great coal strike which they expect in the spring. This is explained by Thomas E. Young, Mark Hanna's coal manager. He says:

It is the intention of the operators to reduce the mining scale of wages. The operators cannot afford to maintain the present rate. The miners want a higher rate and the operators claim a reduction must be made. You can readily see the miners and operators are far apart, and there seems to be little chance of getting together.

Prosperity! Yes; but not for workmen. Rockefeller is said to have made profits aggregating \$30,000,000—\$82,000 a day. He is a type of the men who found 1898 a prosperous year. It was not in higher wages that prosperity made itself manifest; wages are as low, or lower, than before. It was not in legitimate competitive profits; legitimate business has been done at a lower rate of profits than before. All this is conceded. Even the wool industries, those special favorites of protection, are admitted by the Wool and Cotton Reporter to have been so bad in 1898 that "they have done well to make expenses." Trade journals have laboriously explained that a peculiarity of this era of prosperity is that business is done upon reduced profits and work at reduced wages. Where the prosperity has made itself manifest is in what in the patter of the exchange are called

values. There has been an "unprecedented increase in values." Increase in the values of what? Not of work, for wages are reduced. Not of competitive business, for profits are reduced. The increase has been in the values of monopoly "securities." The Goulds, for instance, have seen some of their railroad stock go up from \$10 a share to \$45. During the last week of the year tobacco trust stock was up to 154, as against 96 last year; Santa Fe preferred was at 52, as against 35; Chicago & Northwestern preferred at 191, as against 165; and Rock Island at 115, as against 97. But these higher values must be paid for by the masses of the people. They mean heavier burdens, not better times. "Values" have indeed risen, and men who have monopolized these values are prosperous; but that which creates and maintains all values, the work of the country, is more poorly paid. This is the kind of prosperity we have. It is the only kind that even the most enthusiastic prosperity touting newspaper shows any indication of our having. Is it the kind that Mr. McKinley promised?

It may not be easy at first for democratic democrats outside of Chicago to perceive the vital importance of ex-Gov. Altgeld's "Municipal Ownership and Chicago Platform" campaign for the mayoralty. To some, the more exceptionally ignorant or innocent, it might even appear that Altgeld is actuated by a consuming desire to be mayor. Others, who have the sense to realize that such an office could have no attractions for him, might nevertheless be irritated at what may seem to them his willingness to make trouble in the party over a question of local politics. These critics should understand at once that Altgeld is making "trouble" for the sake of holding the democratic party up to its radical standards, and that without the "trouble" he is making it will be restored to its old place as the assistant republican party.

The plain truth is that Flower,

Whitney, Gorman and their crowd, reenforced by Croker, and using Mayor Harrison as their cat's paw, are planning to undo the convention work of 1896. Their plan contemplates the making of a "broad-gauge platform," one so "broad" that, as with the democratic platforms prior to 1896, anybody can stand upon it. With nothing in it against gold, it is to furnish standing room for gold men; with nothing in it in favor of gold, it is to hold silver men in line; with soft words for "labor," it is to welcome the "sons of toil;" with a straddle on the currency, it is to make a tell-tale seat for both the Indianapolis currency reformers and greenbackers; and with a word and a wink about monopolies, it at once is to secure anti-monopoly votes and monopoly campaign funds.

Strange as it may seem, one of the very important conditions to the success of this plan is the reelection of young Harrison to the mayoralty of Chicago. That will not seem so strange, however, when the circumstances are considered. With the patronage of the Chicago city hall, and the money that Flower's crowd would freely supply, Harrison could carry the primaries of Cook county against overwhelming odds. The plotters would then control nearly one-third of the Illinois state convention; and they would have no difficulty in picking up enough additional delegates through the state to make a majority. In that way, contrary to the will of the vast majority of the democrats of the state, Illinois would be swung into line at the next democratic national convention, in opposition to the platform of 1896, and in support of the Flowers and Whitneys and Crokers. Harrison's election next spring as mayor means a democratic right-about-face in 1900. It were better for the democratic party that a republican mayor of Chicago should be elected than that Harrison should secure this advantage for Flower, Whitney and Croker.

But neither Harrison nor a repub-

lican need be elected. If the democratic democrats of Chicago do their part, and the democratic democrats of the nation, instead of worrying encourage them, Altgeld can, in spite of the machine, be elected mayor of Chicago upon the basis of municipal ownership and the Chicago platform. The principle of municipal ownership can thus be established in the metropolis of the west, with the same blow that frustrates the plottings of monopolists against the democracy of the democratic party.

One of Mr. McKinley's journalistic valets lately indulged, in the Chicago Tribune, in one of the neatest bits of snob writing that has recently fallen under our eye. It is worth preserving:

Mrs. McKinley's dressmaker came over from New York to-day and spent several hours with "the first lady of the land," trying on new gowns. While in the white house, the dressmaker's carriage, which was a hired one, drove off. She barely had time to catch her train, and as the president's carriage was waiting for him, he gracefully put it at the disposal of the New York dressmaker, who entered it and drove off with as much grace as if she were accustomed to have the president's equipage at her disposal every day.

To appreciate the delicacy of this tribute to Mr. McKinley's aristocratic condescension, we must think of some wealthy woman in the place of the dressmaker. Wouldn't Mr. McKinley under similar circumstances have put his carriage at her disposal just as gracefully? And wouldn't the lines quoted above have been devoid in that case of all newspaper interest? What is it then that gives them newspaper interest and space in the case of the dressmaker, except that she was a dressmaker—an inferior mortal?

Mr. Bryan talks like an orator, says Harper's Weekly, when he advises that the Spanish treaty of peace be ratified and that the fight against imperialism be made afterwards. Harper's thinks that after the treaty is ratified there will be only one duty for patriotic citizens, and that will be to devote all their political energy and intelligence to providing good government for what is called our