

The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

Volume VIII Number 417

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1906.

EDITORIAL:

Chicago's civic motto.....	867
Dangerous immigration.....	867
The Federal police power.....	867
Taxation of borrowing by borrowers.....	867
Mayor Dunne and his critics.....	867
Mr. Bryan on Individualism versus Socialism.....	867
Mr. Jerome and his insurance grafted friends.....	868
Better days a-coming.....	868
The traction referendum at the pending Chicago election.....	869
Successful municipal ownership.....	869
Encouraging real estate improvements.....	870
The cause of hard times.....	870
Capital and monopoly.....	870
A Dividing Line (Dillard).....	871

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The impending coal strike.....	871
Organized labor in national politics.....	872
The labor vote in Chicago.....	872
Referendum-voting in Chicago.....	873
Unlawful campaign contributions.....	873
Fighting in the Philippines.....	874
News Notes.....	874
Press Opinions.....	874
In Congress.....	875

RELATED THINGS:

A Cry for the Spring (Starr).....	875
Teaching Honesty.....	875
Legislation That Hinders Prosperity.....	876
Making a Captain of Industry.....	876
Educational Ideals.....	876
Democracy on the March.....	876
The Relation of Municipal Ownership to the Single Tax (Hall).....	877
A Lesson in Trades-Unionism (Rounsvell).....	878
To the Disinherited (verse).....	879

BOOKS:

The Socialization of Humanity.....	879
------------------------------------	-----

CARTOON—He Stays Fixed (Bengough).....	880
--	-----

INDEX TO VOLUME VIII.....	880
---------------------------	-----

For terms and other particulars of publication see cartoon page

EDITORIAL

Chicago's civic motto.

"I will!" is the civic motto of which Chicago has long been boastful. It comes down as an inheritance from the days of the World's Columbian Exposition. But now that circumstances offer Chicago the world's championship in the municipal work toward which all the world is turning, Mr. Eugene E. Prussing would alter her motto of "I will" to "I won't," and Mr. Franklin McVeagh would make it "I can't."

Dangerous Immigration.

"Personally, I think," says Harris R. Cooley, the head of the department of charities and correction at Cleveland, "that there is more danger to our free institutions among those in the first cabin of the steamer than in the steerage." This expresses one of those almost obvious facts which need only to be stated to be acknowledged as true.

The Federal police power.

It was once believed that the Federal government had no police power except over territory ceded to it. Certainly there was never any intention of bestowing general police power upon it. Yet, under cover of preventing fraudulent uses of the mails, the Federal government is actually exercising police power. Only a few days ago criminal proceedings were begun in Indiana by the Federal government in the Federal courts, against a young man for doing business as a publisher after the suspension of his paper. So pronounced an assumption of State functions by the central government would have aroused the nation twenty-five years ago. Today it goes as a matter of course. At the same rate we shall be as contented twenty-five years hence with the transfer to Federal jurisdiction of libel prosecutions.

Taxation of borrowing by borrowers.

A statistical investigation of the effect upon borrowers of the taxation of mortgages has been made by the New York Tax Reform Association. It ought to make the advocates of "taxing money" stop and think, for it has demonstrated, what in substance might have been guessed without an investigation, that the taxation of loans increases interest. Under the New York law for the taxation of mortgages, so this statistical report concludes, the rate of interest on mortgage loans "increases the rate of interest over

what the rate would be were mortgages exempt from taxation," and "this increase is more than the amount of the tax." So the "tax on money," aimed at "loan sharks," has the effect not only of making the borrower bear the burden of the tax, but it enables lenders to exact a little additional interest for themselves. Of what benefit is this to borrowers?

Mayor Dunne and his critics.

It is a good thing to see Mayor Dunne throw aside for a moment his sunny good nature to give some of the unfair critics of his administration the castigation that all this class have so richly deserved. From the beginning of Dunne's administration irreconcilable obstructionists of the "business efficiency" type have availed themselves of every possible opportunity, from banquet table to pulpit, and whether the Mayor or friends of his were present or not, to jeer at him, his policy, his appointments and his accomplishments—and only to jeer, for rational argument they have had none. Protesting that they were wholly impersonal, they have been in fact deliberately, intentionally and offensively personal. The time for a blunt retort had fully come, and Mayor Dunne has made one with good effect. He is now accused of "striking" below the belt." But that need not be discussed, for it is what the objects of his righteous wrath have themselves been doing all the time.

Mr. Bryan on Individualism versus Socialism.

Socialist party socialists will find reason, from their point of view, for criticizing William J. Bryan's article in the Century for April, on Individualism versus Socialism, as an incorrect statement of their philosophy. In some respects their criticisms would be just. While, for instance, the ethics of many socialists are indetical with Christianity, this is not true of all schools

of socialism. But there are, indeed, few things that could be truly said of many socialists which would be true of all schools of socialism. Probably there is only one such thing—hostility to competition; and that is the thing which Mr. Bryan has hit upon as universally distinctive. He accordingly draws the true line between socialism and individualism, as opposing tendencies, "at the point where competition begins to be possible, both schools favoring public ownership where competition is impossible but differing as to the wisdom of public ownership where competition can have free play." Mr. Bryan's paper does not profess to be a searching philosophical inquiry; if it did it would be open to criticism for loose treatment of the competitive principle and of the history of competition. It assumes to do no more than discuss the opposing tendencies of individualism and socialism as their effects appear upon the surface of present political conditions. It is the product not of a philosopher working outward from central principle, but of a statesman working inward from surface phenomena. So considered it is highly satisfactory. And that this statesmanship work is not done blindly may be inferred from Mr. Bryan's statement of the economic goal, toward which statesmanship ought to tend, namely: "Justice requires that each individual shall receive from society a reward proportionate to his contribution to society."

Mr. Jerome and his insurance-grafter friends.

The district attorney of New York, Mr. William Travers Jerome, does not cut a pretty figure in his evident efforts to shield from indictment the insurance magnates who have been detected in diverting trust funds to the uses of political committees.

The criminal law of New York is explicit in terms and unmistakable in meaning. It is contained in section 528 of the Penal Code as follows:

A person who, with the intent to deprive or defraud the true owner of his property, or of the use and benefit thereof, or to appropriate the same to the use of the taker, or of any other person, either (1) . . . ; or, (2) having in his possession, custody, or control, as a bailee, servant, attorney, agent, clerk, trustee, or officer of any person, association, or corporation, or as a public officer, or as a person authorized by agreement, or by competent authority, to hold or take possession, custody, or control, any money, property, evidence of debt or contract, article of value of any nature, or thing in action or possession, appropriates the same to his own use, or that of any other person other than the true owner or person entitled to the benefit thereof, steals such property and is guilty of larceny.

The heavier type describes the crime in question, according to the undisputed facts.

What are the undisputed facts? The accused persons were officers of corporations unrelated to the Republican national committee; as such they had control of the money of those corporations, of which money the Republican national committee was not the true owner; they appropriated definitely ascertained amounts of that money to the Republican national committee. All this being so, what remains to make those acts of misappropriation larcenous? Simply that they shall be ascertained to have been done with the intent to appropriate that money to the use of that committee. And how shall this intent be ascertained? Obviously by inference from the nature of the acts themselves; for the law is not a mind-reader, but an act-interpreter. And the acts themselves in this case testify to their own perfidy. There is no question here of whether the accused persons thought the perfidious acts immoral. The only question is whether they intended to do the acts they did do. Did they intend to transfer funds of their financial institution to the exchequer of the Republican national committee, either as gifts or for unlawful considerations? If they did, then they larcenously intended to appropriate that money to the use of an-

other than its true owner, which makes them guilty of stealing.

Judge O'Sullivan in his charge to the grand jury indicated that view of the matter. But Mr. Jerome wants proof that the intent was distinctly wicked by "goo-goo" standards. Had this diversion of funds from their true owners been made in behalf of "dishonest money," it would have been larcenous; but made as it was in behalf of "honest money," the guilty intent is absent. Such seems to be Mr. Jerome's theory; and his insurance friends are of like opinion. So are Cornelius N. Bliss and George B. Cortelyou, treasurers of the Republican committee, of whom Mr. Jerome, with clearer legal vision than on the other point, observes that they are receivers of stolen goods if the others are thieves. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!"

Better days a-coming.

Less than five years ago the country was aflame with the notion that financial success was the only kind worth bothering about. The educational institutions were "scientifically" teaching it, the churches were pietistically preaching it, and the business classes were exemplifying it. At that time Rockefeller was a worshipful exemplar, and the McCalls, the Morgans and the Depews were approved specimens of ethical culture of the financial sort. And now it is all passing. The churches are beginning again to preach righteousness for its own sake, Depew's name is a byword, McCall died of a broken heart upon getting found out, and Rockefeller is a fugitive from justice. It is even said that some of the corruption money of the McKinley and Roosevelt campaigns is to be restored to the place whence it was stolen. This is most significant of all. For the contribution of other people's money by corporation trustees to Republican campaign funds was well known a few years ago and regarded as a highly moral type