

trade. It will be difficult to persuade people in the East-end of London that it would be iniquitous to levy some tax upon this unearned increment in the value of a swamp.

+

Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury (Lib.), August 3.—Undoubtedly Mr. Lloyd-George has given a severe shock to his political opponents by his speech at Limehouse, and Mr. Churchill turns the incident to good effect. It is perfectly true that Tory critics of the budget have let themselves go, if we may use that expression, in denouncing the budget. They have not put any restraint upon their tongues, but have hurled epithets at the Chancellor of the Exchequer with unrestrained freedom that amounts to license. Mr. Churchill reminds them that they have not scrupled to use such words as fraud, folly, robbery, plunder, spoliation and treachery. We are not sure that Mr. Balfour himself has not used all these words and others, such as madness, lunacy and similar expressions. This, as Mr. Churchill says, was all very well so long as the condemnation was levelled at Mr. Lloyd-George and his budget; but when the Chancellor of the Exchequer turns upon his assailants and uses some of their own words to denounce the system that they uphold and defend, all the violent critics of Mr. Lloyd-George are shocked at the way in which he trounces them in their own style. Can it be, Mr. Churchill asks, that they are thus shocked and indignant because they have no reply ready to the awkward arguments that Mr. Lloyd-George has used? However this may be, the Chancellor of the Exchequer's arguments have not been answered, and we doubt whether they will be.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE MILLIONAIRE.

The gold that with the sunlight lies
 In bursting heaps at dawn,
 The silver smiling from the skies
 At night, to walk upon,
 The diamonds gleaming in the dew,
 He never saw, he never knew.

He got some gold, dug from the mud,
 Some silver, crushed with stones;
 But the gold was red with dead men's blood,
 The silver black with groans;
 And when he died he moaned aloud,
 "They'll make no pocket in my shroud."

—Joaquin Miller.

+ + +

GOLDEN RULE COMMON SENSE.

An Address Delivered by Fred Kohler, Chief of Police of Cleveland, Ohio, at the Convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police at Buffalo, June 16, 1909.

To answer the many inquiries concerning the motive for the adoption and the conditions resulting from our application of the common sense, or

so-called "golden rule" policy, of making and not making arrests in Cleveland, it will be necessary for me to repeat portions of the address delivered at the Convention of Chiefs of Police, at Detroit, Mich., June 3d, 1908.*

The Conception.

For a great many years in Cleveland, practically always, certainly throughout the period of my twenty years' service on the force, the police had done as the police do everywhere with drunks and disorderly persons, petty thieves, bad boys and small offenders generally—we ran them in. It was the custom in Cleveland; it is still the custom of practically the whole police world. And customs—ground as they are into the very fibre of men's minds—are hard to break. But we have broken the custom of the world and the ages in Cleveland.

For many years I had given confused study and some not very enlightening observation to the numerous arrests made for minor offenses. I couldn't see that these wholesale arrests did any good. The number of them did not diminish; it increased. And I found not only that the arrests did not produce good results; they did harm. They brought disgrace, humiliation and suffering to countless innocent persons in no way responsible for the acts of a thoughtless, careless, mischievous, or even, if you will, a malicious first offender.

I found daily at police stations relatives and friends in tears seeking the release of some prisoner, who, when I inquired, proved to be not so very, very bad. In Police Court next day I saw old and feeble parents, weeping wives with crying babies in their arms, and very often other children clinging at their sides—all there to witness the degradation of those they loved. And what was the result? A hasty trial, and since the offense was usually trivial, the prisoner was discharged. Good! But all that suffering was in vain. Sometimes it was worse than vain. Again, sometimes the offender was fined. That was a "result," but who paid? The weeping mother and children—they were robbed of the necessaries of life, and the only gain was a few paltry dollars paid into the City Treasury. Was there one particle of real good accomplished by this process? Watching it all as I did, day after day, I answer "no," and I say now, emphatically, "no."

Now, questioning these unfortunates, it struck me that most of them did what they did through thoughtlessness, natural passion, or in the spirit of frolic or mischief. It seemed to me that this should be understood. It didn't seem at first to be the policeman's duty to study the cases and to use discretion. There was a misunderstanding all around. And, gentlemen, misunderstanding is injustice.

*See The Public of June 12, 1908, pages 244 and 254; and of June 26, 1908, page 293.

Then I remembered that all persons are not arrested who commit minor offenses and even felonies. Many escape detection or are not exposed. Their escape did not hurt them nor society; it was an advantage.

Now, I finally concluded, that it was our duty not to help these unfortunates on their downward course, but to save them. It seemed to me it was up to the police to learn to know the difference between a thief, and a mischievous man or boy. And why not? Of all men, who is so able to judge whether an arrest is necessary as the policeman?

Upon these observations and thoughts my policy was formed. Firm in the belief that some remedy was necessary, I decided to go forward with my Common Sense Plan. I determined to have my policemen use their best human instincts. I proposed that they should exercise the discretion which the judges do not always exercise.

As a step, then, in the right direction, might not a wider interpretation be given to an officer's duty, so that, by his kindly efforts as first and final judge of first offenders, the stream that is now so steadily flowing in the direction of the jail and penitentiary might be diverted into channels of worthy and useful citizenship? Of course it might; and that is my answer as to the motive.

With all these facts and data ever before me, and recognizing the evil embodied therein, and the benefit that would be derived in a change of policy, I personally met with each division of our department, and in an informal way we considered just how far this policy should be carried. We first realized that to make it a success, a kindly feeling would be essential to its official administration. Then every violation of the law or ordinance was carefully gone over from every point of view. And finally we determined that the following considerations should govern our actions:

First, Juveniles were never to be placed in prison. They were to be taken home, or the parents sent for and the child turned over to them for parental correction.

Second, The members of the force were to use their kindly efforts in easing the friction and ill-temper between man and man, wherever and whenever it made itself manifest.

Third, That the best policeman is the one who manages the offender with the least show or display of authority.

Fourth, That some men fall through some unfortunate circumstances and are not criminal at heart, and should be treated accordingly, in which case the best results might be accomplished with a well applied reprimand.

Fifth, Officers should have sufficient evidence of a competent character to secure conviction, before even considering the imprisonment of a person on any charge whatever.

Sixth, Any apparent violators who were not

known to be of good character and reputation were to be accompanied to the precinct station, where the matter would be carefully inquired into by the officer in charge, and the proper action, as specified by the Common Sense Policy, taken.

On January 1st, 1908, the policy went into effect.* Immediately gratifying results were shown; and now, after the 17 months' of severe test that the policy has received in this city, there need be no hesitancy in claiming a great improvement in the performance of police work. True, it was a radical departure from time-worn methods, almost revolutionary; but still it is in harmony with the general accepted theory that the greatest aim of the law was the prevention of crime, the correction and reformation—not the vindictive punishment of the offender.

Some daily papers (through a misunderstanding of the policy) attempted to lead the public to believe that this policy applied to all violators of the laws, which is a clear misrepresentation of real object and intent. We have never catered to crime or criminals, and never will; and our new policy of making or not making arrests never included criminals or habitual offenders. The difficulties formerly experienced from the many technicalities of the law, and in getting sufficient evidence to convict, has been almost entirely eliminated under this new system, for the reason that the members of the department have had more time to devote to felony cases, and to the prosecution of professional criminals and habitual offenders.

Other publicity agents, seeing that many "feature" stories never came to light, have opposed us. But we have felt that it was a gain to have saved so many persons from the embarrassment resulting from the unwise exploitation of their misfortune.

I am a firm believer in publicity (the exposure of criminal method and misrepresentation, always excepted), and I believe that the more publicity that can be given the police and the methods of Police Court procedure in the disposal of real criminals and suspected thieves who make their living by swindling the public, the better it will be for the community. I appreciate criticism; honest criticism does good.

A further argument has been made, that the policy places too much authority in the hands of the police officer. I will answer that by reminding you that the Judge and Court officials always have the last guess. If the police officer has exceeded his authority, the matter can easily be adjusted then.

We have no interest or concern in the snarls and lampoons aimed at us by pettifoggers, unscrupulous politicians, criminologists or philosophers of no experience with the real criminal and who reach their conclusions by theory only.

*See The Public of January 4, 1908, p. 941.

Some little opposition has been also felt from the hired help of some of the private corporations, who have found that they could not use this department to their private interests or advantages, and who themselves neglect to properly protect their private rights, thus preventing crime.

The result obtained since the application of the policy, is our defense.

Now, let us carefully consider the results obtained by this policy. For the year 1908, our records show a reduction of 20,333 arrests, or 66.8 per cent compared with 1907, when the total was 30,418. In our total of 10,085 for 1908, arrests to the number of just one thousand were made for felonies, with less crime and less property stolen, as against 938 for the year 1907. Is this not to be considered to be a favorable result for the Golden Rule Policy? Would it have been better to go on increasing the number of arrests of minor violators, and not have the necessary time for the apprehension of felons or procuring of necessary evidence to convict them? Don't you think it was better to devote more time to the habitual criminal, and the more serious violators against the law, as we have done?

Let us go further and see what was accomplished after the first year, and after the members of the department (who were in sympathy with the movement and gave it their hearty co-operation) had become accustomed to this policy. The table shows arrests made each month:

Total Arrests—	Under the Old and General Custom.		Golden Rule Policy.	
	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.
January	2,285	2,158	911	591
February	2,016	2,267	829	391
March	2,480	2,711	939	483
April	2,801	2,434	907	427
May	2,675	2,781	888	366
	12,207	12,291	4,474	2,258
June	2,766	2,503	882	
July	2,843	2,900	1,010	
August	2,749	2,898	1,015	
September	2,919	2,610	707	
October	2,770	2,351	704	
November	2,700	2,530	619	
December	2,732	2,435	674	
Totals	31,736	30,418	10,085	

May, 1909, shows the smallest number of arrests since the policy was introduced. This is the least number of persons arrested in any month during the past twenty-five years, and arrests had been increasing each year. In this total of 366 arrests for the month of May, there are included 57 arrests for felonies. That in itself is conclusive evidence that our policy is not for the benefit of criminals. In summing up these felonies, we have simply taken the bare arrests. We have not added other subsequent charges against the same culprit, even though we have found that he had committed other felonies before being caught. During the month of May, 1907, under the old custom, there were 1651 arrests for intoxication. In May, 1908, under the Golden Rule Policy, there were 324 arrests; and in May, 1909, 47 for that cause.

Can you imagine anyone being injured by this? Don't the figures show that a great good must have been done?

Meanwhile we have entirely done away with the blackmailing, professional bondsmen, who have made money out of the unfortunates placed in prison, before the proper inquiry into their cases, which is general under the old plan. Under this system, graft, blackmail and extortion is impossible. The citizens and public generally, as well as the courts and public press, know exactly what they can expect, providing they comply with the rules laid down, which are well known.

It is seldom now that you will see old and feeble parents, or weeping wives with crying babies in their arms and other children clinging at their sides, at any of our police stations or Police Court. This degradation and humiliation has been spared our people. They have been saved by our policemen who are now doing real work. And, again, you will not find so many people interested in persons arrested, perjuring themselves in Police Court in their behalf, and so piling crime on crime.

Since the inception of the Golden Rule or Common Sense Policy, taking as a basis the number of arrests made during the year 1907 under the old custom, we have saved on an average about 1800 persons per month from Police and Police Court records, and that means a saving of "second offenders."

Not only the police, but Police Court officials also, who are interested in their work, and not playing politics or catering to the criminal class, are given more time to investigate cases of a more serious nature; and arresting officers are seldom insulted in Police Court.

As to money, during the year 1908 we made 10,085 arrests which cost the City and County, in witness and juror fees alone, approximately \$52,000.00. Figuring that under the old custom of making arrests, we would have at least made as many arrests as the year previous (30,418), you can see what we have saved the city and county in actual money, in witness and juror fees alone, which is only a small item when you take into consideration the money paid out by persons in jeopardy, to professional bondsmen, police court lawyers, loss of time from work of the principal and witnesses, and hundreds of other things that I need not mention here.

As I predicted, the shyster police court lawyer, and the tricky pretending politicians, together with the blackmailing bondsmen, have been loud in their protests against the Golden Rule Policy, because it has deprived them of their source of revenue and political following, but we are about free from them now.

The spirit of the policy is to make every member of the Police Force the kindly adviser of the

public generally, and to give every one a trial and a chance to explain, before being put behind prison bars. We only put them in prison when a further penalty is necessary. We believe that "A little prevention is better than any cure."

To say the Golden Rule Policy has proven a success, is putting it mildly. Its results have been even beyond my expectations. The policy has not only decreased the number of arrests, but has increased the number of arrests of real criminals. It has resulted in driving from the city practically all those whose livelihood depends upon swindling and robbing, and those who remain are under such close observation that it is almost impossible for them to operate successfully. Complaints have reduced accordingly, and there has been less real crime and property stolen than in many previous years.

We now experience "crimeless" and "arrestless" days. It is the result of our work in trying to make better citizens of petty offenders. It is the ideal condition at which we are aiming, and we are fast reaching the goal. We have encouraged and not discouraged men. We have been consistent; we have insisted on the police exercising all the powers conferred upon them by law, instead of allowing a political judge to make votes by discharging prisoners, and blackmailers to extort money from them. All that sort of business has about ceased.

We have discarded artificiality. We have acted sensibly and reasonably, and declined to take advantage of the predictions of inexperienced rich and poor. We do our own thinking, with no effort to accord with the belief or disbelief of anyone; but we court everybody's criticism or suggestion. We have placed ourselves in a position to make the supposed offenders, their relatives and friends, *our friends*, instead of our enemies. This policy will put the American policeman in the position he should occupy. He is *first and best judge*, although we have found that "*he who hopes to improve the world must first look to be reprov'd.*"

I might say that this Golden Rule or Common Sense Policy has been carried through with few or no mistakes, nor has a single member of this department had suit brought against him, or been threatened with the same in his official capacity—a record heretofore unknown.

A year ago I informed you that I believed my policy would succeed. Now I assure you that it is a success, and that many other persons believe in it. We cannot create an earthly paradise, for there will be violations of law until the end of time, even as there were such violations at the very beginning of the existence of the human race. But never in our time in the City of Cleveland will we go back to the old system of throwing human beings carelessly into jail, as has heretofore been the custom the world over.

Police repression has accomplished great things for the City of Cleveland and its population, and all without any new legislation; nor would any new legislation be necessary to carry this policy into general effect throughout the United States

* * *

LLOYD-GEORGE ON THE LAND QUESTION IN BRITISH POLITICS.

Principal Parts of the Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Limehouse, as Reported by the London Times of July 31, 1909.

A few months ago a meeting was held not far from this hall, in the heart of the city of London, demanding that the Government should launch out and run into enormous expenditure on the navy. That meeting ended up with a resolution promising that those who passed that resolution would give financial support to the Government in their undertaking. There have been two or three meetings held in the city of London since (laughter and cheers), attended by the same class of people, but not ending up with a resolution promising to pay. (Laughter.) On the contrary, we are spending the money, but they won't pay. (Laughter.) What has happened since to alter their tone? Simply that we have sent in the bill. (Laughter and cheers.) We started our four Dreadnoughts. They cost eight millions of money. We promised them four more; they cost another eight millions. Somebody has got to pay, and these gentlemen say, "Perfectly true; somebody has got to pay, but we would rather that the somebody were somebody else." (Laughter.) And then they say, "It is not so much the Dreadnoughts we object to, it is the old age pensions." (Hear, hear.) If they object to pensions, why did they promise them? (Cheers.) They won elections on the strength of their promises. It is true they never carried them out. (Laughter.) But they say, "When we promised pensions we meant pensions at the expense of the people for whom they were provided. We simply meant to bring in a bill to compel workmen to contribute to their own pensions." (Laughter.) If that is what they meant, why did they not say so? (Cheers.)

We propose to do more than raise pensions. We are raising money to provide against the evils and the sufferings that follow from unemployment. (Cheers.) We are raising money for the purpose of assisting our great friendly societies to provide for the sick and the widows and orphans. We are providing money to enable us to develop the resources of our own land. (Cheers.) I do not believe any fair-minded man would challenge the justice and the fairness of the objects which we have in view in raising this money.