

This sounds paradoxical. Nevertheless the special election brought him and his people promised relief from the traction magnates. . . . Johnson deserves his victory. He has agitated the three-cent fare idea for years. To defeat him on one occasion the Constitution of the State of Ohio was suspended. He has fought the politicians, the money powers and the press of his community with unwavering fidelity, and at last his patience, his courage and his persistence have won for his people a substantial part of their just demands.

+

The (St. Louis) Mirror (ind.), August 12.—The advocates of municipal ownership will be only briefly downcast by the result of the referendum in Cleveland last week. . . . It is now up to the other side to move. The Cleveland Street Railway Company will have to propose a programme. As matters look now, it seems impossible for the railway company to settle the question on any basis not indorsed by the Johnsonians. In the referendum fight, the monopolists burned their bridges behind them. They advocated a three-cent fare for all the lines in the city. They only seemed to desire that Mayor Johnson shouldn't get the credit of establishing that basis of fare. Mayor Tom says that the defeat only gets out of the way some questions that would have proved troublesome when he shall run for mayor again this fall.

+ +

A Typical Source of Power.

Chicago Examiner (Hearst), August 13.—A myth is shaping itself in the imagination of Washington that Mr. Aldrich is a miraculous man—a Cagliostro, Metternich and Mazarin rolled into one. It is being whispered that this extraordinary feat of charging and routing, not merely "an army in position," but a whole country with its mind made up is due to the incomparable "ability" of the Senator from Rhode Island . . . Mr. Aldrich is not a great man; he belongs to a very ordinary type. He rules, not in virtue of his personal qualities, but because of his representative character. He represents, not the good people of Rhode Island, but the close communion of American plutocracy. And because he is the accepted spokesman of the privileged interests, he has more power than all the elected representatives of all the unprivileged interests. The situation is heavy with ominous suggestion. The time is at hand when the people must find some new and more effective method of political action against the solid front of Privilege.

+ +

British Land Question.

Puck (ind.), August 11.—The stone wall which one may see through in the event of there being a hole big enough has been deftly duplicated in England lately by the row over the budget. The budget provides for a stiff tax on land values. The House of Lords will reject the land-tax proposals if they are sent to it. The members of the House of Lords, or the noble families which they represent, own most of the unoccupied land in the British Isles. While London is an appalling spectacle of congested population and destitution, land which would help more than anything else to solve England's grim problem

of the unemployed is being held out of use, miles and miles of it, for the private pleasures of the nobility; estates, hunting-preserves, what not. The House of Lords may reject the land-tax this time, and next time also, but so long as England has three or four men to every available square foot of land whereon to put them to work out their own industrial salvation, England will have its problem of the unemployed, its discontent, and its growing demoralization. When land over there is so gravely essential to the welfare of the nation, it is fair to say that Lord Thisorthat should be made to pay a pretty penny into the British treasury for the privilege of keeping it out of use in order to chase deer or foxes there when London "bores" him. England will have to make a choice some of these days. It must exist for the breeding of deer, foxes, lords and grouse, or for the breeding of Englishmen.

+ +

Lloyd-George's Land Tax Speech.

The Westminster Gazette (Lib.), July 31.—We are quite willing, if the other side will let us, to conduct the argument for the budget on the plane of pure reason and political economy; but, really, after the language they have used themselves, there is more than a little absurdity in their complaints this morning about the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech at Limehouse. Mr. Lloyd-George has had to listen for weeks while he has been accused of applying force and fraud and every other nefarious practice to the finances of the nation, . . . but when he retorts upon his assailants, carries the war into their camp, and speaks with the same vigor in defense of his proposals as they do in attack, then they call heaven to witness the crudity of his methods.

+

London Daily Chronicle (Lib.), July 31.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his fighting speech at Limehouse last night, went straight to the root of the matter. . . . The loudest outcry is raised against the land taxes. The outcry is natural enough. Privilege is never surrendered without a struggle. Landowners have been suffered for so long to grow rich by unearned increment that they naturally raise a hubbub when the state begins to claim a percentage. But this does not make the action of the state unjust or oppressive. The justice of these new taxes was well illustrated by the series of concrete cases given by Mr. Lloyd-George last night. The growth, the enterprise, the expenditure of the community drop win falls into the lap of landowners.

+

Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury (Lib.), July 31.—Mr. Lloyd-George has a way of putting things that is very inconvenient for his political opponents. . . . Speak where he may, there is never any difficulty in finding examples of the great increase in the value of land through the extension of great towns. At Limehouse he is able to point to land between the Thames and the river Lea, where not long ago there were hundreds of acres of vacant land, not very useful even for agricultural purposes, that have now become immensely valuable as a great center of

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.