

that this policy has also been applied even where it seemed apparent felonies had been committed.

The force was shown how by conscientiously carrying out this policy, they would save many hours' duty in court, a matter of great importance to the officers on night duty, and to the public when officers are on day duty. They would save to the city thousands of dollars in witness fees; much work for the police judges, police clerks and court attaches; wear and tear of all police apparatus. And they would cut politicians and shyster lawyers out of their source of revenue, and drive them back to good, honest work—maybe.

The force became thoroughly interested and, though there were a few mistakes to correct at first, the policy has proved a success during the five months of severe trial which we have given it.

To show this I quote from our reports the number of arrests for the first five months of 1907 and 1908:

January, 1907, 2,158; January, 1908, 911; February, 1907, 2,257; February, 1908, 829; March, 1907, 2,711; March, 1908, 939; April, 1907, 2,434; April, 1908, 907; May, 1907, 2,731; May, 1908, 888.

These figures show that arrests have decreased 68 per cent.

Reports and complaints have diminished at a corresponding rate. Officers, detectives and patrolmen are able to devote more time to the pursuit of the habitual criminal and crimes of a serious nature; to suspicious persons and to those whose livelihood depends upon the swindling and robbing of the honest citizen. This in turn has resulted in driving from our city practically all of these vultures, and those that remain are under such close surveillance that it is almost impossible for them to operate successfully. I think I can truthfully say that Cleveland is well pleased with the result.

I believe in my policy. I believe that if it is properly and generally carried into effect, it will put the American policeman in the position he should occupy. He will learn that the people he has to deal with are human beings, not machines; liable to make mistakes and failures, but not therefore lost souls. And I believe that the patrolman should be the friend and parole officer of these laggards. I believe that the best policeman is he who manages all offenders against the law with the least show of authority, with the least personal pride, with the greatest sense of human justice.

At our last meeting I described to you our policy of "Police Repression," and I explained that the purpose of it was to prevent violations of the law instead of waiting for them to occur. That policy in connection with this, "The Golden Rule

Policy," has really made Cleveland a good city to live in.

And, to take a broad view, I submit that we police can help to make the world a better place to live in. It has been said, and you, gentlemen, with your long experience in police business, you know that the police, unwillingly and unwittingly, perhaps, nevertheless hastily, have been instrumental in making as many criminals as any other agency—poverty, heritage and association excepted. This we have done by making these numerous arrests of first offenders; by exposing and branding them with Police Court and prison records. We have discouraged men. We have driven young and weak men to the haunts and association of habitual and expert criminals, who have taught them the ideals and practices of crime. We have punished, we have not prevented crime.

The time has come to change all this, and I believe we in Cleveland have found the way to do it.

+ + +

THE PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

For The Public.

II.

Extent of Present Publicly Owned Systems.

The first question which we shall answer in regard to public ownership of railroads is: Has this policy been extensively tried anywhere? In connection with this question we will also seek an answer to the somewhat allied question: Has this policy been tried anywhere for a sufficiently long time to permit of definite conclusions? With these two questions answered satisfactorily, provided they can be so answered, we shall have offered evidence as to the falsity of the often repeated statement that publicly owned railroads have been in most cases recent experiments on a small scale, the failure of which either was already apparent, or was likely to be so in a near future.

It is also highly important that we analyze the situation so as to determine whether at present the policy of public ownership of railroads is recognized as beneficial in the countries where applied. This question seems to be best answered by the fact that ever since railways were first being built, there has been, throughout continental Europe, a general tendency from private to government ownership of railroads. This tendency has been augmented as years have passed on, and at present there is not a single sign of any movement in the opposite direction. That this should be so is perfectly natural. It is simply an assertion of the law of evolution. With all its absurd ideas of authority and autocracy, the European continent has been perceiving more clearly than has America or England what are the true functions of the government. This fact should

not be lost sight of. It is highly important that it be fully appreciated by every public spirited American citizen. With all our boasted development and our superior intelligence, we have sadly neglected to distinguish between public and private functions. We have mixed them so hopelessly that in our country corrupt government is looked upon as a matter of course, and honesty in public office is perceived with suspicion. This is, in the last analysis, all the result of our lack of realization of the differences between truly private and truly public functions.

Of the larger European nations, Germany ranks first in having adopted the plan of extensive government ownership of railroads. We will therefore give that country our first attention.

During the latter part of the last century the question of the development of the transportation facilities received the most careful attention of the various German State governments, as well as of the Imperial government itself. It is no exaggeration to say that with the exception of military matters, which always have had the upper hand in Germany, no subject has received so close consideration as that of the development of public transportation facilities. And not only have the *railways* received the attention necessary for the development of an adequate system of roads, but the governments of the various German States have also fully realized their excellent opportunities for *internal waterways*, and have always systematically favored a combined network of railways and canals, in the conviction that a combination of both was desirable for the best interests of the whole nation.

It is not uncommon to find criticism expressed by the defenders of our private railway monopoly on account of this very fact. It has been charged that the German State railways were wholly unable to cope with the traffic, and that this, therefore, had to depend on the waterways quite as much as on the railways. This statement is true in a measure, but it is no charge against the German railways, as those who make it wish to have it appear. Because we in this country have neglected the full development of our internal waterways, and therefore are not used to the more balanced conditions of transportation as we find them in Germany, that is no good reason why we should condemn the practice which has grown out of a careful and logical development of all means of traffic facilities. In Germany, the government has provided for a certain amount of uniformity both as regards railways and waterways. It is generally recognized there that it is possible for both these means of transportation to work well together, and to the mutual advantage of both. It has been found very desirable to have the waterways relieve the railways of part of the heavy traffic in bulky freight which does not require rapid transportation.

Thus, to charge the German railways with inefficiency because of the development of another desirable branch of the general transportation system, is wholly unjust. The charge is made either out of ignorance and unfamiliarity with German traffic conditions, or is presented in bad faith in order to throw a false light upon the actual results obtained by the German State railways.

While the construction of railways in Germany was initiated by private enterprise, both railways and canals, with few exceptions, are now governmental undertakings. It is recognized that the promotion of the transportation facilities is one of the most important functions of the Imperial government, as well as of the governments of the various States. The first railway in Germany was constructed in Bavaria in 1835, this being a private undertaking. The first railway constructed by a German government was opened in 1838 in Brunswick. The management of this road was also undertaken by the government of that State, because it was considered that such a course would be to the best interest of the whole community. Thus, public ownership and operation of railroads has been an accomplished fact in Germany for 70 years.

In 1840 the governments of Baden and Nassau also constructed State railroads. All the southern German States then followed suit within the course of the next few years. A reaction in regard to public ownership in some States caused some of the railroads later on to be turned over into private hands, as in Bavaria in 1856, where all the railroads then passed into private hands, only, however, to *return into the hands of the government as soon as the folly of private ownership and operation had become apparent.*

It has often been said that had it not been for private enterprise, many of our American roads would never have been built. The early and present German, as well as Swedish, experience in this respect points in the opposite direction. In many cases these governments have constructed roads which were considered necessary for the development of the respective countries, which private enterprise was not willing to undertake to build.

The largest German State railway system is that of Prussia, and being by far the largest, it is also of the greatest interest. The first railway in Prussia was a private road, built in 1838, but the road was chartered only on the condition that it could be purchased by the government at will. From 1849 on the Prussian government commenced to construct railways on a large scale, the development of the Prussian State railway system being shown in Table I.

The German State railways, it should be stated, are all owned by the *individual States*, and there is no such thing as an Imperial railway system. The Imperial government, however, acts as a gen-

eral commissioner of the whole nation, and, while having no actual authority over railway matters, exerts its influence in behalf of uniformity and general harmony.

TABLE I.
Growth of Prussian State Railway System.*

Year.	Miles.	Year.	Miles.
1855.....	664	1885.....	12,111
1860.....	934	1890.....	14,833
1865.....	1,064	1895.....	16,440
1870.....	2,028	1898.....	18,263
1875.....	2,563	1900.....	19,270
1880.....	3,756	1902.....	20,173†

The extent of the various German State railway systems was, in round figures, in 1906:

	Miles.
Prussia	20,750
Bavaria	3,800
Saxony	2,000
Württemberg	1,200
Alsace-Lorraine	1,050
Baden	1,050
Oldenburg	350
Mecklenburg-Schwerin	720

Previous to the date when the first German State railway was opened (in 1838), and all the time since, private railroads have also been in operation in the Empire, and ample time has thus been provided for forming a pretty sound judgment regarding whether government or private ownership and operation is preferable. The conclusion reached by the German people themselves is indicated by the fact that the proportion of private railroads to government owned ones has constantly been growing less, so that now less than 8 per cent of the whole railway system remains in private hands.

Seventy years of public ownership has placed the German railway system in one of the foremost places of any in the world. The excellent permanent way, the high-class equipment, and the regularity of the service justify this statement. The Germans themselves cannot conceive of the idea of superiority of private management. It would seem sheer madness to them to make such a proposition. If they compare their State railroads with the private roads of Great Britain with their high regular rates, or those of Spain which have become a by-word all over Europe, it is easy for them to see that they have adhered to a correct principle in their railway policy.

The various German governments, however, have never tried to establish a State monopoly in railroad transportation. Private roads always have been, and still are, chartered, but it is absolutely certain that, contrary to opinions often accepted even by thinking and intelligent persons in the United States, the private roads have not set the pace of development, but this has always been done by the government roads. Private enterprise, in competitive industries, will show the best results. But given a private management

and a monopoly and the case is reversed. And railroading never can be purely competitive, but, on the other hand tends to be, and often is, purely monopolistic. Take a case in our own country—the case of the city of Hartford, Conn., for instance. Although seven railroad lines, and numerous interurban trolley lines, as well as steamboat connections, give ample means of communication, that city cannot be reached from any direction but by traveling in the cars or on the boats of the same company.

If we now turn our attention to other European countries having applied the principle of public ownership of railroads, we find that in Sweden the government owns about 2,800 miles out of a total of 8,500 miles of railway in the country. The first government railroad in that country was opened in 1856. Here, as in Germany, ample time has therefore elapsed for everyone concerned to form an opinion as to the superiority of private management, if it be superior; for Sweden has had private railroads side by side with the State roads all these 52 years. But even the suggestion that private roads are better managed, would, after over half a century's experience with both kinds of roads, seem ridiculous to a citizen of Sweden.

In Norway, about 1,400 miles out of a total of 1,630 miles of railway belongs to the government. The railway system is being rapidly enlarged, and several hundred miles of additional State railway is either planned or under construction. In Denmark, out of nearly 2,000 miles of railway, 1,150 miles are in public hands. In Switzerland 1,530 miles out of a total of 2,110 miles of railway is owned by the government, and there are provisions for the gradual passing of all railroads into the hands of the government. In Holland nearly 1,000 miles out of total railway mileage of somewhat more than 2,100 miles is in the hands of the government.

In Greece the movement for the construction of railroads is comparatively recent; the government owns or directly controls about one-half of the total mileage, which amounts to somewhat more than 800 miles. At the end of a certain period, however, all railroads pass into the hands of the State. It is, in fact, remarkable to note, that the United States, Great Britain and Spain are the only countries of any consequence which have not provided for ultimate government ownership by the passing of the railroads, automatically, into the hands of the State, at the end of a certain period, and that the United States alone is the only country which has not in some way provided for public ownership at any time when the representatives of the public so decide.

Bulgaria owns 780 miles out of 970 miles of railway. In Portugal the State owns more than 500 miles out of a total of 1,500 miles. Servia owns all of her railroads, amounting to 360 miles.

*Computed from Meyers Konversations-Lexikon, fifth and sixth editions.

†From "Bulletin of The Railway Congress."

Roumania also owns all of the railways in the country, about 2,300 miles. In Russia, including Finland, the government owns 29,000 miles of railway, and private companies 11,500 miles. Great Britain and Spain are the only European countries without any railroads at all in the hands of the public.

In Belgium, State railways date back to the time when railways were first built in that country. The Belgian government conceived the idea of a State owned railway system as early as in 1834, and the first government railway was opened for traffic in 1840. At the end of 1906 there were more than 4,500 miles of railway in the country, of which more than 2,500 miles, all standard gage, belonged to the government, and the remainder, mostly narrow gage roads, to private companies.

The French government owns nearly 2,000 miles of railway out of a total of about 25,000 miles; but all railroads become automatically the property of the government at the end of 99 years after chartering, and before that time at the option of the representatives of the people. The public ownership policy of France dates back to 1842.

Austria has 13,000 miles of railway, and fully 8,500 miles are now in the hands of the government. Hungary has over 11,000 miles of railway, 9,200 miles belonging to the State. Finally, Italy, having about 10,000 miles of railway, possesses 8,200 miles of State railroads.

Turning now from Europe to Australia, we find public ownership of railways even a more established and recognized principle. All the Australian railways are owned by the State governments. New South Wales has 3,450 miles of State railway; Queensland, over 3,000; South Australia, nearly 2,000; Victoria, 3,400; New Zealand, 2,500; and Tasmania, about 500 miles. These systems date back to the period between 1850 and 1870, and are thus by no means recent experiments.

In Asia, we find that the Japanese government owns over 4,000 miles of railway. The Chinese government owns 600 miles of railway, and all lines built by private companies revert to the State after 25 years. In India, out of a total of 29,000 miles, 21,700 constitute governmental lines.

In Africa we find that the governments of Transvaal and Orange River Colony own 2,500 miles of railway, the government of Egypt 1,500 miles, and that of Natal 880 miles. In South America, Brazil has about 11,800 miles of State railways; Chile, 1,400; Colombia, 210 miles; and Peru, 850 miles. The remaining South American countries have usually guaranteed the railways in their respective territories, indicating the government as the initiatory and responsible party.

If we now summarize the results of our investigation, we find in the first place that in every European country, Great Britain and Spain excepted, the government owns at least part of the country's railroads, and in nearly all the greater part. Looking further into the matter we would also find that even in Great Britain provisions have been made as much as 64 years ago for public ownership of the railroads at the option of the parliament, and these provisions have been renewed and re-enforced from time to time. We find also that in all those countries where there are government-owned and private railroads side by side, the State has reserved to itself the right to acquire the private roads at its option. In Australia we find government ownership of railroads to be the only recognized principle of railway operation; and even in those countries in the far East which have but lately accepted our western civilization, we find this principle applied. Considering all this, does it not seem fairly safe to assume, even if we had no further proofs, that had government ownership largely proved a failure, these conditions of universal and persistent application would not have prevailed?

It does not seem likely that any nation would have persisted in continuing its ownership of its railways for forty, fifty, and even seventy years, had it not been thoroughly demonstrated that this policy is the most beneficial to the nation. Had State railways largely been failures, it would have been so easy to turn from public to private ownership, that we would not be likely to find any means of transportation in the hands of a government which failed to conduct the business better, or even as well, as private monopoly would do. The people in Europe are very critical in regard to the manner in which their State railroads are run. In fact, had public ownership been a failure there, we should first of all hear it from the European press and public.

Arguments, however, avail but little. In future articles we shall give the facts relating to the service rendered and the financial outcome of public ownership, so that each may judge for himself.

ERIK OBERG.

BOOKS

THE OLD MADE NEW.

The Sanity of Art. By Bernard Shaw. New York. Benj. R. Tucker, Publisher. Price, \$1.00.

The republication of this Open Letter to Benjamin Tucker is justified by the author because "journalism is the highest form of literature. . . . The writer who aims at producing platitudes which are 'not for an age but for all time' has his reward in being unreadable in all ages. . . . Let others