

ports, and would give the power of visitation and examination over such corporations to the proper auditing officers, "to the end that the true value of the privileges had by such corporations may be made plain to the people." There are minor provisions, but here are quite enough to startle and alarm the average corporation man.

While Mr. Johnson urged that state issues should be pressed in the pending state campaign, he took pains to declare his position in regard to national politics. His platform expressly indorsed the Kansas City platform of 1900, and personally commended the candidate who stood upon that platform. Nor did he stop here. In his speech he served notice that nobody can be a good Democrat in 1902, 1903, or the first half of 1904 who is not ready to accept the platform of 1900 until that of the next presidential campaign shall be framed. The Democrats of Ohio, he declared, can identify themselves unmistakably with the Democratic party of the republic "only by acknowledging the authority of the latest national expression of party doctrine on national questions;" and, of course, the rule must apply everywhere. This means that the new leader of Ohio Democracy will oppose the "reorganizers" in the party who would put a stigma upon Bryan, and who would have Democratic state conventions ignore the Kansas City platform, as was done deliberately in Indiana a few weeks ago, in Michigan somewhat later, and in Wisconsin on Wednesday week. He stands with those Democrats in Missouri, Arkansas, North Carolina and other states in the south and west who have "reaffirmed" the Kansas City platform, and with that element in the Iowa Democracy which on September 3 fought for Bryanism on the convention floor, and cast 344 votes, as against 384 for omitting all mention of the Kansas City platform. This element is particularly strong in regions where the feeling against "the money power" is most pronounced; and many Democrats of this type openly say that they would rather have the Republicans carry the presidency again than support a so-called "conservative" Democrat who represents the "reorganizing" element in the party.

#### THE RIGHTS OF LABOR.

An article with the above title, by Bliss Carman, published in the Chicago Tribune of September 6.

As far as I am concerned I suppose I am not qualified to speak on the subject of labor (so called) at all. For

by "labor" one is popularly supposed to mean only physical work—work with the hands—while other kinds of work, however arduous, rejoice in the genteel title of professions. And one who is a journalist by trade is apt not to designate himself a laborer.

The truth is, however, that every man is a natural born laborer, and idleness is an unhappy disease. It is as natural and inevitable for man to work as it is for him to eat or sleep. In fact, the one is only the reflex action of the other; we receive constant nourishment and daily recuperation, and we live under an iron necessity to set free the accumulated energy which rest and food produce. It is inevitable that we should hate many kinds of work—work for which we are unfitted—but it is more inevitable that we should enjoy work of some kind.

If it were permitted to the professional mind to have opinions on practical matters I believe I should think of the strike (or of all strikes) somewhat as follows:

In the first place, the present strike, for all its wastefulness, is productive of one priceless good—it has shown people the absurdity and moral wrong in private ownership of natural monopolies. Is it not the limit of comic perversity? Here is the delightful spectacle of a great nation, with boundless resources in so necessary an article as coal, hampered and annoyed by the obstinate wrangling between an obstinate clique of powerful capitalists on one side and a band of discontented hirelings on the other. And while these two factions, each absolutely selfish, are holding their squabble week after week, the people must go in want of coal! The position is intolerable, and a poetic justice would send the delinquents quickly packing about their business and hand over the coal fields to state ownership.

Poetic justice, however, is slow, and is only wrought out through the tardy and difficult act of men as they gradually come to apprehend the finest demands of ethics and to shape their conduct accordingly.

The trouble is that the great industrial game of modern civilization is run on principles that are morally rotten. Why? Because it does not recognize right and wrong as absolute standards of conduct. Because it has superseded one false conception of life—the conception which said: "Might makes right"—and has set up in its place another equally false, the ideal which says: "Shrewdness makes right." But right and wrong are not matters that can be governed by shrewd and clever

self-interest, any more than they can be regulated by brute strength. They are matters of the heart; they always have been so, and always will be as long as the world lasts. And any form of civilization which is built on a moral judgment is bound to fall, as all its predecessors have failed before it. In our systems of ethics we have had the wit to perceive the significance of moral ideals and to declare them necessary and inviolable. In "practical life," however, as we fatuously call it, we have been content to maintain the old cutthroat system of ethics which we inherit from the beasts below us.

And yet one must always be careful not to rail against things as they are. Let us acknowledge they are bad and manfully attempt to right them. It seems to me that wealthy people are really quite as great sufferers from the social evils as the poor are, only their woes are not so apparent. The poor suffer from atrophy of the body; the rich suffer from atrophy of the soul.

Now, I think we all acknowledge that every man has a right to work. But he also has another right which custom does not recognize at all; that is, the right to own the fruit of his work. Under present conditions no matter how hard a workman may toil, no matter how eminently skillful he may be, he is only permitted to retain as much of the wealth he produces as will enable him to live and go on working. The landlord and the usurer get the rest.

This is true of all men who earn a living. The landlord and the capitalists are often, perhaps usually, workmen, too, and earn a good living, as they should. But they make more than they earn; and this is wrong, because it is made out of the earnings of other men—workmen—without the workmen's consent.

Now, the interests of labor and capital are not diverse; they are one. Both classes are bent on the production of wealth. Neither can do a thing without the assistance of the other. They must work by a compact. And yet the proceeds of their joint efforts are not divided according to any mutual agreement. For one party to the compact takes everything and allows the other party a starvation wage. To the simple hearted intelligence this seems a monstrous iniquity. I believe that it is so. Surely every man is entitled to his share of the wealth of the community in proportion to the value and difficulty of the service he renders to that community. Certainly the unintelligent workman cannot expect an equal share with his skillful fellow.

But their shares should differ in proportion to their skill, not in proportion to their chicanery. Capital has to employ labor; it also employs the laborers. But labor, quite as truly, has to employ capital. Why doesn't it employ the capitalists?

No, we shall not have any better state of affairs until we have more honest capitalists and more intelligent workmen—men who will refuse to live on the earnings of others, and men who will refuse to work slavishly for the benefit of others. Until we reach such a grade of intelligence and honesty the more strikes we have the better.

#### PUBLIC SERVANTS AND FREE SPEECH.

An editorial which appeared under the above title in the issue for August 14, of *The Arena*, of Melbourne, Australia.

Mr. Bent's autocratic refusal to hear a representative from the Victorian railway department who wished to make a protest on his fellow employes' behalf against the proposed treatment of them by the government, and the rebuke administered to other employes for disclosing certain figures connected with the department, invite consideration of what checks, if any, should be placed on the freedom of speech of public servants. It is generally assumed that the public service must go to the dogs if officers employed in it are given the right of criticising their superiors, and are not strictly forbidden to make public facts and figures of which their position makes them cognizant. Discipline, it is said, must be maintained, but it is very questionable whether any good results from discipline which denies to public servants the right of free speech which is allowed to other private citizens. For a railway man to adversely criticise the minister of railways on the public platform is generally recognized as a terrible offense which might reasonably be punished with dismissal, and yet the railway man might be in an excellent position to form a useful judgment on departmental matters and help the country of which he and the minister alike are servants by making his opinions and the facts upon which he bases them known to the public. Why should he not do so? The state pays him for his work as an engine driver or a clerk, and employs him for his supposed efficiency in that work, which need be in no way marred by his entertaining an unfavorable opinion of the doings of his superiors. We give our civil servants votes. We

know that they have great political influence, and that influence would surely be more healthy if they were allowed to say what they think on public matters just as happily as those outside the department.

What harm could result to the state if an engine driver, for instance, were allowed to say at a public meeting that he considered the minister an incompetent or an idler? Any man in private employment may say it; any newspaper may spread the opinion broadcast, but in the engine driver such an expression would be condemned and punished, although his capacity or his willingness to do his prescribed work would not suffer one jot in consequence. It may be said that criticism of superiors by inferiors would cause friction in the department, and there is no doubt that the inferior who took upon himself by means of press or platform to find fault with his superior would not increase his chances of promotion, for human nature is but human nature. Of course, on the other hand, by expressing valuable views or exposing some serious abuse a civil servant might enforce recognition of his usefulness and merits. At any rate, in our view the permission of outspoken comment would secure better service to the state than the present state of affairs under which grievances rankle, or are anonymously communicated to members of the press. The military idea of discipline is not properly applicable to civil affairs, nor in the conduct of state departments is secrecy as to figures, finance, or almost any of their dealings conducive to their usefulness. These institutions belong to the public, which wants all possible information concerning them, to order their conduct through its representatives in parliament who are in immediate authority over the departmental officers themselves. From every public servant there is reason for demanding diligence in his duties and absolute obedience in fulfilling his duties, but we doubt if there is any good reason for demanding, out of office hours, abstention from any form of criticism of departmental methods which would be permitted to a citizen not in government employment.

Republicans commit verbal assaults on the trusts and give them privileges. Democrats recognize in them a natural development and are not afraid of their operation when opportunity is made equal.—Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.

#### THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

For The Public.

President Roosevelt is growing more and more strenuous. This is manifested by his recent gymnastics to resuscitate the Monroe doctrine, while ignoring the fact that we ourselves struck the death blow.

The president says: "We believe in the Monroe doctrine, not as a means of aggression at all, it does not mean that we are aggressive toward any power;" but he fails to tell us how we believed in it in 1898—why we changed our belief in that doctrine long enough to grab the Philippines, thus meddling in the affairs of a European nation.

The president then proceeds to render an interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, quite as remarkable as his recent civil service interpretation. He says: "It means merely that as the biggest power on this continent we remain steadfastly true to the principles first formulated under the presidency of Monroe through John Quincy Adams—the principle that this continent must not be treated as a subject for political colonization by any European power."

The president refers to "principles" formulated, and quotes a "principle." Is he ignorant of the second principle underlying the Monroe doctrine? or does he think that the American people are ignorant of it? or has he failed to mention it because we have not remained "steadfastly true" to principle number two?

The substance of the Monroe doctrine is as follows:

Principle 1.—That the American continents were no longer open to the colonization of European nations; that European governments must not extend their system to any part of North or South America, nor oppress nor in any manner seek to control the destiny of any of the nations of this hemisphere.

Principle 2.—That the United States would not meddle in the political affairs of Europe.

The president evidently means to say that we remain "steadfastly true" to principle No. 1, while ignoring the rights of our European neighbors as set forth in the second principle. The Monroe doctrine is all right. It is the spirit of the Golden Rule applied to an international problem. It is the president's one-sided interpretation that is at fault—an interpretation which makes it an arbitrary, selfish thing, dependent upon might for its maintenance—an interpretation which will necessitate the