

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

expense of an increased navy to command its observance. If President Roosevelt is going to wipe out the second principle of the Monroe doctrine by interpretation, as he did the rights of the civil service army, if he is going to continue to meddle in the political quarrels of European powers, if he proposes to police the world, he must prepare to back that policy up with ships and men and money, for Europe will most certainly retaliate.

And that is exactly what President Roosevelt proposes to do. He is not a man of peace; the fever of war is in his blood. This was recognized in Washington during the Cuban campaign, when it was ordered that in the event of battle Roosevelt's regiment should be permitted to go to the front; and doubtless it was a great disappointment to him that he struck Kettle hill, from which the last Spaniard was fleeing, instead of San Juan hill, which had been taken by the Negro troops. Since that day he seems to have brooded upon war. War is his theme. He is spreading broadcast the doctrine of war, and if he is re-elected in 1904 the United States will be plunged into war, if not before that time. The mimic war games going on are in anticipation of the real wars which are almost upon us. When we began meddling in European affairs in '98, we antagonized Germany to the very point of hostilities, and Germany has not forgotten it. Already we have cast covetous eyes upon the British West Indies. That is why we are told "they want annexation." That is another reason why we need an "efficient navy." Any thoughtful person who has had his eyes and his ears open for the past two years knows that we also need an "efficient navy" to benevolently assimilate the South American republics, and a little later, Mexico.

President Roosevelt is now engaged in preparing the American mind for the new conditions and in spurring it on to approve his policy. After interpreting the Monroe doctrine in a way which cannot fail to make trouble with Europe, by ignoring the principle which gave protection to Europe, he says to the American people: "If our formulation consists simply of statements on the stump or on paper, they are not worth the breath that utters them, or the paper on which they are written. Remember, the Monroe doctrine will be

respected as long as we have a first-class navy, and not very much longer." But he failed to tell us that this additional expense upon the taxpayer only became necessary after we ceased to respect the Monroe doctrine ourselves, and only because we repudiate one of its principles.

The president continues to "dare" the American people thus: "In private life he who asserts something, says what he is going to do, and does not back it up, is always a contemptible creature, and as a nation the last thing we can afford to do is to take a position which we do not intend to try to make good."

After this stirring dissertation, which is evidently intended to launch the increased navy, with which we will meet the European powers in whose matters we have meddled and intend to meddle, the president cries: "Shame to us if we assert the Monroe doctrine, and, if our assertion be called in question, show that we have only made an idle boast, that we are not prepared to back up our words by deeds;" which, being interpreted, meaneth, Shame if the American people fail to endorse an interpretation of the Monroe doctrine which will ensure war, and under cover of its smoke enable Roosevelt to make a grand charge and capture a second term.

REBECCA J. TAYLOR.

#### THE OWNERSHIP OF THE RAILROADS.

For The Public.

The irrepressible conflict between the rights and liberties of the people and the arrogance and greed of the railroad cormorants, has reached a critical stage. The coal strike has forcibly demonstrated the danger and folly of intrusting to individuals the control and management of enterprises that are completely monopolistic.

The idea, assiduously inculcated by the privileged classes, that railroads are the private property of the stockholders, is as preposterous as it is pernicious.

Railroads are public, and not private property; the fact that they are managed as if they were private property does not alter their character.

A railroad is a public highway, and its managers are public agents or state officials. It is impossible to regard them in any other light, or conceive any other relation. A railroad that is not managed by public agents is not a public highway. The state could not exercise its right of eminent domain if a railroad was private property. To

take the property of one person and bestow it upon another, even with just compensation, would be such an arbitrary exercise of the sovereign power that no state constitution would tolerate it.

Judge Jeremiah S. Black, of Pennsylvania, one of the ablest jurists this country has produced, clearly defined the legal relations existing between the state and the persons whom she authorizes to manage her highways, in an opinion rendered in the case of the Erie & N. E. R. R. vs. Casey (2 Casey pp. 307-324).

T. F. MONAHAN.

#### JUDGE BLACK'S DECISION.

The authority given by the Act of Assembly of October, 1855, to the defendant to take possession of the railroad is asserted by the plaintiff's counsel to be an act of confiscation—a taking of private property for public use without compensation. If this be true, the injunction ought to be awarded; for no legislature can do such a thing under our constitution. When a corporation is dissolved by the repeal of its charter, the legislature may appoint or authorize the governor to appoint a person to take charge of its assets for the benefit of its creditors and its stockholders; and this is not confiscation, any more than it is confiscation to appoint an administrator to a dead man or a committee for a lunatic. But money or goods or lands which are or were the private property of a defunct corporation, cannot be arbitrarily seized for the use of the state without compensation paid or provided. This act, however, takes nothing but the road. Is that private property? Certainly not. It is a public highway, solemnly devoted by law to the public use. When the lands were taken to build it on they were taken for public use; otherwise they could not have been taken at all. It is true the plaintiffs had a right to take tolls from all who traveled or carried freight upon it according to certain rates fixed in the charter, but that was a mere franchise, a privilege derived entirely from the charter, and it was gone when the charter was repealed. The state may grant to a corporation or to an individual the franchise of taking tolls on any highway, open or to be opened, whether it be a railroad or river, canal or bridge, turnpike or common road. When the franchise ceases by its own limitation, by forfeiture or by repeal, the highway is thrown back on the hands of the state, and it becomes her duty as the sovereign guardian of the public interests to take care of it. She may renew the franchise, give it to some other person, exercise it herself, or declare the highway open and free to all the people. If the railway itself was the private property of the stockholders, then it remains theirs, and