

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